

DOCUMENTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MISSION STATEMENT OF FACULTY BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee, Committee Chair Brian Roberts (government) submitted the following proposal to change the function of the committee. The rationale is provided in the attached impact statement.

On October 28, 2014, the Committee on Committees unanimously endorsed the proposal; on October 31, 2014, the Faculty Council Executive Committee also recommended approval.

The secretary has classified this proposal as legislation of *general* interest. The Faculty Council will consider the proposal at its meeting on November 17, 2014. Final approval resides with the president.

Handwritten signature of Dean Neikirk, followed by the initials "SGF".

Dean Neikirk, Secretary
General Faculty and Faculty Council

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE MISSION STATEMENT OF FACULTY BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Changes over time to the process by which significant building projects at The University of Texas at Austin are funded, prioritized, and reviewed have tended to erode the mission and effectiveness of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee (FBAC). If meaningful faculty governance in this arena is desired, then the committee suggests changes to the FBAC mission. First, some background on the history and role of the FBAC.

Background

The FBAC has a storied history. Formally constituted in 1922 under the firm leadership of William Battle, the committee played a central role in guiding the implementation of some of the most iconic and enduring design concepts of the 40 Acres. At that time the campus handled the architectural design and funding of capital projects internally, permitting close oversight of the execution of campus building master plans.

In a process that accelerated rapidly with the advent of the 1999 campus master plan – known more familiarly as the “Pelli” plan – the means by which building projects were prioritized, funded, and reviewed put burdens on the FBAC that were often beyond the professional capacities of most of its members. To address the need for timely and informed feedback, the substantive work of the FBAC was increasingly delegated to a smaller, more nimble and engaged subcommittee that, in turn, reported back recommendations to the full committee for what, candidly, often became mechanical approval. Some elements of the FBAC’s formal charge, e.g., setting priorities for building construction, have long been ceded to other decision making bodies and processes on campus.

The roots of diminished role of the FBAC lie with fundamental changes in the process by which building projects emerge on campus. Considerable power has devolved to the academic deans, who raise significant funds to pay for new or substantially renovated buildings, either in the form of gifts or, more recently, by drawing on internal funds. The ability to muster such funding increasingly dictates campus construction priorities, which are formally approved on campus as part of the university’s Capital Improvement Plan overseen by the Facilities and Space Council headed by President Powers and, ultimately, by the Board of Regents. The effective (and perceived programmatic need for) geographic segregation of most colleges and schools, the current building density on campus, and the embracing of campus master plan recommendations significantly limit the footprint options for new buildings. With the Campus Master Planning Committee (CMPC) becoming operational this past spring there was little, if anything, left of the FBAC’s formal mandate not dealt with by other means on campus, thus raising some rather pointed existential issues.

In an effort to resolve some of these issues, a meeting of the FBAC on April 30, 2014, was devoted to reevaluating the committee’s mission, and even its existence. Present at the meeting were, in addition to current FBAC members, two past chairs of the FBAC – Austin Gleeson and Sam Wilson – and, to represent the Faculty Council, Hillary Hart.

A strong consensus emerged from this meeting that the Faculty Building Advisory Committee can and should coexist with the CMPC while retaining an important role on campus. The mission of the FBAC must evolve in ways that avoid redundancy with the CMPC and engender a strong sense of efficacy among its members.

As committee chair, Brian Roberts was empowered to bring forward mission recommendations to the Faculty Council to help realize these goals. To that end, a subsequent meeting with the chair of the CMPC – Fritz Steiner – and Pat Clubb, VP of University Operations, was held in an effort to clearly define the respective roles of the CMPC and the FBAC. The division of labor that was discussed sought to leverage the distinct differences in representation on the two committees. All agreed that the campus cannot lose the perspective that the far more diverse membership of the FBAC brings to facilities discussions; the FBAC members simply experience the campus differently than those of a committee dominated primarily by representatives of one, relatively small school. It is that breadth of experience, rather than the technical wherewithal to deal with the challenges of building design, that should be the foundation for the FBAC’s mission.

The suggested mission language below is meant to capture a vision of faculty governance that is strategic rather than project-specific, but not so far removed from actual decision making that committee recommendations carry no meaningful weight.

Proposed Mission Statement

FUNCTION: To represent the faculty, staff, and students in matters related to the planning and programming of buildings. The committee shall solicit and serve as the conduit for campus-wide faculty input into the nature and direction of existing building initiatives and the broader building planning process on campus and convey those concerns to all affected stakeholders. The committee will monitor the proposed and actual responses to these faculty concerns in the design and construction of new and significantly renovated buildings, and it shall report both the concerns and the responses to the president and periodically to the Faculty Council. No less than annually will the committee meet separately with representatives of extant master planning and public arts committees. A representative of the committee (generally, the chair) shall serve on the Campus Master Planning Committee, or its equivalent. A member of the committee may, when appropriate, be appointed by the president as a voting member to a special committee created during the preparation of the preliminary plans for the erection of a particular building, to serve until the completion thereof.

Proposed mission statement to replace current Function description:

FUNCTION: To represent the faculty, staff, and students in the planning and programming of buildings. The committee shall have a strong voice in (a) campus master planning, (b) priority of building construction, (c) building location, (d) programming of buildings, and (e) reviewing and recommending of final plans. It shall report to the president and periodically to the Faculty Council. During the preparation of the preliminary plans for the erection of a particular building, the president shall appoint a special committee, composed of faculty (and students, when appropriate) who have a direct interest in the proposed building, to serve until the completion thereof, one of whom shall be designated as a voting member of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee for the specified building. Whenever a building is to include library facilities, the University librarian is to be added as an administrative advisor to the special committee.

We do not suggest any changes to the current size or composition of the FBAC.

COMPOSITION: Nine voting members of the General Faculty, including a representative from the School of Architecture, and one member of the University staff, all appointed by the President for five-year terms. Two undergraduate students appointed by the President from a panel of names submitted by Student Government, and one graduate student from a panel submitted by the Graduate Student Assembly. Students shall serve one-year terms and shall be eligible for reappointment. The students may not be from the same college or school. In addition, every year the Chair of the Faculty Council shall appoint two voting faculty members of the Faculty Council for one-year terms. Each year, the committee shall elect its own Chair and Vice Chair who shall be voting faculty members of the committee. The Vice President for University Operations or a delegate shall be an ex officio member. The UT System Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities Planning and Construction and a representative from the Office of Campus Planning and Facilities Management shall serve as administrative advisors without vote.

**POLICY IMPACT STATEMENT FOR
FACULTY LEGISLATION IMPACTING THE HOP**

Please submit one Policy Impact Statement for each policy under consideration.

Submission Date: November 17, 2014 Sponsor: Faculty Council
 Contact within Faculty Council Office: Debbie Roberts x1-8506
 Executive Level Sponsor: Executive Vice President and Provost

Corresponding Faculty Legislation Number: D 11939-11941

Policy Memorandum (PM) Title: Standing Committees of the General Faculty-Institutional Policy or Governance Committees

HOP # (if revision): 2-1060-PM (formerly HOP 1.503)

I. Background and Policy Rationale

A. Why is this policy or revision necessary?

- Legal Regulatory UT System driven
 Financial Social Requirement Operational/Operational Efficiency
 Current University policy is outdated Technological
 Other: Change the function of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee (C5, FBAC).

B. Please provide a brief supporting explanation.

Changes over time to the process by which significant building projects at The University of Texas at Austin are funded, prioritized, and reviewed have tended to erode the mission and effectiveness of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee. If meaningful faculty governance in this arena is desired, then the committee suggests changes to the Faculty Building Advisory Committee mission. The mission of the Faculty Building Advisory Committee must evolve in ways that avoid redundancy with the Campus Master Planning Committee and engender a strong sense of efficacy among its members.

C. What foreseeable advantages will this policy bring to the University?

The proposed change is meant to capture a vision of faculty governance that is strategic rather than project-specific, but not so far removed from actual decision making that committee recommendations carry no meaningful weight.

II. Policy Impact

List University community members affected by this policy: Academic deans, Facilities and Space Council, and the Campus Master Planning Committee.

III. Policy Development & Approval

A. Identify key stakeholders, affected parties and governance groups who have been consulted in review of this faculty legislation:

- General Faculty Standing Committee:** Faculty Building Advisory Committee
 Faculty Council Executive Committee **Faculty Council** **Provost's Office**
 University Policy Office **Legal Affairs**

B. Institutional approval of this policy memoranda amendment resides with:

- Executive Vice President and Provost** **President**

Preliminary review and recommendation for approval provided by the Faculty Council Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees.

C. Following institutional approval, this faculty legislation requires:

- UT System review and approval** **UT System notification**
 No further notification required

Attached to this Policy Impact Statement form is the proposed policy showing tracked revisions. If this is a new policy, label it as "New" in the header box of the policy.

 , SGF

Submitted by:

Authorized Signature- Responsible Policy Owner

November 17, 2014

Date

Questions about this form may be directed to: Leekeshia Williams,
<mailto:leekeshia.williams@austin.utexas.edu>, or by calling 471-0594.

For University Policy Office Administrative Review Below

Assigned Policy Office Case Number: _____