

DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES OF THE GENERAL FACULTY
AND
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of April 17, 1989, published below, have been prepared for the immediate use of the members of the University Council and are included in its Documents and proceedings. They are also included in the Documents and Minutes of the General Faculty for the information of the members.

H. Paul Kelley
H. Paul Kelley, Secretary
The General Faculty

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF APRIL 17, 1989

The third regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1988-1989 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, April 17, 1989, at 2:15 p.m. President William H. Cunningham presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: James Q. Aldrete, Lee E. Baker, Mark E. Bernstein, Harold W. Billings, Daniel A. Bonevac, Robert E. Boyer, Oscar G. Brockett, Billye J. Brown, Ronald M. Brown, Ralph W. Cain, Andrew M. Cooper, William H. Cunningham, R. Conrad Doenges, James T. Doluisio, John R. Durbin, Fred P. Ellison, Gerhard J. Fonken, Wallace T. Fowler, Gary P. Freeman, Alan W. Friedman, R. LaVerne Gallman, William W. Gibson, Jr., Mario J. Gonzalez, David B. Gracy, II, Maureen M. Grasso, Mark F. Hamilton, Linda J. Hayes, William L. Hays, Joan A. Holladay, Michael J. Hulbert, Robert C. Jeffrey, Judith A. Jellison, Gaylord A. Jentz, Malia S. Johnson, Sharon H. Justice, H. Paul Kelley, Robert D. King, James L. Kinneavy, Kenneth W. Kirk, Karrol A. Kitt, William R. Koch, Desmond F. Lawler, William S. Livingston, John C. Loehlin, David R. Maidment, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Priscilla P. Nelson, Patrick L. Parker, Shirley B. Perry, Gene R. Powers, Brenda I. Preyer, James P. Ray, Paul A. Schweizer, Maurice J. Sevigny, Edwin R. Sharpe, Jr., Max R. Sherman, Teresa A. Sullivan, William O. S. Sutherland, Jr., H. Eldon Sutton, Michael J. Whellan, Walter Wilczynski, Martha S. Williams, J. Robert Wills, Paul B. Woodruff, Herbert H. Woodson, Mark G. Yudof.

Absent: Rosalie N. Ambrosino (excused), John R. Barbaret, Frank N. Bash (excused), Lance Bertelsen, Shirley F. Binder (excused), J. Harold Box (excused), Cindy I. Carlson, Heather L. Carter, Evan B. Carton, Nell B. Dale (excused), Wayne A. Danielson (excused), Elizabeth W. Fernea, G. Charles Franklin, Austin M. Gleeson (excused), Anibal Gonzalez-Perez,

Susan G. Hadden, Thomas M. Hatfield (excused), Elaine K. Horwitz, Kevin F. Morrow (excused), Waneen W. Spirduso (excused), Roxanne K. Williamson, Jack H. Wilmore (excused), Robert E. Witt (excused), Ronald E. Wyllys (excused).

Total members present: 66 Total members absent: 24

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

A. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 21, 1988 (D&P 12165-12262/D&M 17874-17971). (APPROVED)

The Minutes of the meeting of November 21, 1988 (D&P 12165-12262/D&M 17874-17971) were APPROVED as distributed.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 12281-12297).

The Secretary's Report (D&P 12281-12297) had been distributed prior to the meeting.

III. DISCUSSION OF SECRETARY'S REPORT -- None.

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. QUESTION CONCERNING THE STATUS OF PREMIUM SHARING FOR GRADUATE STUDENT EMPLOYEES.

Alan W. Friedman (English), Chair of the Faculty Senate, requested an update on the status of premium sharing for graduate student employees. President Cunningham read the following statement:

"Premium sharing is one of the most difficult and frustrating problems I have dealt with since I have been President of The University of Texas at Austin. Please permit me to provide you some history concerning premium sharing.

"Premium sharing was made available to state employees for the first time in September, 1967. The Teacher Retirement statute was modified in 1977 at the request of graduate students from U.T. Austin to exclude all graduate student employees from being members of the state Teacher Retirement System. The Insurance Code was modified in 1983; this modification stated that to be eligible for premium sharing state employees had to be eligible for membership in the Teacher Retirement System. There is no evidence that the legislature intended the 1983 modification in the Insurance Code to prohibit premium sharing for part-time graduate students, and the problem was not identified by the University auditor, the state auditor, the LBB, the legislature, or anyone else.

"The University continued after the change in the Teacher Retirement statute in 1977 and the modification in the Insurance Code in 1983 to request premium sharing for part-time graduate students, and the legislature continued to fund premium sharing for the students. The Administrative Council of the Coordinating Board ruled on February 19, 1988, that there was a conflict of laws and, while the University had been appropriated funds to pay for premium sharing for graduate students by the legislature, the Insurance Code indicated that the money could not be used for premium sharing....

"Needless to say, it took the University some time to respond. We had to evaluate and try to understand several factors -- the conflict in law between the Appropriations Act and the Insurance Code; we did not know if the decision by the Administrative Council of The Coordinating Board could be appealed; we were uncertain how to handle the rest of the Spring Semester 1988 payments, as well as the Summer 1988 payments; and we did not know what we could do with the funds that had been appropriated by the legislature for premium sharing but could not be used for premium sharing.

"I made a decision that while the funds that had been appropriated by the legislature for premium sharing could be used for any legitimate University purpose, as the result of the transferability provision in the Appropriations Bill, we would use the funds for salary supplements for our graduate students or we would return the funds to the state -- that is, I simply did not feel that it was fair to use those funds for something other than what the legislature had intended, even if technically we could. The U.T. System General Council ruled that the funds that had been appropriated by the legislature for premium sharing could be used as a salary supplement, and a decision was made to use the funds in that manner. A memo was sent to all graduate student employees on May 5, 1988, that tried to clarify the premium sharing, salary supplement issue. The memo stated, 'The supplement will be \$115 per month for each student employee during the period of his or her 1988-1989 appointment.'

"Ed Sharpe and a group of graduate students and administrators have worked since last summer to provide advice and counsel to the central administration about premium sharing. Ed has also worked with the leaders of COGS in an informal manner to keep the lines of communication open with respect to premium sharing and to receive their input. I provided testimony on March 20, 1989, in the House, and on March 29, 1989, in the Senate in support of the legislation that would permit the University to provide premium sharing for our graduate students. I anticipate I will testify in the near future concerning a bill that would provide funds from the state to pay for premium sharing for all half-time employed graduate students.

"This brings us up-to-date with one exception -- the House Appropriation Bill calls for the University to repay the state six million dollars during the next biennium. We are working very hard to try to prevent this repayment from being part of the final appropriations bill.

"In summary, we are trying to accomplish three objectives -- first, to gain statutory authority to pay graduate student employees premium sharing benefits in future years; second, to secure the funds for paying premium sharing through the appropriations process in future years; and third, to convince the legislature that the University should not be penalized for providing our graduate student employee benefits in past years."

As a follow-up question, James L. Kinneavy (English) asked whether money from the Available University Fund could be used to pay benefits for the summer for part-time graduate students employed only for the 9-month academic year. President Cunningham said it could not; state law says that a person has to be employed in order to be paid.

B. QUESTION CONCERNING EXPANSION OF THE PREVIEW PROGRAM.

James P. Ray (Students' Association) said: "Last fall we passed a resolution recommending enhancement of the Preview Program by this summer [to at least] 100 students. At the time you [said that] a proposal to expand it to 250 students [had been submitted to] the Legislature. With the Legislature in session, it seems [unlikely that that proposal will be approved. What is the status of U.T. Austin's] commitment to expanding that program?"

President Cunningham replied: "We think the Preview Program is one of the most successful programs we have ever had on campus, and we want to expand that program. I am confident that over time we will expand the program. We asked for funds for 250 students for that program, [but those funds were deleted] very early in the appropriation process. We are not in the position this summer to expand that program, with the limits we have on the budget and also with the uncertainty that we have in the budget. But I would say once again that there is no question that that is an important program; it has been successful. There are some other programs, such as Supplemental Instruction, [that] we are expanding next fall that ... seem to have the same kind of impact that the Preview Program has; [they are] not necessarily cheaper, they are just different ways of solving the problem. [The Preview Program] is an important program for us, and over time it will be expanded."

C. QUESTION CONCERNING THE STATUS OF THE TEXAS ACADEMIC SKILLS PROGRAM (TASP).

Michael J. Whellan (Students' Association) requested "a quick summary of what has happened with the remedial testing program. Rumor has it that a test was given and [that] there have been some results...."

President Cunningham reported that the first administration of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) test had been held and that a higher percentage of people passed than had been anticipated. However, the persons who took the test at the first administration were not a representative sample of the group who will eventually have to take the test. "We are going to have a problem at the University, but the problem at this institution is not going to be the same kind of problem that a lot of other institutions in the state are going to face because of the quality of students we have at U.T. Austin...."

Gerhard J. Fonken (Executive Vice President and Provost) noted that U.T. Austin has been working with the Austin Community College so as to maximize the use of resources at both institutions.

H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) added that 81% of the candidates at the first TASP administration passed all three parts (Reading, Writing, Mathematics). The passing percentages were much higher than were projected for the state as a whole, both for the majority and the ethnic minority groups. This, in large part, was due to the unrepresentativeness of the sample of students who took the first test. Somewhere between 75% and 80% of them were already in college; they were students applying for admission to teacher certification programs. Only 6% of the students who were high school seniors were planning to enter community colleges; whereas well over 60% of entering college freshmen will, in fact, enter community colleges. Over half of the prospective college freshmen that took the TASP test were planning to come to U.T. Austin or to Texas A&M University. The passing rates in subsequent groups of examinees will not be as high, but it is too early to tell what they will be. However, there does seem to be evidence that the essentially untimed nature of the test is going to result in somewhat higher passing rates than were true of the Pre-Professional Skills Test, which was used for teacher certification students in the past.

President Cunningham concluded: "If the question is, 'Are we prepared to deal with the students?', we are not today but we will be by the time the students arrive on campus."

D. QUESTION CONCERNING STUDENT HEALTH INSURANCE.

At the request of Gary Freeman (Government), privileges of the floor were extended to Erik A. Devereux, former President of the Council of Graduate Students (COGS) and University Council student representative-elect. Mr. Devereux said: "I wrote a column [that] was published in the Texan on Friday, and I suggested that it looks like we might be on the way to mandatory student health insurance. I would like to be wrong. I would like to ask the President if he could guarantee to this body that student health insurance will not be mandatory on this campus either in the next academic year or the one to follow."

President Cunningham replied: "Of course I cannot [guarantee that]. Let me tell you where we are. There is a variety of alternatives [that] range from no salary supplements or premium sharing, depending on what happens with the Legislature, all the way up to full salary supplements or premium sharing like we have had in the past. We are looking at alternatives in terms of 'grandfathering' some students who are already students at U.T. Austin. We are looking at smaller premiums or smaller supplements that we would provide, depending on funds. We are looking at student insurance. We have to look at all of those alternatives; those have been under review for some time, and they will continue to be under review. The biggest problem we have is that we simply do not know ... what the law is going to say, ... we do not know whether the state is going to provide us with any funds for this program, and ... we do not know what our appropriations bill is going to be like. If we are funded at our full formula basis, it would be relatively easy to handle this issue in a variety of ways; but we are not going to be. If you take a look at the [appropriations] bill in the House, it is a tough bill on the University. If you take a look at the appropriations bill in the Senate, it will work. We are a long ways from knowing what kind of resources the University is going to have; as a result, we just have to wait until we know what the whole picture is before we start making anyone any kind of guarantees."

Mr. Devereux clarified the meaning of his question: "I have not had anything to do with health benefits for graduate students now for nearly a week, ... and I will have nothing to do with it in the future. My job as a representative from the Cabinet of College Councils will be to represent the broad [range of] students covered by the Cabinet of College Councils. I should have prefaced my question [by stating that] I do not mean in respect to graduate employees at The University of Texas; I mean, will the student health insurance program offered by the U.T. System be mandatory for all students otherwise not insured?"

President Cunningham responded: "I have no idea. I would not anticipate [that it] would be mandatory this year."

E. COMMENTS CONCERNING THE COUNCIL OF GRADUATE STUDENTS (COGS).

At the request of David R. Maidment (Civil Engineering) privileges of the floor were extended to Stanley O.D. Gaines, Jr., a former president of the Council of Graduate Students (COGS). Mr. Gaines commented: "I ... want to clarify a couple of things that may have come up in your minds during the past week. As you know, last Tuesday the current set of COGS officers, as well as nearly 30 representatives, resigned in protest over certain key information not being handed down to them. At that point it was announced that the Council of Graduate Students was officially disbanded. However, since then a group of graduate students has worked to rebuild the Council of Graduate Students, and in fact this Thursday we will hold a meeting ... to discuss the election of new COGS officers."

The faculty adviser to COGS, Dr. David Maidment, has been in contact with Vice Presidents Livingston and Sharpe to discuss possibly reopening the avenues of communication. So I extend an offer to [President Cunningham] and to the Vice Presidents to continue to be in contact with us as we attempt to rebuild the organization, and especially to continue dialogue on the premium sharing issue."

President Cunningham replied: "I was disappointed to see the past COGS officers resign, and of course I would be very pleased to see new COGS officers elected. I can assure you that our offices will continue to be open to COGS, as [they have] been in the past. Thank you very much; we appreciate what you are doing in the University's best interest."

F. COMMENTS CONCERNING BENEFITS FOR GRADUATE STUDENT EMPLOYEES.

Desmond F. Lawler (Civil Engineering) said: "I would just like to make a couple of comments and maybe a plea for the future. The comments are that it appears that the handling of the situation over the last year has led to a serious morale problem among the graduate students, and whether there were any choices on various people's parts in that or not, I am not really sure, because I do not know all of the details. But I think that we have a real problem on campus now with the graduate students that should be addressed in as open a manner as possible. Secondly, I would like to comment that I think that to run a really first-class university it takes excellent faculty, excellent facilities and excellent students; I think that we have that in place now, but our recruiting efforts for next year and potentially in the future are, I think, significantly damaged by this issue of health benefits. And I think it is really critical to the continued creation of a first-class university to have excellent student benefits, particularly for graduate students who will be supported while here. So I would like to encourage you to work absolutely as diligently as possible to bring back something very similar to what we have had in the past, because I think it is very important to the University."

President Cunningham replied: "We have worked very hard for a long time to try to solve this problem. I know it is an emotional problem, and I understand that honest people can disagree about it; I have no problem with that. But I think you should understand that there are not a lot of representatives from other institutions down [at the Legislature] working with us to try to solve the problem; this has been a burden that U.T. Austin and the U.T. System ... have to bear.... I would also say that U.T. Austin has been the school that has provided benefits since 1967, when our sister institutions in the state have not. I would also say that while it is taking time to get to a solution on this, U.T. Austin is the institution that provided the highest amount of salary supplement compared to any other institution in the state. We provided the full \$115; I believe the University of Houston provided \$100. All I want to say to you is that I [cannot] guarantee you today how this is

going to work out; if you all want that, I just cannot help you. What I will guarantee you is that we will do everything humanly possible to solve the problem, and that is all we can say.... With any luck we will be successful, but we have got a long way to go and we are not there yet.... We will do our best to keep you informed about what is happening."

Because of appointments at the Legislature, President Cunningham had to leave the meeting at this point. He turned the Chair over to Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies William S. Livingston.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS - None.

VI. PETITIONS - None.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - None.

VIII. REPORTS.

A. REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE. (RECEIVED)

Alan W. Friedman (English), Chair of the Faculty Senate, reported: "I just want to bring the Council up to date on a few items that the Senate has acted on over the last few months. First ..., you have on your agenda for later in the meeting a document which was produced by the Faculty Senate Library Committee; it is [Item] IX. E. I would like to make two comments about that. First of all, that was not meant to be offered for action; that is simply a report, an information item that we are sharing with the Council, and no action is requested or required. Second of all, with Mr. Billings' permission, I would like to read a brief note that he wrote to John Loehlin in response to that report: 'Dear John: Thank you very much for the generally excellent report and recommendation from the 1988-89 Faculty Senate Library Committee. The two topics most specifically addressed by the committee this year are important to the entire campus community, and your work should be helpful to the library administration and to our users alike as we continue efforts to improve procedures and services. We will treat the recommendations as thoughtfully and practically as we can. Sincerely, Harold Billings, Director of General Libraries.' I would just ... comment briefly that I am very pleased at the way this has worked out. I think the library has received a bit more notice and prominence over the last couple of years because of efforts on the part of a number of people, most especially John Loehlin, who is Chair of the Senate committee, and Harold Billings, who has cooperated so beautifully with that committee. I think it has all been to the good of everyone. I think it is a model of how such committees should work and how administrators can properly respond to their efforts. So we are very pleased about that.

"[Second,] we passed a resolution concerning the Salman Rushdie business at the request of some faculty members from the Department of History. If you saw the New York Times editorial in yesterday's paper, you will understand that the issue remains a live one. There continue

to be actions and threats to various freedoms and lives as a result of the action taken in response to Salman Rushdie's book, Satanic Verses, and we are pleased to report to you the action that we unanimously took in response to that.

"Third, we passed a resolution a little while back at the request of the Student Health Center Alcohol/Drug Liaison Committee in which we requested that the Port Isabel and South Padre Island Chamber of Commerce cease sponsoring the Bud Beach Club Spring Break Action, which encourages college students, most of them under age, to come down and party and drink. The whole business looks slightly eerie and prescient in retrospect at the moment, and I point it out only because it seems to me that the University has an obligation in this regard, not to control people's lives, but to stay within the law with regard to what it offers its students and what it encourages them to do.

"Finally, we passed two resolutions endorsing bills that are before the Legislature, the first having to do with the establishment of a state-wide advisory committee to the Governor on regental appointments, and the second having to do with the appointment of a faculty regent to each board in the state."

There were no questions or comments in response to the report.

IX. NEW BUSINESS.

A. PROPOSED MEETING DATES FOR 1989-1990 (D&P 12265). (APPROVED)

Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) MOVED that the proposed meeting dates for the University Council in 1989-1990 (D&P 12265) be approved. The motion was seconded and APPROVED without discussion.

B. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE "FOWLER REPORT" RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT SUBSTANTIAL WRITING COMPONENT COURSES (D&P 12270-12273). (CARRIED OVER TO NEXT MEETING; MORE INFORMATION REQUESTED)

Joseph J. Lagowski (Chemistry), Chair, presented the report of the Educational Policy Committee on the substantial writing component courses (D&P 12270-12273), which had been distributed in advance. "You also were handed as you came [into the meeting] a modification of those recommendations, [prepared] by Sullivan and Kinneavy of this body. The Educational Policy Committee yields to the details as expressed by Sullivan and Kinneavy, and I will just let them present what they want to do with this particular report."

On behalf of the Committee, Reuben R. McDaniel (Management) MOVED that the University Council approve the recommendations from the Educational Policy Committee, and the motion was seconded. Vice President Livingston reminded the Council that final action could not be taken on the motion at this meeting because of the date on which the proposal had been distributed.

James L. Kinneavy (English) asked the Council members to refer to the document they received when they arrived at the meeting (see Attachment A). "I would like to preface this with a few remarks. First of all, we think that the four areas of concern which the Committee isolated are ... the major areas of concern: access, accountability, flexibility, and resources; all that our report is is an attempt to take on the spirit and the strengths of that report and make them a little bit more concrete and a little bit more specific. I do not ... think that in any major area we are going contrary to the intentions of the report or the spirit of the report. There was a lengthy discussion of this issue on the floor of the Faculty Senate two weeks ago, and what we have attempted to do is to incorporate into our changes and recommendations the gist of those remarks that we thought were salient.

"Let me then point out to you what those issues are, [but] before I say that, let me just say that I hope we can do this right this time. This has been going on for a good number of years ..., and I am very concerned with this personally. I teach one of these courses every semester; last semester I taught two. I was involved with the inception of this program when the people from the University of Michigan came down here and explained to us the model upon which our program was based. I still think it is a very good model. The Michigan model has been going on for some 10 years, and it has been a very successful model. I think also that what we have done in five years is very commendable. Our program now dwarfs the Michigan model. We offer 400 courses a semester; the Michigan model, which is considered a marvelous achievement across the country, offers 75 courses a semester. So ... we have something that we can really be proud of, and I would just like to solidify that, refine it, and improve it.

"Our suggestions are, then, as follows. If you will turn to our report ... the first page is just a preamble and a reminder of some of the recommendations of the Vick Committee. The four motions of the [Educational Policy] Committee we have adopted and modified.... [In] the first proposal, having to do with access, we simply [changed the term 'college' to 'college or school']. We do not want to change [the nature of the recommendation]; what I would like to do is to point out its impact. If you will turn to the last page of the handout you received, I was concerned [about] what would happen if this goes through. I had never seen any comparable figures, and so I had to put together over the weekend a way so that I could understand the impact of this motion. As I understand it, it will be something like this. I examined the courses from three semesters -- Spring 1987, Fall 1988, and Spring 1989. I have only given you on ... the handout the analysis of Fall 1988, but they are all fairly similar. I have attempted to show in the first column the number of SWC courses which are offered.... There are about 24 overlaps of courses that you might subtract from the total if you wanted to, but it is not going to change the general picture. Column 2 [is] the percentage of total SWC courses offered by each college; ... for instance, Architecture offers 5 courses out of 412, and that is approximately 1%. ... Column 3 is the percentage of the undergraduate enrollment.

"What I was looking for was ... an alignment between column 2 and column 3, and I was really pleasantly surprised to see that most of the colleges align fairly nicely, with four exceptions. The ... most notable exception is Liberal Arts. [The College of] Liberal Arts teaches 217 courses out of 412, which accounts for 53% of the offerings, but it enrolls only 28% of the people.

"The other side of that coin is the College of Business Administration, which teaches 44 courses, which is about 11%, but they enroll 23%; so there is a disparity there which I think this recommendation addresses. As I read it, it looks as if Business Administration is going to have to add a sizable number of courses.

"[Another large] disparity is with the College of Education; it teaches 1% of the courses and enrolls 5.5% of the [students]. You can interpret that to mean that they must quintuple their courses if this goes into effect. There is a very good reason, by the way, for the College of Education's figures. The Education majors have to take 12 hours of English, and so most of the Education majors almost automatically get their substantial writing courses in English; that is why [Education has] not bothered to set up any courses. I am not apologizing for them; I am simply pointing out some facts.

"Another interesting disparity is [with the College of] Natural Sciences, which teaches 6% of the courses and enrolls 15% [of the students]. So [the number of courses would have to be more than doubled]. Those are the three colleges [Business Administration, Education, and Natural Sciences] which this particular resolution would affect fairly sizably. I still think that we ought to go ahead with the resolution, however.

"With regard to flexibility, we changed the flexibility argument in three or four ways. If you will take a look at our amended recommendation I will point out the differences. 'We RECOMMEND that The University's Substantial Writing Component requirement be fulfilled by passing any two courses (except E.306 and E.316K), ...' The original document allows ... any dean [to] say E.306 and E.316K [may be] counted [as SWC courses]; in effect, any dean could destroy the program any time he wanted to. So I think that has to be amended.

"Next, '... each of which is certified by the SWC committee of the college or school in which the course is offered to fill the criteria previously established....' This is a change; [the EPC's recommendation put] it into the hands of the dean; I think it ought to be in the hands of the faculty.... I also think that ... the SWC committee of the college or school offering the course ought to have the right to make that decision, not any dean from across the University. So that is just an attempt to clarify that.

"The rest of it is just about the same except that the latter part reads, '...; several drafts of a large paper (requiring additional orig

writing, not merely editing) can be considered separate writing activities.' That is an attempt to get at one large paper [for] which there are several drafts and to consider that as meeting the requirement. I would have no objection with [that]; I do not think the Michigan people would, either.

"Lastly, 'One of the SWC courses must be an upper-division course.' If the first recommendation goes through, this is almost going to be automatic anyway." Mr. Kinneavy then announced that Teresa Sullivan would speak to the next two issues.

Teresa A. Sullivan (Sociology) first asked if Mr. Lagowski had accepted the proposed changes in the EPC Recommendations 1 and 2. Mr. Lagowski indicated that he had. Ms. Sullivan then said: "The accountability recommendation, [EPC Recommendation 3, has been] modified slightly. The reason we have modified it [is that], although it originally provided for administrators to know how many [seats] were available in the courses, we think it is also important for students to know. Any of you who have been working with undergraduates looking for Substantial Writing courses know the frustration they feel because so many of these classes are closed and they do not know how many [seats] are available and in what department. Our practice of cross-listing, while it has many advantages, also contributes to the difficulty in accountability. For example, this semester we [have] a single Substantial Writing Component course which is cross-listed as Germanic Civilization 360E, European Studies 361, Psychology 341K, Sociology 352M, and Women's Studies 345. [It] sounds as if we have five separate courses but, in fact, it is the same course; therefore there are not 150 [seats] available, there are only 30. It seems to me it would be useful if we could tell students that when they are ready to register.

"The final set of recommendations are, perhaps, the most difficult and the most controversial, because [they deal] with resources. One issue the Fowler Committee spent considerable time on, I am told, is the current lack of incentives for faculty members to teach Substantial Writing courses. This lack of incentives seems to be leading to diminishing returns in some departments -- that is, there was initial enthusiasm about offering the sections, but as time goes on it is harder and harder to recruit people to ... teach those sections. There are admittedly few rewards for doing so. One of the issues, of course, is simply Teaching Assistants. The recommendation about Teaching Assistants that we have offered here suggests that Teaching Assistants for the Writing Component courses be recognized as a separate and important funding issue for the University. At present very few of the Substantial Writing Component courses have access to a Teaching Assistant. The recommendation that we retained from the original report of the Educational Policy Committee speaks to the training of those Teaching Assistants; [we] recommended that the Center for Teaching Effectiveness or other [appropriate] agencies organize and conduct workshops for those Teaching Assistants.

"Additional incentives we have suggested include increasing the workload points for a Substantial Writing Component course by giving it the graduate multiplier. The reason for this is [that], at the moment, to teach a Substantial Writing Component course with 30 students involves far more work than teaching the same course [to] 30 students but not in a Substantial Writing Component course. As a result some faculty members who previously taught a [SWC] course have now dropped [the SWC from the course], thereby dropping their own workload very effectively.

"Perhaps less difficult to implement but equally worthy of consideration is our Recommendation 4c: 'We RECOMMEND that successful teaching of SWC courses be given positive considerations in annual reviews for promotion and merit raises.' Right now, when the annual evaluation checklist is filled out, it has boxes for things like 'Taught a lower-division course,' 'Taught an upper-division course;' but there is not even a place to indicate that this faculty member went beyond the requirements of the job and taught a Substantial Writing Component course. Even that rather minimal incentive today is lacking. So this is simply a recommendation to try to find some ways to give faculty members an occasional pat on the back for the hard work that goes into teaching a Substantial Writing Component course.

"Like Professor Kinneavy, I also teach such a course. Although I do find it a rewarding experience, I find it enormously time-consuming, and I think that has been the experience of all of us who teach them. I fear that if we do not find some way to build incentives into the teaching of these courses, we will have fewer and fewer faculty willing to teach them, and that even if we do not intend to make the requirement a dead letter, the practical impact for our students will be a frustrating trek from department to department looking for one of the few remaining [SWC] courses."

Mr. Kinneavy added: "We overlooked one item. If you will take a look at [our Recommendation] 3b, ... this is new; I am a little hesitant about it, but ... we are going to recommend it, anyway. We suggest another dimension of accountability. I think that the first dimension had to do with quantitative accountability, and this has to do with qualitative accountability. 'We RECOMMEND that each college or school SWC committee establish a method of periodically monitoring the quality of the writing in SWC classes in a way that respects the anonymity of teachers and students.' ... The Michigan program does not monitor the courses; it chose not to do that for reasons that I guess are obvious to everybody. Yet, other programs have been tried and not monitored, and [they have] failed. I think that an anonymous monitoring whenever possible, say every three years, or maybe every two years, with just some high-grade papers and some low-grade papers from classes would at least tell us if this program is working or not. So I think that one aspect of accountability ought to be at least a periodic review of what is happening in that particular college. It would not be done by a University-wide committee; you will notice that we did not insist on a University-wide committee. We think that each college ought to preserve its own independence with regard to this, but we do think that that is another important dimension."

Gerhard J. Fonken (Executive Vice President and Provost) commented: "I simply cannot resist, since this is an area that is of interest to me. We all view history somewhat differently. My own view in this area of writing and writing experience is that the faculty abandoned its responsibilities in a very large measure -- there are notable exceptions in some of the literature departments -- many years ago, often on the grounds that to ask students in a class, large or small, to write papers and to be asked to grade them and evaluate them was an excessive burden on the faculty. That may be true, but I simply lament the passage of time and the fact that those changes came into being.

"As to reward and recognition for the teaching of writing courses, I would indeed say in principle that reward and recognition should be extended. It can only be extended by your colleagues. If your budget council is unwilling to recognize your contributions to writing courses, there probably is not much that can be done through University Council legislation to alter that.

"As to the annual reports, I recognize they are quite brief, terse in effect. They do list that one of our colleagues may have written a book or three papers; they make no comment about the quality of that book or the quality of the papers. They list that you have taught a graduate course, an undergraduate course, whatever; there is no measure in there, or indication, not even a hint, as to whether that course was well taught or not well taught.

"Coming back to my central point, it would in the end only be the will of the faculty that brings these things about, nothing else. I wish the committee well. I commend Kinneavy and Lagowski and the committee for making these points. I would urge them to address them to their colleagues through this Council and others, because that is the only way they will be heard."

William O. S. Sutherland, Jr. (English) said: "It seems to me that we can make an improvement in this program, and this can be a beginning of it. I would suggest in Recommendation 1, since this program has been in effect several years and we still do not have enough courses, that the direction 'to offer sufficient courses to allow all of its majors to satisfy The University's Substantial Writing Component requirement' have a date by which each college [or school] should offer enough courses. I would suggest ... by Fall 1990; that would give each college a year to work out the problems and discuss them.

"The second point has to do with the second recommendation [as revised by Sullivan and Kinneavy]. One of the things that we know from working with people's writings is that one of the best ways to get improvement and good writing out of people is to have them writing in a subject in which they are interested and on which the person who is reading the paper is an expert. At the end, [after] 'One of the SWC courses must be an upper division course' I would suggest that we add 'in the student's major.' That then will allow the student to write in the major which he has selected.

"I certainly applaud the notion that the decision should be in the hands of the college that is offering the course and in the hands of the faculty. We have had a ... problem ..., and that is that students come into classes which are not Substantial Writing Component classes and are told that the dean has said this class would count as a Substantial Writing Component class for you. That seems to me to undermine the whole nature of the project and to be quite unfair to the students, since this dean has no control over what is taught in that class and is simply passing the responsibility on to someone else.

"Finally, I would like to make a point about the incentives for doing these courses. One way would be to supply T.A.'s; I think that is an excellent way to do it. That is an expensive way to do it, but almost anything we do in this program is going to cost us something, and it is certainly money well spent. I would suggest particularly that we look at [Recommendation] 4b, where a teacher may count teaching load credit of 4.5 for a class that has reached a particular size. The teaching load credit formula, if I may say so with restraint, acts inequitably across the campus. It works better for a lot of departments than it does for others. Those [departments] that do not teach a lot of large classes ... find a number of our teachers are teaching three courses. That makes it very difficult for us to compete with other universities in recruitment; it also gives a much heavier load to teachers. I think something needs to be done to handle that inequity, and it seems to me the 4.5 for a Substantial Writing Component course is a very reasonable way to do it. It shows, for one thing, ... that the University regards this as a significant activity and is willing to make some kind of reward available for it."

John R. Durbin (Mathematics) said: "I have a question about [Recommendation] 4a, [which concerns] the number of T.A.'s, but first I want to make a comment. I am not sure I really understood what Vice President Fonken meant by his remarks. If he meant that this is totally up to the faculty and [that] the administration does not plan to put any pressure ... on deans and department chairmen and budget councils, then I think that is very unfortunate. That is all I heard. Maybe he was implying something else, but it seems like the administration can use a bit of muscle on people.

"[Recommendation] 4a [calls for] one T.A. for every 20 students; does that mean that would be a T.A.'s only assignment during a semester? That is an hour per week per student, if I understand what T.A.'s are usually paid for, which might be nice, but it also might be expensive."

Mr. Kinneavy reported that the Michigan program is more [complicated]. "If you have 10 people in your class, you get a [tenth] T.A.; if you have 20 people in your class, you get a quarter time T.A., ... and so on...."

Mr. Durbin continued: "The reason I asked it, I just would not want us to pass something that was totally impractical because of the cost, and I think facing up to the resources is a wonderful thing. It is good that you have done that, and so I hope that whatever the Council approves ... is practical so that it has a chance to be carried out. I tried to do a quick computation based on what T.A.'s are paid and how many students we have to process. Awhile ago you were talking [about] at least a million dollars a year; maybe this would cut it down to a half-million. I am not sure what the exact numbers are."

Mr. Kinneavy noted: "It is very difficult to figure what things are going to cost.... A [half-time] T.A. for a full year is about \$8,000 (that is the lowest [salaried] T.A. ...), but we really do not know how many T.A.'s we need.... We are working in a kind of information vacuum, and it might be worthwhile between now and the vote next month to find out what this is going to cost. I made an estimate; if 1/3 of the people [teaching SWC courses already] have T.A.'s, and if 1/3 more want T.A.'s (very often people do not want T.A.'s), it might cost something like [one] or two million dollars, counting the money already dedicated to that. But this is ... purely speculative...; we do not know how much money it is going to cost."

"I will say this, though; the head of the Michigan program ... and the head of the Penn program ... both told me that if you do not have the T.A.'s, the program is going to work initially just on a certain inertial push, but without the T.A. support the faculty will drop off. That happened at Maryland. Half of the program at Maryland was in the separate departments, and half of the program was being taught in a centralized way in the English Department. Because of a lack of T.A. support, nearly all of the separate departmental offerings have been funneled back, and they are now paying the English Department to teach those courses. So ... I think that the T.A.'s are absolutely central to the success of the program, even if it costs a million dollars."

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) asked: "We are talking about buying T.A.'s as if there were a great surplus of them; where are these T.A.'s going to come from even if we have the money? Within my own department we are struggling with the problem of getting some of our very bright graduate students to pass the English test so they can teach. I would say [that] essentially all of our students have positions either as T.A.'s or graduate research assistants. Is the English Department going to supply T.A.'s for the entire campus?"

Mr. Kinneavy replied: "I am sure that is a rhetorical question."

R. Conrad Doenges (Finance) seconded one of Mr. Kinneavy's comments. "I would hope that by the time we meet again on this we could have some better estimates of the cost, not only in dollars, but in terms of resources, like how many T.A.'s total are we talking about, as well as faculty."

"I would also like to suggest a possible change in wording in [Recommendation] 1, Access, substituting for the words 'sufficient courses' something like 'sufficient seats.' There is a difference that I think can best be explained by looking at the exhibit which implies, for instance, that my College of Business offers less than half of the sections we should. Our own estimates are that we offer well over 70% of the seats we require. This is partly because we teach a large number of these courses in 40-student sections (not that we want to teach them in 40-student sections, but that is the way it works out)."

Desmond F. Lawler (Civil Engineering) suggested a minor wording change in Recommendation 4b. "Assuming that this passes, then Recommendation 2 will suggest that not everything has to be done in 3-credit courses; therefore, instead of saying in [Recommendation] 4b '4.5 teaching load credits,' it should say '1.5 teaching load credit per semester credit hour.'"

Alan W. Friedman (English) suggested that "the report that has been produced for us today does go a long way towards implementing ... some of the things that we tried to accomplish in the Basic Education Requirement committee [some years ago] when we discovered that we had a literacy crisis on this campus. The figures since that time do not suggest that the crisis has ended, but a variety of actions, often negative actions, simply inaction, or things happening without faculty involvement, have significantly, it seems to me, reduced the commitment that was made when that report was originally passed and implemented. It might be valuable at this point to determine whether or not the faculty or the University Council wish to go back on record as endorsing some of those items, which if they were part of the report would take us in fact even further. I will just mention one or two of them which it seems to me we thought were very important then, and which have ... fallen by the wayside."

"One was the fact that we had originally approved a writing requirement that read '12 hours beyond English 306.' What we have now is something like '9 hours beyond English 306.' I say 'something like' because if you look at the front section of your Course Schedules where SWC courses are listed, English 316K is not listed; English 316K is not a writing course."

"There was also ... a 6-hour literature requirement for all undergraduate students. That is now closer to 3 hours than to 6, since English 306 is not a literature course."

"It might be simply the case that we cannot handle those requirements as they were originally adopted and we should not even try. But it also might be interesting to have ... the possibility of voting on that to see whether or not the Council would in principle endorse what it approved back in the early 1980's, and then we [could] go from there to see what kind of resources might be involved. I myself would like to see such a vote taken at the next meeting...."

"I would also endorse Mr. Sutherland's recommendations [for changes in the wording [of Recommendations] 1 and 2, that we have a date for [Recommendation] 1, and that [Recommendation] 2 include the notion that one of the courses be in the student's major, as was recommended by the Fowler Report, as you see on the bottom paragraph of page 1 [of the Sullivan-Kinneavy recommendations]. I think that should be ... added to the recommendation and not just simply be part of the preamble.

"There is one other thing in the preamble that seems to me [to be] very important that is not in the set of recommendations, and that is in the large paragraph towards the bottom of the page, quoting from the Vick Committee report: 'The University as a whole should address the many needs that arise: reducing class size,' The original report, and this was endorsed by the Council early on, was that SWC courses should be small in size. We argued in the committee whether that should be a maximum of 20 or 25, and we left it ambiguous. We never assumed that they would be 75, 100, or whatever they currently are in [the College of Business Administration]. I would like to see that in the report.... While it would create one kind of problem, [that would] go a long way towards solving the problem in [Recommendation] 4a, having to do with T.A.'s. We could offer, perhaps, a balance of relatively large courses that required T.A.'s and relatively small courses that did not.

"Two final points: [First,] the original report did include a University-wide standing committee that would be responsible for the certification of courses. I thought that was a good idea originally; I still think it is a good idea. I think if we are moving towards the endorsement of the college-wide certification process it must be in the college where the courses are given, and we should recognize at least that some of us think that that is already a compromise position and should not be compromised further. [Second,] under [Recommendation] 4c I would suggest that the administration can indeed offer guidelines. In my experience budget councils and executive committees do everything they can to follow the guidelines on the merit and reward system that the administration provides, and if the administration said, 'Do, indeed, take successful teaching of SWC courses seriously into account,' they would do so."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) MOVED that "the U.T. Austin administration provide an estimate of the marginal costs of [the Sullivan-Kinneavy] Recommendations 4a and 4b [and the Educational Policy Committee] Recommendation 4 to the University Council prior to its next meeting." The motion was seconded by Mr. Durbin.

Mr. McDaniel continued: "I think we are going to get hung on [Recommendation] 4 if we do not have information, and I do not think the faculty can get the information. ... [Based on] some rough calculations, at a minimum I think it is going to be 1.6 million [dollars]."

Without further discussion Mr. McDaniel's motion was APPROVED.

There was no further discussion. Vice President Livingston reminded the Council that the Educational Policy Committee recommendations, the Sullivan-Kinneavy revisions of those recommendations, and the additional changes suggested in the preceding discussion would be left on the table until the next meeting of the council. He then remarked to Mr. Lagowski "that if you and your committee have accepted the Kinneavy-Sullivan amendments ... and therefore wish to incorporate them into your report, it may be necessary to recast the report for distribution before the next meeting. Whether you will want to incorporate into it all of the other amendments that were suggested by Mr. Sutherland and others I think will have to be left to you...."

C. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DEVELOPMENT OF A POLICY ON RACIAL HARASSMENT (D&P 12268). (SUBSTITUTE MOTION APPROVED)

James P. Ray (Student's Association) introduced a Resolution Concerning the Development of a Policy on Racial Harassment (D&P 12268). "The University of Texas has committed itself to recruiting and retaining minority students. However, it has not committed itself philosophically to controlling racist behavior. The University is dedicated to serving students from diverse backgrounds and strongly denounces discrimination, but we do not have a policy on discrimination and harassment. We need to protect an academic environment that promotes diversity so that all students should have the right to pursue an education without experiencing discrimination.

"In my five long, hard years at the University I have heard of several accounts of racism, including a professor telling a Black student to drop the class because he was not smart enough to pass his class, and students writing racial slurs on a shack. This is a delicate issue, which is the reason why we want a committee established to investigate the establishment of this policy. The Students' Association has done some work ... and [has] looked at [what] other schools [have done]; we recognize that there are problems with policies that other schools have [adopted]. I think this committee [should] do further research.... I [MOVE] that we adopt this resolution concerning the development of a policy on racial harassment." The motion was seconded.

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) said: "I think the intent of this is excellent, and I intend to support it; I think, however, it is presented in a form which is much too weak. This is a problem of all of the WHEREAS's. I think it would be very difficult to prove that diversity is a critical part of education; just to call your attention to some notable lack of diversity, Yale University only ... within our short memory has admitted women to its undergraduate college, and I believe Harvard does not [do so] yet, yet we think of them as very good schools. The point is that racism should not be tolerated because it is wrong, not because to tolerate it somehow influences the quality of education at the University. One other point -- this is offered as a resolution; ... but a resolution is a statement of sentiment, and I think we should have legislation." Mr. Sutton then MOVED that the Council substitute the following motion for the motion made by Mr. Ray:

BE IT RESOLVED that a Committee composed of students, faculty and staff members be appointed by the President to draft a University policy on racial harassment and that this draft be submitted to the University Council no later than the October 1989 meeting of the Council.

The motion to substitute was seconded by Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr.

Without further discussion the motion to substitute was APPROVED, and the Sutton motion became the motion on the floor.

Without further discussion the Sutton motion was then APPROVED without objection.

D. RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF MERIT SALARY INCREASES FOR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING EXCELLENCE (D&P 12269).
(AMENDED AND APPROVED)

Michael J. Hulbert (Students' Association) introduced the Student Assembly Resolution in Support of Merit Salary Increases for Undergraduate Teaching Excellence (D&P 12269) and amended the previously circulated version of the Resolution as shown below; he thanked Alan W. Friedman (English) for suggesting the change:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF MERIT SALARY INCREASES FOR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING EXCELLENCE

WHEREAS there is not enough recognition for outstanding undergraduate teaching, and

WHEREAS merit pay will promote undergraduate teaching as a priority at this university, and

WHEREAS student input on these rewards is essential, now

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the University Council joins the Student Assembly in urging the administration to set up a fund, at the college level, to reward undergraduate teaching excellence, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the administration work with the Students' Association to define teaching excellence, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that student evaluations be considered in the decision-making process for the said salary increases, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the administration establish a University-wide Teaching Honors Day to recognize officially the best teachers.

Mr. Hulbert said: "This is an issue that a lot of people [have] talked about ... this year.... [There is a problem with] the way the benefit system works -- specifically, the way money is allocated within budget councils. I think the main problem is ... that the benefits system of the University is not [congruent] with the goals of the University.

"This is not to say that research is not important, but ... once the goals of research inhibit the goals of undergraduate teaching you need to take a look at that. I think there are a number of disturbing examples that you can point to where ... this has happened and that, in addition, people are not being compensated for doing things like advising and working with student groups and doing some of the things that are somewhat tougher to define but at the same time are very important.... In addition, I do not think that it is ... a good argument just to say that it is entrenched in the system, we will always have ... 'publish or perish.' I believe that now, especially in the light of our enrollment problem, there is a need for professors that do just teach. While there are some very excellent professors that are able to do both, it is very, very demanding; and I think that the professors that are just teaching also deserve that kind of compensation. [Although these things have been discussed this year by] a number of committees, [no proposals have been made].

"One comment that was made to me was, to be very blunt, 'I don't give a shit about undergraduates because I am not paid to.' I think that [exemplifies] the whole system; it is the way the benefit system is set up, and I think that is a real shame. If a corporation did not pay its employees to advance the goals of the corporation, it would really have a problem; I think in the same sense that we have a problem.... [I have heard] stories of professors being penalized for writing textbooks as opposed to writing scholarly articles; ... people will agree [that textbooks] are beneficial to the University and to undergraduates....

"As students we are concerned about this. Some people's first reaction may have been, 'Well, this is not some place where students should be meddling.' But ... [this] directly affects us. [This resolution] is an expression from us of our support for the professors that are ... going that extra mile but oftentimes not being compensated for it. In addition, I think the [Graduate School of Business] ranking just goes to show that the rankings that we are always concerned about are often affected by how students feel about the University, and not just by the ranking of our research or other types of issues.

"I think this is a problem that really needs some guidance [and] vision from the top, and that is why we chose the University Council to pursue it. I think it is time for the University to make a visible statement that those additional things that professors do [to] enhance undergraduate life are important to the University and [that they] will be compensated for [them]. There are many teaching awards ... now, but most of [them] are only one-time awards.... [As] one professor [said], a pay increase is a gift that just keeps giving; but it is more than that --

it is the visible signal of support for professors that are doing [the] kind of work [that is valued, and a signal] to encourage more to also get involved in it...."

In effect, Mr. Hulbert MOVED that the resolution, as amended, be approved, and the motion was seconded. Vice President Livingston called attention to the fact "that this is a resolution rather than an enactment, that it is not automatically self-effectuating."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) spoke against the motion. "I am not sure that I believe all of the WHEREAS's. I hear 'war stories' about people who do not want to teach, but I hear equal 'war stories' about people who do not want to do research and are not doing any."

"I am not sure there is not enough recognition for undergraduate teaching; in my department 40% of my merit increase is a function of my teaching, and I would like it to stay about that."

"I do not know what it means to say that something is a priority; does it mean this will be the number one priority, and will it apply to everybody all of the time? Since at one point, at least, I have felt myself a fairly good undergraduate teacher, I would like to go back to that system, because research is much harder for me. But at least until somebody tells me what this is a priority in relationship to, and who it applies to, then I am going to oppose the resolution."

"And student input on these rewards is essential since, right now, in order to get a raise in my college you have to have student input ...; you cannot get a raise unless you submit student evaluations. I would like that not to change."

"Then, the resolution really refers to three different things, and I am not sure that I feel equally positively about all of them. The first is that the administration set up a fund ..., at the college level, to reward teaching excellence. I know [President] Cunningham well enough to know what that fund is going to be; it is going to be \$100 from the margin of what we now get. Not that he is against teaching; it is just that he already sends money to our college, and he sends a lot of it."

"And, I do not know what we are asking for. Are we asking that we set up a professorship [or] a scholarship recognizing teachers? Just exactly what is this fund? ... As I say, student evaluations are considered, and unless I am mistaken, ... these are required for promotion.... I would like to have a teachers' honors day; I think that is a really good idea, but not in the context of this resolution."

Mr. Hulbert responded: "[With regard to] the student evaluations, there was an article in the Texan that quoted several professors and one associate dean from the College of Liberal Arts that very much discounted the worthiness of student evaluations and student input. I believe that was specifically with regard to merit pay increases; I do not know about promotion, but I think that is a point that needs to be brought up."

Michael J. Whellan (Students' Association) added: "I am convinced that teaching evaluations are not taken that seriously by that many when it comes to promotion time.... I think our intent was to point out that there are several different areas that we would like to begin to pick away at. I do not think [that] automatically making undergraduate teaching the best here at the University ... is going to happen over night ..., but I think if we begin ... creating incentives so that people will improve their teaching effectiveness, perhaps something in the long run may happen. It is just like study abroad. You do not just go in and start yelling and screaming and hope that over night something is going to happen; you have got to begin picking away and try to embarrass the administration to try to get something done. Here we have three different things that we pointed out: honors day; the fund to try and input more money into this area so that people do have some incentive to work a little harder on their teaching; and, finally, that student evaluations be considered so that teachers that are good know that they are actually going to be considered in the evaluation process. It is just a matter of trying to find little ways to make sure that teaching excellence on this ... campus is not swept underneath the rug, as seems to [happen] so often."

Mr. McDaniel replied: "First let me say that, as often as I have accused the administration of things around this university, I think we ought to be really careful about accusing them of not taking something seriously. I think that is a very, very, very serious accusation, and really requires that it be substantiated. To tell me that there was a good teacher that did not get promoted does not substantiate it. I just think that that is a very difficult thing to deal with."

"The other thing is, and I am really serious about this question, are you sure that what you want is for the most important thing for all faculty on this campus during the time that they are on the payroll to be undergraduate teaching?"

James P. Ray (Students' Association) answered: "This motion is not saying that we want [undergraduate teaching to be the most important thing for] all faculty at this university. We are saying that the faculty that take pride in undergraduate teaching excellence and student service in working with students ... should be compensated for it equally [with] those who take pride in only researching."

James L. Kinneavy (English) expressed sensitivity both to the concerns of the students and to some of the problems noted by Mr. McDaniel. In order that it could be reworded, he MOVED that the motion be sent back to the Students' Association. The motion to refer was seconded.

Ronald M. Brown (Vice President for Student Affairs) opposed returning the motion to the Students' Association. "I think if there is any benefit whatsoever to come from the intended resolution, it would be that there be a dialogue between faculty members and students, and if we send it back to the Students' Association it would constitute a monologue."

Mr. McDaniel agreed; he urged the Council members to vote against the motion to refer the resolution back to the Students' Association so that it could instead be referred to the Educational Policy Committee.

Mr. Kinneavy then withdrew his motion to refer.

Mr. McDaniel MOVED that the resolution be referred to the Educational Policy Committee with the request that the Committee report back to the University Council at its September meeting. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Ray (Students' Association) spoke against the motion; he felt the resolution should be referred instead to the "committee set up under Dean Doluisio to study undergraduate education."

Mr. McDaniel said he had considered that possibility, but "I think that committee has already got its hands full of fairly hot issues. And I think that Educational Policy Committee is the committee that is really more appropriate for this motion." Mr. Ray still favored referring the resolution to the Doluisio Committee.

The motion to refer this issue to the Educational Policy Committee was then APPROVED by voice vote.

E. FACULTY SENATE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE U.T. AUSTIN GENERAL LIBRARIES (D&P 12274-12279). (WITHDRAWN)

Alan W. Friedman (English), Chair of the Faculty Senate, noted that the recommendations, which he had discussed earlier in the meeting, were being presented only for the Council's information. He withdrew the recommendations as an agenda item for Council action.

F. RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A COMMITTEE TO ADDRESS THE ISSUE OF SCHOOL DROPOUT PREVENTION EFFORTS (D&P 12280). (APPROVED)

Martha S. Williams (Dean, School of Social Work) introduced and, in effect, MOVED that the Council approve the Resolution to Establish a Committee to Address the Issue of School Dropout Prevention Efforts (D&P 12280). "The proposal is basically to establish a committee within the University to meet with others outside of the University to discuss the whole issue of school dropout prevention. We think the time is right ... to take up this issue of University involvement in school dropout prevention. We are talking specifically about ... the public schools and the private schools up through the high school level. It is obvious that what happens in these educational institutions has a lot of effect on us. The state Legislature has been very much involved in this issue. Private businesses are more and more concerned about the issue. There is going to be a series of television shows ... on learning in America. Those of us who perhaps are closer to this because of the disciplines we represent

feel it would be a good time for the University to form a committee to at least discuss the possibilities of involvement of the University in this issue.

"There are many other issues in public school education that might concern us, but ... the dropout issue is the best one to begin with because of the nature of the widespread concern in the state and also the nation as a whole. The dropout rate in Texas is ... something like 33%.... I think we have an interest in this. Our proposal is basically to form a committee ... and see if there are ways the University might become helpful or more involved, whether it is through research, where we think there are a lot of possibilities, or public service or continuing education, or perhaps even through the teaching process."

The motion to approve the resolution was seconded.

Alan W. Friedman (English) presented some background information. "There have been a series of TACT-sponsored lunches with various legislators and members of the Coordinating Board, people from the [U.T.] System, and so on to talk about various concerns of the University and the faculty specifically, and this arose ... out of one of those lunches. It was held with Senator Barrientos present. We talked a good deal about the kinds of things faculty and the University hope would happen down at the Legislature, and Senator Barrientos challenged the faculty present to do something that he was concerned about, and that was to get involved in this dropout problem. As he presented it, the problem is a serious one; it is of major proportions. The problem is not getting any better, though an awful lot of people are working on it; and the problem is as bad in Austin as it is statewide.... The idea was that there would be some mechanism established whereby the faculty ... who are concerned and the administration could begin to talk about the problem, could begin to find out what is going on, what the problem is, how to define it, who is working on it.... This should be a kind of umbrella group to begin with that would bring together data, facts, information, people who are concerned about this from all sorts of areas -- from AISD, from TEA perhaps, from the Coordinating Board, from the Legislature, from the System, and so on, and begin to see what working together we might help to accomplish. We have already begun to identify some of the areas within which we would hope that action would occur. We think the first step is for the University Council to endorse [and] the Administration to commit its concern in this area and that we see if we cannot indeed begin to meet some of these challenges."

Erik Devereux, who had been granted privileges of the floor earlier in the meeting, commented: "I have been watching this issue for awhile because of attendance of some of the Faculty Senate meetings.... I think it is an excellent suggestion and I think that it could be broadened, because I think there is an opportunity to get the undergraduates and the graduate students at this university involved.... I think it is an excellent idea in terms of working with AISD."

"I also think that there is a unique opportunity here for The University of Texas at Austin to generate extreme goodwill in this community. The U.T. System has generated some attention in the City of Austin because of the resolution of the Brackenridge Tract and it has caused a lot of unhappiness in the City of Austin about the University; I think here is an excellent opportunity for the University to demonstrate a commitment to the welfare of Austin, Texas.

"Many people may be unaware that AISD is one of the most overstudied school districts in the United States. There are numerous studies conducted by researchers at this University in AISD, and there is ... growing tension between AISD and the University because of the feeling that a lot of the faculty see AISD as a place to get their experimental subjects, but it is not clear what the University is prepared to give back to AISD in the way of a benefit. Here we have an opportunity to work together with this school district to give them something that is a clear benefit to help fight recidivism among high school students and lower-grade students as well.

"So I would recommend that the proposal be broadened to ... include student members on the committee [and] to encourage the Students' Association, the Cabinet of College Councils, various different graduate councils to get involved in this, and to get graduate students and undergraduates working in AISD on a volunteer basis. I think that the students could make a very big contribution to this effort."

Dean Williams agreed. "I am sure the committee would agree that students should be involved. We would not want to limit it just to AISD, but [perhaps] all of the school districts within the Central Texas region that we are closely related to. I think there are a lot of possibilities, and I am glad you mentioned the idea of volunteers, for example. I think that ... is just one example of something that we could look into."

The motion was then APPROVED by voice vote.

X. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT -- None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Council is scheduled for Main Building 212 on Monday, May 8, 1989, at 2:15 p.m.

Distributed to members of the University Council and to members of the General Faculty who want minutes on September 15, 1989.

ATTACHMENT A

CHANGES AND ADDITIONS TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE
EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE ON
SUBSTANTIAL WRITING COURSES

At the discussion of the EPC recommendations in the Faculty Senate two weeks ago (April 3, 1989), there was considerable concern about some aspects of the report. Although the four areas of the committee's reports were seen to be important, some dissatisfaction was expressed with regard to each of the four proposals. In an attempt to preserve the spirit and intentions of the recommendations, and yet to strengthen and make them more concrete, the following changes and additions are suggested. In addition, some further background and a rationale are also given.

Preamble. In addition to reminding the members of the council of the specifics of the SWC requirements that are in now in effect (see D&P 12271 in the EPC report), it might be useful to recall some of the other recommendations of the Vick committee (as they were rewritten by subsequent legislation): there were to be 6 units of SWC courses beyond E 306 and E 316K, which were required of all; 6 units were to be at the upper division level; "the certification of such courses [should] be the responsibility of a standing university committee [whose] membership [should] be broadly representative of our faculty."

The Vick committee's attitude to these issues is crystallized in the following paragraph:

"If the University is to stress the importance of basic courses in the curriculum, then it must also commit itself to give high priority to making these courses as effective as possible. . . . Departments should be encouraged to give high priority to these courses in the assignment of faculty. The University as a whole should address the many needs that arise: reducing class size, furnishing graduate or clerical assistance, or supplying instructional aids and equipment. The condition of these courses should be such that they become a source of pride, both on the campus and in the broader community." (REPORT CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON BASIC EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS, February 16, 1981, D&P 8160; the report was approved.)

The Fowler committee, in its report of May 8, 1988, recommended that "at least one of the SWC courses be taken in the student's major" (D&P 11728), that the courses need not be 3 unit courses so long as the full writing requirement is met (D&P 11728). It also recommended some incentives for the teaching of these courses.

THE FOUR PROPOSALS

Access.

The EPC's recommendation is retained:

1. The committee RECOMMENDS that each college or school be directed to offer sufficient courses to allow all of its majors to satisfy The University's Substantial Writing Component requirement within that college or school.

This recommendation will be much easier to meet if the incentives considered below under Resource Availability and Incentives are adopted.

Flexibility.

The amended recommendation is as follows:

2. We RECOMMEND that The University's Substantial Writing Component requirement be fulfilled by passing any two courses (except E 306 and E 316K), each of which is certified by the SWC committee of the college or school in which the course is offered to fulfill the criteria previously established [i.e., three or more writing activities totaling approximately 16 typewritten double spaced pages (about 4,000 words); several drafts of a large paper (requiring additional original writing, not merely editing) can be considered separate writing activities. One of the SWC courses must be an upper division course.

This recommendation does not allow E 306 and E 316K to be substituted for the two additional SWC units and thus assures that each student will take four writing courses. It puts the decision in the hands of the faculty, not the dean. It also allows one of the SWC courses to be lower division. Finally it allows the college or school committee to choose courses other than 3-hour courses for the SWC requirement.

Accountability.

We first suggest a slight revision of the accountability proposal as it was written:

- 3a. We RECOMMEND that the Course Schedule indicate the number of spaces available in each SWC course after the room number. This will enable the college or school SWC committee to plan for the required number of students in the college. It will also give students a clear notion of the availability of classes.

We also suggest another dimension of accountability.

- 3b. We RECOMMEND that each college or school SWC committee establish a method of periodically monitoring the quality of the writing in SWC classes in a way that respects the anonymity of teachers and students.

Resource Availability and Incentives

One of the concerns of the Fowler committee and of the members in the Faculty Senate had to do with the incentives and resources available to those who might want to teach an SWC course. A recent study of some SWC courses revealed that only one-third of the teachers of SWC courses had a TA to help in grading and conferencing. Yet Barbara Morris, head of the Michigan SWC program, upon which ours was modeled, states unequivocally that the success of the program in institutions like ours depends on the use of TA's. Peshe Kurloff says the same of the program at Penn. In addition, there is often the lack of a departmental or college incentive to teach the course. To meet these problems we suggest the following:

- 4a. We RECOMMEND that a TA be supplied for every 20 students in a SWC course, unless a teacher does not want such help. The money for this should be a distinct item in a departmental budget. The University should request specific moneys for this so that other uses of TA's are not preempted.
- 4b. We RECOMMEND that an SWC course that has at least 20 registered students shall count for 4.5 teaching load credits.
- 4c. We RECOMMEND that successful teaching of SWC courses be given positive considerations in annual reviews for promotion and merit raises.
4. We RECOMMEND that sufficient resources be made available to the Center for Teaching Effectiveness or other appropriate agencies to organize and conduct regular workshops or programs to train teachers and teaching assistants for SWC courses.

--Teresa Sullivan, Sociology
James L. Kinneavy, English

18064
12346

COLLEGE OR SCHOOL OFFERINGS IN SWC COURSES, FALL, 1988

COLLEGE	NO. OF SWC COURSES (1)	% OF TOTAL SWC COURSES	% OF UNDGRAD. ENROLLMENT
Architecture	5	1	1
Bus Administ.	44	11	23
Communication	33	8	10
Education	6	1	5.5
Engineering	58	14	12
Fine Arts	11	3	4
Liberal Arts	217	53	28
Natural Sciences	23	6	15
Nursing	5	1	1
Pharmacy	7	2	1
Social Work	3	1	.5
TOTAL	412		

(1) Each section of a course is counted as a course. The numbers for Spring, 1989, are fairly similar.