

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

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of March 18, 1985, 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 MARCH 18, 1985

The seventh regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1984-1985 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, March 18, 1985, at 2:15 p.m. In the absence of President Flawn, Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies William S. Livingston presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Lear L. Ashmore, Barbara Becker-Cantarino, Gerard H. Behague, Simon J. Bernau, Lowell J. Bethel, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, R. H. Bing, Allen H. Bizzell, Terrell Blodgett, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Ben H. Caudle, Coby C. Chase, Kathleen F. Conlin, Wm. H. Cunningham, James T. Doluisio, Wm. C. Duesterhoeft, Jr., Betty S. Flowers, Gerhard J. Fonken, Diane M. Friday, Maureen M. Grasso, Alan D. Gribben, Vickie L. Hampton, Ira Iscoe, Robert C. Jeffrey, Gaylord A. Jentz, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin G. Kennamer, Robert D. King, George B. Kitto, J. Parker Lamb, Steven W. Leslie, Joan I. Lidoff, William S. Livingston, Jane C. Marcus, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Trey Monsour, Jack Otis, David M. Rabban, Alice R. Redland, Walter L. Reed, Bonnie Rickelman, Ramon Saldivar, Rodney L. Schlosser, Leonard G. Schulze, RoseAnn L. Shorey, James H. Sledd, Charles A. Sorber, Waneen W. Spirduso, H. Eldon Sutton, James W. Vick, Claire E. Weinstein, J. Robert Wills, Lewis R. Wiman, Robert E. Witt, Ronald E. Wyllys.

Absent: Edwin B. Allaire, Mark B. Baker, F. Stefan Bertram (excused), Julie H. Bichteler, David L. Bourell, Thomas D. Boyd (excused), Billye J. Brown, Ronald M. Brown, Randall J. Charbeneau, James H. Colvin, Wayne A. Danielson, Peter T. Flawn (excused), G. Charles Franklin, Earnest F. Gloyna (excused), Thomas M. Hatfield (excused), Eleanor W. Jordan, Clarence G. Lasby, Ernest L. Lundelius, Jr., Diane L. Schallert (excused), Max R. Sherman (excused), Ron D. Stutes, Darren C. Walker (excused), Martha S. Williams, Mark G. Yudof.

Total members present: 57 Total members absent: 24

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

- A. The Minutes of the University Council meeting of January 21, 1985, (D&P 9925-9935; 15825-15835) were APPROVED as distributed.
- B. The regular meeting of February 18, 1985, was cancelled; hence there were no Minutes to be approved.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 9916-9921).

Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) had nothing to add to the Report which had been distributed (D&P 9916-9921).

III. DISCUSSION OF SECRETARY'S REPORT - None.

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

James H. Sledd (English) had submitted in advance three questions to the President. Vice President Livingston first read each question and then read a statement from President Flawn in response to that question.

"The first question is in three parts, namely: What is the status of the following English courses: a. 106K and 206: Are they presently being offered? b. 316K: Does it have 'a substantial writing component'? c. 346K: When--if ever--will the requirement of this course be reinstated?"

"As to Question 1.a: The authority to offer or not to offer English 106K and 206L rests with the English Department. The Spring 1985 Course Schedule shows a section of E 106K (hours to be arranged) and a section of E 206L (hours to be arranged). Both courses were open through the add and drop period but were then cancelled due to a lack of student enrollment.

"With regard to Question 1.b: The English/writing component of the various undergraduate degree requirements specifies three English courses (E 306, E 316K, and E 346K) and two additional courses certified as having a 'substantial writing component.' The 'substantial writing component' certification is not used in conjunction with the three required English courses; nevertheless, the English courses include writing.

"With regard to Question 1.c: E 346K is still a degree requirement; it is still in the catalogues of all the schools and colleges offering undergraduate degree programs. Since E 346K will not be offered in the 1985-86 academic year, the Deans are taking steps to permit substitutions or waivers of this course requirement as may be appropriate to specific degree programs under their jurisdiction until such time as the necessary instructional services can be provided. This matter will be reviewed by the English Department and the College of Liberal Arts during the 1985-86 academic year.

"Question 2: How, why, and by whom were the decisions taken which have drastically altered the program in writing formally approved by the University Council, the President and the Board of Regents; and did those decisions either violate the legal or customary rights of the faculty and the Council or breach contractual obligations to students established by University bulletins?"

"Response: Four courses relating to this requirement will remain available to undergraduate students in 1985-86: two required English courses and two required courses certified to have a substantial writing component. The recent action regarding E 346K defers the offering of the fifth required course.

"The action to defer offering E 346K in 1985-86 was based upon the recommendations of the Dean of Liberal Arts and the Chairman of the Department of English. Dean King informed us that the College and the English Department were not prepared to implement fully the instructional program in E 346K in the 1985-86 academic year. Since the Deans have jurisdiction over student programs of study and degree requirements (General Information bulletin, page 51) and thereby the authority for substitution, waiver, or deferral of specific degree requirements, this matter was discussed at the February 11 Deans Council meeting. There was unanimous agreement among the Deans to formulate actions appropriate to their colleges/schools for permitting substitution or waiver of the E 346K requirement until such time as the necessary instructional services can be provided. A follow-up memorandum was sent to the Deans on February 13, 1985, from the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research confirming this discussion and requesting information on the college/school actions to be undertaken to implement substitutions or waivers.

"This action is consistent with established University policy. It is within the authority of the Deans to permit substitution or waiver of specific degree requirements."

James H. Sledd (English) asked: "The question that comes up now would be for how long may a requirement be waived? We are given no date, and if there is no limit on the time then requirements become meaningless." Vice President Livingston responded: "I think you have a good point, but I do not think it is one to which there is at the moment an answer. The answer is in large part that the University is not in a position to offer this course, and it cannot offer the course until it is in a position to do so. How long it is going to take to do that is beyond my knowledge. I think that is the best answer that can be made to that point."

David M. Rabban (Law) inquired about the documented source of the Deans' jurisdiction over degree requirements. Vice-President Livingston responded that it was to be found on page 51 of the current General Information bulletin.

Mr. Rabban next asked for elucidation about the division of authority between the deans and faculty with regard to degree requirements. Vice President Livingston replied: "I do not think anybody can elucidate it precisely or make a clear delineation between the authority of the faculty and the authority of the dean over an academic matter. The faculty is [the] policy-making body and the dean is the administrative body, and the two must work together or the whole thing comes apart. I think it is one of those questions which is blessedly left with a fuzzy margin."

Mr. Rabban then commented: "[As] a new member of the University Council, it is unclear to me why we as a Council were not involved in [the] decision-making process with respect to this issue." Vice President Livingston responded: "One reason for that was simply the urgency of the issue, because the Course Schedule had to go to press and there was very little ... time at the point when the question was raised."

Mr. Rabban then asked: "Has there been or will there be some explanation to the University Council as to the action taken? In other words, is this an atypical procedure because of the exigency that you just described? Under normal circumstances, would the University Council have been involved, or is this not the kind of issue on which the University Council should be involved?" Vice President Livingston answered: "I think the University Council not only has a right, but if possible an obligation to perform with regard to general policy on academic courses."

Alan Gribben (English) pointed out that the requirement of E 346K "still stands." He further said that the Chairman of the English Department, W.O.S. Sutherland, Jr., would be appointing a committee in next few months to address the E 346K question and that the committee would report its deliberations to the Council. Mr. Gribben added that English Department "is fully committed to offering a program in composition."

Mr. Rabban said that he was concerned about the "lack of clarity about the division of responsibility between administration and faculty. We have just been assured that the University Council will be provided with a plan on how E 346K will be offered in the future; it is puzzling to me that we will be offered a plan as to the future, but we were not consulted about the suspension. I take it the answer is that normally we would have been but there were exigent circumstances that prevented that from happening; is that the right understanding?"

Vice President Livingston responded: "No, I would not stand on that explanation only, because it leaves out the authority of the dean to take action which he deems necessary or appropriate either in an individual student's case or in the instance of a general requirement."

In response to further questions by Mr. Rabban concerning faculty/administration authority with regard to policy, Vice President Gerhard J. Fonken (Academic Affairs and Research) spoke: "While, from the perspective of someone in the legal profession, University rules and policies may lack to some degree intelligent precision that one finds within the law, the issue at hand, I think, is relatively clear -- the implementation of waiving [or] permitting substitution does indeed lie in the authority of the dean of the college, hopefully with due consultation with colleagues and the department involved. Were there ... [a] proposal to change a degree program [or] a catalogue, [such a matter] ... must be brought before the Council [because it is a] legislative matter."

"Vice President Fonken then gave several historical examples of exemptions to degree requirements. One example involved waivers or substitutions for foreign language requirements; another involved drama courses. "In 1957 or 1958, the Drama Building burned down ..., and for a period of a year or more it was very difficult for the Drama Department to offer certain types of classes; the facilities were not there. So for a time the College of Fine Arts, by action of the Dean and with good consultation with the faculty in that area, provided for substitutions, waivers and alternatives. They did not alter their catalogue, so the matter was not brought before ... the Faculty Council, the predecessor of the University Council.

"[Currently], the Department of Electrical Engineering is faced with difficulty in providing access to a senior-level [laboratory] course which is part of their degree requirement. They have more students than they can handle. They have inadequate laboratory space; they have not been able to bring more space in on a timely basis, and there is not sufficient money ... [to] put together a patchwork laboratory on a short-time basis. Again, with consultation with the faculty in Electrical Engineering, the Dean has granted ... substitutions for that laboratory course, substitutions that people in the [College of] Engineering are not at all happy with, but they know of no immediate alternative. [The permission to make substitutions] will not be brought before the Council. [The matter] would come before the Council if the [College of] Engineering decided to revise its degree program and change the course.

"Were there any action to delete English 346K from the several undergraduate catalogues, were there an action whereby ... the College of Natural Sciences decided to delete E 346K and [require] some alternative course in the catalogue, that action would have to come before the Council.

"So in that layman's sense, there is no issue here of substance [with which] the Council would deal. There is, in my understanding of things, no issue here where there is something that lies beyond the authority of a dean, because there is no change being made in requirements. There is accomodation being made to struggle through a bad situation."

After a further exchange between Mr. Rabban and Vice President Fonken, Mr. Rabban said: "I think there is a broader issue here than English 346K, and for the future I am curious about what issues to expect to be brought to this body and what issues to expect to be resolved administratively." Vice President Livingston responded: "I

think the best answer I can give you [is] to have a good second look at the provisions in the Handbook of Operating Procedures which deal with the jurisdiction [of] various representative bodies. Do not remind me that they are inadequate, I know they are inadequate."

Mr. Rabban concluded the discussion by saying that he had perused the Regents' Rules, one of which "talks about the primary faculty responsibility in matters of educational policy. Oh, yes, these rules are vague, and they are vague on both sides. Perhaps they cannot be more precise, but I do feel that it is important for us to have a sense of what are the issues that are important for us to have a sense of which are the issues that are properly in our jurisdiction as a body and jurisdiction; that is the line, however hazy, that I am trying to find out."

V. SPECIAL ORDERS -- None.

VI. PETITIONS -- None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS.

A. REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE PROPOSAL TO ABOLISH THE CURRENT PREREGISTRATION/REGISTRATION SYSTEM AND TO INSTITUTE A CONTINUOUS REGISTRATION PERIOD (D&P 9894-9898). (APPROVED)

Vice President Livingston reminded the Council that the proposal to change registration procedures had been discussed but not acted upon at the previous Council meeting. At that meeting, Professor William C. Duesterhoeft, Jr. (Electrical Engineering), Chairman of the Admissions and Registrations Committee, had been asked to take the recommendations back to the Committee and to rephrase the proposal in the form of legislation. Vice President Livingston then sought and received floor privileges for Susan J. Holzoeffel (College of Business Administration), who was informally representing the U.T. Austin Counselors and Advisors Association.

Mr. Duesterhoeft made the following opening statement: "As you know, in September the Council passed a motion referring a proposal by James Smith to the Admissions and Registration Committee. [The proposal] was to abolish the current system and substitute a [continuous] registration period. We were to look into the feasibility of that and report back in January. At the January Council meeting, we reported that the Committee found it was not feasible to institute a continuous system, but we could, by an increase in preregistration, realize some of the goals and objectives of the James Smith proposal. We brought before the Council a number of recommendations that were intended to show how preregistration could be increased, encouraged, and improved. We intended at that time to [request a] vote on four of those recommendations. As the situation stands now, we only need [to vote on] three of the first four recommendations that we presented in January, and they have been reworded.

"If these [three] recommendations are passed today, there are advantages that would be obtained. One, there would be an addition of two or three days to the ... Spring Semester. Of course, potential usages for these days would be considered by the Calendar Committee; we have presented to you some sample calendars that will give you an idea of what could be done by the Calendar Committee. Two, there would be a reduction of disruptive and excessive drops and adds during the first week of class. Perhaps some classes could even get started on the first day of class. We have presented to you some data that show how many adds and drops there are during a semester -- [something on] the order of 100,000 add/drop transactions each semester. With these proposals, the departments would have more information available to make adjustments to their offerings. The preregistration procedure is one of collecting information, [seeing]

what courses the students want, and how many require certain courses. More data would be available if more students preregistered. A greater percentage of students would receive acceptable schedules without having to add or drop. Coupled with these proposals are improvements in the sectioning of preregistered students. The algorithm is being worked on that would give the students the opportunity to put their courses in a priority order so that they would get the more important courses first. Also, if more data were available to the computer, then the students would get better programs. Number five, the advantages are that departments could decide which sections could be cancelled, if there was no demand for a course, without waiting for the registration procedure. Six, there would be a reduction in administrative costs, because preregistration costs less per student than registration. With all of this in mind we would make three motions to the Council; we prefer to make them one at a time.

"The Admissions and Registration Committee recommends and MOVES that:

- "1. Effective Fall 1986, "field house" registration be restricted to NEW students who are unable to pre-register.
- "2. Effective Spring 1986, preregistration for the Summer be implemented and held concurrently with Fall preregistration.
- "3. Effective Fall 1986, fee payment deadlines be moved from December to early January for Spring Semester, and later in August for Fall Semester, and the late registration fee be raised from \$15.00 to \$40.00."

The motion was seconded.

Vice President Livingston then called on Ms. Holzaepfel, who stated: "My purpose today ... is twofold. First of all I would like to create a familiarity for the group of which I am a representative--the Counselor and Advisors Association or Committee. As you may notice, we have not even settled on our name yet, so we are a fledgling group. The purpose of our group is information sharing and also to create position statements on issues that we feel have an impact on us as advisors at the University. My second purpose today is ... to share with you our position on this legislation. We welcome the opportunity to work with you in the future in an advisory or an advocacy position, and the text of our comments and our stand on these recommendations has been [distributed to you]. [The material distributed by Ms. Holzaepfel is reproduced in Attachment A to these Minutes.]

"We found ourselves to be in agreement with the [three] proposals as recommended. We did quite a bit of work with the Bursar and the Registrar and his staff, and we studied these in detail. We also wanted to put forward some other ideas, or insights, or recommendations that we had to offer. Some of them are basically concurring with other recommendations that are in this document, but these are our insights, our points of view, as advisors on the campus who work with students on a day-to-day basis."

Dean Lorin Kennamer (Education) asked if the two to three days that would be available to the Calendar Committee would be obtained by reducing the length of the formal registration week. Mr. Duesterhoeft responded affirmatively; "... if ... Recommendation 1 passes, then we could get by with one day of centralized add/drops and one day of registration, rather than two days of centralized add/drops and two days of registration." Dean Kennamer concluded: "My assumption would be, then, that if these days are made available we may or may not get the Calendar Committee to use them in that way...." Vice President Livingston said that he shared Dean Kennamer's assumption.

Dean Kennamer next noted that, in the extreme, the preregistration proposal could have the effect of closing many course sections prior to the registration opportunity of new students. Mr. Duesterhoeft responded that decanal oversight would be particularly crucial during the phase-in of the new procedures but that experience would facilitate better prediction of student course section choices.

Eldon Sutton (Zoology) inquired about the opportunity for registration of current students who, for whatever reason, had failed to preregister. He also asked about students who had not been enrolled for a long semester. Mr. Duesterhoeft responded that a current student who had failed to preregister during the prescribed period could subsequently preregister if departmental advising was available. David H. Stones (Registrar's Office) added that if a student had not preregistered by the time the sectioning process was completed (two or three weeks after the prescribed preregistration period), that student would register during late registration.

Shirly F. Binder (Director of Admissions) pointed out that students who had been out for a long semester would be required to re-apply for admission; they would be considered to be "new" students and would register as such.

After further discussion, the first motion/recommendation was APPROVED by a voice vote.

Mr. Duesterhoeft then offered as a motion the second recommendation which would have the effect in Spring 1986 of holding preregistration for the Summer and Fall concurrently. Mr. Duesterhoeft pointed out that preregistration for the Fall is held in April. The motion was seconded. Responding to a question from Dean Kennamer, Vice President Livingston noted "that both the Summer and the Fall Course Schedules will be available at the time of the dual preregistration in April."

Responding to a question from Ben H. Caudle (Petroleum Engineering), Mr. Duesterhoeft confirmed that a would-be Summer Session student who failed to preregister would late-register in the "field house" with new students. Dena Kennamer observed that this provision would be disadvantageous to students who enroll only during Summer Sessions -- e.g., teachers. Dean Ronald E. Wyllys (Graduate School of Library and Information Science) said that he shared Dean Kennamer's concern and hoped that exceptions would be allowed for summer-only students. Mr. Stones responded: "The students who attend just in the summer ... have to apply each year for readmission to the University; ... these students will be allowed to preregister if they choose to do so. However, any new student of any kind who has to apply to the University will also be allowed the privilege of participating in "field house" registration, so they will not have to have preregistered if they are attending just in the summer ...; they can register just as they do now."

The second recommendation was then APPROVED by a voice vote.

Mr. Duesterhoeft then offered the third motion/recommendation, which would have the effect of delaying the time when fee payments would be due and increasing the penalty for late registration from \$15.00 to \$40.00. The motion was seconded. After a brief discussion, the motion was then APPROVED by voice vote.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.

A. RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR AN INVESTIGATION AND A REPORT BY THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC POLICIES COMMITTEE. (RECEIVED)

Neal A. Hartman (Admissions Office), Chairman of the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee, noted that at the University Council meeting on November 19, 1984, "there were two particular requests made to the University Parking and Traffic Policies Committee. The first one was that students are now required to move their cars from

the University parking lots surrounding Memorial Stadium prior to home football games. The Committee was asked to examine the real advantages of that practice and the options that are available to reduce the logistical problems that this practice causes for students. To respond to that first request, ... that particular situation is not a policy of the University Parking and Traffic Policies Committee; rather, it is a long-standing tradition that has existed between the Department of Men's Intercollegiate Athletics and the University administration--the parking spaces around Memorial Stadium will be reserved for contributors to the University's athletic program. This occurs normally five Saturdays every Fall semester; occasionally there is a sixth home game. Notices are placed on cars in that vicinity, generally on Friday, asking students or whoever else to move their cars to other available spaces; [if the] cars are not moved as of Saturday morning, people do receive a friendly wake-up call starting about 6:15 a.m. asking them to please move their cars by a certain time so that those spaces will be available. Essentially, ... in your request you asked what the advantages are; I think the advantages to the University community [of providing] spaces for contributors to that particular portion of the University [are probably fairly obvious]. In terms of the logistical problems, it is the feeling basically of the Committee that apparently on Friday evening there are rather ample parking spaces on campus, ... that there is ample parking for students and other people to move their cars for Saturday. We did not take any particular action as a committee on this request. If ... you would like us to do so, we would certainly be happy to consider that.

"The second request was, students have been told that the number of C parking spaces will be maintained during construction of the new University parking garage; the committee was asked to verify that such spaces will be maintained and to identify and report their location. As probably many of you are aware, the University parking garage is under construction. This has displaced some F parking places, A parking places, and C parking places. We have tried, in terms of a committee working with Parking and Traffic and the University police, to recommend that the displacement of all three of those classes of stickers be as equal as possible, and we feel we have done this so far. If you want a daily update on how many F, A, or C spaces are available, Parking and Traffic can provide you with those numbers; they do change daily with the construction that is going on around campus. But you may be interested in knowing for right now the number of permits which have been issued, and you may ... be interested in knowing how many spaces are ... available for those particular permits. We have issued 2,430 [F permits] for 2,073 spaces; we have issued 4,453 [A permits] for 2,970 spaces; and we have issued 14,199 [C permits] for 4,505 spaces."

Diane M. Friday (Student Representative), who had initiated the resolution asking for the Committee report, commented that the report "does not really seem to solve anything.... The point I think that we were trying to make was that a lot of students ... move [their cars] within walking distance of the University anyway, so the students have this burden of ... moving their cars every Friday night when in reality it is not clearing up any spaces for the football games at all."

Mr. Hartman responded: "... we would be happy to entertain any proposal that anyone would like to submit to the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee as a motion to change the policy. It will be ... an interesting situation, since this is not one of our committee's policies; however, if someone would like to submit a proposal through our committee, we will certainly look at it and submit it for approval to the President."

No action was taken on the Committee's report.

B. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC LECTURES COMMITTEE REGARDING THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISTINGUISHED SPEAKERS/VISITORS (D&P 9912-9913). (RESUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE)

Both Warwick P. Wadlington (English), Chairman of the Public Lectures Committee, who prepared the report, and Darren C. Walker (Student Representative), who initiated the request for the report, were unable to be present.

Rodney L. Schlosser (Student Representative) said that he thought that Mr. Wadlington was "mistaken, because I have pulled a copy of the original legislation and it was very clear that Mr. Walker, who introduced the legislation, understood the role of the Public Lectures Committee and was actually asking for a few different things which have not been addressed by this response. There are four points to the original legislation. One is, should new funding sources be identified -- that is, possibly an endowment for special speakers? Two, should there be a new and ... different role for the Public Lectures Committee? Three, is there a more centralized process for choosing distinguished speakers and visitors, possible including the use of the funds that currently this committee has in its purview? Number four [is] coordinating the effort of using speakers for good purposes when they are on campus. Whether you agree with the merits of the legislation or not, the response from the Chair really does not address those issues."

Mr. Schlosser then MOVED that the resolution (D&P 9874; D&M 15757) be resubmitted to the Public Lectures Committee for reply. The motion was seconded.

Simon J. Bernau (Mathematics) spoke against the motion. "If we are going to accuse people of not reading, I think that goes both ways. It seems to me that the Committee response says quite specifically what their current duties are, and that Mr. Walker's motion interpreted against the Committee's response basically asks someone to change the Committee's charge quite drastically. I do not see that we will gain anything at all by sending this back to the Committee."

Mr. Schlosser responded: "I think one of the things that, had the committee met, they might have been able to discuss (and I do not think they met to discuss this) was a question of whether or not the funds that are currently available to that committee should be used to bring in speakers outside of those who the committee believes are important--that is, could anyone make a submission or request for those funds to be used for a speaker. Additionally, I think Mr. Walker was unable to find information that would have specified the true limitation of this committee; possibly it has the opportunity to do a great deal more if it so chooses."

The motion to resubmit was then APPROVED by a vote of 23 to 18.

C. RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PASS-FAIL-A OPTION (D&P 9922-9923). (REFERRED TO EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE)

Trey Monsour (Student Representative) MOVED that the two recommendations set forth on D&P 9922-9923 be referred to the Educational Policy Committee. The first recommendation would allow the student an option of receiving an A, receiving a Pass (CR), or receiving a fail (F); it would replace the existing Pass/Fail option. The second recommendation would redefine the Pass/Fail deadline to be the Pass/Fail/A deadline. The motion was seconded. Without discussion the motion was APPROVED by voice vote.

D. REQUEST FOR A STUDY AND REPORT BY THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (D&P 9924). (EXPLICATED AND APPROVED)

Diane M. Friday (Student Representative) said: "The University Policy Committee of the Student Senate made this recommendation that two lots be designated as lots for students who are living in dormitories on campus...." Ms. Friday then made the following motion:

the University parking lots surrounding Memorial Stadium prior to home football games. The Committee was asked to examine the real advantages of that practice and the options that are available to reduce the logistical problems that this practice causes for students. To respond to that first request, ... that particular situation is not a policy of the University Parking and Traffic Policies Committee; rather, it is a long-standing tradition that has existed between the Department of Men's Intercollegiate Athletics and the University administration--the parking spaces around Memorial Stadium will be reserved for contributors to the University's athletic program. This occurs normally five Saturdays every Fall semester; occasionally there is a sixth home game. Notices are placed on cars in that vicinity, generally on Friday, asking students or whoever else to move their cars to other available spaces; [if the] cars are not moved as of Saturday morning, people do receive a friendly wake-up call starting about 6:15 a.m. asking them to please move their cars by a certain time so that those spaces will be available. Essentially, ... in your request you asked what the advantages are; I think the advantages to the University community [of providing] spaces for contributors to that particular portion of the University [are probably fairly obvious]. In terms of the logistical problems, it is the feeling basically of the Committee that apparently on Friday evening there are rather ample parking spaces on campus, ... that there is ample parking for students and other people to move their cars for Saturday. We did not take any particular action as a committee on this request. If ... you would like us to do so, we would certainly be happy to consider that.

"The second request was, students have been told that the number of C parking spaces will be maintained during construction of the new University parking garage; the committee was asked to verify that such spaces will be maintained and to identify and report their location. As probably many of you are aware, the University parking garage is under construction. This has displaced some F parking places, A parking places, and C parking places. We have tried, in terms of a committee working with Parking and Traffic and the University police, to recommend that the displacement of all three of those classes of stickers be as equal as possible, and we feel we have done this so far. If you want a daily update on how many F, A, or C spaces are available, Parking and Traffic can provide you with those numbers; they do change daily with the construction that is going on around campus. But you may be interested in knowing for right now the number of permits which have been issued, and you may ... be interested in knowing how many spaces are ... available for those particular permits. We have issued 2,430 [F permits] for 2,073 spaces; we have issued 4,453 [A permits] for 2,970 spaces; and we have issued 14,199 [C permits] for 4,505 spaces."

Diane M. Friday (Student Representative), who had initiated the resolution asking for the Committee report, commented that the report "does not really seem to solve anything.... The point I think that we were trying to make was that a lot of students ... move [their cars] within walking distance of the University anyway, so the students have this burden of ... moving their cars every Friday night when in reality it is not clearing up any spaces for the football games at all."

Mr. Hartman responded: "... we would be happy to entertain any proposal that anyone would like to submit to the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee as a motion to change the policy. It will be ... an interesting situation, since this is not one of our committee's policies; however, if someone would like to submit a proposal through our committee, we will certainly look at it and submit it for approval to the President."

No action was taken on the Committee's report.

B. REPORT FROM THE PUBLIC LECTURES COMMITTEE REGARDING THE RESOLUTION CONCERNING DISTINGUISHED SPEAKERS/VISITORS (D&P 9912-9913). (RESUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE)

Both Warwick P. Wadlington (English), Chairman of the Public Lectures Committee, who prepared the report, and Darren C. Walker (Student Representative), who initiated the request for the report, were unable to be present.

Rodney L. Schlosser (Student Representative) said that he thought that Mr. Wadlington was "mistaken, because I have pulled a copy of the original legislation and it was very clear that Mr. Walker, who introduced the legislation, understood the role of the Public Lectures Committee and was actually asking for a few different things which have not been addressed by this response. There are four points to the original legislation. One is, should new funding sources be identified -- that is, possibly an endowment for special speakers? Two, should there be a new and ... different role for the Public Lectures Committee? Three, is there a more centralized process for choosing distinguished speakers and visitors, possible including the use of the funds that currently this committee has in its purview? Number four [is] coordinating the effort of using speakers for good purposes when they are on campus. Whether you agree with the merits of the legislation or not, the response from the Chair really does not address those issues."

Mr. Schlosser then MOVED that the resolution (D&P 9874; D&M 15757) be resubmitted to the Public Lectures Committee for reply. The motion was seconded.

Simon J. Bernau (Mathematics) spoke against the motion. "If we are going to accuse people of not reading, I think that goes both ways. It seems to me that the Committee response says quite specifically what their current duties are, and that Mr. Walker's motion interpreted against the Committee's response basically asks someone to change the Committee's charge quite drastically. I do not see that we will gain anything at all by sending this back to the Committee."

Mr. Schlosser responded: "I think one of the things that, had the committee met, they might have been able to discuss (and I do not think they met to discuss this) was a question of whether or not the funds that are currently available to that committee should be used to bring in speakers outside of those who the committee believes are important--that is, could anyone make a submission or request for those funds to be used for a speaker. Additionally, I think Mr. Walker was unable to find information that would have specified the true limitation of this committee; possibly it has the opportunity to do a great deal more if it so chooses."

The motion to resubmit was then APPROVED by a vote of 23 to 18.

C. RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PASS-FAIL-A OPTION (D&P 9922-9923). (REFERRED TO EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE)

Trey Monsour (Student Representative) MOVED that the two recommendations set forth on D&P 9922-9923 be referred to the Educational Policy Committee. The first recommendation would allow the student an option of receiving an A, receiving a Pass (CR), or receiving a fail (F); it would replace the existing Pass/Fail option. The second recommendation would redefine the Pass/Fail deadline to be the Pass/Fail/A deadline. The motion was seconded. Without discussion the motion was APPROVED by voice vote.

D. REQUEST FOR A STUDY AND REPORT BY THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC POLICIES COMMITTEE (D&P 9924). (EXPLICATED AND APPROVED)

Diane M. Friday (Student Representative) said: "The University Policy Committee of the Student Senate made this recommendation that two lots be designated as lots for students who are living in dormitories on campus...." Ms. Friday then made the following motion:

The Parking and Traffic Policies Committee is requested to consider the recommendation of the Student Senate that current "C" parking lots #67 (south of Jester Center) and #105 (east of the Texas Swim Center) should be reserved for dormitory residents at the University.

The Committee is further requested to report its recommendations to the University Council within a time frame which will enable the new policy, if adopted, to take effect by Fall Semester 1985.

The motion was seconded.

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) asked "about procedure, because the Committee is required to report back to the Council in a time frame which will enable the new policy, if adopted, to take effect. The Council has not previously reviewed matters of parking, to my knowledge, and I question whether or not it should in this case." Vice President Livingston noted "that the verb is 'request' rather than 'require'; I see no impropriety in requesting that committee to tell us what they have done or what they recommend that we do." Mr. Sutton responded: "Nor do I, providing it is perfectly clear that this body will not start taking actions on individual parking lot assignments--in other words, that is one item I would like to leave to the Parking and Traffic Committee." Vice President Livingston concluded: "I think, Dr. Sutton, you will find unanimous agreement with that, and with this exchange in the record, I rule that the motion is in order." There was no further discussion, and the motion was APPROVED by voice vote.

E. MOTION REQUESTING RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS AT THE UPPER-DIVISION LEVEL (INTRODUCED FROM THE FLOOR). (REFERRED TO EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE)

James W. Vick (Mathematics) brought to the Council's attention a concern which had arisen in the Course and Curriculum Committee of the College of Natural Sciences. "We have been looking at a number of proposals of different departments that deal with access to upper-division courses. In the process of our discussions, we have reviewed a number of the programs across campus that have appeared in recent years that restrict access to upper-division courses--first in the College of Business, in [the Departments of Geology and Computer Sciences, and in the] College of Engineering. These have a lot of different characteristics, and they also have a lot of effects that are seen beyond the departments and colleges concerned. For example, the College of Liberal Arts has become a holding tank for these students who are denied access to upper-division programs in the College of Business or elsewhere; in fact, [that College has] been a holding tank for some [Natural Sciences] students. It has resulted in a number of courses being restricted to majors only. We have had situations in which students from our college who wanted to take electives in upper-division courses in another college were barred not just because of their GPA but also because they were not in the right major. There was a general feeling in the Committee that this has developed in a rather haphazard way. Each one of the changes may have been very well motivated and carefully studied at the time, but there is just a patchwork quilt of these requirements [with] very little consistency among them. The committee asked me to bring [a] proposal to the University Council to submit this issue to the Educational Policy Committee, [to] ask them to review the access to upper-division courses across the campus, to investigate the possibility of making [such access] more uniform, and [to] investigate what the effects are of some of these requirements on other departments and colleges.... I think it is an important issue; I see it affecting a lot of students."

15852
10001

Mr. Vick then MOVED that the University Council ask the Educational Policy Committee to review the various rules for access to upper-division courses and to report to the University Council in Fall 1985 on measures that may make them more consistent. The motion was seconded.

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (Communication) commented "that the motion has a basic assumption in it that I am not sure I am ready to accept. The assumption is that the Committee is to work toward discovering how [the rules] can be made more consistent, and I am not sure that that would be a happy result; it may be that inconsistency would be better. It seems to me that ... that phrase could be left out and give the Committee greater latitude in investigating." Mr. Vick agreed and said that the word "consistent" could be replaced with the word "equitable." With no further discussion, Mr. Vick's motion was ADOPTED by voice vote.

F. MOTION TO ENDORSE FURTHER STUDY OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS ASSOCIATION (INTRODUCED FROM THE FLOOR). (REFERRED TO ADMISSIONS AND REGISTRATION COMMITTEE)

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) said: "In our earlier discussion on the registration process, the Counselors and Advisors Association really brought to us a set of recommendations for study...." He then MOVED that the University Council endorse further study by the Registrar's Office and/or the Admissions and Registration Committee of the proposals submitted by the Counselors and Advisors Association. [See Attachment A.] The motion was seconded and, without further discussion, APPROVED by a voice vote.

IX. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. QUESTION ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY TEACHING CENTER.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) raised a question for response by the President at the next meeting of the Council. "We have recently completed the University Teaching Center..., [which is] a very convenient building adjoining the Business School with an overhead crosswalk. I have heard just recently that the College of Business will receive priority in the scheduling of classes at UTC. Now I do not know if this is so or not; I hope it is not so. If it is, I would like to know about it. I think we are, as we all know, very short of teaching space here, and if it is called UTC, it should be [a] University Teaching Center. Otherwise, I think we should change its name." Vice President Livingston suggested that Mr. Iscoe submit the question in writing to the President before the next meeting.

B. STATEMENT ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S ABSENCE.

Vice President Livingston spoke about President Flawn's absence: "President Flawn has obviously not found it possible to be here today, and that has happened on several occasions; when he is gone, he sometimes asks me to preside in his stead. He wants you to know that he does not take this obligation lightly, that he regrets not being here, today as well as the other times ... he has been unable to come. I think you will agree that his priorities are probably correct since he is making speeches in two West Texas cities today on the budget appropriation process. As you may know, Chairman Hay has organized a kind of task force to try to persuade the movers and shakers that this is no time to retrench in higher education, but rather to expand and invest in higher education. The University has been very carefully reviewing its own budget requests and has now taken the view that what is needed is an appropriation large enough to enable us to maintain the momentum that we have been able to generate in these last several years. That, if it is accepted, will yield a modest increase in the appropriation over this present year's budget. With that objective in hand, Chairman Hay's committee has organized a series of meetings around the state, and Dr.

Flawn, along with two or three others, has been going to different cities where the [U.T. ex-students] have gathered groups which consist of ... city council people, important local politicians, editors and publishers of newspapers, [and] other molders of opinion, including those who have most significantly contributed to the campaign funds of the local legislators. The hope is that by gentle persuasion the case for higher education can be made, and [President] Flawn is making a pitch of this sort in 8, 10, 12 different centers of population. He is in West Texas today making two of these speeches, ... and we all know the importance of the task in which he is engaged; but he wants you to know that he is sorry that it takes him away from the University Council."

C. QUESTION ABOUT THE WAIVER OF THE ENGLISH 346K REQUIREMENT.

James H. Sledd (English) said that he had postponed addressing a question to President Flawn through Vice President Livingston until all other business had been conducted. "It is a question of the semantics of the noun 'urgency'. We were told that we could not be consulted [about the English 346K waiver] because of the 'urgency' of the situation. As I recall, the spokesman for the new English requirements said that they were four years in the planning. They were then two years in the debating. When they first went into effect, we instantly heard rumors of great difficulties, and I raised the question of those difficulties in this Council. You will recall I got such a brush-off that I asked to have my opinion recorded that those questions had been unanswered. Now if we had six years of planning and debate, and if questions were raised in the Council many months ago about the difficulties, I wish you would tell us what you understand by the word 'urgency'."

Vice President Livingston responded: "Mr. Sledd, I appreciate your comments, I understand your views, and I would not undertake a dispute with a famous lexicographer, so I decline to rejoin with you on that particular question."

X. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next meeting of the University Council is scheduled for Monday, April 15, at 2:15 p.m. in Main Building 212.

ATTACHMENT A.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FROM THE U.T. AUSTIN COUNSELORS AND ADVISORS ASSOCIATION March 18, 1985

The membership of the Counselors and Advisors Association consists of college and departmental representatives actively involved in on-going student advising and registration activities. A subcommittee of this group was formed to study and comment upon the proposals for changes in the existing system of registration at U.T. Austin.

After discussion with the Registrar and his staff, and the Bursar, we find we are in general agreement with the three proposals being submitted to the University Council by the Admissions and Registration Committee. We would like to state, though, that we believe these proposals will be effective only if the sectionizing process is improved. We encourage the efforts that are being made at the present time to develop a more efficient sectionizing program.

In addition, we would like to recommend the University Council endorse further study of the following proposals:

- 1) We strongly urge the implementation of on-line adds and drops at the departmental level. Many registration errors now occur during Departmental Adds and Drops. This is primarily due to the fact that add and drop transactions may be received and/or processed by the Registrar's Office in the wrong order.
- 2) We propose that Centralized Adds and Drops be limited to one day instead of two. The great majority of the transactions processed now are done so during the afternoon of the second day. If on-line Departmental Adds and Drops are implemented, these may eventually replace Centralized Adds and Drops.
- 3) We would like to suggest an extension of the current Preregistration week. This expansion would allow students more time to consult with advisors, which would in turn relieve pressure on departments and colleges. We recommend the extended period be for no more than two weeks, however, due to the limited resources available at the college and departmental levels.
- 4) We have agreed that the existing Revision of Preregistration Request (655) forms can be better utilized by campus advisors. Students should be encouraged to use this form to make schedule changes before sectionizing. The forms could be distributed to students when they turn in their Preregistration Course Request forms, and mailed out with the final grade reports in the Spring. Students living out of Austin for the Summer who wish to alter their request could then do so by mailing in these forms or bringing them to their Dean's office.

Respectfully submitted,

The Counselors and Advisors
Association