

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

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of April 15, 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 APRIL 15, 1985

The eighth regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1984-1985 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, April 15, 1985, at 2:15 p.m. President Peter T. Flawn presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: Lear L. Ashmore, Gerard H. Behague, Simon J. Bernau, R. H. Bing, Allen H. Bizzell, David L. Bourell, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Ronald M. Brown, Coby C. Chase, Kathleen F. Conlin, Wayne A. Danielson, Peter T. Flawn, Betty S. Flowers, Gerhard J. Fonken, Earnest F. Gloyna, Maureen M. Grasso, Alan D. Gribben, Vickie L. Hampton, Ira Iscoe, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin G. Kennamer, Robert D. King, George B. Kitto, J. Parker Lamb, Steven W. Leslie, Joan I. Lidoff, William S. Livingston, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Trey Monsour, Jack Otis, David M. Rabban, Alice R. Redland, Bonnie Rickelman, Diane L. Schallert, Rodney L. Schlosser, Leonard G. Schulze, Max R. Sherman, RoseAnn L. Shorey, Charles A. Sorber, Waneen W. Spirduso, Ron D. Stutes, H. Eldon Sutton, James W. Vick, J. Robert Wills, Robert E. Witt.

Absent: Edwin B. Allaire, Mark B. Baker, Barbara Becker-Cantarino, F. Stefan Bertram, Lowell J. Bethel (excused), Julie H. Bichteler (excused), Harold W. Billings (excused), Shirley F. Binder, Terrell Blodgett (excused), Thomas D. Boyd, Billye J. Brown (excused), Ben H. Caudle, James T. Doluisio (excused), Wm. C. Duesterhoeft, Jr. (excused), G. Charles Franklin, Diane M. Friday, Thomas M. Hatfield, Robert C. Jeffrey, Gaylord A. Jentz (excused), Eleanor W. Jordan, Clarence G. Lasby, Ernest L. Lundelius, Jr., Jane C. Marcus, Walter L. Reed (excused), Ramon Saldivar (excused), James H. Sledd, Darren C. Walker (excused), Claire E. Weinstein, Martha S. Williams, Lewis R. Wiman, Ronald E. Wyllys (excused), Mark G. Yudof.

Total members present: 46 Total members absent: 35

President Flawn introduced Scott L. Scarborough and Jane E. Perelman, newly elected President and Vice President respectively of the Students' Association, who will be members of the 1985-1986 Council.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF MARCH 18, 1985 (D&P 9991-10004; D&M 15843-15871). (POSTPONED TO NEXT MEETING)

Approval of the Minutes of the University Council meeting of March 18, 1985 (D&P 9991-10004; D&M 15843-15871) was deferred until the May meeting of the Council because some members had not yet received their copies.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT (D&P 9945-9952).

Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) announced two corrections in the Question to the President that appeared on the Order of Business (D&P 9942; D&M 15841). The correct wording of the statement and question submitted by Waneen W. Spirduso is shown in Section IV.A below.

Item D under New Business was "Report of Actions of the Faculty Senate." Distributed at the meeting were two pages of the Documents and Proceedings of the Faculty Senate (D&P 2119-2120) that were relevant to that item of business. Those pages are reproduced as Attachment A to these Minutes.

Also distributed at the meeting were several additional Questions to the President that were received too late to be distributed in advance. Those questions are reproduced at the appropriate places in Section IV, QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT, below.

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

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF COURSES AND INSTRUCTORS.

Waneen W. Spirduso (Physical and Health Education), Chairman of the Faculty Senate, had submitted in writing the following question:

At some point in time several decisions will be reached regarding the pilot project on student evaluation by mail of faculty teaching. These decisions may be, for example, whether to a) extend the pilot project, b) institutionalize the process, or c) change the process. Other questions that might be raised relate to the magnitude of the percent return necessary to consider the project a success, and the proposed use of the results.

What plan does the administration have to involve faculty in these decisions?

President Flawn responded that he was "requesting that the Measurement and Evaluation Center report this summer on the results of the two pilot projects [conducted during the Fall and Spring Semesters of 1984-1985]. Following receipt of that report by the Measurement and Evaluation Center..., we will provide to this Council a summary of the results which then would be on the floor for discussion.... Dr. Fonken is prepared to respond to any additional questions." No additional questions were asked.

B. USE OF THE UNIVERSITY TEACHING CENTER FACILITY.

Distributed at the meeting were two questions submitted in writing by Ira Iscoe (Psychology). The first was:

The University Teaching Center provides well-needed teaching facilities for our campus. It is rumored that beginning in the Fall of 1985 the College of Business Administration will have priority on the University Teaching Center facilities. If this is so, then we should give serious consideration to renaming the University Teaching Center inasmuch as it will not represent what its name implies. We all know that a tremendous space press exists on our campus and if priorities are to be given to one particular college or school there should be some clear justification for such a priority being assigned.

President Flawn responded: "There are 29 general-purpose classrooms in the University Teaching Center. One of these is designated as a media auditorium, scheduled by a faculty committee upon application. The remaining 28 general-purpose classrooms are scheduled by Official Publications, using the same criteria that are used to schedule all general-purpose rooms on campus. These criteria include a matching of room capacity to anticipated class size and [a] building priority based on proximity to the department location. The use of both criteria in combination maximizes both efficient use of room size and faculty convenience, and they provide a rational basis to carry out the classroom scheduling process. Currently the College of Business Administration does have designated priority in 23 of the classrooms in the Center; the Department of Economics has designated priority in the remaining 5. For Fall 1985 at least 20 other departments have classes scheduled in the University Teaching Center, and given that wide useage I do not really see any impropriety in continuing to call that facility the University Teaching Center."

C. QUALITY OF NEW FRESHMEN.

Mr. Iscoe's second question was:

Could you or someone in your administration comment on our success in recruiting top quality students with some reference to where we stand in the competition vis a vis financial support for entering freshmen. In asking for this question I wish to publicly acknowledge the role played by the Honors Colloquium and to compliment the administration on its success.

At President Flawn's request, Vice President for Student Affairs Ronald M. Brown responded:

Rather than going into a lengthy discussion of all of the various kinds of aid available to entering freshmen, I think we could best use the progress in recruitment of National Merit Scholars as an index of progress that we are making. In 1982, which was the last year of [an] entering class not involved with the Honors Colloquium, we had 130 entering freshmen Merit Scholars. In Fall 1984 we had 273, or an increase of 110%. To give some basis for comparison, ... Harvard/Radcliff together had 323; Rice had 169; Princeton, 168; Texas A&M, 162. So I think it is safe to say that we have made substantial progress, and [Mr. Iscoe] is correct in attributing a great deal of that success to the Colloquium. I in turn would have to say that the success of the Colloquium is due to enormous support, enthusiasm, [and] cooperation on the part of the faculty. It has been one of those classic cases where all the University community has pulled together to make a project work, one that is very important to all of us. We will have the Colloquium again this summer. Because of budgetary exigencies we are going to cut it down to one day, and also we are not going to pay travel costs automatically, although we will be liberal in interpreting financial need in paying travel costs. So probably the attendance this summer will be down slightly, but we do think that the success of it has been proven.

D. QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE ENGLISH 346K REQUIREMENT.

James H. Sledd (English) had submitted in writing the following questions about the English 346K requirement, which were distributed at the meeting:

1. Among the reasons given for waiving the University requirement of English 346K was the assertion (attributed by The Daily Texan on February 18 to Vice-President Fonken) that the English Department could not provide the required number of instructors. Since that number was apparently no greater than the Department has had in the recent past (see Professor James Kinneavy's recent calculations for the Faculty Senate), since many veteran instructors are presently available in Austin, and since Texas Southmost College in Brownsville

had over a hundred applicants this spring for a single appointment in English, many of them with Ph.D.'s and publications, what special reason made U.T. Austin incapable of recruitment?

2. Vice-President Fonken's waiver of the requirement of English 346K was supported and allegedly recommended by Professor W.O.S. Sutherland, who said that since "students take the sections that fit their schedules," not the sections that most nearly match their majors, "the basic premise upon which the course was built has been ... lost." But both Professor Kinneavy's statement for the Senate and my personal experience in registration show that students' patient efforts to register for the proper sections were frustrated because the English Department had not scheduled sections to match the students' needs; and in fact the Department's own "Guidelines for Advising," distributed in October, 1984, say specifically that "students are not required to take the variant slanted toward their particular discipline." Do these facts support Professor Kinneavy's assertion that administrators in the English Department are deliberately dismantling a writing program which the Department approved and University legislation formally established?

3. Professor Sutherland is critical of the University Council: "We were given to understand when the Department approved the course in 1978 [the date is mistaken] that the new requirement (specifically E. 346K) would call for less staff than the old. Yet the legislation that appeared on the University Council floor differed markedly from that passed in the Department. It called for every student to take this course...." In fact, however, the Council's legislation stipulated that the Council would be "authorized to approve equivalent courses in writing, offered by individual departments, as a substitute for English 346K" (D&M 14190); and the Council acted on the explicit assurance, by the English Department's spokesman, that "transfer credit for a composition course beyond E. 306 satisfies this requirement" (D&P 9078). Would you recount the subsequent legislative history which cancelled the stated authorization and assurance (D&P 8849, D&P 9127)?

4. At the Council's meeting of January 23, 1984, I asked three questions concerning the contrast between the bright promises which were made by the English Department's spokesman before the new English requirements were enacted (with the Department's full knowledge and expressed approval) and the Department's report, as soon as it set about the implementation of the new requirements, that they presented "substantial problems, significant difficulties, and great challenges" (D&P 9542). The proffered answers included a statement by Professor W.O.S. Sutherland: "I think it would be a great mistake to make plans long ahead of time and stick to those plans; I think that would be rigid and authoritarian, and I think we must learn as we go along" (D&P 9543). Since Department, Council, and administration thus had full warning, over a year in advance, of trouble ahead for the new requirements, did the English Department and the administration indeed act on the assumption that planning to avoid the trouble was undesirable? Was the requirement of E. 346K waived because the administration did not want to provide the money to support the writing program?

President Flawn said that the questions had arrived in his Office late the previous week, that he had been at a meeting of the Board of Regents on Thursday and Friday, and that he had been involved in Honors Day on Saturday. "I have not personally gone into the substance of his questions, except for one specific question which I can answer. He asked 'was the requirement of [English] 346K waived because the administration did not want to provide the money to support the writing program?' Now, the answer to that is 'No.' The decision was made on academic grounds, and indeed it was made before there was the full appreciation of how difficult it might be to find additional funds for operation for next year. The funding problem was not part of the decision to ask the deans to

waive that requirement for next year, until we can sort out some of the logistical problems and the substantive problems that have appeared around this course. It is my understanding that the Department of English and the College of Liberal Arts are studying these issues, including the programmatic issues, the logistical issues, the management issues, and that they are coming forward with some recommendations for resolution of the overall problem. As far as I am concerned, that course is a catalogue requirement. It is currently waived for this coming year, and I would hope to see it implemented in Fall of 1986. I do not propose to get into any further discussions of this unless someone feels compelled to do so." There were no further questions.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS -- None.

VI. PETITIONS -- None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS -- None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.

A. SPECIAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN RESPONSE TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL REQUEST (D&P 9832; D&P 9939-9941). (NEW REQUEST MADE OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS)

The Committee had submitted a written report that provided the Council with a brief summary of U.T. Austin's current international study arrangements. It also had provided brief comparisons with programs at the Universities of Michigan, North Carolina, and Illinois (Champaign-Urbana), as well as with programs at Stanford, Pennsylvania, and Southern Methodist Universities. With regard to the development or expansion of current arrangements, the Committee had listed a number of problems that would have to be overcome and said that, should U.T. Austin "wish to substantially increase foreign study opportunities for its students (especially undergraduates), ... it probably would be necessary to enter into formal arrangements with a few foreign institutions willing to accept annually a fixed number of Texas students. ... Any such arrangements should not replace existing exchange programs, or preclude the establishment of others...." Finally, the Committee had noted that information about opportunities for study abroad could be centralized if the University administration so requested. Neither the committee chairman, James R. Roach (Government), nor any other member was present at the Council meeting to answer questions about the report.

Rodney L. Schlosser (Student Representative) said that the students on the Council appreciated the detail that the report provided. He then MOVED that the Council create an ad hoc committee and charge it with developing proposals for substantially increasing foreign study opportunities for U.T. Austin students, and the motion was seconded.

William S. Livingston (Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies) said: "We have a standing committee on this very subject; why is it necessary to have an ad hoc committee of the University Council...?" Mr. Schlosser replied that "members of that committee [said] that they have given this response but they are uninterested in now trying to come up with a firm proposal to overcome the [problems] outlined in the answer to question 3, which is 'What do we do now?'...."

President Flawn asked Mr. Schlosser if he was "saying that the committee was reluctant to accept a charge from the University Council." Mr. Schlosser replied: "No, they have now responded to the charge, but it seems that now that we have this information, we should do something with it...."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) commented: "I want to be sure

that we do not vote on a motion without understanding what its implications are. The committee says that if the University wanted to expand its offerings, then here are some things that might [have to] take place and, I think, tried to point out some barriers that might have to [be] overcome.... I think that if we [adopt] this motion, we are saying in effect, 'Yes, we do want to expand the international study opportunities beyond those presently described in this report, and we are charging some committee with coming up with the strategy for doing that.' A motion to establish an ad hoc committee to study something always sounds innocuous, but in this case it is not; it is ... a policy statement by the University Council.... Unless I misunderstand what the standing committee has done, it has not made a recommendation on that one way or the other; it is simply responding in terms of what is available and what obstacles there would be to expanding it. I would ... like to see [a recommendation] from the standing committee [as to] whether we should or should not attempt to move forward with international studies before the Council makes that decision...."

Mr. Schlosser agreed with Mr. McDaniel. "The committee, from our discussions, is not interested in getting into that business. It probably is the appropriate committee to do so.... You raise a very important question: Does this Council want to go on record [as] encouraging the creation of more ... overseas programs, specifically in English-speaking nations? ..."

President Flawn again asked Mr. Schlosser: "Now, it is your belief that if this Council were to formally charge this committee with doing what you want done, that they would do it reluctantly or unenthusiastically, or refuse to do it; is that what you are telling me?" Mr. Schlosser replied: "Yes."

Vice President Livingston pointed out that because the committee had not reported in the mode which Mr. Schlosser wished, "it did not follow that the committee would be unwilling to accept a charge of the sort we are here debating. Occam's Razor should above all apply to committees, and it seems to me that this should go back to the committee which has already begun the study of the matter rather than our creating a new committee to start all over again." He then MOVED to amend Mr. Schlosser's motion to refer the matter back to the standing committee.

Mr. Schlosser pointed out that the original charge had not asked the committee to give its opinion, so it had done what it was asked to do. Now, however, the Council was soliciting the committee's opinion as to whether U.T. Austin should get more in the business of international programs in English-speaking nations. After some friendly discussion about simplifying the parliamentary situation, both the original motion and the motion to amend were withdrawn. Mr. Schlosser then MOVED that the Committee on International Programs be asked to formulate its recommendations about the University's future in international programs in English-speaking nations. The new motion was seconded. There was no further discussion, and the motion was APPROVED by voice vote.

B. RECOMMENDATION TO REPLACE THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON TEACHER EDUCATION WITH A NEW STANDING COMMITTEE ON TEACHER EDUCATION (D&P 9944). (POSTPONED TO NEXT MEETING)

Dean Lorrin G. Kennamer (Education) reminded members of the Council that there had been a committee involving faculty members from a number of U.T. Austin colleges appointed by the President that had spent many months studying the teacher education program at this University; James W. Vick (Mathematics) had been the chairman. That committee had made its report to President Flawn. One of the recommendations of the committee was that the present University Council on Teacher Education be replaced with a new interdisciplinary standing committee chaired by a faculty member outside the administration of the College of Education and charged with the responsibility of continuing the study of the teacher

education program, responding to new developments, and monitoring the implementation of the recommendations of the ad hoc committee. Dean Kennamer then MOVED that the recommendation of the ad hoc Committee on Teacher Preparation be implemented as follows:

1. The University Council on Teacher Education should be replaced by a new standing committee with expanded advisory responsibility called the Committee on Teacher Education.
2. The Chairman and members of the Committee on Teacher Education should be appointed by the President of U.T. Austin for two-year terms from a panel of nominees submitted by the Committee on Committees, to include at least nine members of the General Faculty and three students.
3. Members of the committee should represent colleges involved with the preparation of public school teachers. At least one member of the Committee on Teacher Education should be from each of the following colleges: Fine Arts, Communication, Natural Sciences, Education, and Liberal Arts. The Dean of the College of Education and the University Teacher Certification Officer should be ex officio members of the committee.
4. The committee should be charged to continue the study of the teacher education program including suggestions of the recent ad hoc Committee on Teacher Education, to respond to new developments, and to recommend improvements.

Dean Kennamer pointed out that Sections 1 and 3 of his motion were identical to the material previously circulated on D&P 9944, but that the previously circulated Section 4 had been replaced with the wording shown above. [See Attachment B, which was distributed at the meeting.]

Dean Kennamer also pointed out a change in Section 2 of the motion as previously circulated (D&P 9944). The committee being replaced had been required to consist of at least nine General Faculty members and three students. Section 2, as reworded above, contains the same requirement.

The motion as stated above was seconded.

Dean Kennamer began the discussion by saying that this new standing committee would be of support and help to the College of Education and its undergraduate teacher preparation program. The new committee would be more flexible and would continue the study of teacher education started by the special ad hoc committee. The College of Education feels that the new committee will help the College in its relationship with the various other colleges on campus, in particular those that are involved directly in the preparation of teachers. He pointed out that the College of Business Administration is not mentioned in this new proposed committee, because the College of Business Administration has decided to discontinue the preparation of teachers for secondary schools.

President Flawn asked how this proposed new committee differs from the present University Council on Teacher Education. Dean Kennamer replied that one of the major differences would be more flexibility in the chair of the committee. The Dean of the College of Education is automatically the chair of the University Council on Teacher Education; under the new arrangement, the chair is not fixed.

Wayne A. Danielson (Journalism) asked why the phrase "to monitor the implementation of the Vick recommendations" was being omitted. Dean Kennamer responded that the recommendations might or might not be implemented. "Not all of the recommendations of the committee are subject to the direct involvement of the College of Education. In fact, at the request of the President, the recommendations have been categorized into three groups -- those that are the direct responsibility of the

College, those that are activities and responsibilities of other colleges..., and [those] that are more the responsibility or major concern of the central administration. Therefore we would be presumptuous and foolhardy if we were to say ... every single recommendation should be implemented. We are not prepared to say that.... We feel it was misleading to state what would or would not be done. This would be a standing committee, with no more authority than any other standing committee. If there were need for catalogue changes, then the route of recommendation would be to this Council. If there were need for action that involved not catalogue change but some other aspect of the program, it might be routed to [the Office] of one of the Vice Presidents.... It leaves with this committee the continued study [of the recommendations and the teacher preparation program]. Also, it was pointed out to me that the word 'monitor' can be misleading. 'Monitor' can mean to some people that you must do it. To other people it [can] mean [that] you are observing and suggesting. We felt that [the new phrasing] clarified the responsibility [of the committee]."

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) spoke in support of the motion, and there were no further comments. Because of the short notice given that this matter would be taken up at this meeting, under the By-Laws of the Council action on the motion was postponed to the next meeting.

C. REPORT FROM THE STUDENT HEALTH COMMITTEE REGARDING THE RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING THE CREATION OF A STUDENT HEALTH CENTER BOARD OF DIRECTORS (D&P 9886; D&P 9984-9990). (TABLED)

Bill M. Shaw (General Business), Chairman, presented the report from the Student Health Committee. "We are responding today to a direction [from the Council (D&P 9886)] with seven pages of recommendations [D&P 9984-9990]... that you [have received]. I would like to mention at the outset that much of this work can be attributed to the very conscientious efforts of [the] student members of the [Committee] -- Norman Friedman, Victor Schuler, Corinne Stern, and also other faculty members of the [Committee] -- Malia Johnson (Nursing), and Barbara Williams (Social Work).... I would just respond to whatever questions that you and other members of the Council might have."

President Flawn asked Ronald M. Brown (Vice President for Student Affairs) to comment. Vice President Brown stated: "I have no quarrel with the intent or the thrust of the proposal. I do think probably it would be wiser to separate the by-laws from the body of the charge to the group, but that can be handled later. I would like to give the new Director of the Student Health Center an opportunity to participate in the final drafting of this, and ..., assuming this body passes it, [I will recommend] to the President that he hold it until we have hired a new Director. We have several fine candidates, and one of the primary criteria that we are using in judging those candidates is their interest in and their experience in involving students in the programmatic decisions of the health centers with which they have been involved. So asking the President to delay that in no way would be a means of putting it in cold storage; to the contrary, it would be a way of making sure we ended up with a document that we felt would fully implement the intent that you folks have in mind."

Because Mr. Shaw was not a member of the Council, Rodney L. Schlosser (Student Representative) MOVED that the University Council approve the recommendations in the report, and the motion was seconded.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) immediately MOVED that the motion "be tabled pending the University's hiring a new Director of the Health Center, or until the beginning of the next academic year, whichever comes first." The motion to table was seconded and ADOPTED by a voice vote.

D. REPORT OF ACTIONS BY THE FACULTY SENATE (ATTACHMENT A). (NO ACTION)

Waneen W. Spirduso (Physical and Health Education), Chairman of the Faculty Senate, reported on the Faculty Senate actions concerning the matters shown in Attachment A. "This is a report that the Faculty Senate has, of course, circulated in its own Documents and Proceedings (pages 2119-2120), which you were given when you came into the room. The Senate wished that I present these in the form of a very brief report for the purpose of making sure that as many people as possible hear the Senate's position on this. The committee ... was chaired by Diane Schallert [Educational Psychology], [and its other members were] Simon Bernau [Mathematics], William Duesterhoeft [Electrical Engineering], Gaylord Jentz [General Business], Walter Reed [English], and Bonnie Rickleman [Nursing]. They worked very hard and produced two motions, which were approved at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate....

"MOTION 1: The Faculty Senate recognizes that sudden unexpected surges in enrollment may make the last minute hiring of many lecturers inevitable in a particular department for a particular academic year. In a university of the first class, however, we should expect the bulk of our teaching at all levels to be carried out by faculty holding tenure or on tenure track appointments. Accordingly, when enrollment remains high, the Faculty Senate urges deans and higher administrators to ensure that the classes in question not continue to be taught by lecturers. In order to do this, new tenure/tenure track budget lines may have to be found.

"MOTION 2: Background. We recognize that in some departments on this campus there is a growing concern associated with the status and role of lecturers and that in other departments the problem is minimal. We recommend against a University-wide general policy that would apply to all departments without regard to the particular histories and circumstances that exist. Recommendation. We do recommend strongly to all departments, regardless of the significance of current concerns about lecturers, that they prepare a policy statement that would clarify the conditions of association with the department and thus protect the rights of all concerned. As an example of such a statement, we offer one adopted by the Budget Committee of the Department of Mathematics [see Attachment A]. We also recommend that such a policy statement be developed for other non-tenure track positions.

"These two motions and their approval are being mailed to the chairs [of departments] and [to] deans ... of the colleges [and schools]."

Dean Lorrin G. Kenamer (Education) asked if those materials were being mailed to the chairmen and deans for information only, and if any action would have to come through the University Council. Ms. Spirduso replied affirmatively.

IX. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT -- None.

X. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the University Council is scheduled in Main Building 212 at 2:15 p.m. on Monday, May 6, 1985.

Distributed to members of the University Council and to members of the General Faculty who want Minutes on May 2, 1985.

ATTACHMENT A

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE ON
THE STATUS AND ROLE OF THE LECTURER

[Reproduced from Pages 2119-2120 of the Documents
and Proceedings of the Faculty Senate]

The basis of our many discussions included (1) a survey of the number and type of positions held by persons who are teaching at this University who are not in tenure track positions; (2) a comparison of the average class sizes taught by lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors and professors; (3) relevant AAUP statements on part-time and full-time non-tenure track appointments; (4) the Regents' Rules and Handbook of Operating Procedures; (5) input from the heads of departments that appoint a relatively large number of lecturers; and (6) transcripts of the relevant discussions held on the Senate floor. We have one overriding impression of the status and role of lecturers on this campus, and that is that lecturers have widely different roles, privileges, and circumstances associated with their appointments in different departments. Because of this, it is very difficult to talk in generalities of solutions, issues, or even of the severity of concerns. Had we as a committee been clearly identified as advocates of any particular constituency, our task would have been much easier. As it was, we were charged with exploring the full range of possible perspectives. The impression from that view is that there are serious concerns and knotty problems in some parts of the University associated with lecturers that do not have obvious and easy solutions. It is our position as a committee that further Senate discussion of the status and role of the lecturer might best proceed around the following motions.

Motion 1: The Faculty Senate recognizes that sudden unexpected surges in enrollment may make the last minute hiring of many lecturers inevitable in a particular department for a particular academic year. In a university of the first class, however, we should expect the bulk of our teaching at all levels to be carried out by faculty holding tenure or on tenure track appointments. Accordingly, when enrollment remains high, the Faculty Senate urges deans and higher administrators to ensure that the classes in question not continue to be taught by lecturers. In order to do this, new tenure/tenure track budget lines may have to be found.

Motion 2:Background.

We recognize that in some departments on this campus there is a growing concern associated with the status and role of lecturers and that in other departments the problem is minimal. We recommend against a University-wide general policy that would apply to all departments without regard to the particular histories and circumstances that exist.

Recommendation.

We do recommend strongly to all departments, regardless of the significance of current concerns about lecturers, that they prepare a policy statement that would clarify the conditions of association with the department and thus protect the rights of all concerned. As an example of such a statement, we offer one adopted by the Budget Committee of the Department of Mathematics (see below).

We also recommend that such a policy statement be developed for other non-tenure track positions.

SAMPLE GUIDELINES

(Taken from the Budget Committee of the Department of Mathematics)

- "1. Appointments as lecturer shall be special appointments clearly limited to a brief association with the University.

"2. Lecturer appointments can be used as a means to support certain visitors and to provide some flexibility in managing unexpected teaching pressures; however, they should not be used as a strategy to avoid funding the recruitment of a quality professorial faculty adequate for the Department's continuing teaching needs.

"3. No person with an appointment as a lecturer should expect reappointment or continuing appointment beyond the term of the current appointment.

"4. No individual may be appointed as a full-time lecturer for more than a total of three years; equivalently, no more than six long session semesters, nor for more than nine long session semesters and summer sessions combined.

"5. Academic service as a lecturer is not counted toward the satisfaction of any probationary period of service required for consideration of promotion or tenure.

"6. The terms and conditions of each appointment should be stated or confirmed in writing, and a copy of the appointment document should be supplied to the appointee. The appointee should be advised, early in the appointment period, of the substantive and procedural standards generally employed by the Department and the University in evaluating the performance of lecturers."

Diane L. Schallert, Chair
Simon J. Bernau
Wm. C. Duesterhoeft
Gaylord A. Jentz
Walter L. Reed
Bonnie Rickelman