

From the University Council

THE FIFTH REGULAR meeting of the University Council for 1983-84 was convened in Main Building 212 on Monday, Jan. 23, 1984, at 2:15 p.m. In the absence of President Peter T. Flawn, William S. Livingston, vice president and dean of graduate studies, presided.

Approval without correction was given to the minutes of the meeting of Nov. 21, 1983, and the cancelled meeting of Dec. 12, 1983. There was no discussion of the secretary's report.

The following questions to the president had been submitted by James H. Sledd (English):

"Background. The minutes of the English Department for Dec. 8, 1983, include the following item: **'New English requirements'** (Name omitted) will chair the committee charged with overseeing the new E.346K program; substantial problems remain there. At the freshman level, the recommended E.106 and E.206 courses present significant difficulties and may not be taught initially. The new writing component requirement is proving to be a great challenge for most departments ...

"Questions. 1. What are those substantial problems, significant difficulties, and great challenges which the English Department now reports? 2. Why were they not anticipated after the alleged four years of planning, long experience and protracted meetings of many committees? 3. Since failure to offer E.106 and E.206 would weaken support for those freshmen who most need help and need it most immediately, what would be the effect on minority students, for whom it was suggested that the 'laboratory' handling of such work 'will be useful' ...?"

Vice President Livingston noted that President Flawn felt that the first two questions should have been addressed to the English Department, and he called on William O.S. Sutherland, chairman of that department, to respond. Mr. Sutherland stated that the problems are internal to the department, which is at work on the new English requirements. One reason there are problems is that UT Austin has the largest department of English in this country and probably in the world; almost everything the department does is compounded by size. The department is currently implementing the new upper-division writing course, E.346K. Syllabi for three types of E.346K have been developed, and those syllabi are being converted into classroom presentations. There probably will be 100 faculty members teaching that course each semester. There are many problems to solve — for example, how to maintain uniform standards across that many sections of the course. Mr. Sutherland further stated that no matter how much committee time and planning had already taken place, there still remain implementation details that must be worked out.

Vice President Livingston added that the third question also seemed to be a matter internal to the English Department. Mr. Sledd, however, felt that all three questions were University-wide rather than departmental problems. Mr. Livingston responded that the development of new courses, including E.106 and E.206, even if called for by University Council legislation, was the responsibility of departmental faculty. He further noted that those two courses were not created specifically for minority students.

Mr. Sledd concluded that the response to his questions had been "no response," and he asked that his conclusion be recorded in the reports of the meeting.

Reversing the order of the two items of old business, the Council first took up three recommendations from the Admissions and Registration Committee, which were presented by the committee chairman, Simon J. Bernau (Mathematics).

Recommendation I was for the adoption of a statement of principles concerning international student admissions. After a brief discussion and the incorporation of an amendment suggested by Vice President Gerhard J. Fonken (Academic Affairs and Research), the following statement was approved unanimously:

"The responsibilities of the international student admissions officer include the following:

"1. To review and evaluate the credentials of international student applicants in a fair and consistent manner and to deter-



Report by
H. PAUL KELLEY,
Secretary

mine if they have adequate preparation to succeed in their intended major area of study;

"2. To determine that each admitted student has adequate proficiency in the English language to enable him/her to pursue academic work effectively;

"3. To provide each applicant with information regarding costs of attending the University;

"4. To make available to each applicant information about the University, its offerings in his/her field, and its facilities for students in general and for international students in particular;

"5. To provide information and support to other offices and agencies on campus concerned with international students."

In the discussion, Mitchell R. Kreindler (student representative), president of the Students' Association, expressed support for Recommendation I by both himself and the Council of International Students. However, he said that it read more like a job description than a statement of institutional philosophy, and he hoped that the latter type of statement would also be developed.

Mr. Kreindler also asked how the definitions would be determined for "adequate academic preparation" and "adequate proficiency in the English language." Vice President Ronald Brown (Student Affairs) responded that while the academic preparation required for admission is specified in the UT Austin catalogue, the evaluation of academic credentials from institutions outside this country can be very difficult; we make use of every means available to evaluate such credentials. With regard to English language proficiency, he said that at present the foundation is the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL); graduate students are also asked to take an oral examination.

Recommendation II was to insert the following new statement on page 42 of the 1983-84 General Information Bulletin, just below the table of requirements in the admission requirements section:

"Transfer students holding a bachelor's degree and applying for admission as undergraduate degree seekers or as non-degree seekers are subject to all the requirements for students with 54 or more hours."

J. David Gavenda (Physics) asked if the committee had considered the impact of the proposed addition on adults with degrees who return only for continuing education courses. Mr. Bernau replied that it had not, and he withdrew the recommendation for further consideration by his committee.

Recommendation III was to insert a new sentence on page 43 of the 1983-84 General Information Bulletin, at the end of the first paragraph of the transient summer students section. The last two sentences of that section would then be: "Students who attend the University for one or more summer sessions as regular students and who then apply and are admitted as regular students are accorded the same treatment as any other students who have previously attended the University (e.g., scholastic probation policies, etc.). In particular such students will immediately be placed on scholastic probation if their University of Texas at Austin overall grade-point average is below that required for continuance in good standing."

Mr. Bernau noted that the recommended treatment is already mandated but is currently not being enforced. The change is to make the policy more explicit and to start to enforce it again. The recommendation was approved unanimously.

The Council next took up four recommendations from the Faculty Senate concerning external support and the University. John R. Durbin (Mathematics), chairman of the Faculty Senate, introduced the recommendations and called on Jack Otis (Social Work), chairman of the Faculty Senate committee that formulated them, to move their adoption.

Recommendation I stated: "The University Council opposes the recent policy of Federal agencies to classify research results that are obtained from unclassified Federally funded research projects. The Council urges the University administration to develop procedures to aid faculty members who find themselves dealing with this problem, and also urges the administration to work with other national organizations to change the policy."

Vice President Fonken expressed concern that the recommendation not be interpreted as being in opposition to the entire contents of the Executive Order involved. H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology), a member of the Faculty Senate committee, assured the Council that the recommendation was only concerned with after-the-fact classification of previously unclassified research. Recommendation I was then approved without opposition.

Recommendation II called for inserting the word "ordinarily" in paragraph 4 of Section 5.08 of the UT Austin Handbook

of Operating Procedures, which would then read:

"While it encourages projects sponsored by commercial and industrial organizations, the University, as a public institution, cannot engage in projects which involve continuing large-scale production or manufacture. Likewise, the University will not ordinarily undertake projects which limit benefits to one corporation or agency but will accept projects which benefit an entire industry or the public generally."

Mr. Otis noted that the University has in the past undertaken such projects and that occasionally there are good reasons for doing so. The recommendation was approved without opposition.

Recommendation III called for deleting the word "classified" from the second paragraph of Section 5.09 of the UT Austin Handbook of Operating Procedures, which would then read:

"The University shall not accept any classified contract which restricts freedom to acknowledge the existence of the contract, to identify the sponsor, and to disclose the general purpose and scope of the proposed research in sufficient detail to permit informed discussion regarding its appropriateness within the University."

"The University shall accept only those [classified] contracts under which there is a reasonable expectation that the investigation will yield significant new literature at an early date."

"The Advisory Committee on Classified Research shall have the responsibility (1) to conduct a continuing review of the University policies on classified research in the light of the public interest and to seek revision of these policies when appropriate, and (2) to review periodically the ongoing classified research program for conformance with the established policies and to report its findings annually to the president."

Mr. Sledd asked if the proposed change would require that publications result from contracts to teach Summer Institutes. Mr. Otis assured him that it would not; the context of the change was research contracts, not contracts for training or other purposes. The recommendation was then approved.

Recommendation IV called for "the establishment of a new standing advisory committee to the vice president for academic affairs and research. To be called the Advisory Committee on Research and Professional Activities, the committee would be expected to:

"(a) review and recommend policies and procedures governing University and faculty relations with outside organizations,

"(b) advise administrators and faculty members in problematic areas,

"(c) advise any **ad hoc** committee that might be appointed to investigate issues raised to outside employment, and

"(d) develop the criteria and aid in determining the appropriateness of a faculty member's outside professional activity when it arises as an issue."

Mr. Otis said that the purpose of the recommendation was to establish a new committee which would develop expertise in the problem areas specified in order to be of service both to faculty members and to University administrators in contract negotiations.

Vice President Fonken noted that the duties of the new committee seemed to duplicate some of the duties of the current Research Advisory Council and the Standing Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility. He also commented that it was not clear whether the new committee was to be one of the standing committees of the General Faculty, a standing committee of the University Council or a standing advisory committee to his office.

Mr. Gavenda, Mr. Otis and Mr. Durbin said that the committee was intended to be one of the standing committees of the General Faculty. As such it would be available to assist faculty members as well as administrators. Also, at least in recent years, the Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility has not dealt with the kinds of problems and issues the new committee would consider. Thomas W. Kennedy (Civil Engineering) expressed opposition to the recommendation until the nature of the committee could be clarified. Recommendation IV was then defeated.

Turning to new business, the Council approved without discussion the proposed dates for University Council meetings in 1984-1985. The pattern of meeting dates is the same as that for the current year.

James B. Smith Jr. (student representative), then moved "that the University Council create an **ad hoc** Committee on Improving the Fee Payment Schedule to make an investigation into the methods of collecting tuition and fees at other universities and to report to the Council on ways which might be used to increase the flexibility and convenience of the payment schedule for tuition and fees at The University of Texas at

(Continued on Following Page)