16196
10376

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

The Minutes of the University Council meeting of February 17, 1986, 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 FEBRUARY 17, 1985

The sixth regular meeting of the University Council for the academic year 1985-1986 was held in Room 212 of the Main Building on Monday, February 17, 1986, at 2:15 p.m. President William H. Cunningham presided.

ATTENDANCE.

Present: D. Blake Alexander, Lear L. Ashmore, Lance Bertelsen, Lowell J. Bethel, Julie H. Bichteler, Harold W. Billings, Shirley F. Binder, Allen H. Bizzell, J. Harold Box, Robert E. Boyer, Billye J. Brown, Ronald M. Brown, Cindy I. Carlson, Alan K. Cline, JonAnn E. Coniglio, William H. Cunningham, Wayne A. Danielson, James T. Doluisio, William C. Duesterhoeft, Jr., Gerhard J. Fonken, Wallace T. Fowler, R. LaVerne Gallman, Earnest F. Gloyna, Sheldon E. Good, Maureen M. Grasso, Alan D. Gribben, Wilma P. Griffin, Vickie L. Hampton, Kurt O. Heinzelman, Elaine K. Horwitz, Ira Iscoe, Robert C. Jeffrey, Gaylord A. Jentz, Sharon H. Justice, H. Paul Kelley, Lorrin G. Kennamer, Robert D. King, James L. Kinneavy, William R. Koch, Steven W. Leslie, William S. Livingston, John C. Loehlin, Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr., Jack Otis, Jane E. Perelman, David J. Quan, David M. Rabban, Wayne A. Rebhorn, Thomas F. Reese, Bonnie Rickelman, A. Donald Sellstrom, Scott L. Scarborough, Diane L. Schallert, Leonard G. Schulze, John M. Scott, Pamela J. Shoemaker, RoseAnn L. Shorey, Gideon A. Sjoberg, Charles A. Sorber, Waneen W. Spirduso, William M. Stott, R. Craig Stotts, W. O. S. Sutherland, Jr., H. Eldon Sutton, James W. Vick, J. Robert Wills, A. Leslie Willson, Lewis R. Wiman, Robert E. Witt, Ronald E. Wyllys.

Absent: Terrell Blodgett (excused), David L. Bourell (excused), G. Charles Franklin, Thomas M. Hatfield (excused), J. Parker Lamb, Priscilla

Nelson, Robert A. Prentice, Max R. Sherman (excused), Martha S. Williams, Mark G. Yudof (excused).

Total members present: 70 Total members absent: 10

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF DECEMBER 9, 1985 (D&P 10308-10325/ D&M 16166-16183). (APPROVED)

Minutes of the meeting of December 9, 1985, were approved as circulated.

II. SECRETARY'S REPORT.

The Secretary's Report had previously been circulated (D&P 10340-10347).

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

IV. QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

A. QUESTION CONCERNING RECRUITMENT OF GRADUATE STUDENTS.

Ira Iscoe (Psychology) had submitted the following written question:

> While our University has made commendable progress in increasing faculty salaries, I am concerned that we have fallen behind and will continue to fall behind prestigious universities in the recruitment of graduate students. In many ways the reputation of an institution rests on its graduate programs and the quality of graduate programs is intimately tied up with the types of students that colleges and departments can recruit.
>
> In my experience in recruiting graduate students and in helping seniors choose graduate schools, I have been struck with what I consider to be a disparity between what The University of Texas and what other institutions such as the University of California, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, for example, can and do offer entering graduate students. Frequently these universities offer a highly desirable student not only enough money to pay for tuition and fees, but a handsome scholarship or fellowship which in many cases does not involve any type of work for the first year. I recognize that the issue of amount and types of support for graduate students is a most complicated one. My purpose in asking this question is to find out our current status, and if the matter is judged of sufficient importance to schedule it for longer discussion by the University Council.

President Cunningham called on William S. Livingston (Vice President and Dean of Graduate Studies) to respond to the question. Vice President Livingston said that he was glad that the question had been asked becasue it provided him with "a chance to share some concerns of mine and the President's with the Council.... It raises the serious question of whether the University of Texas is competing adequately with ... financial inducements to the graduate students that we try to recruit; and the clear-cut, unequivocal answer to that question is, 'No, we are not competing adequately.' Our offers are not competitive, ... and the problem has been getting worse for several years; the competition is very tough, and we have been falling behind. Our acceptance rate over a good many years has been a little better than 50% -- that is, on our recruitment fellowships we would recruit the people in the range of 50%-52% or 53%; last year that figure fell to 46%, and I have no doubt that ... that decline is due to our declining competitive position. And so, in the course of the last year, we have concluded that we have got to increase the stipends on our fellowship offers, even if that means decreasing the number of fellowship offers. Otherwise we are using our resources to compete for second rate students, and that is not the way to accomplish what we all want to accomplish. So we decided we had to increase it.

"Meanwhile, I went to the President some weeks ago and laid out before him the situation as we saw it. We were able, at that time, to put together some figures from other institutions with which we compare ourselves and with whom we compete, and it is perfectly clear ... that our fellowship offers are not on the same level as those at many other places, including places that we do not [view as competitors]. The President, in response to these observations, has agreed to increase the University Fellowship account for this coming year by a quarter of a million dollars. That is no mean increase. It does not solve the problem, but it will go a long way to help.... The Available University Fund these days is under enormous pressures because of the character and level of the appropriation last year, which has required us to do some shuffling with funds and supplement other accounts with funds from the Available University Fund; next year, and perhaps [for] the next two or three years, the pressure on the Available Fund is going to be enormous. So we are all pleased that the President saw this as among the highest priorities that faced the institution, and in consequence of the additional allocation we have increased the stipends for University Fellowships for the coming year from $5,500 plus tuition and fees to $7,000 plus tuition and fees. The offers that are going out now to recruit new students include that figure of $7,000 plus. We are still not out of the woods by any means, and the President is hoping that we can increase these figures still more next year.

"Now, most of you know, I suspect, that the practice in some departments where there are local funds available is to supplement the stipends which are offered out of the Graduate School office. Particularly that is true in science and engineering, where you are more likely to find additional local funds; in many departments in science and engineering

the $5,500 plus tuition [and fees] has been supplemented in varying amounts over a long period of time for many years. I wish everybody had funds [with which to do that]; obviously many departments simply do not.

"I would like to share one other set of figures with you, because these figures are not anywhere readily available. The Graduate School account, at $1,400,000, is only a portion of the fellowship money that is made available through our graduate programs to recruit good students, or to sustain good students after they are here; the total amount last year was $4,580,000, which is something like three times the amount available through the Graduate School. That $4,580,000 was distributed among 2,024 students, which means an average award of $2,262. Now, do not jump on me too [quickly]; everybody knows that $2,262 is not a competitive recruitment fellowship. These figures include every nickel that is granted by any department or program for any non-labor-involved fellowship assistance. It includes, in many cases, $200 scholarships which are awarded in a few departments so that those students come under the statutory provision for the waiver of non-resident tuition fees; obviously, students who receive those fellowships have to receive them in competition with Texas residents, and I am confident that they do. But the total figure is $4,580,000, and the average stipend is $2,262.

"What we are going to try to do now, and we will need a good deal of help on this, is to think about revising the format of the fellowship offers, particularly the recruitment offers. About three years ago we contrived this system of the preemptive fellowships, which meant that we were able to combine our resources with departmental resources for teaching assistantships and contrive a combined package of fellowship and assistantship awards, and make them available over a 24-month period. I think that had a very salutary effect on our competitive position. We may be able to go beyond that and use an increasing portion of the fellowship money to combine with assistantships, whether research or teaching assistantships, in such a way as to spread it more broadly over a larger competitive arena and make it more productive in terms of recruitment effects. That is going to take a good deal of calculation and a good deal of discussion, and it may not work the same way [everywhere] across the campus, but there is a possibility that we can make our fellowship funds go farther than they go now.

"At any rate, the good news for the moment is, 'Yes, everybody is perfectly well aware of the problem....' I hope that the increasing allocation to the fellowship fund and the increase in the stipend will have some good effects."

Mr. Iscoe said that he was cheered by the report and hoped that graduate student recruitment would remain one of our highest priorities.

In response to a question from Pamela J. Shoemaker (Journalism), Vice President Livingston stated that continuing fellowships also will be increased to $7,000. "I do not want to draw [a] distinction between the

good students that are already here and the good students out there we are trying to recruit. [There may be] a slight diminution in the number of continuing fellowships, but at the moment we do not know how many preemptive fellowships will be awarded; until we get the responses back in we cannot make a confident estimate. Typically, we have been [awarding] about 100 preemptive fellowships and about 90 continuing fellowships, and I am hoping that those figures will at least stay the same. But the answer is, 'Yes, we will use the same stipend.'"

B. QUESTION CONCERNING UTILIZATION OF UNIVERSITY FACILITIES.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management), Chairman of the Faculty Senate, had submitted the following written question to the President:

> The item (D&P 10021-10024) regarding utilization of University facilities continues to plague some members of the Faculty Senate. It appears to us that we are getting the runaround. When the item was raised last Spring at University Council we were told that staff work would be done over the summer. Then we were told that the legal office had been consulted and, as a result of that consultation, the staff work was not done. When we then asked to have someone from the legal office come to the Council and explain the legal issues involved we were told that legal issues were not a barrier to action. The Council acted. Now we are told (through the Secretary's Report, D&P 10329-10330) that the item is back in the legal office.
>
> Please inform us (1) why this issue has now been re-submitted to the legal office and (2) when you expect to decide whether or not to forward this recommendation (and the other related recommendations passed by the University Council)?

President Cunningham said that he would break the question down into three parts and respond separately to each.

"The first portion of the question deals with what appears on [D&P] 10021 under Restrictions on the Content of Speech on University Property: [Regents' Rule VI, Sec 7.26 provides:] 'No person shall be permitted on any campus of the System to advocate or recommend, either orally or in writing, the conscious and deliberate violation of any federal, state, or local law.' [This] is a question of dealing with repeal of a Regents' Rule, which I have no trouble [supporting] if in the end we feel that [Rule] needs to be repealed. There are also, though, ... some constitutional questions that have been raised [by the University Council], and for that reason I have asked our attorneys down in the System office to give me [an opinion] on the constitutional questions. I am not an attorney; I do not pretend to have any expertise in that

area. I appreciate the work that was done by David [Rabban] and other people ..., and I hope that will be instructive to our legal counsel. That is why that portion of it has been sent downtown.

"The second [portion of the question] deals with [what] appears on [D&P] 10022: 'We recommend the elimination of a sponsorship requirement for any organization or local chapters whose membership comes predominantly but not exclusively from University faculty, staff,....' That one ... I have not made my mind up on yet, and I would like to have an opportunity to study it for at least another month. There are some questions that do make me nervous about that -- everything from the fact of turning over a portion of our campus to people who are not intimately involved in the campus, to the fact that we may be accused of competing with private enterprise ..., to the fact that I really do not want to wake up some day and find out that the campus is full of sales conventions because two people on the campus happen to be involved in that....

"The third [portion of the question] deals [with what appears at] the bottom of [D&P] 10022: 'We also recommend that faculty organizations be exempted from the procedural requirements of the General Information bulletin, [Sec. 10-201 to 10-203].' I agree with ... that, and we have asked Official Publications to be the unit ... from now on, instead of the Dean of Students' Office, [that] will provide the opportunity to obtain physical resources on campus.... I agree with your recommendation ..., so I will approve that portion at this time.

"The other pieces are still under investigation."

Mr. McDaniel replied that he thought there were two issues, "one of which you have addressed quite well, and we do not want you to rush to make a decision. Another issue is that this is an item which has been on the agenda for a long time, and we were told last spring the staff work was going to be done. Then we were told staff work could not be done because somehow or other lawyers had gotten involved. So we said, 'Bring the lawyers out; let them talk to us....' And we were told, 'No, ... do not do that; that is not appropriate, either. We have a right to make decisions on our campus about policy.' Well, when I got [that answer], I will be honest with you, I felt I was getting the runaround. I felt as though there had been more than ample time for the administration [to get the] facts it was trying to [obtain], felt as though we had brought the issue to the table ... openly, [and felt] that we had been more than willing to have the legal staff come and discuss it with us even before we brought a recommendation back to Council.

"Now we cannot make up [the lost time], but I think that ... members of the Faculty Senate would appreciate it if ... it was not going to be a question of every time we wake up there is going to be another reason why we cannot discuss an issue.

"I certainly understand, Mr. President, your desire to get an opinion from the legal staff; I hope you get one. I hope it is favorable; if not, I may have something further to say about it."

David M. Rabban (Law) asked if a response from legal counsel was expected by a given date. President Cunningham responded that no date had been given by legal counsel, "but I will urge them to give it to us. I am not looking at that as a place that we can basically bury this thing, I promise you that."

Mr. Rabban next asked: "When we received a response as to why staff work was not done over the summer..., as was suggested last spring when the issue was postponed until this year, part of the response was that the counsel's office did not feel it appropriate to respond while a case was pending. Do you know if the pendency of that case will prolong the consideration of the counsel's staff on this issue?" President Cunningham replied that he hoped it would not.

Mr. Rabban continued: "You mentioned that you would decide with respect to the second issue within a month or so. Would it be unreasonable to ask the counsel to have a response to you on the first question by the time you make up your mind on the second? I say this because I was appointed to chair this committee in the spring of 1984, and the carry-over person on the committee said the prior committee that had discussed this issue in, I think, 1982-83 had asked for and had been promised a response on related issues by the counsel's office for over a year without receiving one. For that reason, I am particularly interested in at least hearing their response within the next month or so, or before spring break." President Cunningham said that he would urge the legal counsel to act. "We are not trying to hide it down there; let me see what I can do. You are welcome to pass it if you want to, and I mean that, and I will use it if you pass it, but on the other hand, I am going to ask them to give it to us as soon as they can.... I am pushing them on a lot of other things, and I will push them on this one. We do not have our own counsel on campus; that is one problem."

Mr. Rabban said that he appreciated the demands on lawyers' time, but he also hoped that a response would be forthcoming within the next month or before spring break "so that we as the Council could come to a resolution before the end of this academic year." President Cunningham said that he totally agreed.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS.

A. DISCUSSION OF ENGLISH/WRITING REQUIREMENT.

President Cunningham called on Executive Vice Presdient and Provost Gerhard J. Fonken to begin the discussion of the English/writing

requirement. Vice President Fonken said: "I think all of you recall that about a year ago, by action of the several colleges and schools, the requirement for English 346K underwent suspension or substitution, depending upon the judgment of the particular college or school. [Also,] at that time, the Department of English was asked to assess the situation and to advise the collective colleges and schools as to what might be done in the future with respect to either [English] 346K or alternatives thereto, and more specifically the other courses that are offered by the Department of English [that] have been adopted by the colleges and schools as part of their curriculum requirements.

"At the same time, a year or so ago, we discussed the status of the courses with substantial writing components. Those, as you recall, were the concept of the Vick committee some years ago and [were] an effort to strengthen the student writing experience on campus (which we all agreed was sorely needed) and to provide a substantial portion of that writing experience through the disciplines -- hopefully, in most cases, the particular discipline [in which] the student was pursuing the degree. To that end, the schools had adopted for their catalogues a common requirement of six hours of courses with substantial writing components, of which three hours must be at the upper-division [level].

"Rather recently we met with the academic deans [and] discussed the situation with respect to English 346K. Based on assessment provided by the Department of English, that particular course has been judged to be not viable, either on the part of the English Department to offer it [or] for the colleges and schools to utilize it in their degree program requirements. So ... the deans intend to [continue to] suspend [English] 346K as a degree requirement, and those colleges and schools which are undergoing new catalogue revisions will, no doubt, write that particular course out of their specific degree requirements."

Vice President Fonken then asked Dean Robert D. King (Liberal Arts) to "describe to you some aspects of the work done by the Department of English, and what it is that the English Department is capable of contributing to the various college and school [coursework requirements]...." Dean King commented: "Basically, what Dr. Fonken said was that the [English] 346K [requirement,] which was to go into full implementation this year, is suspended by action taken by the deans. What that means is that the English Department will be, next fall, teaching two courses that are required of all students -- [English] 306, which is a freshman course, and [English] 316K, which is a sophomore course. I want to go into the background of this a little bit, because it has attracted a lot of attention and it is a complicated issue. I think [that it] needs a lot of discussion so that people who are not as involved in it as we are in Liberal Arts and in the Department of English know something of what we have been doing and trying to do.

"The English Department has gotten itself into trouble because it [has] tried to do too much, tried to teach too many courses [for] all

students at the University. There is no other university in this country with which we would compare ourselves that ... requires as much in the English Department of all students at the university as we do. A rather common situation is a six-hour requirement, but a six-hour requirement that is aimed at the students who have problems with writing; that, in effect, is what we will be having next year -- [English] 306 and 316K. The University of Wisconsin has no English requirement -- none whatsoever, zero hours required; they do have a laboratory, and they have remedial courses that are made available. The English Department can teach some principles about writing, but it cannot teach people how to write; you learn to write by writing. The great principle that was adopted in the General Education requirements, the Vick committee requirements, was that it is the University's responsibility to help students with their writing. That is the purpose behind the substantial writing component courses that now, this year, for the first time ... all students have to take.

"Last year we had to back away from a proposal that we ourselves had made, a junior-level course called English 346K. We suspended that last year. I realize that there [were] some people, expecially some who helped developed the course, who still had confidence in it and wanted the Department to continue. I think the intentions were good; in my judgment, though, and in the judgment of most others, the intentions could not be carried out. We tried it. The English Department voted 53-18 for something else, not [English] 346K. There was not even a motion on the floor of the Department to reinstate [English] 346K as a requirement. I think the Department understands what it can do in teaching English. If someone wants to argue about the qualities of English 346K as a course, then that argument belongs on the floor of the English Department, not on the floor of the University Council. Next fall we will have [English] 306 and 316K.

"During the next two years the English Department will be making plans to restructure the English/writing requirements. The ultimate goal will be one composition course at the freshman level and one writing and literature course at the sophomore level.

"The freshman writing course will be an advanced composition course, which will assume that students already possess the basic proficiency now represented by English 306. Already, almost 40% of our students [receive credit by examination for English] 306; many students transfer credit for it from junior colleges and community colleges. Fewer than a third of the students who finally graduate from U.T. actually take [English] 306 here. The English Department plans to implement a more sophisticated college-level writing course which all students will take and which will build on the skills now taught in English 306.

"The transition from English 306 to this new writing course will be gradual, and it will be carefully planned. The English Department will work with the high schools to make the change as smooth as possible.

Students will be informed well in advance that they must bring a higher level of proficiency in writing to the University. Those students who still fall short of this level upon entering the University will be helped by the Department of English in a variety of ways: short non-credit courses which address basic deficiencies, new advanced placement tests, computer-assisted instruction. The ultimate aim will be to have all students present the competency level now represented by a score of 550 on the ECT [English Composition Test] or a passing grade in English 306.

"The writing course that the Department plans to offer will be a fully developed composition course with at least as much writing as is now required in English 306. Its major strength will be its variety of options and its higher level of proficiency. Students will be given a choice of topics, some organized around interdisciplinary themes, others around rhetorical strategies. The department will begin designing these courses in the near future and introduce them slowly in pilot sections before moving to full implementation.

"I am very sympathetic to the goals of the English Department. They believe that the fundamentals of writing ought to be brought to the University by the entering freshman, and I agree with them. They would like to see every freshman be given a university-level composition course.

"I think it is a noble goal, and I think it is attainable. The question is how do we achieve it. I do not think we can reach it overnight. We need to give the high schools time; we need for the effects of House Bill 72, the Perot Commission's [recommendations], ... to roll in and see what that does to the high schools; and we need to develop support for students who do not score well on the ECT. As I have suggested, there are a number of ways we can do that.

"We are the flagship public University in this state. It is incumbent on us to lead the way and to have the best writing program, the most advanced and demanding writing program of any state school. This we will provide.

"I do fault the English Department writing program for running everybody through a multiple choice exam once and then separating them like sheep and goats on the basis of that test. If you score 55 you get three hours credit; you do not have to take [English] 306. If you score 54 you have to take the course. (The Educational Testing Service multiplies [the score] by 10 to get 550.) I would like to see an emphasis on learning to write rather than an obsession with taking writing courses. We have piled up the requirements for writing, and we have given very little attention to the real question, 'Who needs to take a writing course?' There are plenty of students at the University who do not, and we have very imperfect tools for locating those students and saying, 'You

do not really have to take [English] 306'.... I think in general it would be a good idea to listen to the English Department rather than its critics for good ideas.

"Now, we cannot do any of this overnight. [So] the requirement remains as it is for now, [English] 306 and 316K. But the English Department is not going to sit back and wait. It has said how, in its professional faculty judgment, writing should be taught at our university. It has said that overwhelmingly by faculty vote. Now let it go to work to see what it can achieve."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) said he understood that at present English 306 is an introductory freshman-level course taken by only one-third of the students who get degrees from U.T. Austin. He asked if someone could describe what English 306 will be five years from now and could estimate what proportion of the students that graduate from this University then will have taken the course.

At the request of Alan D. Gribben (English), privileges of the floor were extended to Joseph Kruppa, Associate Chairman of the Department of English and chairman of the committee that developed the proposal examined by the deans of the colleges and schools. Mr. Kruppa replied: "Before I answer [Mr. McDaniel's] question, [let me provide some] background on what the committee did and what we thought about when we looked at the composition requirement. We started work in the early summer, and what we tried to do was strike a balance between what we can do and what we ought to do in educational terms.... I never knew what [living within one's means] meant until I became Associate Chairman of the English Department and tried to staff courses year after year as enrollment increased ... and became almost impossible to handle. We decided as a committee that we had to come up with a composition program that the English Department could staff with good, qualified teachers; one that we would believe in educationally.... We had several basic principles that we started with: One was that we would use no system that depended on continuous use of temporary faculty. (As you know, the number of temporary faculty, one-year lecturers, grew in our department from 20 to ... 70 individuals at one point; we decided this was not a way to run a quality program.) We also decided that we would come up with no plan that allowed the tail to wag the dog ... --that is, we would not try to satisfy everybody in the University. We would come up with a solid plan that we could staff, and it would be, we think, a quality composition program, but not one that would try to satisfy the needs of every single college and every single department. We simply could not do that. As we tried to do it [in the past] we had to hire temporary faculty, and our department became totally unmanageable.

"To respond to Professor McDaniel's question, what we have come up with is, as Dean King says, a program that as we gradually phase it in over the next few years ... will assume the proficiency now represented

by [English] 306 on the part of entering students -- that is, these students will either be able to place out of [English] 306 or, if they have not placed out of it when they come here, we will help them through various kinds of short courses, other kinds of testing instruments, to reach the level of [English] 306. The course they will all take in the future in the place of [English] 306 will be English 309, which Dean King described in brief. It will be a course with a variety of options in it, a course that has titles such as Literature and Composition, Great Books and Composition, Thinking and Writing, The Writing Process. We will have more than one option for students, and we think this will be much more interesting for faculty to teach, and also much more interesting for students to take.

"Even with this scaling down and restructuring of the requirement, we are going to have a much stronger requirement than almost any comparable university in this country. I have been through all the catalogues; I have seen what other places require. We have nothing [for which] to apologize. If we have a six-hour requirement with one basic composition course at the freshman level, a literature course at the sophomore level that also includes writing, plus the two substantial writing component courses, we will have one of the strongest writing requirements in the country....

"The basic proposal that we have come up with is not some sneaky attempt [by] the English Department to avoid the teaching of writing. We are going to teach the same number of writing courses we have been teaching. We are still going to be heavily involved in teaching writing in all of our courses, both [at] the lower-division level and at the upper-division level. We will teach the same kinds of courses, the same number of courses; they will simply be of a more advanced nature, especially that freshman composition course that all students take. And in terms of numbers, to say again that we have nothing to apologize for in the commitment to writing that we have, I just want to cite some figures for you. In the fall of 1985 the English Department [alone] had 575 majors, [and] we had 926 students enrolled in substantial writing component courses. The College of Natural Sciences, with 5,500 majors, had 214 students enrolled in substantial writing component courses. The Engineering College, [with] 4,849 majors, [had] 371 students enrolled in substantial writing component courses. [The College of] Education, [with] 1,898 majors, [had] 204 people enrolled in substantial writing component courses.

"We do not shirk the teaching of writing; we never have, [and] we are not going to in the future. We are still heavily committed to it. We are simply going to do it in a different way. We are going to ask more of the entering students, as befits an institution that is trying to become more than an average institution. And, indeed, that is what we are going to ask of our students in the future, that they be more than average when they come to us, and that we then build upon that more-than-average ability with a more sophisticated writing course."

James L. Kinneavy (English) commented: "I had been wondering how

many months it was going to take [for this item] to get to the University Council, and under what guise. The Department of English passed this legislation, or actually something like this legislation (I would like to underline that), on September 10. In the meantime the legislation has been dormant, I guess, and the University community has heard little ... about it. Now, I am not sure under what guise this comes to us procedurally. Procedurally, apparently a curriculum issue has been decided by the deans, and this body is going to discuss it.... [But] we do not have a document to look at. As a matter of fact, I had not ever heard of [English] 309 before, either; [English] 309 was never discussed. A freshman course was never discussed on the floor of the English Department, nor on the College of Liberal Arts level, nor here. I just think that there are many procedural issues which are not clear here, and I, at least, would like to see what we are even talking about. [Some aspects of] what they are talking about now were never even considered in the English Department.... Jim Vick asked the President a few meetings ago whether or not this was to be given a full-scale hearing. I hope it is to be given a full-scale hearing, with opposition being allowed to express themselves over a certain period of time. But I think that the least we should expect in a discussion of this type is a document from the English Department telling us what is being discussed. I have not seen that yet. I saw the document that the English Department passed on to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, but in some respects it does not sound like this document at all. So that is the first thing I would like to see talked about. There are a lot of procedural issues which I would like to see clarified. I would like to write a short procedural paper [for this group] and have some questions answered.

"[There are also] substantive issues, which I think are very serious, which this body has to consider ... not just from the standpoint of the English Department, but from the standpoint of the whole University community. The eventual phasing out of freshman English is a major proposition. Will it be gone in five years? Well, I do not think so. Back in 1967 the highest number of exemptions ever reached, ... just before the decline in literacy scores on all tests, was 49%.... We then dropped down in 1982 to 18% exempting; 82% of [our entering freshmen] had to take English 306.... Since we raised the [admission] standards [the exemption rate] has climbed [back] up to 32+%. Will it ever hit even 50%? Not in the next five years. Not unless the whole literacy scene changes dramatically. So I think that getting rid of the freshman English [course], and looking to its eventual elimination, is a very long-term proposition. In the meantime we are going to be concerned with 4,000 to 5,000 freshmen for a long time.

"I also frankly think that the second-level course (which the University Council and the General Faculty had originally made a junior-level course, which the English Department established as a sophomore and junior course, and which this report now makes a freshman course [English 309]) is a radical departure which affects most of the colleges of this

particular university. There are 12 undergraduate colleges; [about] seven or eight of these are professional schools, [with] approximately 61% of the undergraduate enrollment. Most of those [professional schools] want some kind of technical writing or business writing or professional writing. The intent of this legislation is to get rid of that. We have had for years a very, very great national reputation for technical writing. The best book used for years ... in technical writing all across the country was written by two U.T. professors, one now dead, one just retired. Our professional schools want technical writing; they do not want some kind of variant of literary criticism.

"Now I am simply saying I do not want to go into all the details, [but] I frankly think that there are people that ought to be heard from, opposition people, not just the English Department; students ought to be heard from, faculty ought to be heard from, administrators ought to be heard from, documents ought to be presented. I would like to present an alternate document next time, so I am hoping that no decision will be made today."

Mr. Kruppa said that he wanted "to respond to a few of Professor Kinneavy's comments and then ask one of my colleagues, who was also a member of our committee, to respond to the one on technical writing.

"First ..., [with regard to English] 309, all we did was change the numbers. It is on the document the Department passed 53 to 18 [as English] 311, 313, and 315; those are exactly the courses we were talking about. They are freshman composition courses, they are not an attempt to phase out freshman English; that is a very misleading term on [Mr. Kinneavy's] part. We are simply going to teach a different kind of freshman composition course; we are not phasing it out.

"I am not going to speak to the procedural problems here, because I do not know what they are. That is the job of this body and, it seems to me, the deans and the administration to figure out.

"Professor Kinneavy is also wrong on exemptions. They did go down. They are not 32% now; they are exactly 40% this year...."

Lester L. Faigley (English) was extended privileges of the floor. He said: "I want to speak briefly on the technical writing issue. We did discuss this issue at length in our committee and about what our response as a department should be to technical writing. In 1982, I did a survey ... of the kinds of writing that college graduates did after they left the University. It was a stratified sampling by occupation and by kind of employment. We found out that college graduates did indeed write a great deal on the job, but we also found out that the nature of writing on the job was changing. This was especially true in technical fields. The advent of computer technology is rapidly changing the nature of technical communication. The fact that computers can produce graphics that formerly took a team of artists to produce is changing the nature of technical reports. We also had a hard time isolating exactly what was

writing. We observed people giving speeches within a department that later became presentations with graphics to a larger segment in-house, that later became a videotape presentation that went on to the corporate office, that later became a written report complete with graphics. We believe that the University should have a strong program in technical communication. This should not only stress technical writing, but it should also be current as far as what is going on with computer graphics, with electronic communication, and [with] all the other changes that are occurring now in the nature of technical communication. We believe the English Department should have some part in this program, but we cannot be the sole basis of this program simply because we are way behind in the technical capacity. We are still back in the pen-and-legal-pad era, and I am afraid the rest of the world is moving on to the computer very rapidly. So we hope that such a program will be started here. We hope that we will have some part in general rhetorical strategies, but we cannot be the sole basis for such a program."

Vice President Fonken added: "Professor Kinneavy asked about procedural matters. I would remind the Council that there is no proposal on the floor. What we are engaged in here is an information process followed with discussion. As to procedure, I think you all recognize this, the authority to adopt courses or not adopt courses for given curricula rests with the faculties of the colleges and schools. Heaven help us if the University Council decides in a moment of good intent to require that the Mathematics Department give four lectures on Simpson's Method of Approximation in its introductory calculus course. I think that [it] is best left to the mathematicians to decide whether or not there shall be three or four semesters of calculus, and differential equations required of engineers is something best left to the engineers to decide. And so too with the content of courses that are offered by the Department of English; what you have heard today was speculation on some, as yet to be determined, future which might enable the offering of a course to which there has been at least tentatively some reference [as English] 309, but there is no proposal at the moment to offer such a course. What is being offered is English 306, and that has been a course of long standing and has been adopted by most of the colleges and schools as a degree requirement, but not all. The College of Fine Arts does not grant credit for that course, nor has it granted credit for that course for many years. [I think that] English 316K is probably found in all college catalogues as a requirement. As to [English] 346K, the procedure which will be followed is the traditional procedure -- the college and school faculties of the 12 or 13 colleges will undoubtedly debate whether that course should be continued in their catalogues as a requirement or not. The debate will be ... moot, given that the Department of English has decided not to offer that course any longer.... The best that [can] be done [by] some college or school is to adopt some other course, be it in the Department of English or be it some other area, but it can only do that realistically if the given department can in a logistic sense manage to handle that course. So there are no unusual procedures; nothing is being adopted here. Nothing is being acted on unilaterally by a dean,

save that which lies in the authority of the dean -- namely, to suspend a given course as a degree requirement for an interim. And all deans present have at times permitted suspension, substitution, deletion, and what have you for a good and sufficient reason."

W. O. S. Sutherland, Jr., Chairman of the Department of English, commented: "I think it is always a little difficult when you make changes from the way you have been doing things, and I think it is natural to feel that the way you did them before was the best way. But I think our students are improving. I think that we [cannot] have a good or great university without good or great students, and that means that we must expect the best and the most from our students. I know that a number of the students that we have today who do not get credit for [English] 306 on the basis of this multiple-choice examination are capable of it, because in the past we did have a writing sample in the department where students who made [scores of] 500 and above were given exemption on the basis of their writing; a number of those students wrote good papers and got advanced placement [on the basis of their] writing. So if we measure the writing directly, that is, by getting them to write, I think we will find a number of our students that we will exempt.

"I am glad that we will have some time to get into place the kind of support system that I think these students need; [Mr.] Kruppa mentioned to you that we are developing some computer-assisted instruction which will help the students. We are planning, with the Dean of the College, to develop our Writing Center and to develop short courses where the students will come in and, say for three or six hours total time, work on something like organizing and writing the essay, or paragraphs and sentences, focusing on problems that the students have. I think that ... within five years, our students [will be] capable of doing this.

"I realize that it is fashionable to say that students are illiterate or to talk about literacy. I do not think literacy has much to do with the students that we admit to the University. It is almost an insult to say that they are literate, but I will say it. I know this because I teach these students. I am teaching a group of them now, and I will say that the [English] 306 students that I am teaching now are brighter than any of the [English] 306 students that I have taught in the past.... My colleagues can be cynical about them if they want to; I am not. I really have great confidence in today's college students. They can and will learn; they are intelligent. They are cooperative, and they will do it if we ask them to. Almost every regularly-admitted student to this university should be able to achieve the level of competency that we are talking about.

"Now, some of them come from high schools where they need more training, and they may need to apply themselves more diligently, but I think they can do it. It is not like scoring 750 on the Math SAT; you need a certain something other than work to score 750 on the Math. But good background, good training, hard work will help these students, and I

think they can do it. It is reasonable that we help them, and it is reasonable that we make association with the high schools so that we can do whatever we can there, too."

Pamela J. Shoemaker (Journalism) asked about the new course under discussion, English 309. "If everyone, indeed, is required to take [English] 309, then how does that solve the problem? We are, I guess, dropping one course because there is not sufficient faculty to teach it if everyone is required to take it; if everyone is required to take the new course, then how could there be sufficient faculty?"

Mr. Kruppa replied: "... What [English] 309 enables us to do ..., as opposed to [English] 346K, [is] to allow transfer credit for [English] 309. When we had [English] 346K as a ... requirement, students could not transfer [credit for] a second composition course from another university or junior college ... to satisfy that upper-division requirement; with a 309 number, people will be able to transfer a second composition course that they have taken elsewhere; so that will help somewhat with the logistics in terms of how we staff it. We, frankly, also hope to interest other colleges and departments in the University in teaching courses that fit into their particular discipline [that can substitute for English 309]. But we have thought about the numbers problem, and we are fairly certain that we can make this number problem work, as opposed to the situation we were facing with [English] 346K, where we would have had to teach virtually every student, both students who came here and transfer students. That was absolutely impossible without hiring something like 75 or 80 lecturers in order to staff those courses. We think the logistics will be possible, because the course is positioned at the lower-division level."

Ms. Shoemaker then asked if there were an estimate of the number of students who might receive transfer credit for such a course. Mr. Sutherland said that "we would not like to get into the details of this, because we are working them out; suffice it to say that if and when the second composition course becomes reality, then we will be responsible for it...."

Wayne A. Danielson (Journalism) said: "The initial story that I heard sounded a little bit like some of the foreign languages, where we have a degree requirement for the first foreign language, but [students] are expected to bring that expertise from the high school. And I thought, 'Well, that is not a bad pattern if we continue here to offer the first course to those who need it, even though they may not count [it] toward graduation credit.' But this does not seem to be the case. It seems to me [that a student must either place out of English 306] or take it elsewhere; what we will have for the first time at the University [is] a graduation requirement for which we are not accepting [the] responsibility of teaching the course."

Mr. Kruppa replied: "That was part of our original proposal, and it

was worded in [an] unfortunate way.... The goal we will be working toward is not that we will require that course; we will require the competency represented by that course, or by the score. [Students] will not be given credit for what is now [English] 306.... I do not think we are really striking out on any fabulous new ground here, because ... the College of Fine Arts has not been counting [English] 306 toward graduation for some time now.... We think that the students ... can bring this competency, or this proficiency, to us. We are not going to count it as a graduation [requirement]; we are not going to give credit for it and not teach it. We are simply going to say, 'You must be competent at a certain level in order to come here, and then we [will] teach you [English] 309.'"

Vice President Fonken, in further response to Mr. Danielson, said that "English 306 will be taught at this university for probably many years to come. It will be taught here by this faculty in the rooms that are owned by this university. It is not going away. You read of some speculation where possibly someday [English] 306 would no longer be necessary. But [English] 306 will be offered this fall, it will be offered next spring, it will be offered the following fall, it will be offered the following spring ..., so it is not a course which is being required and not being taught."

Mr. Kinneavy said that "there are some speculations, and there are some realities. It was a reality in the vote of the English Department that English 306 would not be offered by [the] faculty of this English Department, but that it would be offered either [as an Extension course or in] community colleges; that was passed by the English Department. Now there is talk of offering English [309]; that is speculation. That I have never seen a document for; I have never seen a document to vote on or anything else. That is something that somebody has talked to somebody about, and I do not know what it is.

"About speculation also, and about procedures, and this is to respond to Dr. Fonken, ... this matter affects 12 undergraduate colleges, and consequently it seems to me that it has to come before this body in a document or set of documents that we can vote on; we [should not] sit around and wait for the English Department to say, 'well now, maybe [English] 309 will be offered next year, or maybe it will not'; or, 'it might be technical writing, or it might not be technical writing.' It seems to me we need something solid to vote for."

President Cunningham said that the reason for the English/writing requirement's inclusion on the agenda "is I wanted it discussed, and I put it on the agenda. The reason I wanted it discussed is I want all these things to come out. No one is trying to railroad ... anything.... [This matter will certainly come back before the Council] as catalogues are modified.... If it has to come back at another time, it certainly can. In terms of anything that you want to bring forward to discuss at a future time about this, ... you would be more than welcome to. It is not

a secret society; that is why we are talking about it now, and that is why I wanted it put here, so we could all begin to address the issue. But it is not here [for] any kind of a ... vote, one way or the other, today...."

Scott L. Scarborough (Students' Association) said that comment had been made that "students should be considered in this discussion. It does affect students, it seems to me, more than anyone else.... The Students' Association has been involved ... with this issue for some time. It is one of the major items on our general questionnaire that we sent out, ... so at least we will have some statistical information on the attitude of students relating to the English 306 and 346K issue. However, this issue has proved to be a little bit more complicated, [and] probably the results of the survey will [not] help us a whole lot. We also ... met with [the] Chairman [and several members] of the English Department to try to get some questions answered....

"Although the Students' Association certainly has made no statement of position, at this time I would like to state at least some particular areas ... that I believe that the students will be interested in. Much of the [confusion] here, I think, [concerns] what the ultimate end of this proposal [will be] and what the procedural implementation will [be in] the phase-in period. I hear [that] 40% of students ... place out of [English 306]. One thing that should also be considered ... is that those students who do not place out of [English] 306 are very, very close to placing out; thus the plan for the English Department to try to aid students with computer-assisted [instruction] to help push them over this certain number at least makes the statistics a little bit higher....

"I am a student who took [English] 306. My freshman year, I took the beginning writing class at Trinity University, transferred in, and [was] surprised to find out that I got credit for [English] 307 rather than 306. Immediately I thought, 'Well, the writing course at Texas must not be as good as the beginning writing course at Trinity.' Whether that is true or not, I will say this -- it was the easiest class I ever had at Texas; I did less work and got probably the highest average that I have ever had at a class at Texas. So I am one of those 33% who will be graduating and will receive a degree who has taken it....

"In my estimation, there does need to be some modification of it. I think there are some very tough issues surrounding this, and whether or not we are going to request that students bring a level of English proficiency that is higher than today's standards, one issue that at least students are particularly concerned with is the time of the phase-in period.... I think they will agree that, 'Yes, that is fine,' but we want to be pushed to be a great university with great, top-level students. But we also have students that are here now [who did not have sufficient time to adjust to the recently-instituted education reforms]. That seems to be the major concern -- exactly how long will the implementation period be; will you give students enough time to adjust, and will the

class be offered to students? We have been assured that one of the directions the English Department is going with this is that [English] 306 will be taught during the summer from now until I do not know [when], and that also the Extension or Correspondence or some kind of program will be offered during the fall and the spring on campus -- maybe not by the English Department faculty, but by someone by which [students] can get credit for the class. These considerations, at least, I think, make students feel a little bit better about the issue.

"It is a tough decision, but students have been and will be [actively] involved with the input to the President and to this Council."

Mr. McDaniel said, "I want to compliment the President on processes and procedures that involve talking about issues and getting things out on the table ..., and I think that [it] is important that we do that. I also think it is important that we be especially careful that curriculum issues that do affect and influence large numbers of colleges and large numbers of students are considered by appropriate faculty governance groups, and I am sure that is going to happen. I think it is important that ... the right procedures are followed ... in such a way as to maintain our faculty responsibility for the total curriculum."

David M. Rabban (Law) said he was unclear about decision-making authority pertaining to the English requirement. "I thought I heard Mr. Fonken say that this was a departmental issue for a departmental decision, and then I thought I heard [President Cunningham] say that if it involved a change in the University catalogue it [was] supposed to come to this body.... I do not understand what kinds of changes a department might make that would not be reflected in the University catalogue. Secondly, I do not understand in what capacity the Council of Deans considered this issue; was it a discussion analogous to ours, or do they have some formal role that we do not?"

President Cunningham responded that last year Dean King had informed the Deans' Council that the English Department could not staff English 346K; the Deans therefore suspended English 346K as a graduation requirement. The English Department then offered a proposal which is currently being evaluated -- the proposal under discussion at this Council meeting. "Any changes, though, that are made in college catalogues come from the individual colleges, come up to this group and are voted [on] by this group. [In this instance] there [was] departmental action [by] the English Department, there [will be] college action in the individual colleges, and [that action will] eventually come to the University Council."

Vice President Fonken said: "... My answer to Professor Rabban, good-naturedly, was going to be 'Yes' to both questions. It is the Department of English, or any corresponding department, that makes decisions on the content of a course; [here] we were speaking of the hypothetical course [English] 309.... Those determinations are made by the

department, as is the case for a course in law or mathematics or wherever. The question of the adoption of the course into a curriculum rests with the faculty of the given college or school...."

Mr. Rabban then asked: "When will this issue proceed to the colleges and then to the University Council...?" President Cunningham responded: "One way [will] be as catalogues are revised; that [will] be the normal way. In other words, the catalogues are revised on a ... rolling basis, and as catalogues are revised they [will] come to the University Council."

Mr. Danielson observed that the Council "originally worked on this problem because it was part of the general requirements of the University. I now hear you saying [that] we will get changes as they come up from the colleges in the college catalogues. Does this mean that the Vick [committee] recommendation with respect to English is dead, and that the colleges are now free to revise their English requirements as they see fit?" President Cunningham replied: "I do not think that is ... accurate. What happened was the Vick committee made a report to [the Council] ..., but then [the requirement] came back from the individual colleges with their approval; it came to this group that way."

Mr. Danielson responded: "That is correct, but the colleges felt they were under a strong compulsion to respond to the Vick committee recommendations." President Cunningham emphasized that it was important to remember that the colleges and schools nonetheless had the authority to adopt or reject the recommendations of the Vick committee.

Dean Lorrin G. Kennamer (College of Education) concurred that the Vick committee recommendations went to the Colleges, which in turn changed their degree requirements; the degree requirement changes, college-by-college, then were approved by the University Council. "Also at that same time, there was another ... movement that we have more writing at the upper-division level. My memory tells me this was a separate movement from the deliberations of the Vick committee.

"These two movements came along on parallel tracks. And they arrived, in some ways, ... in the dark of night at a 'switchyard.' Somehow, we have now in the catalogues requirements different in English than we used to have. Speaking for one of the professional schools, we have changed our catalogue. We [the College of Education] have always required ... four courses in English for people getting our degree. But somehow, in these 'trains' coming down these 'tracks' ..., we wound up requiring five courses in English, two of which [are not called 'English']. Now, that disturbed our national accrediting agency; [it said that it wants to know that we are requiring English courses]. That also has caused some problems with our state accreditation; [the state also wants to know that we are requiring English courses]. Now, we can straighten them out; I am just pointing out to the English Department that there is a lot of confusion about, and there will continue to be some confusion until we can get some settlement of this issue.

"The deans did not have to show great wisdom in regards to [English] 346K; that was basically our only alternative. We had [to] set it aside, because it is not offered.... We are waiting for some resolution here. We are willing to listen to the advice of the English Department as to what is the best pattern of preparation ..., and we implore you to take as brief a time as possible in all of this, because there is a lot of confusion out there among the students. Recall, they can claim a catalogue for seven years.... When [the] English Department decides on a freshman or sophomore course, true, that is a departmental decision. True, each college will make up its own mind with its faculty in regards to changing the degree plan. But remember, it is nearly a unilateral decision when the English Department decides that at a freshman and sophomore level, because [we have to live with your course offerings, like it or not]."

James W. Vick (Mathematics), chairman of the earlier Vick committee, offered his perception of the evolution of English/writing requirements. "There were two proposals -- one from our committee, the Basic Requirements Committee, and one from the Department of English. We were in communication as time went by. Our proposals looked a little bit different. The English Department proposal was that there be a uniform sequence of [English] courses 306, 316K, 346K, for all degrees at the University. That was separate from our recommendations. That was passed by the University Council, and with, I believe, minor modifications by President Flawn was enacted. As a result, all of the programs that are now in the catalogues of the University list those courses as requirements. Our report also had a nine-hour recommended English requirement as such, although it was phrased differently. The way the report read, basically we were expecting students to have the ability at the level of [English] 306 when they entered the University, which is not unlike some of the comments that have been debated here; and we were recommending two more courses, [English] 307 and 314K, which would be simultaneously [composition] courses and courses that would expose the students to literature. We were willing to accept, as an alternative, the proposal from the English Department, and that was stated in our report....

"As Dean Kennamer has said, the problem is that right now there is a lot of confusion. This confusion extends beyond the courses that we have discussed here today. For example, when [English] 346K was first offered by the English Department, the traditional technical writing course, [English] 317, was no longer offered. We have degrees in our college that require English 317, and we allowed [English] 346K to substitute for [English] 317. We no longer can ask those students to take [English] 346K because it is not offered, but we also cannot expect them to take [English] 317, because it is not offered. We do continue to require [English 317], and those students take that course elsewhere; I think this is unfortunate. In most cases we cannot waive this course, because it is required for their certification in their professional field. We have the authority to waive it as a degree requirement, but not as a certification requirement. That is a problem that is continuing, and I have had to deal with it several times this semester.... That problem will

not go away, as far as I can tell, until we have a course that we can consider an adequate substitute for technical writing.

"I would say that, at the present moment, we have the weakest possible English requirement. We have a two-semester English requirement, [English] 306 and 316K. I would urge that those of you who are making the decisions would let us know promptly so that we can adjust our requirements. The longer we go with this requirement, the more students will come under it. We cannot start requiring a third English course, as I understand it, until we write it into the catalogue. Right now we are under the 1985-1987 catalogue, and it will not be long before the 1987-1989 catalogue goes to press. I would like to see these changes implemented as soon as we can."

President Cunningham said that the discussion had "been informative, and I think we will re-examine the situation in terms of ... whether it has to come back [to the University Council] or not. At the same time, if someone wishes to bring it here in a reasonable way, ... we would be happy to do that. But as I see it, unless I am persuaded otherwise, it is really a college matter that needs to be worked on with the English Department. I understand and am sympathetic to the problem that Jim Vick has brought up, and we all need to work at it together.... This clearly is one of those situations where honest people can disagree. The point is we want to have a strong English requirement, and I am convinced that the English Department wants that. In that sense we need all to work together to try to get this thing solved, and solved as quickly as possible."

B. DISCUSSION OF POSSIBLE CHANGES IN "F" PARKING STICKERS.

Dorothy J. Stuppy (Nursing), Chairman of the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee, said that it was common knowledge that "parking on this campus is a problem. As the number of people on campus has continued to increase, the number of parking spaces has not necessarily increased at the same rate. As of the 1984-1985 year, the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee began to look at some things which might help us to make better use of the available parking spaces and to decrease the abuse of the decal system which is currently in place. We have found that when there are multiple cars registered to one individual ... there does tend to be abuse of the decal system. Many of you [read] in the Texan several years ago about people selling A permits at Gregory Gym, and our continuing surveys of [parking] lots have [verified] on a regular basis that there are abuses of the decal system. As a result, we began to look to see if there was a different way of giving people permits to park on campus that would allow them to park legitimately and yet to decrease the problems which come along with the decal system.

"Speaking in favor of the decal system, its major outstanding strength seems to be that [the decals are] stuck permanently to your windshield. In some cases that may be a negative; [it is a problem] to

get [them] off. It is also a problem in that many people do not try to get them off, and they then [accumulate them to the point of visual impedance]; I think the greatest number I have counted on one car was seven.

"The problem with the decal is that you register the car, you do not register the person ..., and there are at times both cars, or all three cars, on campus at one time. Other problems with the decal system have been more procedural, in that if you need to get a temporary permit -- [because] you are driving a rental car, your car is in the shop, the windshield on your car has been broken, [or] you get a new car, ... you have to go over to the Parking and Traffic Administration sometimes twice to get new decals to register your new car.

"Those are the major problems which we have found with the decal system, and as a result Ray James went to several workshops around the country looking at the 'hanging tag' or 'transferrable permit' system. Several other campuses had implemented this. They had found that abuse of their parking privileges had gone down, and a couple of them even reported that there had been a decrease in the amount of theft and vandalism on campus, because people were remembering to lock their cars; they did not want to lose their hanging tags.

"Therefore, we did implement last year for those who have A stickers, C or ... G stickers, a hanging or transferable permit. There were some problems with it, as you can anticipate. The major problems were that people forgot to bring their tags, they forgot to transfer [them] as they moved from one car to another, and [some tags were stolen]. All those problems went down over the first three months the tags [were] used; we have documented that, and there are very few ... people who say that their tags have been stolen who can say [with certainty] that they locked their cars. We have continued to have decals available for those people who have cars which do not lock, such as people with convertibles, jeeps, [or] other kinds of vehicles [in] which there is no way [to secure a] hanging tag.

"As a result of our experience ... over this past semester, ... we have suggested that the hanging permit, the transferable permit, be implemented for other decal holders on campus [as well], including those with F permits. That was our recommendation. We have [determined] that the decal on the windshield is not really a major problem ... when the person is only registering one car; it is [a problem] for the people who are registering more than one car. Therefore our recommendation ... is that people ... be issued [only] one permit. If they have one car, they could choose to have a stick-on decal if they wanted; if they had two cars that they were using on campus on a regular basis, ... they would need to get a hanging tag which they could then transfer from one vehicle to another...."

Wayne A. Rebhorn, Jr. (English) said that he appreciated "the

problem with the stickers, and I think the [hanging permit] sounds like a very good solution. But you have forgotten one thing -- this is Texas. In the summer, if you leave your windows up (or mostly up) and lock the car, it might explode before you get back there, unless it is under one of the six remaining trees that are in parking lots. So while I approve of this, I would prefer ..., especially for F stickers, ... to continue with the old system and assume that my colleagues will not abuse it all that much, rather than have to drive home in a blazing inferno every day at five o'clock."

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) concurred with Mr. Rebhorn. "The problem is an abuse problem, and the question is whether all of us who obey the law will burn up because of those who do not. There are all kinds of possible solutions. One possible solution, for example, is to give a different color decal to the people who have two cars so that theirs can be checked more easily, and [their cars towed away if necessary]. I think we [are trying to inconvenience many people] when we have [only] a few abusers. [The hanging permits also, in addition to creating heat and theft problems, are inconvenient; prior to every trip to campus one must remember to be sure the permit is in the car we are driving.] There are problems such as when my wife wants to come and pick me up at noon; she has to have a [permit] on her car to come [on campus], whether she stops other than to pick me up or not.... You do not have to tow too many faculty cars off the lots for people to start being more responsible."

Ms. Stuppy responded: "We do have evidence that there is abuse on a regular basis in the faculty lots. Those lots have been spot-checked on a fairly regular basis the last month, and [each time the lots have been checked] at least one person [has been found] who has [parked] a car that does not belong there. That does not sound like a lot, but if [I am] looking for the last place in that lot, I am going to get a little upset that somebody, some daughter or wife, is parked there."

Dean Robert C. Jeffrey (College of Communication) endorsed the present decal system and the towing of offenders' cars. Ira Iscoe (Psychology) concurred, adding that the number of Disabled permits should be investigated; he had observed a number of people in apparent good health who had D permits.

President Cunningham promised to "take this under administrative advisement."

VI. PETITIONS - None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS - None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.

A. PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE DATE OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING FROM APRIL 21 TO APRIL 14, 1986. (APPROVED)

Secretary H. Paul Kelley (Educational Psychology) noted that the April meeting of the University Council was scheduled for April 21, 1986. Since that day has been declared a special holiday, Texas Sesquicentennial Day, he MOVED that the date of the meeting be changed to April 14, 1986. The motion was APPROVED without discussion.

B. REPORT FROM THE PARKING AND TRAFFIC POLICIES COMMITTEE CONCERNING DORMITORY RESIDENT PARKING. (RECEIVED)

Dorothy J. Stuppy (Nursing), Chairman of the Parking and Traffic Policies Committee, reminded members that last year's Council had requested the Committee to "consider the problem of dormitory resident parking [D&P 9924]. We have come back with a recommendation that [no changes] be instituted at this point in time. We have been able to put together some information that indicates that we have approximately 10% of the student body ... who live in dormitory housing. Approximately 50% of those hold C permits. If we were to give resident parking status to all of those people, that would use approximately 50% of the available C parking, and I cannot believe that the 90% of students [who commute] would be at all pleased with that. In order to do anything to limit those dorm permits we would have to go through some things which would become an administrative nightmare, which is deciding which lots, what percentage of students, would seniors outrank freshmen, would the determination be strictly on the part of a lottery, and ... then would a need to increase fees ... drive some students out of that potential pot.

"[We feel] that the resident students ..., because they are on campus seven days a week, almost all the time, ... have a de facto resident parking privilege. They have first chance at all of the parking which is ... close to their dormitories, and if they choose to 'garage' their cars there, they may stay there all semester. So we have not recommended that another permit be [instituted] for residents who live on campus."

The Council voted to RECEIVE the report from the Committee.

IX. REMAINING QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT.

Reuben R. McDaniel, Jr. (Management) said that he understood that "there is a relatively severe request coming from the Governor in terms of changes in budgetary matters. I realize this has kept you and your executives busy for quite a while. I hope that we will be informed as those [changes] take place and that the faculty will be involved, to whatever level appropriate, in terms of helping to make some of those kinds of decisions. This looks like it is going to be a very severe request from the Governor in terms of the amount of reduction, or at least

restrictions or restraints, we might be under, including such things as travel restrictions, ... new position restrictions, [and] raise restrictions.... And I hope you will keep us informed so we will not just get all of our news from the Austin Statesman on these issues...."

H. Eldon Sutton (Zoology) said: "I noticed in the Texan the other day that the University Council has not addressed the issue of hazing. This is a matter which I think should be rectified, lest they think that by not addressing it we are not concerned about it." Mr. Sutton then MOVED that the Council adopt the following resolution:

> The University Council considers hazing to be completely inappropriate in any organization that is part of or associated with The University of Texas at Austin. We therefore support the efforts of the President and others in the Administration to eliminate hazing at this institution and urge that these efforts be pursued vigorously.

The motion was ADOPTED by a voice vote.

X. ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Council is scheduled in Main Building 212 at 2:15 p.m. on Monday, March 17, 1986.

Distributed to members of the University Council and to members of the General Faculty who want Minutes on March 14, 1986.