

Faculty Council Meeting
March 11, 2019
SAC 2.302 at 2:15 PM

Charlotte Canning, Faculty Council Chair and Professor, Theatre and Dance

Good afternoon and welcome. I want to call to order the seventh meeting of Faculty Council for the 2018-19 academic year. It is good to see you all here. Before we begin, a few reminders. When you speak, please say your name and department for the minutes. We follow Robert's Rules more or less, so please do not speak without being recognized by the Chair. We're one staff person down today, so if you forgot to sign in when you came, please do so before you leave so we have an accurate record of attendance. If you're a guest and would like to speak from the floor, you need permission from the Chair. Either you or a member can make that request. If there are a lot of questions or comments about something, I will favor calling on those who have not spoken over those who have, and, as always, and in every setting we meet as faculty, please make sure your remarks are focused on the matter at hand, succinct, professional, and respectful.

Before we move on, I want to pause our business today, and, on behalf of Faculty Council Executive Committee, remember President Bill Powers, who passed away yesterday. Much has been said about Bill in the articles that have come out in the last twenty-four hours. Here, in the context of Faculty Council, I—I want to focus on Bill Powers' belief in the faculty of this University. His faith in us and in our research was total and complete. He stood up for the serendipity of discovery over profit/loss spreadsheets, for the ineffable connections knowledge can make over the predictability of mindless expansion, and, over all else, for the soul of the University. He may have had to focus on spreadsheets and growth, but he didn't want the faculty to have to do so at the expense of our development of new knowledge and our teaching. When it would have been politically expedient and perhaps even beneficial to abandon the faculty, Bill Powers simply refused. He knew that standing up for research and teaching was standing up for the future of education, for the future of coming generations, and, most importantly, for the future of our democracy. In 2016, President Powers received the Texas Exes Distinguished Alumnus Award. Thanking everyone, he celebrated his good fortune, chiefly, for him, being a faculty member at UT Austin. "What a blessing," he marveled, and this is quoting him, "for me to spend my career here at UT as a member of the faculty, then as Dean, and President, and now, coming full circle, I am back to being a member of the faculty." End quote. But with blessings come responsibility, and he concluded his remarks that evening with a charge. It's the charge I want to end on because I think it is what is nearest—what was nearest and dearest to his heart. He said, quote, "UT is one of the world's great teaching and research universities and therefore, every single one of us needs to work every day to keep it that way and support our great university." End quote. As faculty, we have a special role in fulfilling that charge, and doing so every day is as important to us as it was to Bill. Faculty Council sends its condolences to Kim and their children and grandchildren. We also thank them for sharing him so generously with UT. Please join me in a moment of silence for our colleague, Bill Powers.

[silence]

We'll now move on to today's agenda. The first item is report of the Secretary, Alan Friedman.

[5:04]

Alan Friedman, Faculty Council Secretary and Professor, English

Thank you, Charlotte. I would like, before doing my report, to add a few words to what has already been said about Bill Powers, whom I esteemed highly as an administrator, a colleague, and a friend. What I perhaps valued most about Bill were his deep commitment to the tenets of higher education and his ability to engage both extramural and internal communities in fruitful dialogue about them. Bill schmoozed to the University's benefit with politicians, legislators, alums, and donors, and he consulted directly and often with faculty, staff, and students. Not only was his door always open, so too were his ears and mind, even after he had determined on a particular course of action. In my experience he was always willing to explain why he decided as he had, and also to reconsider when presented with a persuasive argument to the contrary. And Bill never failed to address and respect the individual with whom he was interacting, to honor that person's perspective and expertise, and to change course when doing so seemed appropriate. So many of his actions were aimed at helping to make UT the institution of the first-class it was meant to be and serving the shared interests of all its constituents. It was perhaps the finest action of this Council when, at a crucial moment in Bill's presidency and on behalf of the entire University community, it unanimously endorsed a Vote of Confidence in Bill Powers and his administration.

Since my last report, Sandra A. Catlett has replaced Wolfgang Bollich as the Staff Council representative on the Faculty Council. Is Sandra here, by any chance? Would you stand and be welcomed?

[audience applause]

President Fenves has appointed memorial resolution committees for Ben Caudle, Professor Emeritus, Petroleum and Geosystems Engineering, and Charles Whitney, Professor of Journalism.

Memorial resolutions have been completed and submitted for Frederick N. Martin, Professor Emeritus of Communication Sciences and Disorders; Eugene H. Wissler, Professor Emeritus of Chemical Engineering; and Timothy J. Schallert, Professor Emeritus of Psychology.

In other business, we are still awaiting final approval from the Coordinating Board for the Core Curriculum Course Lists for 2019-20. It's getting a little late in the day, but that's not surprising.

Legislation concerning the addition of new instructor titles to the criteria used to determine voting members of the General Faculty was approved by the Council on a no-protest basis. It has now also been approved by the Provost and the President.

The proposed changes to the Faculty Standing Committees that the Council approved in February have elicited suggestions for revision from the Provost's Office and others. The respective Standing Committees are reviewing the feedback for possible revisions, after which

the Council will reconsider the recommendations on a, presumably, no-protest basis. Final approval resides with the President.

And finally, the Resolution to Redesign Student Course Exit Surveys and to Reinvent the Evaluation of an Instructor's Impact on Academic Learning and Engagement that the Council endorsed in December has led to the formation of two task forces by the Education Policy Committee to address these issues. They are currently underway.

That's the report. Shall I go on to the minutes? The minutes of the regular Faculty Council meeting of February 18th have been posted. Are there any additions or corrections to them? Seeing none, I will presume that they have been approved as submitted. Thank you.

[9:31]

Charlotte Canning, Faculty Council Chair and Professor, Theatre and Dance

The next item on our agenda is communication with the President.

Greg Fenves, President

Alright, well, good afternoon. I am also going to talk about Bill Powers. So, Charlotte, thank you for your very eloquent statement, and Alan, I really very much appreciated your comments. And actually, I'll come back to something you said at the end of my brief remarks.

Can we just bring up the slide of Bill back just to remember that smiling face with the "hook em" instead of my face there? So, I'm only here at UT because of Bill. It was almost exactly eleven years ago this month that I first met Bill Powers when I was thinking of coming to the University of Texas as Dean of Cockrell School of Engineering, and personally, we hit it off right after our first meeting. And he was one of the—he was the main reason I decided to come to the University, as I said, eleven, making that decision eleven years ago.

Bill had a forty-year career here at UT. I knew him for about a quarter of that. Many of you that are here knew him for either the entire forty years or most of his forty years as a faculty member in the Law School and then subsequently Dean of the Law School and then President of the University of Texas for a little over nine years, the second longest-serving President in the University's history.

His accomplishments as President I think are already well-known and well-discussed. Even before he became President, leading the task force on reform of undergraduate education that had so many tremendous impacts on this University and undergraduate education and teaching. Then, becoming, when he became President, his focus on us as a top teaching and research university, and he always used those two words together. His accomplishments in setting where we have transformed higher education in terms of our students not just coming to UT but graduating successfully. Bill let—set that goal of 70% along with the task force that Randy Diehl, Dean Diehl, chaired in 2011. That—when I talk about what we have done as a university in student success, it is a remarkable story in modern American higher education, I get asked the question, "well, how did you do it?" And my answer is multi-part, but the first part is the most important part, and that's leadership, a university leader saying, "this is important. We need to work

together as a university to accomplish this goal not only for our students but for the credibility of higher education and what a college education means in today's society." And so, Bill started that process off.

He was the impetus behind another major transformation at UT: Dell Medical School, and I saw firsthand how that came about beginning in 2011. And it would not have happened without Bill's commitment and without his leadership and without his ability to "schmooze" politicians in the process which he had an unparalleled ability to do that.

But what I really want to talk about is Bill's second half of his presidency that began early in 2011 and lasted until his very last day in office in June 2015. And that was, what is a major public research university? What is its mission? And defending that mission against people who had a very different view about what the role of higher education, especially public higher education, is. And I worked—I had the opportunity to work with Bill quite closely during those four years from 2011-2015 when he truly was defending the University, and while much of that has been discussed over the years and since Bill stepped down as President, it took a tremendous toll on him emotionally. And many of us who are close to Bill Powers also believe it took a tremendous toll on him physically in those years and fighting the battle. He truly believed, as I do, that the faculty are the heart of a university. In fact, a university doesn't exist without the dedication of, the commitment, the excellence of the faculty, and I was going to reference what Alan already has about a very unique thing in American higher education of faculty having a Vote of Confidence in a President.

Doesn't happen that often, and I just want to finish my brief remarks with a little bit of a story. And some of you that were here around the July 4th weekend of 2014 will remember the events of July 4th weekend 2014 and shortly thereafter when it looked like Bill might be out of a job in a pretty short order. And it was that, it was the faculty vote that was very seminal in reaching the resolution, although not ideal, better than it had looked on July 4th of 2014. But I just want to reflect on one—the ending aspect of that, and that is the Faculty Council meeting, the special Faculty Council meeting that was called a few days after the July 4th weekend when the outlook for the University was pretty uncertain. And Bill and myself and others had been working behind the scenes over that weekend but had not come to a resolution, and Bill was saying, "I can't cancel a Faculty Council meeting. The Faculty Council is an independent body of the University. If they want to meet, they're going to meet." And so, the meeting went on ahead. I can't remember if it was a Tuesday or a Wednesday after the weekend. Do you remember Hillary? Was it Monday? Okay, I think—I don't quite think it was Monday because there were still some other things, so it must have been on Tuesday. And so, still no final resolution, and so, the Faculty Council meeting gets underway. Hillary Hart was Chair of the Faculty Council that year and convened the meeting, and we were meeting upstairs in Bill's office. We had a whole group around the conference table. It was being live webcast, so we watched the beginning of the meeting and I was the designated person to go downstairs and, you know, sort of be there at the meeting since Bill clearly did not—shouldn't have been there. And so, I'm sitting off on the side and Alan starts out with a very fiery speech, as I recall, and speeches are continuing—I get a text message: "come on upstairs." Ugh, this doesn't sound good. So, I go upstairs, and they finally had had the resolution. So, then we're sitting around Bill's conference table saying, "now what do we do?" Everyone pointed to me: "you go downstairs and tell the Faculty Council."

[audience laughter]

So, Hillary, I'm sure you remember this. I came downstairs, tapped on your shoulder, and said, "I need to speak." And, of course, that was the announcement that Bill was going to stay on for one more year before stepping down. There were cheers and a standing ovation. Many of you were there and know that. What I do want to tell you is I went back upstairs after the meeting was over. Bill's still sitting at the table, and I can't tell you how emotional he was to see the Faculty Council coming together in the middle of a summer, a packed Main 212, in support of not only him but what he stood for during his time as President. So, that's a memory I'll always remember. Wanted to convey that to you all. So, those are my comments.

Otherwise, things are going well. It almost sounds small and irrelevant as we think back on Bill Powers' life and contribution, but I think things are going well. We're halfway done with the legislative session—phew! Now, the second half is sometimes—that gets a little bit more tense, but as I reported in previous Faculty Council meetings, I think we're—this actually may turn out to be a very good legislative session for us on budget issues which is, we're not ambitious, just do not lose ground is my goal with the legislature. And also, we will have some policy issues but none of them as potentially concerning as we've had in past sessions, so I'm very encouraged. But it is only halfway through the session, so we still have roughly seventy days or so to go after this week.

But let me finish with the comments there. I know this has been a difficult time for many at the University with Bill Power's passing, so I'll finish my comments. So, I think we now have questions, and I believe there were some submitted questions?

[19:10]

Okay, so you can read, it has to do with the amazing alphabets and letters that are in bronze on the UT Tower, the iconic symbol of the University. And we're certainly aware of the condition of the Tower and the Main building. We've finally replaced the roof after many years of leaking and other damage, so that was actually a very essential deferred maintenance project. We—it's all a question of what are our priorities and the capital needs and where that funding goes. We roughly as a campus have about—over a billion dollars of deferred maintenance in all our buildings, and Darryl Bazzell's here. Darryl, how much is—what's our R&R [Replacement and Renewal] budget? Twenty million a year? Twenty-two million? Sixteen. I bumped it up to twenty-two million or something like that. So, we are always looking at where do we absolutely have essential repairs that are critical to the performing of the function of the university of teaching and research, and there are many parts of the campus that don't look as good as they should because of the deferred maintenance issues. So, it's just a—right now it's—I wouldn't say we have a Tower project on any near-term planning because we just have such higher priorities with the buildings that sort of students, where faculty do research, that we just don't have it as a, right now, as a high priority on the deferred maintenance list. I don't know if there's any follow-up on that.

Okay. So, this is a question about training decisions especially around bias and unconscious bias and other forms of bias. It's required for supervisory and that are involved in personnel decisions and the question is to what extent does the upper administration undergo such training and to what extent should such training be required for senior administrators including myself. Well, so there is—we do—we are very concerned about decision-making at all levels including my level and senior administration that all decisions are based on accurate information, they're fair and unbiased. And bias can enter in many dimensions. Where we have, from an institutional perspective, you know, most of these problems revolve around personnel decisions, particularly supervisory personnel in staff and, to a certain extent, faculty, but many of them where we have disputes revolve around staff.

Now, faculty is certainly important, and one of the things that we've, that the Provost's Office has been working on is improved training for search committees, for faculty search committee meeting. So, certainly, chairs of search committees undergo training. Faculty are critical—are crucial in recommendations leading to faculty hiring, and that's not a job they do every day. And that's not a job that for some faculty serving on a search committee, they are doing it for the first time or do it on a relatively rare occasion, and so, the bias training is an important part of a search process that has integrity and leading to the right decisions. At the University level, at the administration level, we have the standard training that all supervisory personnel go through. It is not specifically the bias training that we have faculty search chairs and in some cases search committee members go under, but it certainly at my level, at the senior administration level, we are always asking ourselves when we are looking at a decision to look at it from multiple perspectives including understanding if there are any biases that could enter into that discussion and enter into that decision. And I'm very proud of the fact that at the senior executive level, at the Vice President level, we have a very diverse senior leadership, and that itself is the best way to look completely around the factors of a decision to see if there are unconscious or other types of biases that may be entering into a decision. And it's quite often that we'll be discussing these even though the decision, final decisions are mine, I get input from diverse sources that we look around the room and walk through the decision from multiple viewpoints to understand that there aren't unconscious or other types of biases that could be entering into a decision. And having led search committees, having been a department chair, and having been a dean, I'm very cognizant through that search committee process about the important role of bias training for all members in the faculty search process. And I don't know who asked the question, but if there are any follow-ups?

Okay. Alright, so this is a question having to do with the President's committee, the final step in the decision-making process and multi-review process according to our *HOP* about when there's a final determination and, there always is a final determination from the President's committee. We just have a President's committee issue a final decision on the promotion decision without a written statement other than the decision itself, and so the question is: "why does this final level of adjudication not follow the procedures established for all other levels of the process?" And there's a, "how can we be more transparent for P and T [promotion and tenure] procedures?" So, I would not call this an adjudication. This is a multi-level decision-making process. We ask, at each level, for input. The budget council will—member will—write evaluations, and then there's a budget council or executive committee vote. There is not a written record of that vote other than the tally of the vote itself. Then we ask Deans will and departmentalized schools and

colleges will have a promotion and tenure process. The P and T committee or whatever it's called does have a record vote, but there is no written decision by the P and T committee itself. Although, we do ask Deans to characterize the discussion and any major issues that came up with the vote. According to our *HOP*, then a Dean makes a presentation to the President's committee. It consists of five members. We, depending on the case, we may, we will discuss it very extensively often, but not exclusively, in the presence of the Dean. And when there is a determination, especially if it's—it's the final determination is different than recommended by the Dean—we make sure that we inform the Dean about the discussions that take place if they were not present and the reasons, which are often, sometimes, quite involved. And we've spent, Maurie, sometimes we spend hours—hours on a single case that is—sometimes has lots of aspects to it to just do not reduce that to a written record. And we convey those aspects in its holistic way to the Dean and feel in that process, which has been our *HOP*-based process for a long time, long before I got there, that the Dean is then in the best position to work with the faculty member on the processes then follow that decision which are several including final arguments. There's opportunities for reconsideration, and then there are opportunities for filing a grievance with the CCAFR [Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility] committee and the CCAFR process. The CCAFR process is different. There is always a written response to a CCAFR submission sent to my office. So, this has been the process here. I think it works very effectively for the purposes of promotion and tenure processes. These are very thorough reviews at all level, and the ones I'm most familiar with having done them at a Dean's level and now at the President's level, they are very thorough. And we just do not feel that reducing, as I said, those discussions to a written record are beneficial to the overall process.

[28:55]

Susan S. Heinzelman, Associate Professor, English; Center for Women's and Gender Studies

Sue Heinzelman, Gender and Women's Studies and the English department. This is my question. I'm concerned that there is a—there seems to be a gap between what happens at the very senior level, and this is absolutely not about an accusation of bias or misjudgment or anything. It's just that if it really does take hours to decide on a single case, it strikes me that the candidate in the case of somebody who's been turned back despite the previous votes in the process is in an impossible position to respond to what must have been a very complicated, multifaceted debate about the value of that candidate to the University. I think the point here is not to accuse anybody at any stage of failing to do anything, but to make it more possible for the candidate who has received, after six years, a vote that goes against what he or she believed from the lower levels might have been a positive outcome. How does that candidate respond when they have only what their Dean tells them, which may be some version of the very complicated argument that went on when the case was discussed? And, you know, hearsay, second opinions about what, interpreting what the final adjudication or final decision was. I just think there's a gap which makes it hard for the candidate to respond directly and pointedly to the points that have been made, so.

Greg Fenves, President

Well, Sue, I understand your—the point that you're making. We do rely and expect the Deans to be able to convey the, accurately, the fulsome nature of many of these discussions, and my experience is there's never one factor. You know, it was just, wasn't quite what we expected. It's

usually multiple factors, and we talk about those with the Dean and we expect the—part of the Dean’s responsibility is to convey the substance of what those discussions were and the basis for the decision.

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Hi. Brian Evans, Chair of CCAFR, which is a crazy acronym, right, for Committee of Counsel on Academic Freedom and Responsibility? But more generally, not just this year, but just more generally, there are many ways I think you convey expectations down to in the organizational hierarchy I suppose, to the Deans, and I suppose they would convey to the Department Chairs. Can you describe some of the ways you pass on expectations for future cases, especially for early cases that are shorter than the six years in rank for probationary period?

Greg Fenves, President

So, Brian, thank you for the question. I think we’ve worked hard, especially over the past four, five years, maybe six years, I don’t know if Janet—is Janet Dukerich here? So, when I became Provost, I’ll just go back a little bit in history, I thought we had a huge gap in what was needed in a modern Provost’s Office, and this is a Senior Vice Provost specifically related to faculty by and which, faculty hiring, recruitment, promotion, and tenure are the most important aspects. So, Janet’s praises are sung often, but I’ll do them here again because this was really was her role as a Senior Vice Provost, to do a better job conveying to the entire faculty and to the leadership at the departments and at the dean’s offices, our criteria for tenure, which have not changed in any substantial way, making them clearer, having discussions about what the—how these are interpreted and the expectations. So, we’ve tried to work on the, improve the written documentation to all faculty, department chairs, and everybody involved in the promotion and tenure process. She does a road show with visiting departments, and if a department hasn’t invited Janet and Carmen to come visit, then you’re missing out on an opportunity for in-depth discussion about the promotion and tenure criteria, examples of issues that are have worked well and issues that haven’t worked well. I think every year we have a panel that’s open to faculty that’s the President’s committee is leading, so I know Trent and other members of the committee have been in that where we get the same questions every year, and we’re glad to answer those same questions. Hopefully the answers stay the same every year. And then we have, very importantly, we’ve been doing briefings specifically for department chairs and associate deans. So, I think over the past five years we’ve done a much better job, I hope, and we’re always looking for feedback on conveying not only the policies but some examples of interpretation of what’s working and what’s not.

Now, on the specific question of early promotion, we have normative times for consideration to promotion from assistant to associate and a normative time from associate to full professor. And we are, we do pay attention to the timing of a promotion case and if it’s early, before the normative time, we call that “accelerated.” And we want to know why the case is ready for consideration of promotion at this time as opposed to the normal time, and we do that because if an institution doesn’t, then the normal six years becomes five years because so-and-so was promoted in five years, and then the normal becomes four years because so-and-so was promoted in four years, and so, we have a very simple question, a very basic question, “why now?” And if the answer is, “this person is doing great, is on track for promotion, if the case came up next

year, they'd be promoted," I don't, and we as a committee don't consider that a good enough answer because then we should change our normative time from six years to five years or whatever if we think that is the normal track for performance we expect of faculty in each rank, but we haven't done that, so we feel an obligation to uphold those standards.

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

With the new non-tenured track faculty titles, do you also see six years as the normal time for non-tenure track to go from assistant to associate and from associate to full?

Greg Fenves, President

Yeah, so I don't think we're seeing that as a normative time, although, you know, some of these, you know, there were some titles we were never promoting anybody, so just starting to promote lecturers to senior lecturers to distinguished lecturers, I think, has been an accomplishment of the institution and recognizing non-tenure faculty for excellent and distinguished performance. I don't know, Carmen's not—Carmen or Janet's not here, so I don't know if we have a normative time, but I don't think it's become—I don't think it's become an issue. And it gets a little complicated because we've been changing titles and, especially in clinical and other types of—

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Yeah, I'm referring to the new titles of assistant—

Greg Fenves, President

Some of these are just conversions from one title series to another.

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

The new titles of assistant professor of instruction, assistant professor of practice, and so forth, clinical, so just a lot of new titles and I was just wondering what the—so the thinking is still being thought out.

Greg Fenves, President

I don't think we have solidified any specific normative times.

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Okay, and as far as numbers goes, last year I think there were eight negative promotion cases out of 127 and this year it's fourteen negative out of 152, so it's a lot of—so mostly positive outcomes by far, 90%, I guess this year. Eighty—almost about as many—

Greg Fenves, President

A little under 90%, I think.

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

What was it? It was? A smidgeon under ninety.

Greg Fenves, President

A little under 90%.

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Okay. Thank you.

Greg Fenves, President

And, again, that's for all reasons, not just—decision could have, comes up to us with a negative decision from the dean, for example.

Hillary Hart, Director, Experiential Learning Initiatives, and Distinguished Senior Lecturer, Civil, Architectural, and Environmental Engineering

Just a quick point of information. Hillary Hart, Civil Engineering, about a report that was done in the early aughts by Judy Langlois and a bunch of us worked on it, that suggests, and I can get—send you this report if it helps you create normative time periods—suggests six years for lecturer to senior lecturer, senior lecturer to distinguished senior lecturer, and that was a report that added on that final title. So, that would track, and those titles were meant to track with tenure-track, so the new ones track even better. So, point of consideration.

Greg Fenves, President

Thank you, Hillary. Thank you.

[38:30]

Lorenzo Sadun, Professor, Mathematics

Lorenzo Sadun, Mathematics. I've got a question on a different subject, or, is that appropriate or should I wait for?

Greg Fenves, President

Go ahead.

Lorenzo Sadun, Professor, Mathematics

This morning I got an email about the UT salary gap program that certain funding agencies like the NIH [National Institutes of Health] and CPRIT [Cancer Prevention and Research Institute of Texas] basically set caps on the summer salary that you're supposed to be able to get from a grant at, I think it's somewhere between 15-18,000 depending on which agency, and most of our, the top research universities—I'm certain about MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology]; I'm not certain, I didn't look up the others—but, basically have no problem going along with these caps. But UT has a program that says if you're already, if you're earning such a high nine-month salary that your summer salary would be more than 15 or 18,000 a year, that UT will pay the difference. And at a time when there's a limit to what we can spend on rank-and-file research faculty, and there's a limit to what we can spend on non-tenure-track faculty, and the student

services are getting squeezed, why are we spending this money on our highest and highest-paid faculty?

Greg Fenves, President

I know a little bit about the salary cap. I know we've had some discussions, but I've not been following it, so maybe we could collect some information and get back—unless, Maurie, you know? I mean, historically, UT has been supplementing the salaries if they're above the NIH cap. That's the only cap I'm aware of, and these, as you pointed out, these are some of our most productive faculty bringing in external grants. But, I know there's been a discussion, there's been a change in the program. I'm just not aware of the details right now. So, I think we'll—we can come back at a meeting next month with some more specifics about the program.

Lorenzo Sadun, Professor, Mathematics

Thanks.

Greg Fenves, President

Okay. Alright, thank you.

[41:02]

Charlotte Canning, Faculty Council Chair and Professor, Theatre and Dance

Our next item of business is report from the chair. As always, I will try to be concise today and just bring you up to date on a number of things: meetings I've been attended—attending, initiatives that I'm working on with various parts of campus. So, one of the sort of big new things that's come up since we last met were conversations underway with the Provost's Office about how to make the Committee on Undergraduate Degree Program Review, better known, perhaps, as CUDPR, more efficient, and how to ensure greater faculty oversight over curricular change. We're still figuring out the best way forward on this, and meetings are ongoing. And we will keep you posted. There may be some legislation to vote on at some point before the end of the year. The joint A&M meeting was just held, organized by Chair Elect Brian Evans. He will report on this, but I do want to say it was a terrific day with excellent conversations about key issues facing higher ed, so thank you, Brian, for all your hard work on that event. Darryl Bazzell's office is continuing to develop scooter policy for the campus *[sigh]*.

[audience laughter]

He has been consulting very closely with C9, which is the Transportation Policies Committee and its chair, Professor Linda Golden. I've sat in on a couple of those meetings. I've learned more about scooters than I thought I ever would, and I've never been on one, so. I've also met with folks from the Dell Medical School, and we will continue to work with them and the Provost's Office as well as the Office of the General Faculty to identify the voting members of the Dell Faculty based on our current rules and policies. This is a complicated issue that first arose when the Dell Medical School was founded. Because, at the time, they weren't—they hadn't had the length of time in office to be eligible, we didn't kind of figure out who exactly would vote, but we are figuring it out now and will have updates for you definitely before the end of the year. I do want to say, however, what I did say to the Dell folks on the phone when we

met last week that, for my money, there are sort of two issues. One is the important policy issue of who has the right to vote and identifying those people and making sure their rights are respected, but there's also the issue of voices in the room, which is equally important. So, what I told the folks I was meeting with and want to repeat here: if there are people on the Dell Medical School faculty who want to contribute to or participate in committees on campus, standing committees, we are more than happy to figure out how to put them on those committees and accommodate them so that they are important voices in the room. I don't think there's any problem with acknowledging that the kind of expertise and ideas that our Dell colleagues bring to the table are badly needed all across campus, so hopefully as we move forward even before whatever legislative changes we have to make, Dell colleagues who want to participate will be able to find themselves accommodated. And I urged the folks at the meeting to have people get in touch with me. I want to say that again, to this: if you know of folks in Dell Medical School who want to participate, please have them get in touch with me, and I promise I will find them a happy home. I was really—it really touched my heart to think there are faculty across campus dying to be on committees and I didn't know about them.

[audience laughter]

Since October 28, Professor Christine Julien, who is the chair of the C4 Educational Policy Committee and I have worked closely with leaders of student government on issues of how to address issues of sensitive content in classes especially around course content that involves sexual assault. We are trying to find the most effective ways to achieve the goals that student government has set including a meeting we had this morning and some, I think, really rich plans for ongoing conversations and how to continue to develop the ideas. So, I really appreciate their willingness to stick it out and keep working with us. It's a really terrific partnership. And finally, we continue to move ahead on the two task forces that will address teaching and course evaluations, the task force on exterior signs or signs in windows of buildings, training for budget councils and executive committees, and supporting the work of the graduate school task force. I just came here from a meeting of that task force and think that they're doing terrific work. It's really promising. There was a lot of energy in the room. They have a large part of the grad school website, and I will see that Faculty Council links to that so that you all can, for those of you who are interested, can find out more about what that task force is doing and what their timeline is. And, as always, I end with the same request. If you are a committee chair and your committee is considering a resolution or report, please be in touch. Time is growing very short, and we want to make sure that standing committees get room on the agenda as they are obviously the priority for Faculty Council. So, thank you very much. Next up is report of the chair elect, Brian Evans.

[46:46]

Brian Evans, Faculty Council Chair Elect and Professor, Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering

Thank you, Charlotte. This is a report on our joint meeting with Texas A&M University Faculty Senate. This is an annual, joint meeting of the two senates, and on odd years it's here at, in Austin at UT, and then in even years in A&M. So, we had fifty attendees last Monday. We welcomed comments by President Fenves, Provost McInnis, and Dean Lupiani from Texas

A&M, and, of course, we acknowledged the grateful funding—I'm very grateful for the funding by President Fenves for this event.

This is for—we had a number of people speaking to each other. It was a nice dialogue. Texas A&M University Chancellor John Sharp talked about restoring full state formula funding for higher education, that's all campuses, all systems, and also the Texas Research University fun that's been cut. It got cut in the last legislative session, to bring that back to its full amount. That fund supports us at UT Austin and also those at A&M. UT System Chancellor John Millikin who's new, he's been on the job about six months, he talked about increasing educational opportunities, which is a major challenge especially with the population expected to double by 2050. This is important. Our population in the state of Texas is expected to double by 2050. We can't double the number of campuses by 2050, so something else has to happen. Commissioner Raymund Paredes, the Texas Higher Coordinating Board, also harped on this theme. We have a large and growing percentage of K-12 students who are economically disadvantaged, and they will be seeking access to higher education. They've talked about a shorter-term goal, which is 60x30, so by the year 2030, having 60% of 25-34 year olds having a post-secondary degree or some other certification, and right now it's at 42%, so quite a ways to go.

We had views from the state legislature. The—our legislators that we had invited had last-minute committee obligations to serve the people of their districts, so it was Senator Buckingham, Representative Hinojosa, and Representative Howard. However, Representative Howard sent her chief of staff and also Senator Brandon Creighton, who's Chair of the Senate Higher Education Committee, sent the staff person who's in charge of directing the higher ed committee for the senate. So, they also gave us quite a bit to think about. I attached those notes, or, actually, Debbie Roberts, Casey Sloan, attached the notes from Jacob Cottingham's response to my five questions I had sent to him in advance. So, both Jacob Cottingham and Joel Resendez graciously accepted our invitation at the very last minute given the last-minute cancellations by the state legislators. So, we're very gracious to have them. So, they referred to in 2011 we took a lot of cuts in higher ed, and those cuts have not been fully restored even though our economy is recovering. So, he talked about that, also the priorities of the House higher education committee, including college affordability, campus freedom, and reaching the 60x30 goals.

We also had comments from Assistant Commissioner Rex Peebles, and that was our lengthy one. So, we went to one-hour discussion on that intended for thirty minutes, and this was on fields of study, which is great and well-intentioned and has been around a long time, and that's to help facilitate transfer students from Texas institutions of higher ed to Texas four-year universities. And, the action item that came out of that from both of our academic senates, is to try to team up and critique fields of study and how they impact us at UT and A&M and offer suggestions for improving the implementation of the fields of study, which is state law. Thank you.

[audience applause]

[50:42]

Charlotte Canning, Faculty Council Chair and Professor, Theatre and Dance

I'm very, very pleased to introduce the next speaker under new business. Last fall, Brian Evans and I met with Lorraine Harricombe, head of UT libraries, and discussed a range of matters, but one of the things we agreed was that given the importance of libraries to the faculty and to the University as a whole, it didn't make any sense that we didn't have any kind of ongoing formal relationship at Faculty Council to connect with the relationship that, of course, the library committee has and just more informal conversations. So, we agreed that we would create an annual feature which is the annual report of the University libraries. So, I'm very, very pleased to have Vice Provost and Director Lorraine Harricombe join us today and give that report.

[audience applause]

[51:43]

Lorraine Harricombe, Vice Provost and Director, UT Libraries

Okay. Well, good afternoon, and thank you for the opportunity to be here and present the state of the Libraries. This is actually my third presentation at the Faculty Council, and I'll get to the first one a little later. I want to start off by just embedding the Libraries and anchor the Libraries right in the middle of the core duties to support this University in research, teaching, and learning. As you know, many of our librarians work very closely with you already, the teachers, the faculty, the instructors, doctors, with our students in spaces in the library. We acquire the content as well as curate the collections that we do acquire for this University, and because of the volume of the information, it is absolutely our duty and our responsibility to make connections between you and the content that we do acquire. So, we facilitate discover and accessibility of that information, not just through our catalog, the online catalog, but also through other search engines, and then of course, if we don't preserve the information, who will? So, we do take that as a very core responsibility in the Library.

To do this, of course, requires resources and, as you can imagine, the information resource is probably the most important one in this presentation because it is one that we all are always very concerned about. 44% of the Libraries budget, total budget, is invested in information resources, and that includes content of all kinds. The personnel, the very expertise that we require to process the information and to work with you all are core to the function of the University, and we invest 45% of the University's Libraries budget in our personnel. And then the modern infrastructure that requires spaces, technology, 7% of the Libraries budget go into that. It's a very small piece of the budget, but it's probably also one of the most important. It keeps the trains running, and it's functioning, and it's supporting core functions.

I want to just highlight an example of infrastructure. If you have not been to the Life Science Library recently, I encourage you to go there for this reason, and I want to thank Provost McInnis for funding the Libraries to reclaim space in the Towers. This is the first time that the Libraries have been receiving space in twenty years, so thank you for that. It's a beautiful space. We will be opening that space next month. Books are being loaded into the room, and that's now the Hall of Texas to the left as you come into the Life Science Library. And, of course, you know we have the Hall of Noble Words to the right, so we have two beautiful reading rooms in the Tower where the library was first built as an independent building.

On another aspect of the technology, I just wanted to highlight the digital asset management system. Our experts in the library, especially our library IT has worked hard to develop this, and we are glad to have the backend of this now so that our own digital assets in the library can be loaded and made, eventually, made discoverable and accessible to you as well.

Not a very good slide. Looks no different than last year. You may recall this one. We've had a decline over many years in the library and FTE [full time equivalent], and despite the decline, I do want to say that we don't need all the people that we used to have in the libraries. Work's changed. Processes have been automated, combined, etcetera, but we do take every vacancy very seriously. We review and reassess what we actually need in the library based on your research and based on other expectations, and two that I'd like to highlight over the last three years that we've recruited, a new expertise, the GIS [Geographic Information Systems] specialist is new as of last summer, Michael Shensky, and before that, a data specialist, Jessica Trelogan. They are both working very closely with faculty. They host many, many workshops in the library in PCL and have full workshops I think every session that they have. So, if you're not aware of them, they can help you with things like research data management. Please look them up or let us know.

Acquisitions budget, not surprisingly here, also a very similar graph than last year. As you can see, the Libraries budget for information resources has essentially remained flat. While it's not been cut, a flat budget indicates a loss in buying power for us, and this is an area where not just UT but many libraries are challenged in terms of finding the funding to buy everything the faculty need for research and teaching.

This slide is of particular concern because the gap on the right between the dark orange and the light orange line is the one that we should be watching carefully. As long as that gap gets wider, we are not able to keep up with what we need here, and so our strategy is to manage the serials budget, that's the largest budget, our electronic resources budget in the library, to make sure that we take a look every year at what's used, how often it's used, and to make sure that we buy the materials and invest in the materials that align with the research program here at UT. The actual increase is about 5-8% annually, and without any additional funding into the libraries budget, of course, that gap can only grow wider.

So, that's a quick update about where we are today with regard to resources, staffing, and so on. As you can see, that's not a sustainable model, and I'm very pleased that Provost McInnis has launched a Provost task force to help us rethink what a library like UT library need to be for the twenty-first century. And many of you have attended some of the town halls that we've already hosted last November and as recently as two weeks ago. There are three subcommittees. I will direct you to the website. If you have any feedback about any of the committee work or any questions or any comments or any ideas, please let us know. I am a co-chair of the Provost task force together with Dean Addington. Sorry. We haven't seen each other in a while. But so far we've had an open town hall two weeks ago for the collections committee, and one that was very energetic because it came a day before the UC System announced its negotiations with Elsevier and has energized the campus in a way that makes me very excited to be here because finally, we can latch onto something like Berkeley and make strides, hopefully, over the next three years.

The three committees: collections, digital scholarship, and library spaces, will have meetings the rest of this semester. I believe the spaces will meet on April 15th. Please look on the website for places where they'll meet as well as the digital scholarship work there. These are just some of the dates and some of the committee meetings. I'll direct you to the website.

I want to just take the last few minutes to talk about the Elsevier negotiations with UC System. Have you all heard about that? Yes? This is big news. It's a very, very big deal for the UC System to have walked away from negotiations with Elsevier, and I want to take just a minute here because I've been asked many questions about this, and I'm sure you have many questions. We do have a contract with Elsevier. We have one contract for the whole system even though each institution pays its own share into that contract. So, fifteen institutions, we have a five-year contract. We do multi-year contracts because we can negotiate better caps, and as you can see here we have one for five years at 3.5%. This is a contract that will expire in December 2021, so three years hence is when our contract will expire. And we will have time to work with you if you're so interested in talking more about what we as a university and/or system might do. Investment is about fifty million dollars over five years of which UT Austin invests twelve million over the five years or two million per year. Just wanted to highlight some of the things that would be necessary, because there's much interest, both in the C7 as well in the collections subcommittee in this work now. It's important to identify the goals. Why we would want to pursue this with Elsevier or any of the other vendors and publishers? Who needs to lead it? I believe faculty-led work here is important. If we are going to pursue it, we need to make sure we have University administration support, and if we want to do it at the system level, at least the system level support, definitely Faculty Council support, library support, and tons of data to make the case and to be able to negotiate with Elsevier in particular.

Where are we now? I call it "Berkeley envy." Everybody wants to be like Berkeley. Faculty interest here is high, like I said. I'm inundated with questions and so is Jen Ebbeler, who is leading the Provost's committee on collections. So, we have infrastructure already because we have that Provost's task force, and with so many town halls this semester I think it's a good time for us to really engage the faculty this semester. We'll need expertise, and we'll need some data, as I pointed out already. Just towards the end here I want to highlight, if we need, we're going to engage in this work, and, as a result of the Provost's task force work, these are the things I think we can expect over the next three to five years, is to really take a look at the opportunities, short-term, mid-term, and long-term for UT Libraries to be ready and embrace and own the disruptions that we should expect any time change happens. Champion diversity. In the Libraries we've had our first residency program specific for diverse librarians, and I'm very pleased to say again Provost provided funding for us to bring in librarians of color. To live our strategy and to continue to be the library for the University of the first class and to focus on our vision moving forward. And I'll end here just putting on the vision again because, unlike the university of the twentieth century where we were service providers, our goal and my hope is that our librarians and our staff who'll become engaged and active partners with you in the research and teaching life cycle. Thank you.

[audience applause]

Any questions? Thank you.

[1:05:19]

Charlotte Canning, Faculty Council Chair and Professor, Theatre and Dance

Thank you very much, Vice Provost and Director Harricombe. You saw me walking around. We are trying to make sure we get out on time and accommodate some changes to the agenda, so here's what we're going to do for the last presentation. The—our colleagues from the Victim's Advocate Network have very graciously agreed to join us at the next meeting, and we will have the presentation on the EID password change campaign because that is coming up very shortly. And were we to postpone it to the next meeting it would be in a timely way for us to take in the information and to understand what's coming, so Cam Beasley and Autumn Shields. No. You're all different. Autumn Shields is here with some of her best friends to talk to us about that.

Autumn Shields, Lead Information Technology Manager, Identity Management

Thank you. Thanks for giving us the time to talk about this. I'm Autumn Shields. I'm with the Identity and Access Management team. Normally Cam Beasley, our Information Security Officer, gives this talk with me. He is on jury duty, so he couldn't be with us today. But I will talk about his slides where he gives some background on the security reasons behind this and then I'll go into the process and what you should expect. And if y'all have any questions for Cam we can take those and follow up with you.

So, normally, Cam has you guess the answers to these questions. I will go through a little quicker since we're running out of time, but just a little background on EID passwords. The oldest active EID password out there right now is from 1997. It is very old in password years. The average age of a faculty and staff member's password is three years and ten months, and that's pretty impressive with all the new EIDs that are getting created every day. Compromised EID accounts that were reported in 2018: 3,134. And that's an increase of 161% from 2017.

So, especially among faculty and staff we have a lot of folks that haven't changed their password in fifteen years. The last time we went through a kind of bulk change was in 2004, and one big issue with that is that password reuse is a really common issue. People use their passwords across multiple different applications so they don't have to remember a lot of different passwords. And you know there are lots of attacks where passwords get stolen all the time from different sources, so if you've used your password in different places, that's just all more places that that password could get exposed. So, this password change campaign that we're going through this semester is just one step in a larger project we're doing to improve our password security, so this is why. We understand that this impacts you, but this is some of the reasons why we need to do this password change. So, this is not affecting everybody who has a UT EID. This is specifically for those of you who have not changed your password since November 2015. So, if you are going to be required to change your password, you will be notified in advance. You'll get two emails in advance from the Information Security Office. If you're not sure whether you've changed your password in the last three years or if you reuse your password elsewhere, we recommend that you go ahead and change your password.

I just wanted to show this as an example. So, as I said, you'll receive notifications in advance. You'll receive emails that'll say, "you're required to change your password." It'll give you

instructions how to do so, and once you get that email, you can go, following the instructions, to change your password. And then you'll be finished with the process. Nothing else will happen. If you don't change your password when you receive those notifications, then after the date specified in the email you may be forced to change your password. And this is what that'll look like. If you're trying to log in to a website that's protected by UT login, you'll see that message, "you need to change your password." That "change password" is a link that you would be able to click and go change your password. If you're not logged into your machine that requires UT EID authentication, you could get locked out of your machine, so it's a good idea to go ahead and change it at a convenient time before you get forced to do so.

So, we're doing this, since there is such a large number of people who need to change their password we're doing this in chunks so that we can make sure that the service desk is able to support everybody who needs help. So, right now current staff are receiving notifications, this is staff members who are not faculty. For those of you who are faculty, you'll start receiving those notifications in April and you'll need to change your password by April 16th to avoid getting forced to change it. This is just a little information about how we created this plan and some of the different folks that we worked with. We worked with a focus group. I won't go into too much detail since we're running out of time, but I wanted to let you know that we've also worked very closely with the UT service desk on this. So, this service desk is prepared to help folks that run into any trouble changing their password. We also have some support documentation for you here. The EID password rules changed in October, so they may be different from the last time you set your password. It's a little easier to set a password that you can remember now. You can use pass phrases. You can use a sentence up to thirty-two characters. You can use spaces. You can use dictionary words. We have a project FAQ, which is questions about this process, and we have a user guide where we've been compiling some advice just for different support issues you could run into. For example, if you need to know how to—forget the WiFi password on one of your phones or something like that. As we, you know, receive questions and feedback, we're continuing to add to this support documentation, so feel free to reach out to us at this email address. If you have a question that's not covered in our FAQ or something you think needs to be added to that user guide, please feel free to reach out to us, and we'll be glad to update the documentation, add any helpful information that you need to get through this. Any questions we could answer right now? Thank you.

[1:12:48]

Charlotte Canning, Faculty Council Chair and Professor, Theatre and Dance

Thank you very much, and remember all the slides from today will be available on the Faculty Council website. So, if you want to access any of that information or the email addresses because you have questions, you'll be able to do that very easily. Thank you all so much for today's meeting. Remember we will be back in the Main building for our next meeting. Elections will open March 25th, and for those of you chairing faculty standing committees, your reports will be due May 6th. So, thank you again, and we will see you in April.

Adjourned at 3:31.