ORDER OF BUSINESS

I. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (D 16951-16952)—Alan W. Friedman (Professor, English).

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.
   A. Minutes of the Regular Faculty Council Meeting of February 18, 2019 (D 16939-16944).

III. COMMUNICATION WITH THE PRESIDENT—Gregory L. Fenves.
   A. Comments by the President.
   B. Questions to the President—see attachment.

IV. REPORT OF THE CHAIR—Charlotte Canning (Professor, Theatre and Dance).

V. REPORT OF THE CHAIR ELECT—Brian L. Evans (Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering).

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS—None.

VII. REPORTS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY, COLLEGES, SCHOOLS, AND COMMITTEES—None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS.
   A. Annual Report of the University Libraries—Lorraine Haricombe (Vice Provost and Director).
   B. Victim’s Advocate Network—Deborah Sharp (Lecturer and Senior Social Worker, Office of the Associate Vice President for Human Resources).
   C. EID Password Change Campaign—Cam Beasley (Chief Information Security Officer, ISO) and Autumn Shields (Lead IT Manager, Identity Access Management).

IX. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMENTS.
   A. The April 15th Faculty Council meeting will be held in MAI 212.
   B. The Faculty Council elections open March 25th.
   C. Annual Reports of the General Faculty Standing Committees are due May 6th.

X. QUESTIONS TO THE CHAIR.

XI. ADJOURNMENT.

Alan W. Friedman, Secretary
General Faculty and Faculty Council
The University of Texas at Austin
Arthur J. Thaman and Wilhelmina Doré Thaman Professor of English and Comparative Literature

Distributed through the Faculty Council website https://facultycouncil.utexas.edu on March 6, 2019
Questions to the President
Faculty Council Meeting,
March 11, 2019

From Gordon S. Novak (Professor, Department of Computer Science)
The alphabetic letters on the UT Tower are rusting. Not only does this look bad, but it may result in damage to these historic artifacts if it continues. Are there plans to restore the letters on the Tower?

From Professor Lorenzo Sadun (Professor, Department of Mathematics)
Across the University, faculty and administrators are required to undergo training to avoid bias in their supervisory and personnel decisions. To what extent does the upper administration undergo such training? To what extent should such training be required for senior administrators, yourself included?

From Associate Professor Susan Heinzelman (Associate Professor, Department of English)
When faculty go up for tenure and promotion, there is a written record at almost every step. Department and college committees have statements that contextualize their vote, chairs and deans write letters. When the case receives its final determination, however, there is no explanation. This may be appropriate when the findings are consistent across the process but when they are not—especially when the candidate is not granted tenure or promotion despite receiving positive votes in all previous stages of the process—it is problematic. Candidates wishing to respond to or grieve the final outcome of their case have only word-of-mouth information upon which to base their response. Why does this final level of adjudication not follow the procedures established for all other levels of the process? How can we create more transparency for P&T procedures?