

July 26, 2004

Dr. Jude Valdez
Vice President for Extended Services
The University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas

Dear Dr. Valdez:

At our meeting of Monday, June 7, 2004 you informed me that my time with PREP beginning in the fall would probably be reduced to 25% (as opposed to my current 50%) because of PREP budgeting problems. You said you would allow me to participate in some site inspections of PREP as long as I promised not to express my views about curriculum, pedagogy and administration. You said that my fundraising responsibilities would be assigned to someone else, and that my title would be changed to "Founding Director" or "Founding Coordinator." I responded by saying that I expected to be redesignated chief executive officer of PREP at 75% of my time. In a memorandum dated June 28, 2004, you notified me that your proposed changes would be implemented, effective September 1, 2004.

I write to serve notice that the appointment changes you are implementing are unacceptable, and that I reject them. Furthermore, because of the unconscionable actions taken against me over the past 20 months and the disgraceful lack of integrity shown by you and possibly other UTSA officials, I am resigning from my position with the PREP program management, effective August 31, 2004.

I dedicated 25 years of hard work in creating and coordinating PREP and nurturing it into a local, statewide, and nationwide program that has impacted the lives of thousands of women and underrepresented minorities so that they are prepared for college studies and careers in science and engineering. The documented success of my intellectual and creative work has been recognized at the local, state, and national levels and TexPREP is listed as one of the BEST 20 programs in the nation. During my tenure as leader of San Antonio PREP, TexPREP, and Proyecto Access, and with the help of many collaborators, over 23,000 young women and men benefited from these programs. The winners in this work have been these young people, particularly underserved minorities and women, whose talents and abilities are needed in our country today.

However, since November 25, 2002, I have been subjected by you to a string of autocratic and self-serving decisions and deceitful behavior that have been insulting to me, personally and professionally.

Let us review the facts – and facts they are. I have documents and/or contemporary notes to substantiate every assertion.

- On **November 7, 2002**, in a meeting with a campus police officer, called at his request, Detective Tom Calucci informed me that I had been accused of coercion and misuse of university property in connection with my position as pro bono treasurer of the San Antonio Education Foundation (SAEF). (Both allegations are patently false, as I have repeatedly stated.) The campus police officer read me the Miranda Rights, advised me to retain an attorney, and indicated that the UTSA police would send the case to the District Attorney or to the Alamo Community College District. I was not given an opportunity to respond and no UTSA official informed me of what was occurring. I was kept in the dark by UTSA. When I did secure legal representation shortly thereafter, my attorney asked to meet with UTSA police and attorneys, and he was told that they could not talk to us because the case had already been sent to the District Attorney or to the ACCD Police Department.
- On **November 20, 2002**, in a letter to the UT System’s Director of Audit, Dr. Ricardo Romo requested an audit of the PREP accounts “based on the ongoing criminal investigation that concerns one of our employees, Dr. Manuel Berriozabal, Director of the Texas Prefreshman Engineering Program (PREP).”
- On **November 22, 2002**, you extended the five-day administrative leave of absence, effective November 25, 2002, which I had requested on the same day to cooperate with the University police in this matter. You had told me that if I didn’t request the leave, you would impose it anyway. That same day, you wrote to me accepting the leave and extending it until “at least December 15, 2002 or until I am informed of the completion of the investigation.” This was the first of a series of extensions of my administrative leave, which finally ended June 30, 2003. You informed me that this action was necessary because I was a suspect for criminal wrong doing which could lead to an indictment and jail time if convicted. Furthermore, you stated that state regulations or statutes required this action. You refused to cite the authority orally or in writing for imposing this leave of absence.
- Throughout the **Christmas and New Year holiday season of 2002** I was denied access to my office. While at home and under the most trying of circumstances, I wrote the one-million-dollar NASA annual grant proposal for the national Proyecto Access program for the summer of 2003. I did so with the help of a PREP office staff member whose service you begrudgingly assigned to me.
- On **January 2, 2003**, you allowed me to go back to my Proyecto Access office; however, I was told that I could not communicate with PREP staff and that my leave was still in effect. To this day you have prohibited me from communicating with PREP staff.

- At a meeting on **January 9, 2003**, requested by, and with, representatives of La Raza Faculty and Administrators Association to solicit information on my leave, Dr. Romo spoke highly of my work and, responding to questions from the faculty, indicated that “TexPREP is fine.” Volunteering information about the audit he had called for in November, Dr. Romo said that “every ‘i’ may not have been dotted but all that was a non-issue ... what we have seen is above board.” Dr. Romo told the La Raza group that my leave had solely to do with the ACCD issues and not with any issues concerning UTSA or TexPREP. Dr. Romo also stated that the reason I had been put on administrative leave was because UT System regulations required it.
- On **January 11, 2003**, my computer was completely blocked. I was not able to receive e-mail and my regular mail was also intercepted. My e-mail was routed to your office and I had to get my regular mail through your office, as well. In some instances, important correspondence was delayed because of this interception.
- At 10:00 a.m. on **January 22, 2003**, UTSA Detective Tom Calucci and Sergeant Tom Fluckiger came to my office. In a very intimidating and frightening manner, Detective Calucci informed me that I had no business being in my office. He declined my offer to examine an e-mail confirming that you had authorized my presence. Instead, he and Sgt. Fluckiger left my office. Several minutes later Sgt. Fluckiger – not Detective Calucci, the offending officer – returned and apologized for the intrusion. The episode left me very flustered, nervous and distraught throughout the remainder of the day. On January 28, 2003, when I complained to you about Detective Calucci’s actions, you stated that it had been satisfactorily handled by Sgt. Fluckiger’s apology. Concerned about the implications of this abusive behavior by a police employee of the university, I disagreed.
- On **January 23, 2003**, at your request, my wife María and I met with you in your office. In her presence, you repeated your earlier assertion that the leave you had imposed on me was due to the District Attorney’s investigation of ACCD/SAEF. You stated, “The DA is calling the shots.” You also accused me of intimidating the PREP staff and that I should cease such actions. In addition to my office, you gave me permission to use the downtown campus restroom and eating facilities. Furthermore, you forbade me to attend Mathematics Department meetings until the investigation was complete. The Provost, however, rescinded this last directive five days later on January 28, 2003.
- During the months of **March and April 2003** my wife and I learned from state officials and from a NASA official who oversees Proyecto Access that there are no state or federal regulations requiring administrative leave in cases such as mine. If any action is to be taken, it is at the discretion of the local university administration. In short, I learned that the administration of the University I had served honorably for 26 years as a tenured member of the faculty and as the founder and director of one of its most acclaimed public service programs, could

have acted otherwise. UTSA didn't even give me the courtesy of the truth; it was UTSA's decision to impose this severe sanction on me – not a mythical regulation. After I confronted you with this information, you conceded that it was your decision to put me on leave.

- On **April 16, 2003**, you informed me that a new Principal Investigator would be named for the 2003 NASA Proyecto Access grant. However, you also stated that I would resume this position as soon as the investigation of ACCD/SAEF was completed. In fact, on May 9, 2003, you informed me that I was scheduled to resume my full PREP administrative responsibilities in the fall.

During this whole time – from **November 22, 2002** until my leave of absence officially ended on **June 30, 2003** – and under painful and humiliating circumstances, I offered my services to you to assure the successful implementation of the 2003 San Antonio PREP, TexPREP and Proyecto Access programs. During this time you asked me to prepare a major funding proposal and several major reports, and you asked me to approach some benefactors for support. You even assured me, as noted above, that I would resume my professional responsibilities with PREP by the fall of 2003.

With hindsight I now see that while I was dutifully and responsibly cooperating with the District Attorney's office in its ACCD/SAEF investigation, and doing everything you asked in order to ensure that PREP and Proyecto Access would not suffer as a result of my forced leave of absence, you and perhaps other members of the UTSA administration were concocting Plan B, to remove me as the chief executive officer of PREP.

- On **May 22, 2003**, the District Attorney faxed a letter to UTSA's attorney, indicating that I was only a *witness* in the ACCD case. The letter stated that the District Attorney's office "had no reason to consider Dr. Berriozabal anything other than a witness in the ACCD case." At the time, I was unaware of this correspondence with UTSA. However, I had received an e-mail message from an external source on **May 21, 2003**, that indicated that the District Attorney's office considered me a cooperating witness in its investigation of SAEF.
- On **May 23, 2003** – the day after the District Attorney notified UTSA that I was only a witness in the ACCD case – you wrote me a letter informing me that, based on information you had received from the UTSA Police Department, you were proceeding with an internal investigation regarding my employment at UTSA and that the Human Resources office would coordinate the investigation. This was a repeat of the complaint filed in October 2002 – the complaint that the UTSA police informed me of on November 7, per the first bullet in this letter, and which they said they were forwarding to the District Attorney's office.
- On **May 27, 2003**, you came to my office to discuss the written notice you had given me of the impending investigation and said you wanted to arrive at closure of this Human Resources investigation as soon as possible. You said you had asked for a copy of the police report upon which the Human Resources

investigation would be based, and that you would share it all with me. I responded by saying that this internal investigation should have been conducted six months earlier, right after the complaint had been filed, pointing out that my attorney and I had offered to talk with both the UTSA police and UTSA attorney Liz Mitchell but were rebuffed. I also showed you a portion of a written summary of an interview I had with a District Attorney's investigator on March 27, 2003 that dealt with the issues identified in the "Incident Report." In other words, the allegation of coercion that served as the basis for the charge in the UTSA police "Incident Report" had already been addressed by the District Attorney's office. I indicated to you that I did not trust the UTSA police since the time I had been intimidated by Detective Calucci on January 22, 2003. When you made it clear that the new investigation was going to proceed regardless, I stated that I expected in the conduct of the investigation that:

- my attorney would be actively involved
- tape recordings would be made, and
- all persons interviewed would be requested to take oaths.

You agreed to this. However, you soon reneged on all three stipulations.

- Two weeks later, on **June 13, 2003**, my attorney and I met with you and David Diaz of Human Resources as part of the internal investigation. I had no opportunity to ask questions and my attorney was forbidden to speak; I simply responded to questions and refuted the allegations leveled against me. It was at this time that you provided me with a copy of the UTSA police report that was the basis of this investigation – the police report you told me you had asked for at our May 27 meeting and that you said you would share with me. Labeled an "Incident Report," the UTSA police report was a write-up of the allegations made on October 23, 2002. Curiously, the Incident Report was dated not October 23, 2002 but **May 27, 2003** – *seven months* after the complaint was filed and *the very day* you said you asked for it.

In case the inferences to be drawn are not sufficiently clear, let me state them: As soon as UTSA learned from the District Attorney's office that I was a cooperating witness on the ACCD/SAEF case, you started to find reasons, *after the fact*, to have me charged with a criminal offense, or, at the very least, to justify the abusive treatment I had received.

But the UTSA internal investigation went nowhere:

- On **June 23, 2003**, I followed-up the June 13 interview, with a letter refuting specifically in writing the allegations of coercion and misuse of University property. One month later, on July 23, 2003, and only after pressing for it, I received a copy of Mr. Diaz's "report" of the internal investigation. The "report" consisted of a cover sheet titled, "Summary of Interviews Conducted as Part of Administrative Investigation Regarding Use of University Time and Other Matters by PREP Employees" and the statements of three witnesses taken on

June 5, June 6, and June 11, 2003, respectively, and of my statement taken on June 13. The so-called internal investigation fizzled out with no findings, no conclusion, and no recommendations.

With nothing forthcoming from the District Attorney's office and now with nothing panning out from the UTSA internal investigation, the path should have been clear to restore me to my full professional standing, right? Wrong.

- Three days later, at the end of the workday on **June 26, 2003**, you handed me a letter and left my office before I could read it and discuss its contents with you. In the letter, you informed me that my administrative leave was being rescinded, effective June 30, 2003. Your letter stated that when I resumed work with PREP four days later, it would be in a new position, as "Director of Development" – a position with no staff and with a decrease from 100% to 50% assignment with PREP. You offered no explanations for this dramatic change in my professional standing in a program I founded and had directed for 24 years – a change that also resulted in a decrease in salary for the 2003-2004 fiscal year and that was occurring two months before the end of my contractual year. In fact, your letter presented this "change" – a transparent euphemism for "demotion" – in glowing terms!
- On **June 27, 2003**, I met with you at 2:30 p.m., to discuss the contents of the letter. At 4:28 p.m., that same day, as I later discovered through documents obtained by the Texas Public Information Act, you sent Dr. Romo an e-mail, which read, in part:

I met with Dr. Berriozabal yesterday and today. Explained that his new roll [sic] in PREP would involve a **shared leadership** for the program with the title of PREP Development Director. He was accepting at first, but then today (after some reflection, I guess) he "offered" an alternate scenario, namely, he would like the title of "Executive Director" with appropriate responsibilities.

Both you and I know that this is an elaborate lie. I met with you for the first time to discuss this job "change" only moments before you wrote this e-mail to the President. I never was "accepting at first" – neither the day we actually met or the day before. As you know, I have always and consistently insisted on being restored to my rightful position as the leader of PREP. In fact, the new job description came complete with a hierarchical chart that showed the PREP Development Director off to one side, with no staff, working under you.

Your e-mail to Dr. Romo went on to say:

Of course if we did this it would put us in the awkward position of responding to a management problem by promoting the individual who created the problem. Dr. Berriozabal is probably not a happy camper, but maybe the weekend will change his mind. More later.

Dr. Romo followed-up with an e-mail of concurrence with your recommendation; he stated:

Thanks. You are right....no to Exec. Dir. ... I hope he can work through this, for it is about all we can do. RR

Your internal investigation, initiated seven months after a complaint was filed yielded no results, no conclusions, no findings, and no recommendations.

- Following an exchange of e-mails about the new position, on **July 1, 2003**, you restated that I had been appointed to the PREP Development position and was “to function in that position as of Monday [June 30].” You asked me “to declare to me in writing your acceptance or decline” of the new appointment. At the end of the day, I wrote that I accepted the appointment *under protest*.
- In **July 2003**, I questioned your ethical conduct. I had acquired a copy of a proposal that you prepared, signed and submitted to the NASA/Minority University Research Education Division in Houston for support of 2003 TexPREP. In this proposal, you listed yourself as the program coordinator on page v., and on page 2 you took credit for two professional awards that you never received. I was the recipient of those awards. On July 23, 2003, I talked with the Provost, Dr. Guy Bailey, and the Vice Provost for Business Affairs, Mr. David Larson, about the proposal and your fraudulent claims. They informed me that they would look into the matter and give me a prompt response. I received none.

The following week I tried to make an appointment to talk with President Romo about this and other PREP matters. His assistant, Jan Steger, informed me that protocol required that I first talk with you before I could make an appointment. In compliance, I informed you that my agenda for a meeting with Dr. Romo included discussing these items: my restoration as chief executive officer of PREP, the removal of PREP from under your office control to another area, and your fraudulent professional claims in the NASA proposal. (Later, on September 16, 2003, your comment on the last item was that it was a “laughable matter.” You never even offered an apology for making those false claims.) After talking with you, several times I tried unsuccessfully to make an appointment with Dr. Romo; he refused to talk with me. Although on July 31, he sent me a letter of congratulations on the standing ovation I received from PREP participants and their families and friends at the PREP closing-day assembly. Dr. Romo also

informed me that his office would have a mediator appointed for you and me, if we could not settle our differences by August 31, 2003. We did not settle our differences by August 31, 2003, and he never followed up on this commitment.

- A week or two later, on **August 7, 2003**, you wrote me a letter with allegations drawn from UTSA's internal investigation – allegations I had clearly refuted in my response and which never materialized into anything more than allegations through the investigation. The letter began, “I will reiterate the reasons for your demotion.” This, of course, was the first time you ever referred to my “change in position” to PREP Development Director as a “demotion.” And the reasons, as noted, constituted a rehash of unsubstantiated and refuted allegations, allegations that should have been made moot by the internal investigation. Finally, you conclude your letter with the statement:

With respect to some of the findings I have listed above, the UTSA Police conducted an investigation and presented their case to the Bexar County District Attorney's Office where the charges are still pending.

This clearly reflected your second or continuing effort to justify your imposition of the administrative leave of absence on me and your removing me as the chief executive of PREP and Proyecto Access. The timing of your letter, following my exposing your unethical conduct, did not fail to attract my attention.

- On **August 18, 2003**, I again e-mailed a message to Dr. Bailey and Mr. Larson, with a copy to Dr. Romo, about your false professional claims. I have yet to hear from them about this matter. In April 2004, Mr. Larson retired from UTSA.
- In early **September 2003**, you forced me to move out of my office to another that was at least 40% smaller – and you gave me one day in which to do it. You said you needed my office for the new full-time Proyecto Access Director (a position that was filled three months later). I pleaded with you to postpone the move since I had just, ten days earlier, undergone brachytherapy treatment for prostate cancer. I informed you that my doctor had instructed me to refrain from strenuous activity for two to three weeks. In response, you insisted that I supply a letter from my doctor. Despite my doing so, you ruled that the move would proceed as scheduled, stating that your executive assistant would supervise it on Monday, September 8. As you should have surmised from the number of books and files I had in my larger office, the move to a smaller office required me to take many of my 27-years worth of files home. To be ready for the move on Monday required that my wife and I work the whole stressful weekend, separating books and files to be moved to the new office and our home.
- On **October 6, 2003**, I learned from an article published in the Express-News that you were now saying it was the November/December 2002 audit that prompted my demotion. During the previous month of September, the

community had begun to protest and ask questions about my situation. Since you had no plausible reason for removing me from the leadership of PREP, you and other UTSA administrators exhumed the heretofore “above board” audit and found it to be the post facto reason for my removal from the academic and intellectual leadership of PREP.

- On **January 6, 2004**, you reprimanded me for exercising my professional prerogative in giving my opinion on the merits of “Systems Thinking,” which your choice as the new PREP Director was presenting to the Proyecto Access directors at the December meeting in San Antonio. It angered you that some of the directors wanted to meet with me privately at the conclusion of the first day’s session. It is also noteworthy that when I appealed the reprimand, Dr. Romo willingly talked with you and the new PREP Director about it, but lacked the courtesy and decency to meet with me and allow me to provide him with my testimony.
- On **March 10, 2004**, you proposed a “truce” at a meeting where you were handing me my annual personnel evaluation. As to the truce, I reiterated my position that a necessary condition was my complete reinstatement as the chief executive of PREP. As to the personnel evaluation, you gave it to me at the end of the meeting with no discussion of its contents. When I returned to my office and read your professional evaluation of me, I was stunned to see how you belittled my work and achievements of the previous year. In my entire professional academic career, I had never received such an unjust, condescending, disrespectful, and insulting evaluation. That you wrote this evaluation at the same time that you were asking for a “truce” speaks volumes of your intent and character. I responded to the evaluation on March 23, 2004.
- At our meeting on **June 7, 2004**, as I continued to question the “Systems Thinking” pedagogy promoted by the new PREP Director, you justified your appointment of this individual, who is not a mathematician, by referring to him as a “mathematician in his own right.” You also took the opportunity to disparage me, stating that my publications were only reports.

Since my official return from leave at the end of June 2003, your treatment of me was usually demeaning and patronizing. If I took issue with you on a certain matter, you became hostile towards me and reminded me in one way or another that you “are my supervisor and I am your subordinate.” The few times you seemed to talk civilly with me was when you needed my expertise or services to perform a pressing task or to solve a crisis.

During the past six months of 2004, you have ordered me not to communicate with PREP, TexPREP, and Proyecto Access staff or directors. You have provided me no staff. I must go through your assistant to obtain even the most basic secretarial services. You have ordered me not to communicate with NASA officials. I have been relegated to

sending e-mails or making phone calls to your assistant to secure even the most basic office necessities, such as, folders, rubber bands, printer cartridges, and even paper clips.

More disconcerting to me than this humiliating maltreatment, however, has been your insistence in piloting Systems Thinking¹ in San Antonio PREP.

As you know, I strongly questioned your piloting of Systems Thinking in San Antonio PREP, given that the PREP pedagogy has already achieved documented success in the preparation of women and minorities for college studies and careers in science and engineering. On **March 10, 2004**, when I noted that PREP was acclaimed for its successes at the local, state, and national levels, you responded by saying that Systems Thinking experts had been consulted and that members of the faculty of the Department of Science and Mathematics Education were also consulted about Systems Thinking. I subsequently talked with each of the mathematics educators of the UTSA Department of Science and Mathematics Education and none has said that he/she was ever contacted by you or anyone else connected with PREP about Systems Thinking. You compounded this lie when, on **April 14, 2004**, you denied that you ever stated that you had contacted the Department of Science and Mathematics Education faculty about Systems Thinking.

I find it strange that the new PREP Director, who was appointed in the fall of 2003, should decide to pilot this change in pedagogy when he has not yet completed a single summer of PREP operations. Does he know the program's pedagogy and curriculum well enough to dismiss it? What evidence does he possess that PREP was broken and needed to be fixed?

TexPREP, in fact, this year was cited by the Congressionally mandated BEST (Building Engineering and Science Talent) project as one of 20 programs nationally out of 200 for developing diversity in the technological professions. It is a teacher-led, content-oriented, and rigorous program that has *high performance expectations* of its participants. Research on Systems Thinking, on the other hand, reveals that although it has been around for many years, this pedagogical system has not demonstrated any success in improving the numbers of minority students who subsequently pursued college science and engineering studies. As one educational researcher for the BEST Project informed me, Systems Thinking was never even a candidate considered for improving the diversity of women, underrepresented minorities, or disabled students in the technology professions.

On **October 9, 2003** you commented to me that one of the criticisms of the PREP program was its "high expectations of student performance." This comment and attitude signals to me a profound change in direction in the program I founded 25 years ago.

¹ According to Word IQ Dictionary and Encyclopedia, Systems Thinking involves the use of various techniques to study systems of many kinds. It includes studying things in a holistic way, rather than purely reductionist techniques. It aims to gain insights into the whole by understanding the linkages, interactions and processes between the elements that comprise the whole "system." Its application has been used in management and the environment. On the other hand, the objective of PREP is the development of abstract reasoning and concrete problem-solving skills through the acquisition of mathematics-based content in our participants so that they can successfully pursue college level science, engineering, or other mathematics-related areas.

From the beginning, I insisted that if you have high expectations of students, they will meet them. For the past 25 years, I have been proven right. Students of all socio-economic backgrounds, races and gender have risen to the high expectations and gone on to achieve great things in their lives. The PREP database documents the program's successes.

Since its inception, I have been proud to have my good name, integrity and professional reputation inextricably linked to PREP. However, I can no longer allow you to use my name in the management of the program. Despite my complete isolation from PREP, I am aware that you and possibly other UTSA administrators are informing public officials and others who have made inquiries about PREP that I have active leadership responsibilities in PREP in such areas as development, planning and evaluation, and promotion. This, as we both know, is a lie.

I am not only stating my concerns about the future of PREP in this letter but also taking the time to review what has happened since November 2002 because I fear that the total lack of respect and abuse that has been inflicted on me by you can be repeated. These abuses need to be exposed because if this happened to me, a tenured professor with a long record of service to this University and the community, what protection does an untenured faculty member or a member of the staff or administrator with less seniority have from bureaucratic tyrants? In fact, several times when I have taken exception to your treatment you have reminded me that others in the University subjected to leaves of absence have been accorded similar treatment.

UTSA's policies, or, more accurately, its non-policies related to paid administrative leave are appallingly non-existent. The process, or lack of process, used to make decisions on such leave is appalling and unjust. Faculty and administrators can put their academic competence and creativity to work to conceive beneficial programs for our students and community. They can work for years to fulfill a dream in their profession only to find that in one fell swoop their program or project can be taken away from them for no cause and without due process or appeal. Other supervisors like you can do what you have done and get away with it. This is wrong!

In other words, what has happened to me and how I have been treated could happen to anyone at UTSA. Your treatment of me shows that supervisors are free to abuse faculty and staff and cause irreparable harm with impunity. You have no fear of being held accountable for your demeaning and disrespectful behavior towards me.

UTSA is still a young university. It is now establishing its reputation on the values it stands for and will espouse – values that will influence the student body and the entire faculty and staff. In our country today what is needed is education that not only provides content but that strengthens character. Ethical leadership and conduct and respect for the dignity of each individual should be the foundation of all that we do. Taken in this context, what I have experienced for the past year and a half is totally counter to those values.

In my opinion, your actions and behavior are a disgrace to this University and to other faculty and staff who work hard to serve our students and the community. You have pirated my professional work. I consider you a liability and an embarrassment to our University community.

With deep regret and a great sense of loss, I hereby tender my resignation from your management of PREP.

Sincerely,

(signed/sent 7/26/04)

Manuel P. Berriozábal
Professor of Applied Mathematics
Founder, San Antonio Prefreshmen Engineering Program,
and Texas Prefreshmen Engineering Program
Co-Founder, Proyecto Access

MPB/mab

cc: Members UT System Board of Regents
Dr. Mark Yudof
Dr. Ricardo Romo
Dr. Guy Bailey
Dr. David Johnson
Dr. Deborah Armstrong
Dr. Lucio Tavernini
Dr. Aaron Cassill
Dr. Mansour El-Kikhia