

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, November 5, 1979 Kiva, Room 211 College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, November 5, 1979, in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Sixty-six members were present with Dr. Richard M. Edwards presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Altschul, Antinoro, A. Armstrong, Atwater, B. Barrett, W. Barrett, Campbell, Cassady, K. Clark, R. Clark, Cole, Coxon, Crowder, Cunningham, DeArmond, Dickinson, Edwards, Ferrell, Fleming, Flick, Gallagher, Goodwin, Green, Hartsell, Henderson, Hinton, Hull, Hummel, Jorgensen, Kassander, Kellogg, Kennedy, LaBan, Longman, Mautner, May, Meredith, Nelson, Paulsen, Pergrin, G. Peterson, R. Peterson, Pickens, Ramsay, Rehm, Remers, Ridge, Roby, Rollins, Rosenberg, Rosenblatt, Roubicek, Shanfield, Sigworth, Snyder, Sorensen, Steelink, Stubblefield, Svob, Thomas, Thompson, Tindall, von Teuber, Wilson, Younggren, and Zukoski. In the absence of Dr. Sankey, Dr. LaBan served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: J. Armstrong, Barefield, Briggs, Brubaker, Butler, Dresher, Gaines, Garcia, Gibbs, Gourley, Hasan, Hazzard, Jones, Kettel, Kruttsch, Laird, Metcalfe, Munsinger, Odishaw, Schaefer, Sumner, Tomizuka, A. Weaver, D. Weaver, Windsor, and Witte.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of October 1, 1979 were approved as distributed, with the following corrections.

Dr. Sigworth wished the minutes to show that he did not use the word "input" erroneously, as in "faculty input." (Page 16, sixth paragraph, of the October 1 minutes.)

On page 18, the third paragraph, in Dr. Tomizuka's comments about the amount of money expended in support of remedial course work, the reference to the University of Arizona should be corrected to read the University of California at Berkeley.

On page 12, in the first paragraph of the Report from the Chairman of the Faculty, the Coordinator of International Programs should be identified as Mr. Eugene von Teuber.

REPORT FROM THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: ASUA President May announced that the Associated Students were sponsoring a lecture by Ralph Nader who would speak on campus in the main auditorium the evening of November 13. ASUA concerts also would present Waylon Jennings and The John Prine Band on Friday evening, November 9, at McKale Center. The ASUA-sponsored bus trip to U.S.C. accommodated about 320 students and it was a great success. The students hope to offer similar trips in the future.

Mr. May mentioned that at the next Faculty Senate meeting the students would bring up a study room proposal. This proposal deals with utilizing empty classrooms in the evening by the students for study rooms.

Mr. May said that at the Board of Regents' meeting November 8-9 at ASU, two matters of interest to the students and the University would be brought up: 1) A negative-checkoff system for student health insurance; and 2) A tuition increase. Although an ad hoc committee of the Board of Regents had already decided that out-of-state students should pay 85% of the cost of education, student leaders wished to spread the non-resident tuition increase, a tentative \$400 a year, over two years rather than to put it into effect in one year. Their aim was to reduce the hardship on out-of-state students by giving them time to prepare for the increase and by preventing defection from the University, decreasing thereby the enrollment and faculty positions.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROCEDURES: Dr. Rehm, Chairman of the Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Academic Procedures, said that the October 1979 edition of "Conditions of Faculty Service", the result of the deliberations of a joint Arizona Universities Faculty-Board of Regents staff ad hoc committee, had been distributed to Senate members that afternoon. He encouraged those who had comments to put them in writing and send them to him by November 20. These reactions would then be evaluated, discussed, and consolidated by the Standing Committee on Academic Procedures and would be brought to the Faculty Senate in December for further discussion and resolution before they were presented as a single response to the Board of Regents for their consideration prior to formal adoption of the "Conditions of Faculty Service".

Dr. Rehm expressed his appreciation for Dr. Raymond A. Thompson's efforts in helping put this document together along with representatives from the other universities. They were very happy with the document. They had a good group to work with. They believed that they were providing the faculty with a document much more in tune with the times than the previously proposed one.

APPROVAL OF REVISED GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF ACADEMIC DEANS: Dr. Rehm presented to the Faculty Senate the Revised Guidelines for the Review of Academic Deans. He said the proposal came from the Standing Committee on Academic Procedures as a seconded motion and was before the Senate for discussion.

(The Guidelines as adopted are stated in full at the end of this section of the minutes.)

Dr. Zukoski observed that the College of Medicine no longer had a vice president and wondered if the appropriate insertion of Provost would be made. Dr. Rehm assured him that this addition would be made in the final draft so the terminology would be correct for all divisions of the University.

Dr. Sigworth inquired why the committee made no provision for the faculty of a college to have a say in establishing its review committee. It

would seem appropriate, particularly for a large college, that at least one or two of the faculty members on the review committee be elected by the faculty of the college. As it stood now, of course, the committee could be "rigged" by the President in any way he should choose.

Dr. Rehm replied that section III of the "Guidelines for the Review of Academic Deans" stated that each college would establish its own method of selecting the members of the dean's review committee. A college, in the context used here, he added, means deans, department heads, faculty members. There is no appointment procedure by vice presidents or the President in establishing this committee. It is to be done in a way whereby each college decides what is appropriate for its own particular situation.

Dean Hull asked why there was no method established whereby a dean could ask for a review and wondered if there was a reason for omitting that alternative.

Dr. Rehm answered that it had not been considered by the committee but that if a dean was conscientious enough to feel he needed to be reviewed he would have to "lay it upon his faculty" to instigate a review. The dean could also ask the President to take action under guideline II c., Administrative review by the President.

Dean Rosenblatt said that he was glad that the Senate was getting around to reviewing academic deans because everyone was reviewing everyone else. Faculty and department heads were already being reviewed and the time would probably come when we would be reviewing, perhaps rightly so, tenured faculty. He thought the document was fine but he wondered about the 2/3 requirement in section II b., Special review, which is to take place upon petition of two-thirds of the department heads (or equivalent) in a particular college. Why 2/3, a substantial number, which, in an urgency to get a dean reviewed, might delay such action?

Dr. Rehm stated that 2/3 was a protection to the dean so that he would not continually be being asked for a review by only 50% of the people with whom he worked.

Dr. Zukoski asked if each college would be required to set up its dean's college review committee now or to wait until someone put this document into action. He thought the committee and how it was to be selected, with its procedures, should be established once and for all in each college at a definite time.

Dr. Rehm said that when the document was approved the time clock began. If a dean needed to be reviewed before 1984, perhaps an early arrangement of the program should be made. The committee did not determine when each college should activate its procedure.

The question was called for and the motion carried unanimously.

The Guidelines for the Review of Academic Deans as adopted follow:

GUIDELINES FOR THE REVIEW OF ACADEMIC DEANS

I. Background

In the University structure Deans serve at the pleasure of the President, and as such they are continually being evaluated by higher administrators. Thus the purpose of the Dean's review guidelines presented here is to afford those who occupy levels below the dean an opportunity to also have input to the review or reevaluation of their dean's performance.

II. Establishment of Review

A review of a particular dean can be put in motion under any of the following:

- a) Periodic review which is to take place not less frequently than every five years.
- b) Special review which is to take place upon petition of two-thirds of the department heads (or equivalents) in a particular college. In this instance faculty members of a college can call for a review by convincing the requisite number of department heads (or equivalents) that such a review is necessary. A special review of a particular dean cannot occur more often than every three years, and for a new dean not until at least three years of service in the deanship have been completed.
- c) Administrative review is a review by which the President can use these guidelines to obtain more detailed information on the performance of a particular dean.

Once the need for a review is established it is to be coordinated through the appropriate vice-president's or provost's office.

III. Review Committee

Because of the varied nature of the colleges on campus, each college is in the best position to establish its own method of selecting the members of the Dean's review committee. However each college's committee should consist of a) faculty members from the Dean's college, and b) department heads (or equivalents) from the Dean's college. In addition, if appropriate, the committee could have a representative who is not a member of the Dean's college but who holds a position similar in level to the Dean's in a related field in either academe, business, industry, the professions, or the arts.

When a review committee has been formed, it will formulate its own review procedures prior to beginning the review, and will send a description of the procedures and composition of the review committee to the dean being reviewed, the appropriate vice-president or provost, the Faculty Senate Standing Committee on Academic Procedures, and every faculty member of the pertinent college.

IV. Review Content

The end result of the review is to determine the relative success that a dean is having in carrying out the dean's duties. Thus some of the items the review committee should investigate, among others are: leadership; management effectiveness; ability to work with department heads, higher administrators, faculty members and staff; communication; public relations; fund raising and budgetary skills; support of teaching, research, and public service; and desire for establishment and maintenance of quality programs.

Each review committee is expected to establish its own method of obtaining information on the above or other items. Possible methods might be: direct interview with the dean, department heads, and faculty members; anonymous or signed written surveys; outside agency evaluations; rating scales; faculty polls; discussions with employers of the college's graduates, etc.

V. Reporting Procedures

The findings of a particular dean's review committee are advisory only. Thus all information gained and recommendations made are to be submitted to the appropriate vice-president or provost for the implementation of any action deemed necessary. Since the purpose of the review is constructive, it is also imperative that the review committee's recommendations be communicated to the reviewed dean. Faculty feedback as to the committee's recommendations would be through the members of the review committee who could summarize results for the faculty of the reviewed dean's college.

APPROVAL OF CATALOG MATERIAL AS REPORTED IN "CURRICULUM" BULLETINS: The Senate approved catalog material furnished Senate members in "Curriculum" bulletins Vol. 8, No. 5 (September 28, 1979) and Vol. 8, No. 6 (October 18, 1979).

APPROVAL OF DEGREES CONFERRED SEPTEMBER 1, 1979: The secretary stated that the Senate members should have received the list of students completing degree requirements September 1, 1979. The total number of degrees completed September 1 was 1242 and included 600 bachelor's degrees, 482 master's degrees, 2 Juris Doctor degrees, 72 Doctor of Medicine degrees, 5 Specialist degrees, and 81 Doctor's degrees (Graduate College). He recommended that these degrees be approved. A motion to approve the degrees was made and seconded and carried unanimously. (A list of the names of these degree recipients and each respective degree is attached to the Secretary's official file copy of these minutes.)

COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN REPORT ON UNDERGRADUATE WRITING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: Senator Rebecca Kellogg, chairman of a special sub-committee of the Committee of Eleven, presented for consideration by the Senate a report from the Committee of Eleven on undergraduate writing at the University of Arizona, "Are You Embarrassed By This Term Paper?", with appendices and bibliography. The full report had been sent to each member of the Senate before this meeting. (Note: Each faculty member is to receive a copy of the Report with the minutes of this Senate meeting. A copy of the appendices and bibliography will be available in the office of each dean, director, and department head.)

Ms. Kellogg said that the recommendations which the Committee of Eleven brought to the Senate today were the result of two years of research into questions concerning undergraduate writing at the University of Arizona and other universities across the country. She then said the following:

"Many members of the University of Arizona community have been most helpful to us over the past two years. I would like to thank some of you in particular: Dr. Paul Rosenblatt, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts--who provided us with valuable ideas early in our research, and who has been supportive of our efforts. Dean Rosenblatt has given us ideas and suggestions which have helped shape part of the Report. Professor Edgar Dryden, Head of the Department of English, has aided in our understanding of the philosophy and objectives of the current composition program. Professor Charles Davis, Director of the Freshman Composition Program, has been very helpful in providing details about the University's program and has kept us aware of state-wide developments. Dr. Albert Weaver, Executive Vice-President, sponsored our attendance at a conference which examined the causes for the decline of basic reading and writing skills among college-bound students. Dr. John P. Schaefer, President of the University of Arizona, helped finance our research and has continually supported the direction which our study has taken.

"Let me review and comment briefly on the Committee of Eleven's recommendations. They are stated immediately after the title page of the Report on Undergraduate Writing. 'First, each undergraduate and transfer student shall take a writing proficiency examination between the student's fiftieth and ninetieth hour of degree credit. Second, a university writing center shall be established to improve writing skills of undergraduate students. Third, a university writing board shall be established to advise the university writing center. Fourth, the student-teacher ratio shall be reduced in all sections of the freshman composition sequence.' The fifth recommendation has been amended by the Committee of Eleven to read as follows: 'Writing program faculty members shall be eligible for tenure.' Would you please note this change on your copy of the Report. This has been amended for clarity and to increase the strength of the University's program.

"If these recommendations are voted down, we will continue as we have; that is, providing our undergraduates with an inadequate education. We will be requiring them to perform to our standards without providing them with the writing ability to do so. Remember that we are not talking just of students who will graduate from the University of Arizona and go on into the

work force. We are also speaking of students who will enter graduate school. Thirty percent of our graduate students took their undergraduate training here. If we provide our undergraduates with inadequate writing skills, we are also reducing the competency of thirty percent of our graduate students--students from whom we expect continued scholarship beyond the baccalaureate level.

"If these recommendations are passed, the following will occur: The President will appoint the University Writing Board members. The Board will work with Dr. Dryden and the Department of English to create the University Writing Center. The Center staff will develop the proficiency examination, which will go to the Undergraduate Council for curricular review. Reduction of the student-teacher ratio in all sections of the freshman composition sequence and establishment of tenure eligibility for writing program faculty members will begin to take place--to be fully achieved over a period of time."

Ms. Kellogg requested and obtained the consent of the Senate for members of the Committee of Eleven and for Dr. Edgar Dryden and Dr. Charles Davis to be allowed to speak throughout the discussion which was to be held on each of the recommendations. She asked that Dr. Mary Maher and Dr. Cornelius Steelink, as other subcommittee members responsible for the Report, be allowed also to speak. Ms. Kellogg said that she had been advised that since these recommendations came to the Senate as seconded motions, discussion could now begin.

Dr. Sigworth, as a member of the Committee of Eleven, as Chairman of the Faculty, and as a Professor of English, urged the Senate to adopt the recommendations presented in the "Report on Undergraduate Writing." He also expressed the following: "I am happy to report to the Senate that the Department of English at a meeting last week voted 30 to 6 to approve the Report. In a department as contentious as ours, that is practically unanimity. The six negative votes, however, represented some real reservations, some of which members of the Senate may share, and I, therefore, wish to discuss them as briefly as I can. The first has to do with the possibility that it would become necessary to hire tenure-track instructors who would be inadequately qualified, in order to meet the demands for instructional staff which would arise as a result of decreased class size and extra possible positions in the Writing Center. This concern is more nearly private to the English Department, but I have full confidence that the administration of the department is strong enough to withstand any pressures to weaken our staff.

"The second objection concerned the University's Writing Board, and the fear that the Board might become some sort of administration monster which would gobble up the department. The members of the Senate probably are not much concerned with that possibility, but may well be concerned about the Writing Board on other grounds.

"The exact composition of the Writing Board is left vague in the Report, partly because, I think, it represents less an administrative organ than a commitment by the whole University to a concern of the whole University. Freshman English, as you all know, is the only course which every student must

take, or must at least fulfill the requirement. I am happy to note that in the Report there is no criticism of the way that course is conducted, but there is throughout the Report the implication that student writing is a University-wide concern, and that to improve the state of undergraduate writing, a certain amount of money is necessary. It does not seem to me appropriate that the Senate address directly the matter of financing the various proposals. Administrators will have to do so after we adopt the Report, and the Writing Board will also have to do so, advising the administrators, and, I should hope, making efforts to seek some outside seed money in the form of grants to get the program started. The provision that the Writing Board would articulate--without specifying curriculum--the philosophy of the academic community regarding the testing of undergraduate writing skills, seems to me, as I assume it seemed to the large majority of the English Department, an appropriate one, since the entire academic community, through the Board, is to be involved indirectly in the improvement of undergraduate writing. The commitment is thus articulated in the Writing Board.

"Upon adoption of this Report, I shall consult further with the Committee of Eleven and with President Schaefer as to the precise composition of the Board. I shall ask the Committee on Committees to circularize the faculty, asking for volunteers from every college to serve on the Board. From these names, President Schaefer will select the Board with, I hope, my advice, and I shall urge the President to consider the appointment of several alumni from the Tucson community to serve with faculty members on the Board. Undergraduate writing is, after all, not purely a matter of concern to the University, but to the large community of educated and articulate people whom the University serves. The community almost certainly has something to contribute to us, and I think we should seek its advice.

"When the Board has been formed, I shall return to the Senate with a report. After the adoption of the Report now before the Senate, 'Are You Embarrassed By This Term Paper?', which, as I said, is not intended to specify administrative demands, but rather to express a commitment, the Senate may, if it chooses, concern itself with defining more precisely the duties of the Board. It does not seem appropriate for this discussion today to get wound up in that sort of detail. It is the commitment that you will be making today which is important. I should hope that the Report can be adopted as an expression of the University's concern with a University-wide problem, and as a commitment to seek a solution."

Susan Thomas said that she and the student members of the Faculty Senate had some comments and reactions to the Report. They thought there was no consistency in grading within the English Department, that students tried to avoid Freshman English, that they were discouraged upon taking the course. Some students found their writing acceptable for the first semester course and were discouraged by the teacher of English 104. There seemed to be an inherent inconsistency in the Freshman English program. Ms. Thomas said that her student colleagues in the Senate were pleased that Freshman Composition Writing Program faculty members would be eligible for tenure if the recommendation was approved.

Dean Rosenblatt said he was pleased over the concern about Freshman English. He was impressed with the comments of the students. He realized

that although the Committee of Eleven Report did not include criticism of the Freshman English program, that criticism could be made of the program. Perhaps the quality of the program should be looked at with some very careful detail. He pointed out that he is equally concerned about the problems the University has in mathematics, which are very serious, in fact, which are more serious than in English. The Committee on Transitional Studies in the College of Liberal Arts was meeting today, while the Faculty Senate was meeting, about the problems in these two fields. While he appreciated many elements in the document, for there was good in it, he said, he was somewhat upset about it. He doesn't like the title or the motto of the Report. He doesn't think we are embarrassed. Our motto should be "We Will Not Be Embarrassed Any More." He is not just saddened, but angry over the waste that takes place when students are ill-prepared when they come to the University. They are capable but they are ill-prepared.

There seemed to be a kind of faith in this document, Dr. Rosenblatt continued, that if one reduces the student-teacher ration, say to 15 to 1, that, therefore, one will get a better Freshman English course. Numbers in themselves do not exclude quality.

* This document does not address itself to foreign language classes, he said. The Freshman English classes this year have been somewhat crowded and average about 30. In past years they were held to 25 to 27. The language classes average 35 to 37. That is too high. The question of foreign language study is directly related to Freshman English. What most of us learned about grammar has been learned through studying a foreign language. And he said, he was speaking as a Professor of English.

The College of Liberal Arts has committees at work studying the teaching programs in humanities, sciences, social sciences, and communications, Dr. Rosenblatt continued. "These problems are not discussed in isolation; we have some interrelations between subjects. We have to see the balance between subjects. We have to see how curriculum in one area will affect curriculum in another area." Since these committees have spent a year and a half of hard work examining these basic problems and their interrelations with educational theories, he asked that the Committee of Eleven Report be simply "accepted" today. He would like these recommendations to be looked at very carefully by the appropriate committees in the College of Liberal Arts and have these committees report back to the Faculty Senate. He hoped that these recommendations would not be adopted at this particular time.

Dr. Sigworth said that the only course that is a concern of the entire University is Freshman English and that concern must be addressed not by a single college, for example the College of Liberal Arts, but by the whole University.

Dr. Thompson agreed that the entire University is concerned with the teaching of English; nevertheless, the teaching of English is carried out by a single unit of the University and he said he thinks, therefore, that we have to look for some kind of partnership in the discussion that may take place in arriving at decisions. It is inappropriate for the University to set procedures whereby a college will carry out its mission. It is very appropriate for the University as a whole to express concern, set policy, and to ask a college to consider certain kinds of feasibilities in carrying out its mission. There is a difference here

* 24.2 (See "Approval of Minutes" item in December 3, 1979 Senate meeting where this change was approved.)

between total University concern and commitment for a better job in a particular area. But he thinks it is appropriate to go back to the unit that carries out the mission to see how these things may be carried out.

Dean Hull supported the comments of both Professor Thompson and Dean Rosenblatt. He regretted that the Committee of Eleven had focused its attention on only one deficiency. He would not want to wish the English Department any greater burden than it already had, but it is quite true, he said, that if U of A students are deficient in writing, they most certainly are also quite deficient in speech.

Dean Hull also commented on Recommendation 4 of the Report: "The student-teacher ratio shall be reduced in all sections in the Freshman Composition Sequences". He conceded that this was an administrative matter that involved financing, but the statement itself was quite meaningless, for to reduce a class by one, for instance, would accomplish nothing and would not necessarily affect the quality of the class.

Dr. LaBan shared information gleaned from a study by Paul Rankin on communication behavior among executives and white-collar workers. The survey disclosed that on the job, 9% of these managers' time was spent in writing, 16% of the time in reading, 30% of the time in speaking, and 45% of the time in listening. In 1971, another study revealed that an average of 80% of an executive's day was involved in talking and listening. A 1973 industrial study showed that communication activities consumed from 50% to 90% of a manager's time and 75% of that time was spent in individual, face-to-face communication. Dr. LaBan said that consideration of the study of communication at the University ought to include all communication, both speaking and writing.

Dr. Zukoski said that we have to learn how to read before we can become an executive and even more important, we have to learn how to write. He believed the teaching of writing is very important to the entire University and that the English Department hasn't yet met the challenge. He felt the Senate should move ahead with the resolutions and that the Writing Board should work closely with the colleges as well as the English Department. He felt that until the University did something about this matter, it would not be solved by secondary education in the state of Arizona. "Mediocrity will continue to rule there forever until someone makes the decision to stand up and be counted, to prepare the students better." He urged the Senate to approve the resolutions which many universities have adopted to help solve this problem of undergraduate education.

Ms. Kellogg said she was pleased to know that members of the Senate felt that the committee should also investigate reading and mathematics. The Committee of Eleven did begin to discuss mathematical skills in conjunction with the report on writing and found both areas to be very large and in difficult straits. The Committee made a choice to begin its research with writing. She was pleased that there were groups on campus working in the area of mathematics. She agreed that the Senate should be concerned with students' basic skills. The Committee would like to think that students had skills to get through four years of undergraduate training and graduate from the University of Arizona and go on to even bigger and better things. This has not really been borne out. She,

Dr. Maher, and Dr. Steelink, especially as members of the Committee and involved with the research, heard from large numbers of faculty members, particularly those who teach juniors and seniors, saying, "I don't know what's happening, but when students get into my course they can't write decent papers", or "When I have them write a short essay on a limited subject, I can't really understand what they say." Faculty members also have expressed to them: "I don't grade writing; I can't. If I graded writing areas, I could never get my course content across to students. I only grade on whether or not I can understand an idea." Other faculty members had expressed regret that they could not grade their students' writing skill; that they could not take the time. Students told the Committee that when going to interviews and when investigating graduate school programs, they have been asked to do some writing, primarily to find out if they can express themselves on paper.

Ms. Kellogg stated that the Committee was certainly concerned about the ratio of students to instructors in other courses. However, the Committee had chosen to start its concern with basic writing. She emphasized that if you can't write you put yourself under a severe handicap. If you can't write, she said, you're going to have a more difficult time expressing yourself orally.

Ms. Kellogg continued, "We know students can express themselves orally. They are very literate orally, but when you ask them to put that in writing, they don't know exactly how to say it. The recommendations that we have developed are ones which after two years of research, after examining other universities' programs, and after talking with faculty, students, and administration on this campus and others, we feel form the basis for a strengthened program in writing at this University. The Writing Center would provide the ability for the student to get help throughout the four undergraduate years. We have made these recommendations because we see the need. We have brought them to the Senate because we have heard a concern expressed by you. Certainly if the Senate thinks the writing is all right, if you want to put your funds, time, or effort into another program, or if you want writing to take a second place to other things, which admittedly are also important, you have that choice."

Professor Ridge agreed that students are more able to communicate orally than in writing. It was a disappointment to him, he said, to see that only one of the recommendations, No. 4, was of immediate and direct assistance to the student. The others call for the establishment of various bureaucracies somewhat away from the student that may or may not result in assistance to him or her. He thought that approval of Recommendation 4 alone would do much in assisting the student. He had reservations about the other four recommendations.

Dr. Kassander said that he has to read faculty writing. He saw as much faculty writing on campus as anyone. He urged similar attention to faculty writing. That aside, he continued, he wanted to relate an experience he had as a young Assistant Professor of Engineering Physics at Iowa State University. He was once called into the office of the Dean of the College of Engineering and was told that the Dean had received a number of complaints and that Dr. Kassander was to discontinue grading reports on the basis of English. Dr. Kassander answered that he was trying to do the students a favor by correcting their English

and that the grade he gave was on the basis of the content of the report. The Dean said it made no difference and that he was to leave the English alone. The Dean of the College of Liberal Arts concurred. Dr. Kassander did not think a college dean at the University of Arizona would behave in this way. On the other hand, he did not think that most faculty members take the time to correct English errors that are found in reports in their classes.

Although it is not appropriate for the Faculty Senate to tell the English Department how it should teach a particular portion of the English instruction, Dr. Kassander said, it yet remains a task for all of us to attempt to improve the students' and our own communication skills whenever we have that opportunity. We have that opportunity very nicely, he thought, in Ph.D. requirements, or in seminars.

Dr. Kassander did not see how the Senate could demand of the faculty a commitment to improve the communication process of all students, in all subjects, at all levels, without some sort of University-wide commitment. He thought the recommendations would be beneficial if they were to cause the faculty to take greater care to improve the presentation and content of their courses. The Writing Center would serve to call to the attention of the entire University that it is a responsibility of all faculty to do their best in this regard.

Dr. Remers said that the report the Senate had been given stated that upper-division students have difficulty carrying knowledge gained from the Freshman Composition sequence into courses requiring technical or subject-related writing skills. The inference was that students do have the basic skills and knowledge after completion of Freshman Composition. It seemed to him that it was the duty of upper-division teachers to help the students make that ability applicable to the kind of writing that is required at the upper level.

Dr. Remers said he was not sure what an examination between the student's 50th and 90th hour of degree credit was going to do, how one would test the ability of the student to write for a specialty by some university-wide examination. Perhaps we would hear more of this in subsequent discussions, he allowed.

Dr. Dryden expressed uneasiness about the vagueness of the Report. It had been his administrative experience that whenever questions of finances were left vague, it was the department that paid. This omission bothered him. Like Dr. Rosenblatt, Dr. Dryden applauded the realization that good writing is part of the overall mission of the University. He also knew that there did exist a Department of Student Writing, that is, the Department of English. Creating another level of bureaucracy by establishing a Writing Center, for example, is not the way to go about solving the problem. The idea of a Writing Board bothered him not because he thought it was going to tell him what to do, but because it was going to force him to write 35 memoranda a day. He didn't know what it would do to student writing, but it would improve his, simply because he would get more practice. He agreed completely that we needed some sort of organization that would give students remedial, tutorial work. He could conceive of such a Writing Center, dealing with just those basic remedial problems, completely outside the English Department. We would have had that long since, had we had the money.

It costs money to do those kinds of things. Money and its absence and finding people to do the job need to be considered when one thinks about the Writing Board. To summarize, it was the absence of those practical, nitty-gritty details in the Report that made Dr. Dryden suspicious.

Dr. Gerald Peterson said that the College of Engineering had a Committee on Undergraduate Writing long before the research for this report was started. The Engineering faculty recognized there exists a most difficult problem. He thought the Report was a positive and practical report and he was very pleased with it. It suggested very specifically bringing together some specific resources to attack this problem and none other. He could think of no other single attribute that he would consider to be more the mark of an educated individual than the ability to write the language clearly, succinctly and effectively. If one cannot do that, he is not educated. Education is what the University is about. This is a problem which we must attack. It does not say we should not be concerned about other problems such as mathematics, speech, and so on. The College of Engineering is very much concerned about mathematics. He thought the key recommendation was No. 3, the establishment of a Writing Board, because that expressed a commitment to have a group of interested individuals who would work toward one objective and nothing else. He thought that was critical. As long as the matter is left to a department or a college that has other objectives that have to be parallel to it, it will not receive the attention it should. He could not agree with Dr. Dryden more if it were just another level of bureaucracy. He thought that the University needed to focus on this problem and bring resources, perhaps heretofore unavailable, to bear on it. Everyone has wished not to criticize the Freshman Composition program. He had great admiration for Dr. Charles Davis and thought that he was doing as much as he could with the resources he had. But the very fact that the Senate had this report before it said that Dr. Davis' resources weren't enough and more needed to be done. He didn't think waiting around for several more months until various committees of the College of Liberal Arts made their reports was going to change that fact. This problem goes far beyond Liberal Arts. We are all concerned. He strongly recommended, therefore, adoption of these recommendations.

Dr. Maher said that it seemed to her that if we have one contingent questioning the vagueness of the Report and another contingent complaining about the details of the Report, perhaps we have a report that is going right down the middle and right where it should go. To clarify further, she offered an analogy. When a teacher develops a course at the University, the first thing that is done is to lay down the philosophy and the objectives. Then down the line somewhere, the lesson plans are written. This Report is intended to be a positive statement of philosophy and objectives. The Committee doesn't want to get into the lesson plans too much because some of that has to be resolved by the English Department and the Writing Board, which is intended to be an interdisciplinary body. The Writing Board is the one key agency which the Committee hopes will bring full faculty commitment into the plan itself. Everything that happens underneath the recommendations toward the end of the Report, what the Writing Board or the Writing Center do, are merely suggestions.

Dr. Maher said that she didn't know if the faculty needed help in

grammar or a workshop in grantsmanship. The Committee hoped that sort of duty could fall under the Writing Center's purview. What the Committee wished to emphasize was that they have laid out some general, bare-bone objectives that they hoped would bring improvement finally in the current program. The proposed program presents clear, foundational support for what the Committee envision some day the quality of writing could be on this campus, given the resources and aids.

Dr. Coxon expressed concern that even after we have done all these things recommended by the Report, we'll still have a remedial situation. We are not attacking the problem at its root, and maybe we cannot, but it seemed to him that if the problem itself is to be solved, somehow colleges and universities collectively have to stand up and insist on proper entrance requirements in order to force the community at large, and the public schools in particular, to do their job. Remedial English is not the proper function of a center of academic excellence, which this University claims to be. With the exception of Professor Zukoski, no one had even mentioned this question this afternoon. This is a fundamental problem and while he applauded the concern of everybody and shared it in doing something of a remedial nature, Dr. Coxon said that he must ask the question, "Is this really all we can do?"

Dr. Charles Davis was asked by Vice President Edwards if he cared to make comment. Dr. Davis retorted he would rather be interrogated than comment. He told the Senate that he and his colleagues in the English Department do work with the secondary schools and all seek the better preparation of the student. One of the problems he thought the Report addressed was the nature of writing in American academic institutions. The classic report on this was Kitzhaber's of Dartmouth and probably many of that study's conclusions, he thought, remain valid today. For example, the undergraduate student probably did his best writing in the second semester of Freshman Composition and everything was downhill after that. It should be noted, Dr. Davis cautioned, that all students do not take the second semester of Freshman Composition at the University of Arizona. Many of them take the course at other schools whose standards are lower and whose grades are higher. He thought the report addressed the importance of looking at a student's writing at a time when he or she has decided what he or she wants to be. If a student's interest is in a technical field and if we can identify at that time that the student's writing is weak, we have resources to develop the student's ability to write technical reports. If a student's interest is business, we can determine if the student's writing is weak and give the student appropriate help in a course in that field.

The main thought of the Report is not simply Freshman Composition, but to realize that the kind and quality of undergraduate writing is one of the things that determines the quality of the bachelor's degree at the University of Arizona. Freshman English alone cannot do this. Writing has to occur after this point to sustain the desired and needed level of literacy. Students do not always take their Freshman English here, Dr. Davis reemphasized.

At this point, Dr. Edwards asked the Senate if a student member of the Committee of Eleven, Russ Hoover, who is not a member of the Senate, might be

allowed to speak. There was no objection.

Mr. Hoover stressed the importance of written communication in preparing resumes, in completing employment application forms and in applying to graduate schools. He then referred to the probable tuition increase by the Board of Regents and recommended that this additional money, estimated to be around \$3,440,000, be used to finance the Report's recommendations.

Mr. Antinoro interjected that when tuition was increased that did not mean the University was going to receive an extra \$3 million; what it probably meant was that the state appropriation would be lowered to balance the increase picked up in tuition.

Dr. Fleming stated that it was her understanding that the intent of the Report was not to put an extra onus on the English Department, but to get the faculty to concern itself with the quality of writing. She thought that many people on the faculty had an anxiety as to what that involvement would mean to them. The anxiety, however, was about a superficial issue. The National Assessment of Educational Progress, which reported every four years on the writing of nine-year-olds, thirteen-year-olds and seventeen-year-olds, found in 1974, for instance, that the skills of punctuation, mechanics, and capitalization were about as strong as they had ever been. Where the students had declined was in the ability to organize, to reason logically. These were the basic skills and the ones that every teacher on campus was teaching, or could be teaching, or should be teaching, all the time. The biology professor teaching analysis or the economics professor comparing one system to another are examples. These people were teaching writing and were teaching skills. She urged the Senate not to turn down the Report out of some false anxiety that teachers were going to have to write down every mechanical error they found on students' papers. Writing was more than that!

Dean Rosenblatt said that this problem was related to other problems. The study of languages as such is related to the problem of teaching Freshman English. There were suggestions and ideas in the Report, including the idea of establishing a Writing Center separate from the English Department, that we should examine and consider seriously. He was grateful for the document and for the interest but he considered the Report essentially a naive document which did not truly conceptualize things and didn't attack some of the basic problems. From students who came to his office, he thought that students found much of Freshman English a bore, no matter who the teacher was. He asked them if it was a challenging course. Was it a place where their mind was in action? He heard a lot about grammar, dangling modifiers and the like, and he was not denying their importance, but he was talking about courses that addressed the mind and the intellect. To change the structure would not accomplish this task. The structure we have right now was in response to a need for remedial work. It was instituted a number of years ago and it has not really done the job. It was his strong feeling that the Report was a valuable document and that its spirit was good. There were recommendations he was highly in favor of, but he would like the appropriate committees in his college to examine these recommendations and make their report since this entire subject is of University concern. He thought it would be a very serious mistake to adopt this Report with all of its recommendations at today's meeting.

Dr. Thompson stated that no one questioned the importance of writing. It was very well expressed by a great Mexican writer, "Writing is nothing more than a difficult way of reading." While Dr. Thompson placed himself on record favoring better writing, and doing something about it, he was concerned about the specificity of the recommendations that had been given to the Senate. There can be no university-wide commitment, he explained, unless every faculty member is, in some way, committed to be, in part, a teacher of his or her own language. That was really what a University-wide commitment would be. Yet the recommendations were asking the Senate to focus upon particular procedures with respect to one department and one existing program. The Senate is a legislative body and legislative bodies take action in two steps. First, they authorize action. Authorizing action means to focus on philosophy and objectives, a goal which we want to accomplish. That goal is accomplished by some kind of enabling legislation which, in fact, says, "We are going to do the following specific things and we're going to pay for it in the following way in order to accomplish those great goals and philosophies we have previously adopted."

The document the Senate had before it, for example, proposed creating a Writing Board. This would be doing more than establishing philosophy and objectives. It would be presenting a very specific way of getting something done. When one reads what that Writing Board is supposed to do, one finds that it has a lot of authority and yet one doesn't know exactly how far that authority is going to go and how it is to be exercised. Dr. Thompson said that he didn't read into the Report the idea that the English Department would be negotiating, as was suggested earlier, with the Writing Board. It seemed to him that the English Department would have to negotiate with its dean and the University administration to accomplish those things. He thought that the Writing Board should not have that kind of administrative power. It should be an advisory, policy-making body. He noticed a combination of vagueness and specificity but the vagueness, in his view, was at the wrong end of the scale. The vagueness was about what the proposed powerful new organizations may do.

Dr. Thompson then offered a substitute motion: "That the Senate receive the Report of the Committee of Eleven, confirm the University-wide commitment to the improvement of the teaching of the writing of English that is so well articulated in the Report, and urge the President, in close consultation with the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, to establish procedures to carry out soon the goals of the Committee of Eleven Report." The motion was seconded.

Dr. Zukoski thought that this was just another way of delaying action. He said the word "soon" in this University meant many things. Since the substitute motion did not come through as urging precise action, he urged defeat of that motion.

Dr. Steelink stated that one of the favorite ways of the Faculty Senate of the University to get rid of an item was to refer it to committee. He thought this was what the motion at hand amounted to. He would rather see the Committee of Eleven Report voted down now on its merits than have it

referred elsewhere. Therefore, he urged the Senate to vote the substitute motion down.

Dr. Kassander didn't view the motion before the Senate as a referral to a committee. Although he spoke for the Report and would continue to do so, he said, Dr. Rosenblatt had told the Senate that there had been for some time committees at work in the College of Liberal Arts on these matters and we owed him the opportunity to provide us with additional information.

Dr. Kassander then asked Parliamentarian LaBan how the Senate could refer the Report for an appropriate time to the various Liberal Arts College committees for their response before the Senate's final action. Dr. LaBan answered that one could simply refer a matter to a committee, for a specified time, if one wished. He offered two alternatives: 1) Refer the Report to Dean Rosenblatt for subsequent referral to the college committees, or 2) Ask the Senate to specify the committees, name the members of the committees, and indicate how their members would be selected. "If you don't do either of these", Dr. LaBan cautioned, "you follow the path Dr. Zukoski suggested, namely, who knows when what action will be taken by whom? If there is a time limit, simply state what it will be. If there is no time limit, fine."

Dr. Kassander asked if it would be appropriate or if it would unduly complicate the procedure on the floor to ask that at the next Senate meeting the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts bring to the Senate the plans of committees of his college as they relate to this report.

Dr. LaBan answered that Dr. Kassander could propose amending Dr. Thompson's motion to carry that provision, if he wished.

Dr. Thompson said he specifically avoided the usual faculty approach of "referring to committee" for fear that Dr. Zukoski would accuse him of what he indeed had accused him of! He had tried to identify two people who could do something, the President and the Dean, but he wanted to avoid specifying exactly what they must do. The Senate needed to tell them: "Here is a difficult problem that needs resolution. We want it resolved now. Here are lots of good ideas. Take a look at them and do something about them. The more we specifically refer to committees, the more we delay them." If the President and the Dean tell these committees to get at it, to provide some responses, and then we give the President and the Dean some flexibility to move ahead with action, we may get something done in the near future. Otherwise, we're merely proliferating the committee problem.

Dr. Robert Clark then called for a point of order and called for the question on the substitute motion. Dr. Edwards called for a voice vote on the question. The chair was in doubt over the voice vote and called for a show of hands which revealed that Dr. Thompson's substitute motion failed with 34 "No" votes and 28 "Yes" votes.

Dr. Kassander then moved that the Report be referred to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and that he bring back to the next meeting of the Senate his college's response to the Report. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Steelink asked what was meant by the college's response. The response of the dean of the college?

Dr. Kassander answered: "No, the college response will comprise the dean's various committees' response. The dean knows which committees there are and that this is why I suggested it be referred to him for the college response."

Dr. Sigworth spoke against the motion. He agreed with Dr. Steelink that the Report should be approved or voted down on its merits. He said he was tired of studies of this matter. He remembered the first English Department faculty meeting he attended 26 years ago at the University of Arizona. The main item on the agenda was the establishment of a Writing Clinic. As a new member, he allowed himself to be put on the committee, along with Jack Huggins and Dorothy Fuller. They devised a nice plan for the Writing Clinic. However, it turned out that establishment of a Writing Clinic was quite impossible because it was going to cost \$4,000. There have been repeated efforts by the English Department and by the College of Liberal Arts to do something about the university-wide problem of student writing. Now we have this Report proposing for the first time that an effort be made which would involve the entire University. The proposal for the Writing Board was not vague, he thought; the specifications in lower case letters underneath the recommendations did not carry the force of law. The only thing the Senate was voting on was whether the Writing Board should be established. Dr. Sigworth said he had already indicated to the Senate the manner in which this would be done. After the Senate had made this university-wide commitment, there was nothing to keep the Senate from proceeding to specific legislation. This was the enabling legislation that Dr. Thompson spoke of. Following the commitment, the Senate could address itself to specific matters, as indeed the Writing Board would have to. He didn't anticipate that substantive improvements would be made for several years, probably, after the adoption of the Report, but he did think the Report had to be adopted and it should be adopted today.

Dr. Kassander called for a point of order and asked the parliamentarian if there was debate on a motion to refer to committee. Dr. LaBan answered that a motion to refer to committee is debatable.

Professor Tindall referred to a current movie, "Apocalypse Now", and said it could have been entitled simply "Apocalypse". "Now" was added to dramatize the urgency of that subject matter. The writing skills problem the Senate was now addressing was very urgent, he said, and was, in fact, an apocalypse now. We all realize that it has been a problem for a long time. These recommendations are specific recommendations which attempt to remedy this. The various deans and heads of departments have had opportunities over the last few years to come forth with other recommendations and have not. So at the present time the only thing the Senate was looking at was whether to adopt these recommendations or do nothing. Dr. Tindall said he would agree with Dr. Kassander's motion if at the next Senate meeting members would have motions before them that were specific. He didn't think that there was any point at the next Senate meeting to have comments about the Report. He thought that

those committees familiar with this problem could offer specific recommendations. "People graduate every semester. Their success in getting jobs and in getting into graduate schools is heavily dependent upon their writing skills and we need action now, not more discussion," he concluded.

Dr. Tindall then asked Dr. Kassander to modify his motion to ask that other alternatives and specific recommendations be put forth and voted on at the next Senate meeting.

Dr. Kassander amended his motion to read that the response of the Liberal Arts College should include specific recommendations or specific alternatives. This amendment was accepted by the original seconder.

Dr. Thompson commented on the split in the vote on his substitute motion. It suggested some uneasiness in the Senate, he said. If the Senate were faced with the decision today of adopting the Report or not adopting it, he stated, then frankly he would vote to adopt it. But he was uneasy about the idea that with all the concerns that have been expressed, the Senate is so anxious to rush into adopting it now. He wondered why the Senate was not willing to allow the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts one month to come back and give further information. Were the Senators so convinced that the Committee of Eleven has the only wisdom that they don't want to have further information? Was it not part of the democratic process to seek and consult, especially on matters as serious as this one? The concern Dr. Thompson had, he said, must be shared by others or otherwise a substitute motion would not have been considered. He urged, therefore, that the Senate adopt Dr. Kassander's motion. He was not concerned that after 26 years we were still talking about Freshman English. "When this University stops worrying about Freshman English and thinks it has a solution to the problem, then we should be worried," he said.

The question was called for and the motion was restated by Dr. Kassander: That the Report be referred to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and that he bring back to the next meeting of the Senate his college's response to the Report, such response to include alternatives or specific recommendations.

Dr. Zukoski asked that the Dean's reply be in writing so that the Senate could duly consider his specific points. Dr. Kassander countered and said that the Dean could reply any way he wished. The question on Dr. Kassander's motion was again called for. The chair was in doubt on the voice vote and called for a show of hands. A show of hands disclosed that the motion carried with 41 "Yes" votes and 20 "No" votes.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: Vice President Edwards informed the Senate that President Schaefer had appointed a Senate ad hoc committee which would study the matter of groups not member agencies of the United Way being authorized to conduct fund drives among University personnel. The chairman of the committee is Dr. Waldo Anderson. The other members are Dr. Leon Blitzer, Dr. Frank LaBan, Dr. Deonisie Trifan and Dr. Katherine Young. The committee

is at work and is expected to bring a report to the next Senate meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 o'clock.

Douglas J. Ward

Douglas J. Ward, Secretary pro tem

Joseph J. Gallo

Joseph Gallo, Assistant Secretary pro tem

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF NOVEMBER 5, 1979:

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of October 1, 1979.
2. Approval of revised guidelines for the review of academic deans.
3. Approval of "Curriculum" bulletins, Vol. 8, No. 5, issue date of September 28, 1979, and Vol. 8, No. 6, issue date of October 18, 1979.
4. Approval of degrees conferred September 1, 1979.
5. Approval of motion to refer Committee of Eleven Report on Undergraduate Writing to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and that he bring back to the next meeting of the Senate his college's response to the report, such response to include alternatives or specific recommendations.

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

1. Consideration of Committee of Eleven Report on Undergraduate Writing.