

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, February 7, 1994 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, February 7, 1994, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-four members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Malcolm J. Zwolinski presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Anderson, Atwater, Badger, Barrett, Brichler, Buras, DaDeppo, Desai, Dvorak, Enos, Fernandez, Garcia, Gruener, Hammond, Hildebrand, Hill, Huete, Impey, Inman, Joens, Lewis, Manke, McElroy, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Parsons, Pitt, Roemer, Shoemaker, Silverman, Songer, Sullivan, Sypherd, Troy, Warburton, E. Williams, J. Williams, Witte, Zukoski, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bertram, Coons, Dahlgran, Dickinson, Ewbank, Fajardo, Jones, Lei, Reynolds, Ruiz, Sjong, W. Williams, and Wright.

2. OPEN SESSION: Dr. Dinshaw Contractor, Acting Head, Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics: "One of the items on your agenda today deals with a proposed major in environmental engineering for the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees and a proposal to change the name of the Department of Chemical Engineering to the Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering. This proposal is an outcome of the reorganization of the Chemical Engineering Department, in which four faculty were moved from the Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics Department to the Chemical Engineering Department. President Pacheco had appointed an advisory committee to make recommendations regarding this reorganization. I have distributed to you the final report of that advisory committee. Recommendation 1 is now almost completely executed. Recommendations 2 and 3 deal exactly with the proposals that are being made to you today; they received a split vote. It would be difficult to read a mandate into that vote. I wish particularly to bring to your attention Recommendation 4, which received a unanimous vote: 'A process should be initiated immediately which will result in a long-range plan for The University of Arizona's environmental engineering and sciences. This effort should involve all units which teach or do research in this area, and should result in a structure which will maximize the delivery of education and research in this important area.' I do not believe that this recommendation has been carried out. With the discussion and evaluation part of the report, I have underlined material that I believe is relevant to your discussing this today. Thank you for your time."

Mr. Tom Cooley, President of the Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC), referred to a memo placed on Senators' desks regarding legislation that may be going forward to the student body concerning a proposal that GPSC be removed as a primary legislative body, returning student governance to a unicameral system. "Graduate students would be under-represented and unable to address their issues. We first and foremost want to inform you of this and say that GPSC is very much committed to having one student government on this campus, we are working towards that end, and we would like to work with the faculty in ways that have been historically established by ASUA."

3. REPORTS

- 3A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Pacheco: "I will devote

the bulk of my remarks today to next year's budget, but first I want to comment briefly on two other items. Earlier this year, at all three universities, there was extensive faculty and administrative involvement in developing a set of criteria that the Board of Regents might use in assessing university proposals to reduce, consolidate or eliminate academic programs. I am pleased to report to you that since the Senate last met, the Regents have adopted this set of criteria. This is a significant step because, at least from our perspective, it means that any proposal that is submitted will be assessed in a systematic and consistent manner. The criteria, we believe, will ensure that anyone whose position is affected has received procedural protection and that there has been faculty and faculty governance input in developing any proposal. And certainly, if we find some shortcomings, we are committed to ensuring that all efforts are made so that the criteria are fair to everyone involved.

"The second thing that I would like to comment on is media reports of student complaints regarding the buildings and the health conditions at the Christopher City apartments. We are, of course, looking into the situation, and will continue to look into it, but what I want to note today is that these complaints appear to reflect the much more general problem of deferred maintenance, which is creating problems throughout the University. This is not necessarily an isolated case. We have instances that are quite bad across the campus. This one is probably worse than some of the others. In this particular case, there is an added twist in that the facility is run as a self-supporting auxiliary, and the residents have generally been unwilling to pay higher rents to meet the costs of the desirable improvements. This, of course, has a history all its own, that I understand goes back to the late eighties and now has again come up.

"Let me turn to our fiscal year 1995 budget, which is now making its way through the Legislature and will be doing so in the next several weeks. We're going to be making presentations to the House and the Senate budget appropriations committees in the next couple of days. From our perspective, the Governor's recommendation is far more attractive than that of the JLBC, but both of them fall far short of the requests that we made. The Governor has proposed salary increases averaging 5 percent and an additional \$1.9 million for market adjustments. The Governor would expect us to fund part of the 5 percent from local funds. He also proposed the funding of our request for additional utility funds and for library acquisitions, and partial funding for enrollment growth and for ERE rate adjustments. For building renovations, he has recommended 58 percent of the formula, which is higher than it has been in any of a number of years, but it is still only 58 percent. He has also recommended some funds for planning the new four-year college. Even so, his overall recommendation fell short of our request by several million dollars, so when we go to the Legislature, we will be talking about these matters.

"The JLBC's recommendation includes funds for a 2.5 percent salary increase, no extra funds for library acquisitions and utility charges, smaller amounts for enrollment growth and ERE adjustments, and no funds for renovating buildings and planning for the new four-year college. The JLBC's recommendation falls short of our request by approximately \$12 million. Given the recovering state economy and the massive projected increase in state revenues, it seems to me that this is a time for the State to make it possible for the universities to begin the recovery that they so badly need. I believe that our original request was very reasonable, and quite appropriate, and it would allow us to address some of our most serious salary and other problem situations without in any way repairing all of the damage that has been suffered in the harsh financial conditions of recent years. Given the competition for the extra revenues, it's not going to

be an easy matter for the three universities to convince the Legislature of the justice of our case, but you can be assured that we're going to do our very best. We're going to try to start from the premise that, in fact, our request was a reasonable one, that it's not in any way inflated as it may have been in previous years, and I'm not saying that it was, but just simply we know that this year it wasn't. Those were minimal requests that we made. We do need to protect the budget bases for the universities, and there are some matters that just simply can no longer be delayed."

- 3B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: [Dr. Sypherd was delayed downtown and presented information under agenda item 4: Questions and item 8, the proposed merit/step pay plan.
- 3C. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia said he had a number of matters to report. "We have not yet seen the formation of the faculty advisory committee to guide the development for the new four-year college. The Board of Regents' Enrollment Growth Commission called for faculty participation in the development of that new campus.

"I want to thank Provost Sypherd for his letter to all faculty urging participation in the faculty election process. That was a valuable contribution on his part.

"The CORE (Continuous Organizational Renewal) process is involved in a number of activities, some of which are of significance to faculty and faculty governance. One team is looking at adapting the University's training materials used for protocols in management processes. Terri Riffe, of the University Teaching Center, is the team leader and the person to talk with if you are interested in that development. The Human Resources team headed by Martha Gilliland has spawned a subteam that will be looking at performance evaluations, including faculty evaluations, and will make recommendations for revamping the evaluation process. Dr. Zwolinski is a member of that subteam, so if you have comments on that process, you should talk with him. The Committee of Eleven has accepted the job of faculty governance liaison to CORE; if you have comments on anything associated with CORE that pertains to faculty governance, you should direct them to Senator Myers.

"The Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the University Budget and Strategic Planning Committee is in a new phase related to the reorganization process. Deans have been apprised of questions which the Subcommittee has raised concerning a number of units, and for the next three weeks will be coming before that Subcommittee to discuss those units, as well as any other units that they see as in need of restructuring within the scope of each college's strategic plan. The Subcommittee will then make recommendations to the Provost concerning any restructurings which appear to be needed, given all of this dialogue. I believe there will be another iterative round back to the deans at that point, and then the recommendations will be made to the President.

"The Deans Council had a retreat about a week and a half ago. There was some discussion of formulation and coordination of strategic plans, among other topics. One of the topics of interest to the Senate, because it has discussed it in the past, is that the Deans Council has agreed to form a subteam which will examine the question of adding a teaching track to the professoriate, in addition to the regular research, teaching and service track. I do not know the details, but it is an issue that is under current discussion and will probably come to the Faculty Senate at some future time.

"The last item I have is a general comment on faculty governance. As I see it, we have reached a new stage in the participation of faculty governance in the affairs of the University. We have gone from a stage of marginal inclusion to a stage of mere mandatory token inclusion in all the functions that are proceeding. That is an improvement, even if it doesn't sound like one. That is how I evaluate the situation at this time. We are not yet at the stage of having the opinions of faculty governance valued because it is a representative voice or because the institution is best served by partnership with the faculty. Each of us was elected in contested races, and we do represent the opinions of the majority of the faculty that chose us all to represent them. We will continue to work toward partnership in moving the University forward."

3D. REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

3E. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Zwolinski: "The Senate Executive Committee, at its most recent meeting, decided to schedule a special session of the Faculty Senate on Monday, March 21, 3:15 to 5:00 p.m., the purpose being to initiate debate on several issues, some of which Dr. Garcia just spoke to, covering curriculum matters, weekend and evening classes, the new four-year college in Pima County, possibly even General Education. We have entered into some debate on these issues on the Senate floor, but really not enough to deal with them appropriately. The Executive Committee believes a special session is needed where these items can be addressed and everyone will have the opportunity to speak.

"Nominating petitions for the Secretary of the Faculty, five members of the Committee of Eleven, the Faculty Senate College Representatives, and two members of the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee are due one week from today. I know many of you are running for re-election, but I want you to encourage your colleagues to participate in this faculty governance process. We are becoming more actively involved, as Senator Garcia indicated. Many issues are going to be discussed in the months ahead, and we need to have good representation of faculty in those discussions.

"Board of Regents President Doug Wall and Executive Director Dr. Frank Besnette will address the Senate at its April 4 meeting. They will speak for about 20 minutes, followed by a 10-minute question and answer period.

"General guidelines on salary compensation were placed on your desks today. They were developed by an ad hoc committee, chaired by Vice President Cusanovich, that included several members of the Senate. The guidelines will be transmitted to individual colleges, which will be asked to develop specific processes for meeting these guidelines. General salary compensation is discussed on page 1, classified staff on page 2, faculty/professional/administrator performance/market raises on page 3, and definitions on page 4. I would like to urge all of you to seek out the process that will occur in your individual colleges. Each of you may want to participate or at least be aware of what's going on as colleges develop their specific recommendations within these guidelines. Completed recommendations will be submitted to the ad hoc committee. We all understand that we may not have any merit funds to allocate, but the process is being established now. All of us should be involved at the college level. The process requires that faculty and staff be involved in the generation of these responses.

"I'd like to give you just a quick report on a two-day seminar, held several weeks ago in Tempe, regarding scholarly communication. Approximately 30 representatives, primarily faculty and library personnel, from each of the three

institutions attended, including five Senators (Senators Myers, Witte, Wright, Ewbank, and himself). The seminar was designed to identify issues relating to scholarly communications, and then to discuss them and prepare action plans for the respective institutions. I thought the seminar was very successful. It was funded by the Provosts and the Presidents from each of the institutions, and I commend them on their efforts in supporting this particular activity. One issue that was identified concerned making access to electronic communication easier on all campuses. Some people are still working with a pad and pencil, while others are hooked into Ethernet or other kinds of communications devices. Those who desire to be productive in terms of electronic communication may, in some cases, experience difficulty in getting their buildings or offices wired for the proper network. Another issue is the growing concern about copyrights, fair use practices, and rapid technology changes, primarily in terms of professional journal articles. It appears that electronic communications will be a means of growing importance in the transmission of professional information. This is an important development in terms of its impact on promotion and tenure decisions. I think we need to have some dialogue on this topic, and perhaps to initiate a culture change on campus. We're just beginning to deal with these issues here, and as information is developed, I will report to the Senate."

- 3F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Lewis: "Starting with the Legislative front, ASUA will be working with the Arizona Students Association (ASA), on several issues. One is a financial aid package called Spire that will target low-income and at-risk students when they are younger, similar to the 'I Have a Dream' concept that was presented in New York a number of years ago. In addition, this week ASA and all the student organizations across the state will get together with the Legislature for their annual conference, on the same day that the Senate budget hearing will occur, guaranteeing a good turnout. I want to let you know that we will be reaffirming our opposition to the current direction that the Legislature is taking with respect to decoupling, and faculty compensation packages.

"As I was looking through the salary compensation document, I noticed it is in clear agreement with the stance of ASA and ASUA, that criteria include performance rewards for teaching in the classroom.

"In the area of financial aid, we will be discussing the supplemental 'set-aside' with the Arizona Board of Regents. The Board sets aside a certain amount from time to time for additional financial aid. But, unfortunately, the supplemental 'set-aside' is not solidified from year to year, and consequently you run into a problem when an expected revenue source may not be available for students in the following year. With respect to tuition, there is more to come, but one of the principles that will be guiding our focus this year, from a state-wide perspective, is affordability focusing on cost-of-attendance formulas. How much does it actually cost a student to live and be enrolled in school at the University of Arizona, as opposed to other schools?

"I am glad to see that the administration has a clear commitment to truly seek efficiencies and areas where we can do things better academically. I am certain that positive effects will be realized.

"Tom Cooley made a presentation earlier regarding the graduate students. This is a very important issue for us. In concert with his comments, ASUA agrees that a singular student governance is the best option.

"ASUA's Minority Action Council will be coordinating a culture week, and Maya

Angelou will be coming to the University of Arizona on February 15. Every single ticket has been sold out. Our biannual delegate assembly will be held next week, at which time we garner the input of students campus-wide. On February 17, we will have the second pep rally of the semester to generate a sense of community. ASUA has created a committee to find a suitable campus location, and will assist the Athletics program by helping to coordinate an additional pep rally prior to the UCLA game."

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Witte asked Dr. Zwolinski, concerning the salary compensation recommendation, if anything had changed since several years ago when the Faculty Senate unanimously voted that unless there was an increase of more than 5 percent, there should be no merit increases because there were no appropriate procedures in place. Dr. Zwolinski responded that the unknown factor was how much, if any at all, would be available for merit. "If 5 percent was available for salary increases, the subcommittee felt that splitting it 50/50 would be desirable, with 50 percent being allocated for what we called general adjustment, and the other half earmarked for merit, based on the guidelines presented today. I think the bent of the Legislature is that if any funds for salary increases are going to be provided, they will be primarily across-the-board--I think that's the problem that we're going to be faced with. We are trying to establish a process, a procedure, so that if merit allocations become available, we will have some guidelines in place.

Dr. Sypherd: "If I may, I'd like to respond, too. If you look at page 3 of the salary compensation handout, under Faculty/Professional/Administrator Performance/Market Raises, the second sentence under the second bullet says '...each Dean, appropriate Director or Vice President will develop a Performance/Market plan.' The objective is that the plan would come back to this University committee for review and approval, and it is certainly the intention that that plan would include a peer review system for evaluating merit."

Senator Myers asked if the document represented an action taken by the ad hoc committee. Dr. Zwolinski responded that the document represented what the subcommittee had established as broad, general guidelines--the framework for merit allocations. He noted one correction on page 4: 'salary comparison' should read 'salary compression.' Senator Myers asked to whom it was addressed. Dr. Zwolinski responded that it was addressed to the respective college units, who in turn were to develop their own specific plans to meet the guidelines. Senator Myers said he believed the Senate should act on the document before it was transmitted to colleges, in order to consider possible changes. Secondly, "You are saying that the colleges are going to make decisions in which faculty will participate, but as I read the document, it merely says the dean or director will submit their plans for approval, although it doesn't say for approval by any particular group. I don't see any evidence, in fact, that the Faculty Senate will be involved in the process at all or that there will be any oversight by faculty governance on procedures. I would suggest that we should have a document from that subcommittee to the Senate for approval before it is transmitted to the colleges, and that there should be a mechanism whereby those plans are reviewed in the context of the guidelines that have been approved by the Faculty Senate.

Senator Buras: "We have in front of us the proposal by Provost Sypherd regarding a performance/step pay system, which seems to be closely structured with these guidelines. I wonder whether there is any mention of a connection between the two processes." Dr. Sypherd: "The report in front of you from the University subcommittee is designed to get us in line before what we are hoping will be Legislative action that provides us with 5 percent plus \$1.9 million. It's not

clear that that's going to happen. What is clear is the Governor's requirement that a plan be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee for their approval, and that plan is going to have to have elements of how we deal with equity, market and merit. We have been trying to hurry this along so that we would have something to communicate back when the JLBC asks for that submission. I believe that a performance/step proposal that the Senate might approve would take us a number of months to implement, probably more like a year, so that is going to have to come along in time."

Senator Impey asked Dr. Pacheco, in view of the dismal budget realities facing the universities, and the \$.5 billion surplus in State revenues, why the universities' credibility was so low at the Legislature and how the universities could make the case for an improved situation for higher education.

Dr. Pacheco said he didn't know why credibility was so low, but "our credibility in Arizona is about at the same level that it is in other parts of the country, so we're not any different, or any better off, and probably not any worse off, than other parts of the country. That's small comfort, but I think that what various constituents are looking for is ways in which we make good use of what they perceive to be their tax dollars. They don't see that, and it's up to us to show them that, in fact, we are spending the money wisely. It's also up to us to have programs in place that will tend to improve processes in the universities that will redeem us, if you like. I think that there is a turn-around that's occurring in that alumni, the business community, and others are starting to notice that some improvements are occurring. But sometimes the Legislative response comes a little bit behind that, and to some degree perhaps the Governor is responding sooner than the Legislature is. I think that the recommendations that are coming forth from the Governor's office or from the Legislature should be seen as starting points, and that we will end up at least a little bit better than we have been in the previous years; in other words, that we will have stopped the downward slide. I do not look for a lot of improvement in the next year. We will make the case that we have done about as much as we can to become more efficient, but I think there are still a lot of people out there who don't see that happening. That is manifested in a number of different ways. I believe that the involvement of the members of the business community, and members of the Alumni Association, have had an impact on helping people to see that the situation is turning around. I think it has been helpful that many of you, and other faculty, have been talking about what the real needs are. But to be blunt with you, we don't have the same credibility that outsiders have, and so we have to make our case with them. We're making some progress, but it's going to be slow here, just as it is any other place else."

Senator Myers asked Dr. Sypherd if he could arrange to have a copy of the details of how faculty were involved in the preparation of the guidelines approved by the Regents, distributed to the Senate. Dr. Sypherd responded affirmatively.

Senator Silverman said that he agreed with Dr. Pacheco that in many ways outside people might be more effective in interactions with the Legislature, but he believed that faculty could also play a role, especially by joining the student effort. "I do think we're at a point where perhaps the Senate should take the ball and figure out ways to better communicate our story to our Legislators." Concerning salary compensation, he said he agreed with Senator Myers, and he asked Dr. Sypherd if he could give the Senate a sense of where the salary guidelines issue stands: had the document already been distributed to Deans, with a deadline for reporting back? And when will the University report its plan to the Governor or the JLBC?

Dr. Sypherd said that the document had not yet been transmitted to Deans and Directors. He believed that it had been reviewed by the President's Cabinet, and perhaps by the Provost's staff. He said he wanted it to come to this body before it went anyplace else. Senator Silverman asked if changes could still be made. Dr. Sypherd indicated that he had been taking notes. Senator Silverman said that he was aware there were faculty members on the subcommittee, and he considered it to be one of their responsibilities to keep the Senate updated, perhaps through the appropriate standing committees. He added that he hoped Dr. Sypherd would stress that the colleges' responses must include staff and faculty involvement at all levels.

Senator Lewis said that, in response to comments on interactions with the Legislature, he had recently learned that some of the faculty at ASU have offered their services to some of the Legislators in different types of research areas. "I don't know how people would respond to that, but I guess the point is that one of the constituencies is taking active steps to decrease the gap between what a Legislator perceives the institution to be, and what it really is. Invariably, every time I am in a meeting with a Legislator, even some from the Tucson area, I find myself spending time to let them know what it is really like here, rather than talking about my issues as a student leader. What that suggests to me is that there might be ways in which other participants could help to continually enlighten the Legislature, to ensure a strong understanding about what it really means to be a member of the faculty or the student body of the University of Arizona. I guess I'll just put out my plea one more time, and ask if there is any way in which the faculty would want to work with us."

Senator E. Williams said he supported the comments made by Senators Myers and Silverman, and he believed the salary guideline document should come before the Senate. Concerning the issue of credibility, he said he agreed with Senator Silverman that one of the problems is that we are not vocalizing faculty in our plans quite as extensively as we should. He said he thought we had lost credibility because the sons and daughters of Arizona taxpayers could not find classes in the University, and when they did, they found them to be overcrowded, and that they could not graduate in the four or five years that they had hoped to graduate in, and they also found that ranked professors were frequently not teaching freshmen and sophomores. He said these problems were recognized a couple of years ago, and measures were being taken to overcome them. He said he had been encouraged by those measures, and it seemed to him that the only way to reclaim credibility was to move ahead as energetically as possible to do exactly those several things that we've begun.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 1994: The Minutes of January 10, 1994, were approved as distributed.
6. REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES:
- 6A. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Atwater noted that the amended version of the Faculty Teaching Responsibilities proposal, as approved by the Senate at the January meeting, had been included in the packet for this meeting. The proposal was transmitted to Dr. Sypherd with a request that it be distributed to administrative heads as soon as possible for immediate implementation. She reported that APPC is in the process of following up on Faculty Workload issues, and will ask the Provost to provide reactions to a proposal on the Faculty Workload topic and the quality of Undergraduate Education. She said the Undergraduate Education document was prepared by a small group under the leadership of Vice-Provost Ed McCullough in response to a request

from Board of Regents President Andy Hurwitz for university follow-up on presentations made to the Board last May on Undergraduate Education. APPC is attempting to provide reaction to the rather lengthy document. Today, APPC is to present its final seconded motion on the Academic Program Reviews and will discuss Externally Supported Research Assignments with some suggestions for change. APPC is also finishing up recommendations on a policy which should come before the Senate next month concerning employee access to institutional data.

- 6B. REPORT OF THE FACULTY BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Dr. Zwolinski said that there was no report today, but the committee is working on several items, and will report to the Senate at the March meeting.
- 6C. REPORT OF THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Inman said that ICPC had completed its numerical report on performance standards under General Education, and it will be placed on the Senate's March agenda. ICPC will be meeting with representatives of the Composition Program and the Composition Board on February 15 to discuss the Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Examination, and it is in the process of scheduling speakers for the Provost's Teaching Symposium, which will be held in April.
- 6D. REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Barrett reported that the committee had met on January 31 to consider two items. One was a request from Vice President for Research Michael Cusanovich regarding library materials copyright policy, as referenced in the Presiding Officer's report, in particular a document called the Model University Policy Regarding Faculty Publication in Scientific and Technical Scholarly Journals from the Task Force on Copyrights, Triangle Research Library. He said the committee has requested that this document be distributed to the Faculty Senate for discussion, perhaps on the April agenda. The committee decided to take no action because it felt that there were already ways of dealing with this issue in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. Secondly, the committee discussed the Conflict of Interest/Commitment Policy document, and what modifications might be required. Some modifications are being developed, he said, and the committee will bring this document before the Faculty Senate in April.
- 6E. REPORT OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Pitt, reporting for Dr. Williams, said that the committee met today, and was joined by Registrar Arlene Becella. They discussed registration problems and late fees. She said the committee will meet with Bursar Jean Johnson at its next meeting and may have a report for the Senate at its April meeting.
- 6F. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN: Senator Myers reported that several weeks ago, on behalf of the Chairman of the Faculty, he attended a meeting in Phoenix of the Inter-University Outreach Council, where a presentation was made by the UofA Alumni group. He said he took advantage of that opportunity to suggest that the Alumni group meet with the Committee of Eleven, and that meeting occurred on February 4. "That turned out to be a very productive meeting, and I think it will lead to additional opportunity for faculty and the Alumni Association to be involved, particularly in terms of relations with the Legislature. I expect that you will be hearing more about opportunities for Faculty Senate members to participate."
7. APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 9, Section III, carried over from the January meeting because of the lack of a quorum at the end of the meeting, was moved (motion 1993/94-38) and seconded. Senator Garcia reported that the Curriculum Process Committee, formed

at the request of the Senate, had been meeting weekly and has drafted a document that would lead to revisions in the curriculum approval process. Information would come to the Senate at each meeting in the usual way, but the Senate would take action only once a year. A voice vote on motion 1993/94-38 indicated approval, with one abstention.

Dr. Zwolinski reported that Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 10, Section I, contained five items for approval: A, B, C, D and E. It had come to his attention that objections had been filed concerning both Item B, the revision of qualifications for declaration as a media arts major, and Item C, the proposed major in environmental engineering and the proposed change in name of the Department of Chemical Engineering to the Department of Chemical and Environmental Engineering. Senator Silverman moved (motion 1993/94-39A) to table Items B and C, and that motion was seconded. A voice vote indicated the motion was approved. Senator Silverman commented concerning Items D and E, noting that since the University is talking about downsizing, he wondered about the advisability of approving new majors. He asked whether the Graduate Council had discussed the effect the new majors would have on the budget. He asked, further, if anyone present had information on Items D and E. While he was not opposed on the substantive issue, he was concerned about the budgetary implications.

Senator Gruener said that he recalled Dr. Sypherd saying that, since we are an institution of higher learning, we cannot simply stop all creative activity. "I think that these have gone through the Graduate Council and have been deliberated upon quite seriously, and unless there are any other mitigating circumstances, then I don't think we should sway from our usual way of approving matters without additional information."

Senator Garcia said that he thought the question Senator Silverman was asking was related to the ongoing reorganization process, which called for a restructuring of units, perhaps out of existence, while at the same time new majors were being proposed.

Senator Desai said that if individuals do not read the Curriculum Bulletin, they could miss some very important changes, and he believed that the Curriculum Office has the responsibility to send such proposals to various units for review.

Senator Neuman moved (motion 1993/94-39B) that, until the Curriculum Process Committee submits its recommendations to the Senate, all action with respect to curriculum approval or disapproval be tabled until the Senate takes a final vote on how to handle curricular matters. The motion was seconded.

Senator Gruener said he would like to speak against this motion "because, to my knowledge, this has been standard procedure at this University for a very long time, and I think it is exactly the wrong time to start changing policy before new policy has been recommended. I can tell you that these two programs under discussion are interdisciplinary programs which do not involve additional faculty. If we table or disapprove of these two programs, we are basically telling the faculty not to take on or create any new initiatives, and I think that's a very dangerous business."

Senator DaDeppo asked if there was any real imperative for taking action now.

Senator Neuman said he believed that the problem the Senate is facing with the Curriculum Bulletins is that the Senate usually lacks the requisite information necessary to make positive or negative decisions.

Senator Songer said it was his understanding that undergraduate curricular matters are initiated in departments, and must be approved by the college curriculum committee and the Undergraduate Council before making their way to the Senate, and that graduate matters travel the same route, except that they must obtain approval from the Graduate Council. "Consideration has been given to the impact of these matters. This procedure permits representatives from colleges other than the one proposing the program to address the quality of the program, to determine whether it duplicates something else, and whether problems exist. I think these checks have already been made. Especially now, before we have a new procedure in place, putting these proposals on hold is simply one more thing for a group of faculty to bear who have been trying to carry on creative activity in the face of little if any budgetary encouragement to do so."

Senator Hammond asked if the groups that examined these curricular issues were elected or appointed, the question being whether the Senate was the first elected body to review them.

Senator DaDeppo, referring to the topic introduced during Open Session by Dr. Dinshaw, noted that there are issues that do not receive close attention. The University Advisory Committee on the Reorganization of the Chemical Engineering Department submitted a report to the Senate which included the following in section 4: "A process should be initiated immediately which will result in a long-range plan for The University of Arizona's environmental engineering and sciences. This effort should involve all units which teach or do research in this area, and should result in a structure which will maximize the delivery of education and research in this important area." Senator DaDeppo said he was not aware that the process had been initiated as specified.

Senator Aleamoni: "Presumably these proposals have gone through departmental and college consideration. If we are going to try to second guess all that, I think we're asking for some problems. If this curricular material is part of a unit that is being restructured, it will still fall under the restructuring guidelines, and be taken care of in that way. I am a bit reluctant to say we're going to change a process because it wasn't reviewed by an elected committee, even though we may need to rectify that."

Senator Silverman said it might be helpful for the Senate to know what the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils do when they get these recommendations: Do they merely examine the substance? Do they look at budgetary concerns? Do they look at the campus-wide impact when new majors are created? What kinds of issues do they review? What kinds of questions do they ask? Secondly, he wondered what the Senate's role is: Is it just to rubber stamp what the Graduate Council does? "If so, then why even bother with it? If we have a role, then I think we need to have some information in order to discuss these matters. What is the purpose of this coming before us if our role doesn't include asking questions about the budget and what the impact is?"

Senator Joens observed that the proposals had been recommended by all units that reviewed them, and perhaps the Senate should rubber stamp them. He said many people had put hard work into the proposals, and he believed they should be approved. He added that the Senate should abide by the current system until a new structure is in place.

Senator Neuman explained that the motivation behind his motion was avoidance of Senate rubber stamping of issues when it was not fully aware of background information. He said he believed that it was not the business of the Senate to

approve or not approve of proposals that it did not fully understand, or for which it did not have full background information.

Dr. Sypherd, responding to Senator Hammond's question, said that the members of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils are appointed by the administration. "However, in an agreement that I've struck with the Senate, we are moving to make those two Councils Senate committees. We have taken the first step, so that one-third of the membership of both of those Councils has been appointed by the Senate. Next year, two-thirds. And in the following year, they will have become entirely Senate committees. I would urge the Senate to recognize these discussions about where expertise lies and once a year accept a report so that you're not going to approve or disapprove, but simply accept a report from these committees that will be laboring mightily over proposals that are made."

Dr. Zwolinski thanked all participants for their comments, and then called the question, which he believed was to defer action on any further curriculum matters until the report from the Curriculum Process Committee had been acted upon.

Senator Songer requested clarification: did the motion refer to all curriculum matters, including the deletion or addition of courses? Dr. Zwolinski said he would interpret the motion to mean any and all curricular matters. Senator Songer asked if all Curriculum Bulletin material would henceforth not be examined by the Senate until after action on the anticipated report. Dr. Zwolinski responded that that was his interpretation. He then called for the vote. A voice vote indicated the motion failed.

Senator Gruener then moved (motion 1993/94-39C) for approval of items A, D and E in Section I of the Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10. The motion was seconded, and a voice vote indicated approval. Approval of Section III was then moved (motion 1993/94-39D) and seconded.

Senator Myers said that he noticed that a new course, Agricultural and Resource Economics (AREC) 676, reads like a Mathematics course, and he saw no Mathematics prerequisite. He also noted that a new Optical Sciences (OPTI) course, 342, has a description that is entirely that of a Mathematics course, as well as a spelling error ("vonvolution" should be "convolution.") He said he wondered to what extent the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils made inquiries concerning these courses, and he also wondered if they should be cross-listed. Senator Myers said this is the kind of information the Senate should have before acting on the material. He moved (motion 1993/94-39E) that those two courses be withdrawn from Section III until further information was available. That motion was seconded.

Senator Hill said he would move to separate the two courses because he did not see the issue as the same: one case was cited for lack of a prerequisite, while the second case was brought up because of the nature of the course. He said he would argue that the Optical Sciences course could be approved.

Senator Pitt said it was her understanding that the role of the Curriculum Office was to look specifically at course descriptions and contact other departments that may have some kind of cross-listing interest. She assumed that had been done with these two courses.

Dr. Sankey: "In the Curriculum Office, we try to send a copy of all new course proposals with a note to all departments that we discern might have interest. We do that for hundreds, or possibly thousands, of courses each year. Without access to records in my office, I cannot confirm whether these two were sent."

A voice vote on the amendment to eliminate the two courses from consideration at this time was inconclusive, but a show of hands indicated the motion was defeated.

Discussion continued on the motion (1993/94-39D) to approve the remainder of Section III. Senator Warburton asked if new courses follow the pattern of development at the department level, forwarding to the college, and then transmittal to the Undergraduate or Graduate Council. Dr. Sankey said no. "New courses come from departments to colleges to the Curriculum Office, at which time they are published in this Bulletin, which is distributed at least two weeks in advance of the Senate meeting to between 700 and 800 persons on our campus. If a faculty member, or anyone else, has objection, they inform the Curriculum Office. At that point we would get back to the offering department, in writing, to indicate there has been an objection. We ask that these parties come together to resolve the problem, if at all possible. For more than twenty years, new courses have not gone to either the Graduate or Undergraduate Council unless there has been some special problem."

Senator Warburton asked if Dr. Sankey could explain to him how a college or four faculties could place a course in the Curriculum Bulletin entitled Arts and Sciences 195a, You and the U. He asked which department initiated the new course, and how four faculties created and submitted this course.

Dr. Sankey said that the Curriculum Office also advises departments and colleges to attend the Senate meetings when items are controversial. He said that, in this case, he had contacted Associate Dean Susan Steele and suggested that she or someone from the College Curriculum Committee should attend today's meeting. He said he received a memo, hand-carried to him this afternoon, indicating she was unable to attend and that no one from the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Review Committee could attend, either. He read the following information, contained in her memo: "This committee approved the use of the prefix A&S last spring, and the Undergraduate Council accepted this decision. I note that there are also precedents using non-departmentally based prefixes in the area of Fine Arts: Fine Arts 207, 307, 317. There is also precedent in Agriculture..." He said "the traditional view has been that faculty are assigned to colleges and departments, and that faculty are responsible for curriculum. Therefore, only in very special and unusual cases would a course be offered by a unit that doesn't have assigned faculty. There are, however, some exceptions to that in cases in which the course seems not to fit in any given unit. So the answer to the question is that the course was offered under a University designation, which the Senate did not support. It went back to the College of Arts and Sciences through the Undergraduate Council, and it came back under the jurisdiction of the College of Arts and Sciences and, in particular, the Curriculum Review Committee. That's the history of the offering to the Senate."

Senator J. Williams said that on page 5, Hydrology and Water Resources 696g, there is a statement indicating it is identical to Agricultural Resource Economics 696g and HWR 696g, but he believed it meant Systems and Industrial Engineering 696g.

A voice vote on motion 1993/94-39D indicated approval.

Senator Garcia said he believed all legislative bodies face the problem of acting on measures over which they may not have had much control, but because they are representative of a larger group, it is their duty to examine those aspects they can see, and to ask questions when they can't. He added that most curricular

cases are self-explanatory, but not in all cases, in which case the legislative process is best served by having expert witnesses available. He said the important point is the exercise of the Senate's prerogative to approve these matters on behalf of the faculty, "speaking not as experts, but as representatives of the faculty--approving a process, not necessarily the technical details."

Senator Myers said that he believed it would be desirable in the future to have representatives of the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council present to provide additional insight whenever the Senate is considering curriculum matters. He added that it was his understanding that neither Council examines budgetary questions.

8. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON PERFORMANCE/STEP PAY SYSTEM: Dr. Zwolinski asked Senator Garcia to initiate discussion on this topic, until Dr. Sypherd, who had been called out of the meeting, could return. Senator Garcia said his understanding of this issue was encompassed by discussion at the Senate's January meeting, as clarified in the minutes. "We have a proposal which the Provost is bringing to us concerning a way of regularizing the pay system so that contentiousness and arbitrariness are removed, and so that peer review is mandated and regularized in every unit, not just in some units, and that all raises are tied to performance evaluations. This system has been tested in a wide variety of other universities, some of which are like us and some of which are not, and it has worked well in the entire range of institutions in terms of reducing the contentiousness about salary issues. I believe that is an accurate statement, and I believe that's what the Provost is looking for. As I understand the Provost's request of us today, he would like to present to the Board of Regents, for initial discussion at the next Board of Regents meeting, a conceptual paper that has the concurrence of the Senate and which expresses to the Board that which Senator Sypherd will now finish explaining."

Dr. Sypherd noted that in January he presented to the Senate an overview of how the system would work and what the structure would be. "Before us is the issue of taking this to the Board with a recommendation. As I reported to you last month, ASU and NAU have still not indicated that they are prepared to make this recommendation, although I have been asked by the Faculty Senate at ASU to go and explain how a system like this works. So there is a little uncertainty about the effect that our recommendation would have on the Board of Regents. There are also some other issues: 1) if there is a merit system, that implies that there is a sum of money that's called merit money, and 2) that we would develop clear guidelines and criteria within the university to make a merit/step system work." He added that the Legislature prefers the term 'performance,' rather than 'merit.'

Senator Inman moved (motion 1993/94-40A) that the Senate concur in the plan of the Provost to present his concept to the Board of Regents. A second was heard.

Senator J. O'Brien commented that the first-year costs looked overwhelming. He asked if a discipline-bias would be built into the system, i.e., full professors in one discipline making half the salary of professors in other disciplines.

Dr. Sypherd: "The problem that we have right now is we are forced to make a recommendation to the Regents, and we don't have a system. Without a system, we can't even calculate the cost, although we can make some models and say if we use this one, the cost will be this much and so on. What you have in the packet is the California system, one that we cannot adopt. There is simply no way we can bring our pay system in line with the numbers that you see there for

the UC system. If we could adopt this in principle, then we could determine what the steps could look like. Instead of five or six steps in the Associate Professor range, for example, we may need ten or twelve steps in order to move toward regularizing and getting out of this compression problem that we're in, and I think we're going to have to migrate into a system that we can manage. I also think the issue of what does it cost depends on what we can afford. We may well have to determine some kind of floating scale for what the percent change is from one step to another. If salary funds get determined annually with the budget allocation, there will still be many unanswered questions about how we move from our present 'system' to some kind of system that puts everyone on steps and evaluates them periodically based on performance."

Senator Garcia said he would like to have in the record the fact that the performance evaluations would be peer evaluations, and there would be an elected faculty mechanism triggered by all of them so that there would not be some other back door as at present.

Dr. Sypherd: "I guess I certainly agree with that, and in order to be completely open about this, the back door is that all recommendations are recommendations, and so if there is a peer group that makes recommendations, there is always the administration, namely the Provost and the President, to deal with on the final determinations. But so that everyone understands, I will be proposing a system that involves a peer-recommended system for performance evaluation."

Senator Silverman asked for clarification on the meaning of today's action: did Dr. Sypherd want approval of the concept of a merit system, and that is what would be presented to the Board, and then at a later date the administration would present particular details to the Board? Dr. Sypherd said that what the President needed now in order to go to the Board was approval by the Faculty Senate of the concept of a step/performance system for faculty compensation. "I think we still have some other issues that we're going to have to deal with. How do we do it? What do we do about other appointed personnel? What do we do about staff?" Senator Silverman said he was presuming that at some point in the future, the Senate would be consulted on specifics, and that it would have the option of supporting or disapproving the details. Dr. Sypherd emphasized that working out a plan for implementation would be an iterative process, with many questions to be resolved in consultation with the Senate.

Senator E. Williams asked if the proposed system would not necessarily be modeled after the California system, but rather inspired by it. Dr. Sypherd: "That is the request that the Arizona Faculties Council brought to the Regents, using that as a model, how would each campus respond?"

Senator Anderson said she didn't believe she could approve the proposal even in concept unless student evaluations were a part of the system. Dr. Sypherd said that the current P&T process calls for the submission of student evaluations in the evaluation of teaching. He stated his commitment, and his confidence that the President agreed, that there would be in the guidelines the requirement that teaching evaluations by students and by peers be a part of that evaluation."

Senator Hammond said he went to school in California, and he remembered that people quoted step and rank, but it was common to hear of many off-step salaries. It seemed as though the formal salary system did not really affect what people actually were paid. He wondered why we would want to bring in such a system.

Dr. Sypherd: "Let me first respond to your comment. Apparently you had only

Nobel Laureates. The fact is that every member in the system, every member of the professoriate, is paid according to rank and step except those that were above scale, and those are senior faculty, Pulitzer Prize winners, Academy of Science members, and so on. Interestingly, in the California system, they have to have the approval of the Board of Regents in every particular case. Now, why you do it is because it develops a confidence that your performance is going to be reviewed by your peers and not by just one or two administrators. And secondly, you will know that periodically you are going to be evaluated for moving from one step to another."

Senator Hammond said he didn't really understand how that differs from what we now have--annual evaluations--although evaluations don't guarantee salary increases. Dr. Sypherd: "That is the crux of the problem. This becomes an entitlement, but it is a point in the budget that we can take to the Legislature. Legislators and Regents ask me if we are rewarding teaching, and my response is, with what? We don't have a reward system. How do we reward teaching? A performance system is a reward system, and the President would have to begin the slow, arduous process of convincing the budget process that this is an item that must be included in the budget."

Dr. Pacheco: "That is precisely the point I want to make. Approving this in principle would allow us to go to the Board of Regents. With Board approval, we could then start building a partnership with the Legislature to make this part and parcel of the ongoing budget process, so that they would, in fact, fund it over a period of time. I think that there's an intuitive sense out there on the part of the current Legislature that something like this would be good. I don't know that the same intuition is there about providing the funding for it. It would then be up to us to start building a partnership so that the Legislature would in fact fund it over a period of time so that it would become part of the line item for the universities."

Senator Garcia: "I think what is proposed is much to be preferred over what we now have because it has some points that I have been arguing for. It has a true peer evaluation system, it has some promise of money, either internally or externally generated, to go with the system. Even if the steps are small, even if we have to reduce the scale in order to get on board, it has a regularization which is up to the Senate internally in the iterative process. The Senate does not at the moment have any control over the pay distribution system--none, zero. So this offers more than we now have."

Senator S. O'Brien said she wanted to be sure that "we are talking about the Continuing/Continuing Eligible and Tenured/Tenure-Eligible tracks in the concept as per our conversation at the last meeting about where do those in these categories fall. I believe your response was we need to figure that out. Does this concept include all of those faculty?"

Dr. Sypherd: "I think that the motion and amendments to the motion should make clear the conditions under which the Senate is approving the administration going forward to the Regents to request a performance/step system and the caveats need to be added on so that we have a record of the things that I am agreeing to. As I said last month, I think that this issue is something that I need to understand better, and how it relates to the way we evaluate and reward in the limited degrees of freedom that we now have. It is my understanding that we regard continuing track in the same way that we do tenure track, and if that's the case, and tradition holds that those individuals are evaluated the same, I would argue that they should be evaluated in the same way in the new system."

Senator Silverman moved (motion 1993/94-40B) to amend the motion on the floor so that before any plan is implemented, it first be referred to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee, as determined by the Senate Executive Committee, and then be brought to the Senate for approval. The motion was seconded and was approved on a voice vote.

Dr. Zwolinski asked if there was further discussion on the amended motion.

Senator Manke said she supported Senator S. O'Brien's concerns about faculty who do not have titles such as Assistant, Associate or full Professor, since more than 50 percent of the faculty of the College of Nursing do not have such titles.

Senator Myers requested clarification as to the language of the motion. Senator Roemer reported that the motion, before addition of the amendment was: that the Senate concur in the plan of the Provost to present the concept of a performance/step compensation plan to the Board of Regents. Senator Myers said that "one of the most serious aspects of the question is the transition from where people are presently to where they get placed in the step system, assuming the step system will be adopted. Salary compression may become exacerbated if people are not placed in the step system in the right kind of way. That is, they will get locked in at whatever compression exists. I think we have to be very concerned about the question of how the transition is to take place."

Dr. Sypherd: "If you'll look in the materials that were handed out, there's a bar graph that has salaries. It does not make any difference what the numbers are in this bar graph. It graphically demonstrates the problem of compression. Let me tell you what the real heartburn is for department heads, directors, deans, and provosts: Where would you like to spend your limited money? Would you like to spend it moving upward the top performers in the scales, or would you like to use your money to move these lower discriminators upward? With unlimited money, we could do both. This is going to be, I think, a profound issue in any regard, and frankly, I don't have an answer."

Senator E. Williams said he planned to support the motion because "we are beginning to institutionalize a systematic process that will, at least to some degree, minimize the sort of private deals that have been cut over the years, and which have led to compression. There will be faculty input, and a system whereby one can predict results more confidently than in the sort of ad hoc, indeed corrupt, system that has developed at this university over the years."

The question was called, and a voice vote indicated approval.

9. ADJOURNMENT: Dr. Zwolinski noted that the remaining items on the agenda would have to be addressed at the March meeting. The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

---

Elizabeth Roemer  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

10. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 7, 1994:

- 1993/94-38 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 9, Section III.  
1993/94-39A Tabling of items B and C in Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10, Section I.  
1993/94-39B Motion defeated to table any further curricular action until the Curriculum Process Committee reports.  
1993/94-39C Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10, Section I: A, D and E.  
1993/94-39D Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10, Section III.  
1993/94-39E Motion defeated to withdraw two courses from Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10, Section III.  
1993/94-40A Approval of motion that Senate concur on presentation of the concept of a performance/step compensation plan to the Arizona Board of Regents.  
1993/94-40B Amendment of motion 40A: before any specific performance/step compensation plan is implemented, that it first be referred to the appropriate Faculty Senate committee, as determined by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and then be brought to the Senate for approval.

ATTACHMENTS TO THESE MINUTES:

Final Report of the Committee on Guidelines for 1994-95 Salary Adjustments for University Personnel