

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, December 2, 1991 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:10 p.m. on Monday, December 2, 1991, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-seven members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Vivian L. Cox presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Aquilano, Atwater, Badger, Barrett, Bickel, Bootman, Burkhart, Cox, Cusanovich, Dvorak, Elliott, Enos, Ganapol, Garcia, Goetinck, Grabel, Hetrick, Hildebrand, Hyder, Joens, Jones, Kermes, Knight, Larson, LaSalle, Lei, Mautner, McElroy, Mitchell, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pao Tao, Pacheco, Pitt, Reiter, Roemer, Silverman, Songer, Spera, Thomson, Tomizuka, Valenzuela, Vezino, Witte, Zukoski, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Braden, Cole, Cork, Ewbank, Ganguly, Impey, Law, Rich, Saint-Germain, Salomon, Sugnet, and Terrazas.

OPEN SESSION: Professor Paul Turner, Anthropology, said that he teaches a course that has, as a final exam, a 10 to 15 page term paper, and he has graded perhaps 500 to 1,000 over the years. He received two grade appeals last semester, and met with the appropriate Grade Appeal Committee. He said he made his case and left the meeting confident that he had convincingly stated his case--that the grades not be changed. However, he received a letter from his Dean indicating one grade change would be made, although a split decision had been made in the second case. Professor Turner said he had believed this would be a simple matter of justice, especially in view of his consistent record over the years, and he didn't believe anyone had the right to change a grade under those circumstances. Because there is no avenue of appeal available to him, he wanted to learn whether the Faculty Senate is fully aware of such circumstances.

Senator Silverman asked if the Senate Executive Committee could request that the Affirmative Action Officer submit a report to the Senate concerning diversification in the workforce, since information reported recently in the media was very disturbing. Senator Witte said the Senate, perhaps in 1983, passed a recommendation that she believed was unanimous, requesting an annual report in a particular format. She added that the report has not been received thus far. Senator Garcia reported he had already requested this report, in the format referred to by Senator Witte, and he had received it last week. He added that there had been insufficient time to place it on today's agenda, but it will be submitted to the Senate for discussion on a future agenda.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: President Manuel T. Pacheco said he would like to touch on two unrelated matters, and then devote the bulk of his comments to the serious budget situation we are facing.

"First, as you know, the Arizona Board of Regents has adopted comprehensive policies dealing with the status of women in the Arizona universities, and has instructed each university to establish a local commission to help develop strategies for implementing those policies and to monitor progress. I now have appointed a six-member planning committee to advise me regarding the charge to the new Commission, as well as its structure, initial membership, and potential leadership. This planning committee is chaired by Professor Patsy Brannon, who is Chairwoman of the Association for Women Faculty. I would like to have this

Commission in place later this month.

"On a second topic, I want to comment on a personnel case. The local chapter of the American Association of University Professors suggested that inappropriate procedures were used in reducing a faculty member's salary, and suggested that the Senate's Academic Personnel Policy Committee be asked to review the situation. This seemed to me to be a good idea, and I agreed. The Senate committee now has reported, and in its opinion, while neither Regents' nor University policy address the situation explicitly, it does say that it would be best to follow the procedures laid down for other serious situations. I have accepted the committee's opinion and, accordingly, I shall ask the Committee on Conciliation and, if appropriate, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, to consider the case in question.

"Now let me turn to the main topic for today, to the University's budget and to a situation that is going to concern all of us. I want to talk first about the current year, and then turn to future years. Let me make it very clear at the outset that the anticipated mid-year budget recision is a serious complicating factor but it is not the central problem that confronts us.

"You know better than I about the financial problems the University has faced in recent years. Through years of substantial enrollment growth our state appropriations expanded less rapidly than our costs. Additional students rarely have been fully funded, nor have building renovations and rising utility costs. Moreover, successive mid-year recisions have amounted to a cumulative value of about \$50 million, and have repeatedly damaged the University and eaten away at reserves. Despite all of the budget reductions and reallocations of past years, we entered the current year with our resources stretched to their limit. Now we face new problems arising both from internal and external factors. By internal, I mean problems developing within the University, and by external I mean the Governor's recent call for all state agencies to plan for mid-year budget cuts. Let me deal with the internal problems first. As a result of falling enrollments this semester, our student revenues fell by approximately \$2.5 million. Spring enrollments, of course, are uncertain at this time, and we have to be prepared for them falling below projected levels. This could add to our revenue shortfall. In addition, while we arranged to sweep salary savings from vacant positions as one way to balance our budgets, these arrangements have not yielded the amount that we anticipated. The hiring freeze that I imposed a few weeks ago should help to remedy this situation, but, as of this moment, it is uncertain what the total savings are going to be.

"Now, on top of all of this, we are faced with the possibility of a mid-year cut in the state budget. The Governor has asked for savings plans equal to 1%, 3%, and 5% of our state budget. Since the burden of these cuts would fall on our second semester resources, their impact would be equal to cuts of 2, 6 or 10% of our annual appropriation. Their dollar value at the different levels amounts to roughly \$2.5 million or \$7.4 million or \$12.3 million. In other words, taking both internal and external problems into account, our budget problem for the remainder of this year could range between a minimum of \$2.5 million and a maximum of over \$14.8 million. I have asked the Deans Council, the Advisory Budget Priorities Planning Task Force, the Senate's own Budget and Strategic Planning Policy Committee, and ASUA's University Budget Review Committee for their recommendations on where to cut. This advice is beginning to come in. By early January, I expect to have in hand a comprehensive set of guidelines for budget cutting so that we can take some action. I want to stress that cuts at the higher possibilities would mean extensive layoffs at all levels in the University, as well

as significantly reduced services to support students and faculty members alike.

"This is all unwelcome news, but I have yet to come to the main point that I want to make this afternoon. The worst possible thing that we could do would be to regard all of this as a problem only for the current year. The plain truth is that the University is trying to do too much with too few resources. We have to keep our eye both on managing this year's budget and on the equally urgent need to balance our activities and resources in the coming years.

"The Governor has indicated that he anticipates no new funds for the universities next year. In addition, the Resources Committee of the Arizona Board of Regents has recommended that tuition not be increased for 1992-93. Moreover, we have to expect about \$14.4 million in increased expenses next year. These include increased utility charges, increased insurance costs, full-year debt service on new buildings, new requirements for Risk Management, and the costs of federal legislation dealing with the handicapped. Those costs are unavoidable. Their impact, if we do not receive any new funds, will be the same as a \$14.4 million cut in our budget.

"A cut of those dimensions will require a close look at cutting, consolidating or eliminating entire programs, both academic and support programs. We shall be beyond the point at which across-the-board cuts are acceptable. We need to preserve the quality of what we do. In addition, we would need to look at the possibilities for reducing or eliminating temporary teaching appointments, and at increasing teaching loads. In this connection, I think it would be reasonable to expect most administrators who carry faculty rank to do some teaching, including the President of your University. Given the reduced support services, we would have to give some thought to reducing the number of students that we admit. This would require a careful weighing of alternatives. Fewer students may mean fewer expenses, but they also mean a reduced state appropriation and smaller student revenues.

"You will appreciate, I believe, that not all these changes could or should be introduced at once. They would require careful planning, but we could expect to have a comprehensive package of changes in place for 1993-94. My closing remark is that we are not alone in this. This may be cold comfort, but those of us who attend national meetings are all too aware that universities across the country are facing similar kinds of situations. This is the reality of the impact of economic recession on higher education. The coming years in the universities are going to be unlike, in my opinion, anything that most of us have experienced in our professional careers. As I say, it's not just this year, but at least into the foreseeable future."

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Dr. Cole was absent.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Knight asked Senators to encourage their colleagues and students to attend the forums scheduled for candidates for the Vice Presidency for Student Affairs. Concerning tuition discussions, she said the Regents are scheduled to make a decision on Friday, and ASUA and ASA will attend that meeting. While most faculty do distribute syllabi at the beginning of a semester, she reported that ASUA had passed a resolution requiring all faculty to do so, because some students have experienced problems. She said that the resolution will go to the Undergraduate Council tomorrow and hopefully to the Senate in the next month or two. Senator Knight said she would be glad to discuss ASUA's budget recommendations with any member of the Senate.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER SENATE MINUTES AND CURRICULUM BULLETIN: Dr. Cox reported one amendment to the November 4 Senate Minutes, due to a tape change (bottom of page 42): "Senator Roemer responded that currently there is no mechanism for broad-based campus input on budgetary priorities. Appointment of the Advisory Budget Priorities Planning Task Force by the President at the time of the recession a year ago was to some degree in recognition of that gap. One of the findings of the Fischer Report was that no one, including the Presidents' Council (more properly, the Resources Committee), had been taking responsibility for the financial health of the institution as a whole. With vigorous competition for limited resources, the need for participation of a broadly representative group in setting budgetary priorities seems clear. With respect to the elected faculty budget committee, she added that the idea of newly elected..." Approval was then moved (motion 1991/92-40) for the November 4 Senate Minutes, as amended, and for Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 14, No. 4. A voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

ENDORSEMENT OF CONTINUING VOTING STATUS FOR MULTI-YEAR LECTURERS: Senator Garcia, in his role as Chairman of the Faculty, reported that at its meeting on September 4, the Faculty Membership Committee voted to extend voting status to Multi-Year Lecturers during their three-year terms, and once voting status has been established, even if subsequent contracts are issued for only one year, voting status will have been "grandfathered in." He reported the Senate Executive Committee requested Senate endorsement of this principle under motion 1991/92-41: "That the Faculty Senate endorse the establishment of voting status for Multi-Year Lecturers, such voting status to continue uninterrupted even if subsequent appointments are for one year only." He said the committee believed that budgetary decisions should not disenfranchise individuals. Senator Dvorak asked what would occur if there was a gap between multi-year and one-year appointments, due to a hiring freeze or some other reason. Senator Garcia said he believed service would have to be continuous, or it would result in new status. A voice vote indicated unanimous approval of motion 1991/92-41.

DISCUSSION ON FINAL REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON DISCRIMINATORY SPEECH: Senator Bickel said when he was asked by Dr. Cox to serve on the Senate's ad hoc committee, he had very strong opinions on the issue of freedom of speech, and when he expressed those opinions to that committee, he was asked to Chair it. He said his role was to act as coordinator, bringing student observations to the attention of the committee. With the assistance of a number of Faculty Senators, including Henry Ewbank, the committee prepared comments for Professor Ares, who included them in the University committee's final report.

Senator Witte noted that (1) similar documents, in Minnesota and Wisconsin, have been declared illegal by the court; (2) Elizabeth Buchanan, a University Attorney, had dissented from the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation and report; (3) Professor Ares' attached "Separate Statement" appeared to be evidence that he, too, considered the proposal to be illegal. She said that concerning the concept of civility, she would need a definition to determine whether it was motivated by a perception that vigorous debate and inquiry is unpleasant, and thus an attempt to curtail free speech in academic freedom. In terms of hate speech, she said, the expression "civil rights" should be substituted for "civility," and examples of unacceptable language should be brought into the open. Senator Witte said she would "urge those who have been the recipients of hate speech in its worst sense to ask for their Civil Rights before they ask for civility," and she moved to table discussion indefinitely, or until such time a court indicates the intent of the document is legal. The motion was seconded, and after further discussion, Senator Witte then withdrew her motion, as it was not her intent to stifle discussion.

Senator Silverman asked if Professor Ares had been scheduled to attend this meeting. Dr. Cox indicated he had not been officially invited. Senator Silverman said he had some concerns about restricting free speech, but at the same time, he believed it is important this institution make a statement about this type of speech. He indicated he would like further discussion on how that statement could be made. Senator Witte said she believed the exposure of speech, as opposed to the quiet disciplining of closed hearings, would be most effective, and she recommended such cases be brought to the Faculty Senate: "getting to the business of civil rights and affirmative action is the most important thing we can do, bringing that out into the open."

Senator Jones said he didn't understand where verbal abuse ends and sexual harassment begins, and he was concerned that the right to free speech would be extended so far into the other area that someone could be sexually harassed verbally on this campus in the name of allowing an individual free speech. He said he would also like Professor Ares present to discuss ways to reach a middle ground. He then asked how this document related to the Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order. Senator Bickel said he was under the impression that it was going to be inserted or included. Senator Jones asked if other universities are developing parallel statements. Senator Bickel said it was his understanding that ASU and NAU already have documents in essentially the final stages. Senator Knight said that last year ASUA raised many questions about this document, and while she believes problems remain, it is important to make a statement about the issue. She said it appears many people will vote against the proposal, and she wondered if the Senate will make any effort to address the issue.

Senator Aquilano wondered whether a specific, personal attack on an individual would qualify as freedom of speech. Senator Witte, referring to an article from the October 23 Chronicle of Higher Education entitled "Hate-Speech Code at U. of Wisconsin Voided by Court," said it was clear to her that "it can be hate speech, it can be harmful speech, it can be devastating speech, but it remains speech, and it remains protected..." Senator Bickel shared an incident that had occurred in his laboratory a few years ago, involving harassment; he solved the problem through personal intervention. Senator Aquilano moved (motion 1991/92-42) that Professor Ares be invited to further discuss this issue with the Senate before discussion was concluded. That motion was seconded and approved on a voice vote.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia urged Senators to attend the forums for candidates for Vice President for Student Affairs, and to fill out the forms which will be available to record their impressions. He noted that this position controls \$80 million of University support services, and it will be important to hire the best possible person.

He reported that President Pacheco has written to Deans, Directors and Department Heads concerning faculty participation on University committees. The letter indicates that administrators must consider the participation on University-wide and other committees as significant contributions when an individual's performance is being evaluated. He said faculty could request copies of that document from the recipients to ensure their awareness of its presence.

At its November meeting, the Arizona Faculties Council discussed the role and mission of the Arizona Board of Regents central staff. Because two major central staff positions are now vacant (Academic Affairs Officer and Executive Director) "it seemed a good time to rethink why you have a central staff, what role you want them to play, and how big you think it should be....we recommended generally

a reduction of the central staff to a role which would be investigative and coordinating, as opposed to directive...." He said AFC's next meeting will occur on December 6, and will deal primarily with budget problems.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Cox reported that seven Senators, including herself, took advantage of the opportunity to visit Mt. Graham on November 11. She said it will not be possible to schedule another opportunity until weather permits, perhaps in late spring. She expressed appreciation to those who participated.

Dr. Cox said faculty governance leaders have been meeting with the Arizona Board of Regents' Programs and Resources Committees to develop insights into the complexities of the budget situation. Individuals who have made presentations to those committees will be invited to meet with the Senate to provide important information on a variety of issues that must be weighed concerning the difficult economic times to come.

She said the Undergraduate Education study group has been examining the issue of scholarship, of redefining it in terms of what it means as one works with undergraduate students, and the task force hopes to have something to share with the University community in the near future.

Dr. Cox reported she has received a request to reconsider the establishment of a committee to look at the feasibility and the function of a Faculty Club, and she will appoint a committee to examine this issue.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Zwolinski reported the committee has been working on a number of items. (1) As indicated by President Pacheco, the committee provided, through Presiding Officer Cox, a response to a request concerning salary reductions. (2) At the request of the Chairman of the Faculty, the committee examined the issue of departmental Constitutions and Bylaws, and in particular, the English Department's. He said the committee reviewed the material, including proposed changes from the Provost's Office, and decided it did not wish to place itself in the position of a point by point review. Instead, it reached unanimous endorsement of the right of a department faculty to determine its own form of governance, including the role of department leadership and, with that conclusion, supported the English Department vote on its governance procedures. (3) The committee is reviewing University-wide policy and procedures for faculty peer evaluations because of the variance between units on how faculty peer evaluations are conducted. A subcommittee comprised of members Larry Aleamoni and Gerald Monsman (Co-Chairs), Shirley Fahey, and Carl Tomizuka will examine current peer evaluation procedures. (4) The committee has been asked to draft a policy for retention reviews and performance evaluations of shared appointments, which differ from joint appointments in that a faculty member's salary is paid by two different departments. "Right now it is very difficult to determine just exactly how that individual is going to be evaluated in terms of two-, four- and six-year reviews, promotion and tenure, and how performance evaluations are conducted." He said committee members Betty Atwater and Charles Adams are co-chairing that subcommittee, and he requested that Senators who might be interested in serving on that subcommittee to let him or Dr. Cox know within the next few weeks. (5) The committee is also working on modifications to the Constitution and Bylaws, to implement the changes concerning the Senate's Budget and Strategic Planning Policy Committee.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. Kenneth Young reported the committee is working on three items of business: (1) The upper-division mathematics proficiency examination, which the committee will bring to the Senate at the January meeting. (2) The frequency of departmental reviews. He said committee member John McCullen has suggested the model in use at Princeton would be a very useful model to follow: three outside members of a review committee for each department, permanently assigned to this department, with expenses paid by the department, who would meet once a year; every three years they would prepare a brief report on the department, and an in-depth review every fifteen years. He noted that the Board of Regents now requires seven-year in-depth reviews, but he talked with some of the members of the Board of Regents, and they indicated they weren't interested in a really detailed review, but did want a more frequent review than even seven years. He said feedback from the faculty indicates they believe every seven years is too often for a full, in-depth review. The committee hopes to have a draft proposal for the Senate's January meeting. (3) The annual spring Provost's Teaching Symposium. Dr. Young indicated plans have not been finalized yet.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Ganapol reported the committee has met twice since his last report, and has considered the following issues: (1) The conflict of interest policy document. He said that for some time this document had been in the Office of the Vice President for Research awaiting policy decisions by NIH and NSF, but since the decisions were not forthcoming, the Vice President for Research and committee members decided to proceed with revisions. He said the committee, as well as the Technology Transfer Committee, firmly believes that full disclosure should be the cornerstone of any such policy. (2) The intellectual property document. Until recently, he said, this document has been in the hands of the University Attorneys, and the latest version has undergone substantial revision. "Some of the modifications were rather drastic, and for this reason the attorneys were respectfully asked by the Technology Transfer Committee to generate a more universally acceptable version by mid-December. I would like to express to the Senate the committee's disappointment at not being able to bring this document to the Senate floor at this time. We hope to have it before you, however, in the near future." Senator Ganapol said several additional points concerning this document have been raised by the committee members, including clarification of the use of facilities by students, mentioned in his last report, a need for a timetable for action by the Office of Technology Transfer for an intellectual property disclosure, and possibly the hiring of an attorney who is an expert in intellectual property, as a consultant for the final drafting. (3) The Committee on Research Infrastructure. Senator Dennis Larson, former chair of the Research Policy Committee, has been added to that committee as the Research Policy Committee's representative, but he has yet to be asked to participate, and RPC is, therefore, concerned about the operation of that committee. He requested that Senators and any members of the University community transmit to Senator Larson any concerns they have with any University organization. He said the committee will communicate its concerns to Senator Larson, such as continuing difficulties with the FRS system and some user unfriendliness of some of the University's service organizations. (4) The vote taken by the Senate taken at its October meeting on a forum for Mt. Graham. He said that to the casual observer, and taking it to an extreme, the Senate vote seemed to indicate that the Senate might be becoming involved in approval or disapproval of University research. "Intellectual freedom would, therefore, be in jeopardy if such a vote were to be taken for all research projects. We concluded, however, that this is most likely not the case, since this particular vote was the result of the intense public interest in the large amount of University resources that had been expended for this project. The RPC at this time sees

no particular threat to performing open research at the University of Arizona."

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Professor Jeffrey Warburton said the committee is working on several concerns, two of which are: (1) advising and the 44,000 Drop/Add forms filed last semester--how the lack of advising affects students, and the varying level of support among colleges. (2) Committee member Senator Grabel's proposed policy concerning implementation of On-Course, which would place senior checks into the SIS system.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Enos asked Senator Garcia about participation on committees. "My long-time concern is that there is really no way of evaluating degree of participation." Senator Garcia said it was his belief that it is incumbent upon the performance evaluation committees of the departments to investigate these; letters should be written to appropriate administrators, because there is somebody who knows whether this participation has occurred or not, and even the person concerned could request such letters. He added that the performance evaluation committee shouldn't accept blindly committee service any more than it accepts blindly statements about publication or teaching. "I think in the past nobody's investigated this because not much credit is given to service, so it hasn't mattered to anybody, but perhaps if it begins to matter in a serious way, then we need to be just as careful in this business as we are in publication or teaching."

Concerning the Academic Personnel Policy Committee's report, Senator Silverman said he was concerned with the concept of a faculty's opting for a very strong department head who makes all decisions. He said he believed there should be some minimum standards throughout this institution mandating some faculty input at the department level. Senator Zwolinski responded that the committee believes that faculty can determine their unit's faculty governance procedure, and there will always be some diversity.

Senator Witte said she would feel more comfortable with some basic governance, at least at some level to assure active participation. She also wanted to commend the Research Policy Committee for "continuing the illustrious service of this committee, which has had tremendous faculty input, and has addressed very important faculty concerns, and speaks back when they see things that aren't right or aren't in the interest of faculty in the University community."

Senator Silverman said he was not sure how to proceed with this issue, but he hoped that the report made by the Academic Personnel Policy Committee is not taken to mean Senate approval, but rather an item discussed by the committee. Senator Aleamoni, as a member of APPC, said it is important to bear in mind the background: a department's Constitution and Bylaws was submitted to the committee for review; the committee determined that the faculty had voted approval of its governing structure, and it would not be appropriate for the committee to impose a different structure on them. If the Senate or the institution was now to decide some minimum standard needs to be met, then the committee could reexamine the documents from that perspective. Senator Witte said she thinks the issue of faculty governance is important, and should be an item of protracted discussion and review. Senator Zwolinski said he agreed that the issue of faculty governance should be discussed, and that the committee dealt with the issue as well as it could in the time available, "but certainly one of the side benefits of this type of discussion is to raise these issues and bring them out on the Senate floor. I agree this is something we should look at closely and maybe have a good discussion on it. Maybe this is one of the Senate's responsibilities, to look very closely at some of these things." Senator Garcia said there are

some departments within the institution where faculty governance has been unilaterally squelched by a strong department head, i.e., Bylaws have been proposed and not enacted because a particular head prevented that from occurring. He agreed that this is not a simple subject, and might well require discussion. Senator Jones said that the issue of the authority of the department head or chair seems to be at the root, and that he hoped further review might include Conditions of Administrative Service.

DISCUSSION ON AND APPROVAL OF THE REVISED CHARGE OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE WRITING COMMITTEE: Dr. Kenneth Young said that after discussion by the Senate, the committee had redrafted the proposal, and this revision was coming to the Senate for approval as a seconded motion (1991/92-43). He said the major change made was reorganization of some of the topics for clarity. The committee had also looked at the membership of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee (IWC) and clarified the composition. He added that the intent is exactly the same.

Senator Goetinck noted that last year one of his department's second-semester, third-year students took the exam, and failed it. The advisor read the exam and passed it on to several departmental faculty. Senator Goetinck said there was not one grammatical error, it was well written, and followed classical exposition. In his opinion, it was a good paper, although perhaps not "politically correct." He wondered what the criteria are for passing or failing, because at faculty urging, the undergraduate advisor had telephoned to inquire why the student failed. When told that department faculty did not agree with the failing grade, the individual answering the phone said "Fine, do whatever you want." Dr. Young said the advisor should have received a report indicating why it failed. Senator Goetinck stated that nothing had accompanied it. Dr. Young said there is provision for any student, and he assumed any faculty member, to request a review of that essay to find out why it was failed. Senator Goetinck responded that they had proceeded in the way just explained. Dr. Young said he suspected that the people who graded the exam may have felt the student did not address one of the questions posed, that the essay may have been written more or less out of context with what the student was asked to write about. Senator Goetinck said that it did deal quite properly with the subject matter. Dr. Young noted that passage or failure of the upper-division writing proficiency examination does not affect a student's graduation, because passage is not required for graduation. "The purpose of the examination is to identify students who have difficulties in writing, and to get them into writing emphasis courses that will improve their communication skills. So there is no adverse affect on the student unless the student was told by their department they were expected to enroll or register for a writing emphasis course." He said it was his experience that the examination identifies a great many students who have difficulty in writing, and that two independent faculty members, on independent readings, have to decide that the essay failed. He said he would find it difficult to believe that solely on the basis of political content the essay was failed. He suggested that Senator Goetinck talk with Diane Clymer or Ty Bouldin of the University Composition Board to find out exactly why that essay was failed. Senator Elliott asked if the committee's role was being expanded and the composition being changed. Dr. Young said the role was not being expanded, merely clarified, and membership is not being expanded.

Senator Hyder said he wondered why only one student was placed on this committee. Dr. Young responded that the committee had basically followed the current structure, and simply clarified it. Senator Hyder said he believed the presence of students on this committee would be helpful, and he wondered about the possibility of placing two or three students on it. After further discussion, Senator

Knight moved (motion 1991/92-44) to amend this document to read three student members, one of whom would be a graduate student, and that motion was seconded.

Senator Atwater asked Senator Knight why she was proposing placement of a graduate student on the committee. Senator Knight said she would like to see a graduate teaching assistant on the committee because some are involved in this area. Senator Atwater asked if she is specifying a graduate teaching assistant, and Senator Knight responded she was not, but she was proposing three to bring the numbers closer to parity in the relationship of faculty representation on the committee. Senator Atwater said she was not opposed to having students on committees, but didn't see the rationale for a graduate student because this is an undergraduate writing exam. She counterproposed two student members. Senator Grabel said he would move to "friendly amend" Senator Knight's motion by striking one student. Motion 1991/92-45 was then seconded and approved on a voice vote. It was noted, however, that three student representatives were still being recommended in motion -44. Some discussion followed on the size of the committee, and a vote indicated failure, both voice vote and a show of hands.

Senator Grabel then moved to amend the proposal to read "two students." Motion 1991/92-46 was then seconded. Senator Pitt said that she thinks students do have a special perspective to identified problems, and she supported having more than one student on the committee. She added that student members bring a special perspective to the Student Affairs Policy Committee, and they have a special way of obtaining knowledge unavailable to faculty members. Senator Knight said one additional important point was that sometimes, being a single student on a committee can be very intimidating. Senator Larson stated that student membership on the Research Policy Committee had been very worthwhile. A voice vote indicated approval.

A voice vote then indicated unanimous approval of motion 1991/92-43, as amended, to read as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
INTERCOLLEGIATE WRITING COMMITTEE

The Intercollegiate Writing Committee was established in 1984 to promote excellence in writing by students in all colleges of the University of Arizona. The IWC works in cooperation with the University Composition Board and the Composition Program (both housed in the Department of English) in fulfilling its functions. The functions of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee include the following:

- a. Freshman Composition Program. The IWC shall monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Freshman Composition Program and the Freshman Placement Examination.
- b. Upper Division Writing Proficiency Examination (UDWPE). The IWC shall monitor and evaluate the UDWPE and the related writing courses designed to provide remedial assistance to students failing the UDWPE. The IWC shall encourage, support, and assist each college as necessary in formalizing the procedures to be followed when a student fails the UDWPE. The IWC shall insure that students are adequately informed in regard to faculty expectations of student performance on the UDWPE.
- c. Writing Emphasis Courses. The IWC shall review and monitor the writing standards specific to each college within the University. The IWC shall

encourage, support, and assist each college as necessary in developing and improving writing emphasis courses.

- d. Outreach. The IWC shall encourage, support, and assist the development of outreach programs designed to upgrade secondary school writing programs.
- e. Annual Report. The IWC shall report annually to the Faculty Senate on: (1) the Freshman Composition Program and the Freshman Placement Examination; (2) the Upper Division Writing Proficiency Examination, including relevant demographics; (3) writing emphasis courses; and (4) other matters related to writing proficiency at the University of Arizona. A draft of this report shall be submitted to the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee for feedback prior to submission of the final report to the Faculty Senate.

The Intercollegiate Writing Committee shall be composed as follows:

- a. A representative from each undergraduate college recommended by the Committee on Committees, two members of the Undergraduate Council recommended by the Undergraduate Council, and two students recommended by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona. Members shall be selected by the Provost.
- b. The Director of Freshman Composition and the Senior Coordinator of the University Composition Board shall serve ex officio.

At their first meeting each May, the IWC members shall elect one member to chair the committee during the subsequent year. Members shall serve three-year terms on a rotating basis.

OLD BUSINESS: Senator Spera said he had been speechless for seventy minutes because of the serious matters contained in President Pacheco's report, so his comments would have to be made under Old Business. He wondered why we have lost students, and thus the \$2.5 million. Secondly, he did not believe the problem would be resolved by having administrators teach, thereby learning what faculty go through. He asked whether President Pacheco would consider the possibility of cutting the number of Vice Presidents to two: (1) Academic Affairs and (2) Administrative. He said it is demoralizing for faculty, who are expected to perform at the highest level, to go three years in a row without an increase.

President Pacheco responded that he will consider an organizational structure which he believes to be appropriate for this University. Currently we have six Vice Presidents and approximately eight or nine either Associate or Assistant Vice Presidents. He said he believes the entire administrative structure of the University needs to be examined, but he doubted seriously that the University could be administered efficiently or effectively with only two Vice Presidents.

Senator Silverman said that last year the Senate, when the University was facing another mid-year budget cut, passed a resolution that the Library be exempted, and he and Senator Zukoski were today going to submit a motion to reaffirm that, but in light of Dr. Pacheco's report, they decided not to at this point. Because Senator Zukoski had to leave, he asked Senator Silverman to read a short statement: "As a Senator, the financial interests of the University Library are of great interest to me. I hope that the Library's budget will be carefully considered in light of the present financial crisis facing the University, with no

greater or no worse fate than other parts of the University." Senator Silverman said he would agree with this statement.

Senator Hetrick said that the last few times he ran for Senate membership, his platform statement contained one item that every administrator who calls him/herself a professor should teach a course. He said he didn't have it in mind as an economy measure, but he was delighted to hear the President's proposal. He said he thought it would have a number of good features, not the least of which would be to get administrators in better contact with the real needs of students.

Dr. Pacheco noted that he had been asked two questions previously, and he had responded to only one. "The decrease in students was a planning decrease. This University, in my opinion, accepted too many students in years past, which led to both the diminution of services to students and to reduction of the number of classes available to students. There is a definite plan to reduce students to as close to 35,000 as possible, so the existing resources can accommodate the number of students appropriate to the institution."

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Ford Burkhart, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

ATTACHMENTS TO THESE MINUTES: None.

MOTIONS APPROVED AT DECEMBER 2, 1991 MEETING:

- 1991/92-40 Approval of November 4 Senate Minutes and Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 14, No. 4.
- 1991/92-41 Approval of continuing voting status for Multi-Year Lecturers.
- 1991/92-42 Approval to delay further discussion on the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Discriminatory Speech until January.
- 1991/92-43 Approval of revised charge of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee as amended.
- 1991/92-44 Defeat of proposal to amend motion 1991/92-43.
- 1991/92-45 Approval of proposal to amend motion 1991/92-44.
- 1991/92-46 Approval of proposal to amend motion 1991/92-43.