

**REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S  
TASK FORCE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION**

*Respectfully Submitted by*

**Patsy Brannon, Nutrition and Food Science**  
**J. Douglas Canfield, Comparative Literature and Literary Theory, Chair**  
**Celestino Fernández, Undergraduate Academic Affairs, *ex-officio***  
**J.D. García, Physics**  
**Juan R. García, History**  
**Moira M. Geoffrion, Art**  
**Yetta M. Goodman, Language, Reading, and Culture**  
**Michael R. Gottfredson, Management and Policy**  
**John G. Hildebrand, Neurobiology**  
**Eugene H. Levy, Planetary Sciences**  
**Clifford M. Lytle, Political Science**  
**Jerome A. Lucido, Admissions and New Student Enrollment**  
**Jennifer Manuszak, Undergraduate Student**  
**Thomas W. Peterson, Chemical Engineering**  
**Susan M. Steele, Linguistics**

**THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**

**MAY 1992**

This Task Force on Undergraduate Education was appointed by the President in recognition of the need for improvement in the University's approach to undergraduate education. As part of its information gathering, the Task Force met with many groups both on and off campus, including students, faculty, staff, teaching assistants, administrators, and legislators.<sup>1</sup> During these encounters, the Task Force learned of experiences, heard opinions, and received advice that was crucial to formulating its report. It is clear from these encounters that many on the campus are deeply committed to high quality undergraduate education. Many aspects of undergraduate education on this campus are excellent, and many students find outstanding and enriching educations and experiences at The University of Arizona. However, the Task Force also discovered real problems and inadequacies. We acknowledge these problems and inadequacies and are determined to correct them.

Across the country, universities and colleges--both public and private--are reviewing their programs, structures, and agendas and are seeking ways to improve undergraduate education without damaging other crucial components of their missions. There is a growing consensus that large segments of university education require significant improvement and change. The needed improvements will demand changes in: the State's approach to, and support of, higher education; the University curriculum; faculty involvement in undergraduate education; student, faculty, and administrator attitudes; preparation of students as they come into the University; and the commitment and quality of the University's education support structures. Universities play large and diverse roles in contemporary American society. As the world economy grows increasingly dependent on technology and knowledge-based enterprise, we can expect that the roles and responsibilities of universities will grow even larger. It is crucial for The University of Arizona to establish policies and structures that make optimal use of limited resources and diverse human potentials to improve and enhance the quality of undergraduate education.

In many respects, this review is coming at an especially inauspicious time. With weakening state and national economies, and in the face of diminishing resources, existing programs are threatened, and funds for fixing pressing problems are not readily available. Responding to the University's problems will require sensitive, wise, and decisive leadership, as well as a clear sense of priorities, both inside and outside of the University.

This report is intended to set forth general principles that we believe could elevate the quality of undergraduate education at The University of Arizona in a fundamental way. It is also intended to point toward those areas that we believe to be most urgently in need of attention and to propose some substantial improvements. Its principles and recommendations in many cases are interrelated and cannot be taken separately.

Finally, the Task Force ardently hopes that this report is the first step in a process of changing the culture at The University of Arizona with regard to undergraduate education. Thus we have structured our report under headings stressing that culture. We understand that the report will be widely disseminated for dialogue and constructive response. We also expect that the President will implement these recommendations with all deliberate speed and that he will make semi-annual public reports on their progress.

## INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

As a Land Grant institution, The University of Arizona has a special responsibility to educate the people of the state, to provide them with the skills and knowledge requisite to be productive citizens in the broadest sense. At the same time, the University has a responsibility to advance the frontiers of knowledge and creativity and to refine interpretive methods. Both functions come together in its mission to educate undergraduates in that the undergraduate classroom is energized by the passion of discovery, insight, and creation that is shared between faculty and students of diverse backgrounds.

Undergraduate education at the college or university level must provide citizens with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of mind that are the foundation of a lifetime commitment to learning, personal development, and social responsibility.

First, knowledge: Educated persons are aware of a substantial body of facts, ideas, and theories and have a critical appreciation of the ways this knowledge is acquired and used. They understand and appreciate other cultures as well as Western culture. They are familiar with the various modes of access to knowledge which can facilitate a lifetime of learning.

Second, skills: Educated persons have at their disposal various intellectual skills that can serve them throughout their lives. Among the most important are the skills of analysis, synthesis, problem-solving, and evaluation--the ability to define the issues in a complex problem, place the issues in their appropriate context, identify the pertinent facts and their relations, examine alternative interpretations, and arrive at sound conclusions. Other indispensable skills are the ability to write, speak, and listen effectively; to employ the symbolic and quantitative language of mathematics; and to interpret the semiotics of culture, the ways societies construct their value and meaning systems, through literature and art as well as rituals and institutions.

Third, attitudes of mind: Four attitudes--all essential to the wise and humane use of knowledge and intellectual skills--are especially important. The first is intellectual integrity, that is, a respect for evidence, reason, and the contingent nature of truth. The second is open-mindedness, that is, a respect for different views and the ability to suspend judgment until convincing evidence is available or until the bases for these differences are understood. The third is motivation, that is, such personal characteristics as initiative, curiosity, and an appetite for learning. The fourth is intellectual commitment, that is, the willingness to pursue a line of inquiry to its logical conclusion--no matter how uncomfortable the conclusion.

Thus equipped, university graduates should be ready to take their place in the world: to pursue careers or advanced degrees, to participate in a democracy, to serve their fellow human beings, and to achieve personal fulfillment.<sup>2</sup>

## UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### I. FACULTY CULTURE:

**A. The Professoriate:** The core responsibility for education resides with the professorial faculty. Although there are many demands on the faculty for education at all levels--undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral--it is essential that all members of the faculty express and realize a strong commitment to undergraduate education, that the needs of undergraduate education not be sacrificed to the other components of university education, and that undergraduate teaching occupy a position of importance and prestige equal to that of the other components of professorial responsibility. Because the real and perceived priorities of the faculty control the educational atmosphere of the University, responsibility for, and commitment to, undergraduate education should be a part of every professor's scholarly life. The educational environment that we wish to foster at The University of Arizona demands no less than this.

\*All members of the professorial faculty should consider it a responsibility--and should be expected--to participate with distinction in classroom teaching at the undergraduate level. This expectation extends to all members of the University Administration who hold professorial appointments. This commitment to undergraduate teaching should be understood to involve classes at all levels, including lower-division classes, clinical work, laboratory and studio instruction.

\*Accordingly, all letters of appointment should emphasize this responsibility by including the first sentence of the above paragraph. All prospective faculty, regardless of rank, should be willing and able to teach at all levels of the undergraduate curriculum. And every unit should encourage the pedagogical development of its personnel who come into contact with students.

\*All professorial faculty should be expected to be active in other important aspects of undergraduate education, such as advising and mentoring of individual students and supervision of independent work.

\*All professorial faculty at The University of Arizona, because it is a research university, are expected to keep abreast of and contribute to developments in their fields. Teaching must be fully informed by scholarship and energized by the passion for discovery and creation.

**B. Other Instructional Personnel:** It is a fact of life at The University of Arizona that non-professorial faculty are needed to staff selected courses. These non-professorial faculty currently include both temporary, part-time adjunct appointees and graduate assistants in teaching (GATs). Adjunct faculty at The University of Arizona are not now accorded appointment status and dignity commensurate with their important contributions to university teaching. In some departments, the graduate-teaching-assistant corps has been allowed to grow beyond the capacity of departments to prepare them adequately or to subsequently place them in appropriate career positions. The University should reassess its means of staffing undergraduate courses with the objectives of increasing teaching quality and making more effective use and allocations of institutional resources.

\*Full-time lecturers can play an important and effective role in fulfilling the educational mission of the University. The University should consider establishing regular career-path lectureships--including the possibility of continuing-eligible and continuing Lecturer appointments--as a complementary means of meeting certain clearly identified, basic educational needs. In some departments, a large fraction of undergraduate teaching may most effectively be done by Lecturers. The University should establish standards, policies, and procedures for the appointment of career-path Lecturers. Lecturer appointments--while they involve a balance of duties different from those of professorial faculty--should be made on a rigorous basis, fully commensurate with the standards of excellence applied to other University of Arizona faculty appointments, including open recruitment from the broad national pool of scholars. Persons should be appointed to lecturer positions with the clear understanding that they are engaged to be excellent teachers at the undergraduate level, carrying full-time teaching loads in specified parts of the University's curriculum. Lecturers should be seen as complementing and supplementing the teaching contributions of professorial faculty, and should not relieve the responsibility of all professorial faculty to be engaged in undergraduate classroom teaching, including lower-division courses.

Where appropriate, the University should consider expanding the practice of establishing programs of visiting instructorships in cooperation with the public schools and other institutions. In such programs, talented teachers spend specified terms as full-time teachers in the University.

\*The University should establish standards and procedures for the appointment and use of GATs. The preparation, use, needs, supervision, mentoring and assessment of graduate students should be carefully considered and addressed vis-a-vis their current role in undergraduate instruction as teaching assistants and their possible future role as professors. GATs should be given full responsibility for classroom courses only after careful assessment of their skills and capacities as teachers, normally after having worked in an assistant

capacity under the guidance of a faculty member, and only after having been exposed sufficiently to the substance of the discipline.

\*Graduate programs should be established on their own merits, and not for the purpose of securing graduate teaching assistants to care for undergraduate classes. In other words, a unit's undergraduate teaching responsibilities should not be allowed to drive the size of graduate programs. Clearly some such programs exist. Where they do, the university must proceed to reduce their size and create alternative means of fulfilling those departments' undergraduate instructional responsibilities. Undergraduate teaching needs should be met largely by professorial, lecturer, and visiting instructor faculty; insofar as they are available from graduate programs built in response to specific needs and opportunities of those programs, GATs should play ancillary roles.

GAT positions are necessarily allocated according to legitimate undergraduate curricular needs. Nonetheless, departments and colleges should, where practical and appropriate, award GATships to individuals on the basis of accomplishments, capabilities, and teaching skill, without respect to departmental boundaries. In view of the unusual success and distinction of many interdisciplinary programs at The University of Arizona--as well as the high quality of many graduate students enrolled in those programs--it is appropriate, and will best serve the interests of quality education, to ensure that graduate students in the interdisciplinary programs are made part of the regular pool from which GATs are drawn.

**C. Allocation of Faculty Positions:** Allocations of positions have not tracked well undergraduate teaching needs. More attention needs to be given to this aspect of our mission. The Provost should establish policies for allocation of resources to departments so that they can meet the institution's overall teaching and scholarly responsibilities in the most effective way possible. In establishing such policies, the University should consider the differing needs of undergraduate and advanced graduate education, as well as the challenges, opportunities, and distinction of various research programs, to ascertain the optimal division of resources--on a department-by-department basis--between professorial, lecturer, and visiting faculty, as well as GATs. The University's mission and responsibilities will best be met in the long run by significant restructuring of the faculty in some areas.

## II. STUDENT CULTURE:

### A. Makeup of the Student Body:

1. **Academic Diversity:** The diversity among students attending The University of Arizona--in terms of skills, capacities, interests, motivations, and goals--requires that the State and the University find ways to meet their disparate needs.

\*The State should establish a differentiated system of post-secondary education, including community colleges, state colleges, and research universities. Such a three-tiered system has several advantages: It would provide options not currently available to Arizona's students; it would result in an increase in retention and graduation rates; it would provide clarity of mission to the institutions and their constituents; and it would allow for more efficient utilization of resources directed toward higher education.

\*In the interim, The University of Arizona should explore internal mechanisms for providing a diversity of educational experiences consistent with the diverse needs and preparations of its undergraduate population.

**2. Multicultural Diversity:** Both the State and the Nation include diverse peoples and cultures. The student body should reflect this diversity.

\*Efforts should continue to recruit and retain undergraduate students from diverse backgrounds, especially from underrepresented populations. With respect to recruitment this means, among other things, engaging in an active academic outreach program to enhance the curriculum in middle and high schools and to ensure that students from all backgrounds are enrolled in college preparatory course work. With respect to retention this means, among other things, using existing data to keep track of the progress of such students and to intervene when the situation warrants it. It also means creating a cultural environment in which students of all backgrounds feel comfortable--and empowered.

**3. Non-traditional Students:** The undergraduate population increasingly includes students who can no longer pursue their education straight out of high school to a conclusion within the traditional four years.

\*The University should accommodate non-traditional students by extending offerings and services. A distinct administrative structure, such as the Extended University, may be necessary to help support and serve this population. However, its functions should not extend to offering classes for regular University credit or degrees with the University imprimatur. Where creation of such a shadow university threatens, the Provost should take immediate steps to restore academic oversight and control.

**4. Academically Distinguished Students:** The University has a tradition of attracting Arizona's brightest students as well as academically talented students from other states and countries. Because the competitive recruiting posture of

the University has eroded in recent years as a result of budgetary constraints and reduced scholarship availability, this tradition must be aggressively renewed and strengthened.

\*The University, through its various development offices, including the University of Arizona Foundation, must rededicate and commit itself to improving the quality of its undergraduate student body by seeking out and increasing substantially the amount of scholarship funds and funds to enhance activities of the Honors Center.

**B. Admissions:** The University is only one component of the broader educational enterprise of the State and the Nation. Effective undergraduate education must be built on a solid foundation of earlier preparation in the elementary and secondary schools. Concurrently with efforts to improve undergraduate college education, efforts must be exerted toward working collaboratively with high schools and community colleges to improve the preparation of students coming into the University from high schools and community colleges. Students must be prepared to do university-level work when they enter The University of Arizona.

\*The University should reexamine its entrance requirements and, in close coordination with the State's high schools, raise the entrance requirements for, and the quality of preparation of, incoming students. By the fall of 1996, entering students should have a full four years of courses essential for university work (math, science, and social science, as well as English), and two years of a second language.

\*Given the increasing pool of students through the year 2010, The University of Arizona should make immediate plans to implement a selective admissions policy. Such a policy would select students from among those applicants whose academic credentials indicate at least a 75% probability of attaining a 2.0 grade point average in their first year. Currently this implies on average a high school GPA of at least 3.0 in a college-preparatory curriculum and an SAT combined score of at least 850, and for community college transfer students at least a 2.75 GPA 40 units, of transferable coursework.

\*At the same time, entering classes should reflect the geographic and ethnic diversity of our state and be drawn from across the nation and around the world.

\*Within the goals and constraints enumerated above, the following admission model is appropriate. By the fall of 1996 at the latest a substantial majority of the new freshman class should be admitted on the basis of academic criteria alone, while the balance of the class should be admitted on academic plus



supplemental diversity criteria, such as regional, ethnic, age, and special talent considerations.

\*The size and composition of entering classes should be determined on a basis commensurate with the University's ability to provide the coursework, services, and learning environments necessary for student success.

\*The Task Force recognizes that the implementation of this policy will limit the accessibility of the University to a part of the State's population that will need to be served differently, as in the three-tiered system discussed in II.A.1. above.

**C. Student Responsibilities:** Learning requires a cooperative interaction between students and faculty, with responsibilities on the part of the students as well as the faculty.

\*Students should approach classes with the attitude that a large part of the responsibility for becoming educated is theirs; they should expect that the faculty will provide educationally challenging classes and they should engage in candid, constructive dialogue with faculty about the quality of education, as well as its substance.

\*Students should take the responsibility for becoming knowledgeable about both university and departmental requirements, and, when necessary, actively seek out advisors to clarify problems.

**III. INSTITUTIONAL CULTURE:** Many aspects of this report cannot be implemented or effectively carried out in the absence of appropriate State support and institutional policies. The missions of the University require a broad sense of responsibility on the part of University faculty and the Administration; a similar sense of commitment and responsibility is required of the Regents and of State political leaders. The State, the Regents, and the Administration must provide resources and support at levels commensurate with the high performance and contribution that it expects of The University of Arizona.

**A. Resources:**

1. **Instructional:** Adequate and timely plans should be made, and resources provided and allocated, so as to ensure that needed classes be available and accessible. The Provost and the Deans are charged with--and have not yet met--the responsibility to provide sufficient course offerings to meet the needs of undergraduate students.

\*The University curriculum and schedule of course offerings should be scrutinized for the purpose of identifying and correcting any existing

imbalances between the large numbers of narrowly specialized advanced courses and the necessary broad-based undergraduate courses. The aims should be to increase the balance of attention and effort devoted by the faculty to the undergraduate segments of the University's curriculum; to increase the involvement of faculty in undergraduate education during the early formative college years; and to ensure that adequate numbers of courses and sections be offered.

Past inattention to these enrollment issues has resulted in an inversion pattern wherein current upper-division students are enrolling for lower-division courses to meet General Education requirements. The Provost and the Deans should immediately initiate a tactical plan to overcome this problem:

\*In heavy demand lower-division courses this plan should, where appropriate, include reserving seats for freshmen and temporarily increasing enrollment capacity. The initial implementation phase of this plan should be in place for spring registration 1993. A plan that relies solely on a request for additional faculty resources is inadequate.

## **2. Operations and Infrastructure:**

\*Operations budgets needed to support instructional programs, from supplies to equipment to photocopying, are woefully inadequate and must be increased.

\*The infrastructure of the university must be supportive of the teaching mission. Buildings, classroom and other facilities should be designed to promote and enhance the educational mission of the university. This includes adequately designed, equipped, and maintained classrooms, studios, and laboratories. It is essential that faculty be consulted in connection with the design of teaching facilities, especially for shared, general-use facilities, the designs of which are not supervised by academic departments. Urgent attention must be given to providing state-of-the-art computer facilities for information retrieval in the library and for instructional purposes across campus.

3. **Staff:** Because they play such a vital role in supporting undergraduate education, the institution should provide adequate numbers of classified and professional staff with appropriate pay, opportunities for merit pay and for development and advancement. Existing plans for salary market/equity adjustments must be completed as soon as possible.

**B. Institutional Research:** In a time when hard decisions must be made about programs and resources, it is essential that these decisions be based on something other than folklore and habit.

\*Reliable data are required by administrative and academic campus units. The Provost should establish a mechanism to gather, organize, and distribute these data.

**C. Evaluation, Rewards, and Workloads:**

\*Excellence in teaching--rigorously assessed and fully documented--should properly be valued in promotion and tenure decisions as well as in the allocation of such rewards as merit pay, honors, and sabbaticals. Assessment should take into account student evaluations of both classes and instructors and peer review of the content and presentation of class material. Assessment of teaching should also be aimed at providing information helpful to faculty in improving their teaching performance.

\*Performance evaluations of scholarship, teaching, and service, and the consequences of such evaluations, must be taken seriously. The University should not tolerate situations in which the performance of a faculty member, administrator, or staff member is repeatedly documented to be unsatisfactory. The University should define and implement appropriate procedures, based on due process, whereby such individuals can be removed from University service, regardless of tenure or continuing status.

\*The aspirations expressed in this report are unfulfillable in the absence of merit pay. Although the tenure system plays a very important role in modern universities, tenure restrictions make it essential that pay increases be coupled closely to performance to maintain adequate incentives for high performance. This means not only that individuals who are performing inadequately will receive no pay increases, but also that the reward system will not be driven entirely by outside offers.

\*Departments and colleges are expected to establish teaching load guidelines, with the approval of their dean and the Provost. The recommended standard across campus should be a 4-course per semester load for lecturers (4-4) and a 3-3 load for professors who are engaged in the expected service obligations of the professoriate but are not also carrying out a vigorous and distinguished program of research and/or creative activity. Faculty who are carrying out demonstrably vigorous and distinguished programs of research and/or creative activity, should have teaching loads commensurate with national standards at peer departments in other universities. Any variation from these standards must be justified by a compelling argument.

\*The President of the University should encourage the University of Arizona Foundation to seek funds for endowed professorships in Distinguished Undergraduate Teaching. We suggest that the award be an annual salary supplement of \$20,000 (\$10,000 addition to base pay, \$10,000 unrestricted stipend) and that these professorships be considered as rewards for distinguished records of undergraduate teaching with automatic renewal if outstanding teaching continues.

#### D. Curriculum:

1. **Quality:** While recognizing the continuing need to serve a large student body, the University should encourage and facilitate teaching of high quality. In all academic classes, graduate and undergraduate alike, faculty members should promote engaged interaction with students that fosters the development of a critical and thoughtful response. Faculty should design presentations, assignments, and examinations that emphasize conceptual aspects of the subject matter.

2. **General Education:** It is reasonable for a university community to consider whether all of its students should share a common educational experience, what is usually termed "General Education." At the same time, a large state university encompasses not just the liberal arts but professional programs as well, where the constraints of professional accreditation restrict the amount of what can be required in liberal education below what might be acceptable in a college of arts and sciences. The current situation at the University acknowledges these two pressures: Colleges have a core of shared requirements, but the requirements from college to college are not co-extensive.

\*A minimum core of common requirements should be codified. A University committee should be established to coordinate and support these requirements. The following recommended summary, based almost entirely on existing shared requirements, should form a minimum university-wide general education distribution:

6 hours of Freshman Composition  
3 hours of college-level mathematics  
6 hours of physical and biological science  
6 hours of social and behavioral science  
6 hours of arts and humanities

This University committee should be constructed from the college-level general education committees and report to the Vice President for Academic Services and Undergraduate Education.

\*Insofar as possible, the courses meeting these core requirements should also be shared across the colleges. (This may not always be possible; for example, while all colleges require mathematics, the level varies widely.) Building from the current college-level requirements and their selection criteria, the University committee should establish the criteria and approve the courses.

\*The University requirements should provide the floor for college requirements. Each college should have a general education committee, reporting to the college dean (or vice provost, if more appropriate). Each college committee should (re)specify the college requirements in addition to the University core. In doing so, colleges should minimize the difficulty for students of transferring from college to college.

3. **Freshman Year:** The freshman-year experience is pivotal in fully engaging undergraduate students in the fabric of intellectual, social, and cultural life on the campus. The freshman year should be designed to provide a stimulating introduction to academic disciplines, classes (including small group sessions) with professorial faculty, accurate academic advising, and carefully constructed opportunities for out-of-classroom contact with faculty and professional staff.

\*Departments and colleges (including the professional colleges) should be encouraged to offer freshman colloquia focusing on the issues of their respective disciplines to engage freshmen in the excitement that accompanies scholarship and discovery. On an experimental basis these colloquia could serve as a means of satisfying the Freshman Composition requirement. Professors who teach such courses might also mentor the students until they graduate.

4. **Diversity in the Curriculum:** Cultural diversity should be a regular part of a student's undergraduate education. Colleges should continue to require courses that stress diversity in culture, race, class, and gender, and wherever possible and appropriate faculty should integrate into their courses concerns of diversity.

5. **Majors and Minors:** Majors are often designed according to the professional paradigms of the faculty instead of the educational needs of the students, most of whom will not become professionals in their major fields. Minors seem to have a real relevance in the preparation of preprofessionals in some fields but in others may have outlived their usefulness.

\*Deans, especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, should reexamine undergraduate majors and minors within their college to ensure that they meet the educational needs of students who immediately enter the work force upon graduation as well as those who go on to graduate school.

6. **Capstone Experience:** Departments and colleges should be encouraged to require a senior thesis or project that could culminate a student's undergraduate education.

E. **Campus Environment:** An atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning is essential to an undergraduate education of distinction. An environment must be designed which enhances a sense of campus community. This community should be centered on free and open exchange of ideas, democratic principles, and human dignity. Students require thoughtfully designed and maintained living, studying, eating, congregating, and recreational areas.

\*The University needs to provide an atmosphere conducive to study. The libraries need to be recognized as quiet places for scholarly activity; other silent study areas need also to be provided.

\*To create and foster interaction among students and faculty, the Faculty Fellows Program, which currently places a faculty office in selected residence halls and other settings, should be extended to all campus housing facilities, the ethnic cultural centers, fraternities and sororities, and the like.

\*Officials charged with basic enrollment and administrative services should take immediate steps to streamline and humanize the current bureaucratic environment. This includes all advising, registration, and support services directed to new and continuing students. The humanization process should include creation of an efficient referral network and training of all front-line staff in its proper use.

\*A University Ombudsperson should be appointed to investigate and attempt to resolve student complaints.

\*The campus mall, currently a venue for free speech and cultural exchange, must be preserved for this purpose. Moreover, its beauty and functionality must be fastidiously maintained. At the same time, care must be taken that activities not disrupt classes.

## **F. Advising:**

\*The University should ensure that every student has the opportunity to benefit from competent, timely, and sympathetic curricular and career advising and substantive mentoring. This is especially important for first-year students. The University should also streamline policies and procedures that impede student progress toward graduation.

\*Fundamental to improvements in academic advising at the University is a functional and accessible automated advising and degree certification system. Such a system must be given the priority and resources for successful installation and implementation. At the same time the RSVP registration system must be improved and enhanced both to be more responsive to academic needs, such as prerequisites and major status, and to provide more functional access for its primary student users.

\*Academic advising should be viewed as a basic responsibility of the faculty. Departments that have not developed an advising network involving faculty in this function should initiate one. All academic advisors should have reasonable access to ongoing student records through S.I.S.

\*Ideally, students should consult a college/department advisor prior to registration each semester. Departments and colleges need to devise methods for implementing this principle.

## **G. Administration:**

\*Because the issue impacts so profoundly upon undergraduate education, the academic and scholarly missions of the University must be accorded their proper role and priority in the administration of the institution. In particular, it is essential that the responsibility and authority for establishing University policies and priorities be vested in the Provost and in those administrators who--in close consultation with the faculty--have the knowledge, qualifications, experience, and values needed to understand and make informed judgments about educational and scholarly matters.

\*The implementation of this report must be the responsibility of the Provost, who may choose to work through the Vice President for Academic Services and Undergraduate Education. If so, the Vice President should work through an enhanced Undergraduate Council committed to quality undergraduate education and representative of our best combination of scholarship and teaching.

## CONCLUSION

The Task Force believes that the implementation of this report will go a long way toward creating at The University of Arizona a culture conducive to excellent undergraduate education. But the faculty, the administration, and the students must all commit themselves to this collegial enterprise. Faculty in particular need to rededicate themselves to their vocation as educators of undergraduates. In turn, the State must put its money where its rhetoric is and provide us with the necessary resources to carry out this extremely important aspect of our mission. That means adequate money for personnel, operations, building, and the maintenance of the infrastructure. If the people of the State of Arizona want quality undergraduate education at their universities, they must pressure their legislators to correct the structural flaws in gathering revenue and to support the University of Arizona at the level necessary to insure quality. Working together, we can all help improve the quality of undergraduate education at The University of Arizona.



## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> In addition to three open fora held in the fall of 1991 (to which general invitations were issued in several venues), subcommittees of the Task Force met with representatives from the following groups: regents and legislators; the Provost's Office and the Deans; Vice President for Student Affairs, Dean of Students, other senior staff in Student Affairs; Minority Student Affairs and the Diversity Action Council; Parents' Association Advisory Board; Extended University; Instructional Computing Advisory Committee; college General Education committees; academic advisors; teaching-award winners and teachers of large lecture classes; graduate assistants in teaching (twice); ASUA (several times); and the Minority Action Council. Representatives from the following additional organizations were all invited to submit input: the library; superintendents of several school districts statewide; Campus Climate Committee; Classified Staff Advisory Council; National Alumni Board; Advisory Committee on International Programs; all student clubs, organizations, and residence halls. In addition, the Task Force read numerous reports and books on undergraduate education.

<sup>2</sup> This statement of philosophy is freely adapted from the excellent Plan for Assessing Undergraduate Education at The University of Arizona, written by the Task Force on Assessment of the Quality and Outcomes of Undergraduate Education, chaired by Clifton F. Conrad (May 15, 1987). We are grateful to this previous task force--and to many other committees and offices in both academic and student services--whose work has been beneficial, indeed essential to this task force. We are also grateful to all the students, staff, faculty, administrators and people from the community who gave us crucial input. Special thanks go to Dr. Douglas G. Stuart, Regents Professor and Associate Dean for Research in the College of Medicine, who gave us valuable input as a member of the Task Force for the first semester, and to Elizabeth S. Armandroff, Special Assistant for Undergraduate Academic Affairs, who facilitated this report in manifold ways.

## MISSION THEMES AND PRINCIPLES STATEMENT

### Task Force on Mission

#### Program for the Assessment of Institutional Priorities

#### PREAMBLE

The charge to the Mission Task Force from President Manuel Pacheco was "to define a set of mission principles and themes that will provide the foundation for the development of the assessment criteria. . . . Because of the short time that is available, it is not expected that this Task Force will rewrite the currently approved mission statement." The Task Force therefore defined its task as giving meaning to the phrase "centrality to mission" in the absence of a set of priorities. This effort referred, for its foundations, to principal source documents given to the Task Force by the President that included several different mission statements, reports from key University committees, and the President's own vision statement. The Mission Task Force also met with the Chairs of the other Assessment task forces to find out what kinds of mission "foundation" statements would help them the most. Community members were invited to respond to the first draft printed in the September 4, 1992 issue of Lo Que Pasa; open hearings were held by the Mission Task Force for faculty, students, and staff; the Task Force met with the Staff Advisory Council and the Faculty Senate; and a brainstorming session was conducted with representatives from every campus sector. All of the resulting insights and suggestions have contributed greatly to the University

mission themes and principles that the Task Force on Mission now recommends as the basic assumptions that should underlie all further stages of the Program for the Assessment of Institutional Priorities.

Our report is divided into three sections. The first section highlights major mission themes. It is not a rewriting of the mission, but an extraction of the most important ideas from existing mission documents and from commentary on these ideas by numerous members of the University community. We believe that these themes capture the character, values, and spirit of the University and will serve the University community well as a basis for shaping and determining future priorities. The second section lists the principles for setting priorities that emerge from those themes. These principles are identified to assist the Task Forces on Criteria in developing standards for program assessment that will reinforce and strengthen the University of Arizona mission themes during periods of change now and in the future. The concluding section offers advice from the Mission Task Force on the methods by which the general principles can be transformed into meaningful priorities that will aid decision-makers in choosing between competing alternatives.

#### **MISSION THEMES**

The University of Arizona is a public, land-grant, research institution. Its ultimate aim is to improve the quality of life

for the people of Arizona and the nation. To this end, the University provides distinguished undergraduate, graduate, and professional instruction for students; engages in basic and applied research of national and international significance; creates, collects, preserves, and disseminates knowledge; and seeks to bring advances in scholarship and creative achievement into everyday life, especially the lives of its students. The traditional three missions of the University -- teaching, research/creative achievement, and public service -- are embodied in these activities. To be sure, these three elements may be differently emphasized from unit to unit depending on the particular strengths of each unit, the roles of each in a University education, and the relation each unit has to state and national needs. But these varying emphases must combine, overall, to produce a University which is highly effective in all three of its missions.

To fulfill these missions, the University must recruit and retain a diverse faculty of the highest scholarly distinction and teaching effectiveness. It must provide an atmosphere of intellectual freedom by maintaining, and even expanding, the generous breadth in its academic focus and public obligations. It must avail itself of and foster the unique physical attributes and cultural resources of the Southwestern region. The pervasive institutional values should be a respect for the highest standards in research, scholarship, and creative endeavor; a fostering of strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary programs of research and

instruction; a concern for the application of new knowledge and insights to improve the human condition; and an interest in perpetuating and disseminating old and new knowledge through dedicated teaching.

The University must also actively recruit and retain a diverse staff, whose expertise and performance are essential to the three traditional missions of the University. Classified and professional staff not only support students and faculty, but also conduct academic and research endeavors and provide service to the University community and the community at large. The University must promote an environment that values and provides for adequate staffing, resource support, and career opportunities through employee development, training, and recognition.

The core responsibility for education lies with the professorial faculty. It is the responsibility of the professorial faculty to conduct instructional programs with distinction at the undergraduate and graduate levels. All professorial faculty should be active in all important aspects of education, including teaching, advising/mentoring, and the supervision of independent work. Professorial faculty are also required to be actively involved in research, scholarship, and/or creative activity. These endeavors are important for several reasons: to further the creation, interpretation, and dissemination of new knowledge; to educate the next generation of scientists, scholars, professionals,

teachers, and artists on the basis of the most advanced insights; and to create a stimulating intellectual environment for students as they explore the various disciplines and the interactions among them. The University community expects professors to be good teachers, as well as good researchers, and that is to set a demanding standard. Nevertheless, it is at the research university, more than any other, where the two dimensions best come together.

The University must actively recruit and retain talented students while achieving and maintaining the richness of cultural and ethnic diversity. Students are expected to assume responsibility for learning and to make it personally relevant. Students are also expected to be responsible for their own behavior and to foster community standards of mutual respect and caring for each other. On its side, the University must ensure that every student has the opportunity to benefit from competent, timely curricular and career advising, substantive mentoring, and streamlined policies and means of access which foster and support timely progress toward graduation.

As a land-grant institution, the University of Arizona has an obligation to serve society by sharing its teaching and research beyond the campus, applying its knowledge to the solution of problems -- problems of people, public bodies, and industry and agriculture -- where its help is needed and can be useful. It

therefore responds to the needs of the people of the State and the Nation by conducting comprehensive outreach programs of education and public service, each firmly rooted in academic expertise. These responsibilities are met through educational outreach, the pursuit of economic development, and advanced training in the professions, as well as through advances in the arts, the sciences, and the humanities.

The University, in pursuing these endeavors, strives to be a thoughtfully-designed working and living environment, appropriate to the desert Southwest, that enhances a sense of campus community, facilitates its connections with the wider community, and provides a supportive physical setting for the work of students, faculty, staff, and a variety of community groups. This environment is -- and ought to be -- grounded in that free and open exchange of ideas, values, and multicultural perspectives, an exchange basic to democratic principles and the pursuit of human dignity. It is determined to be a place where faculty, students, and staff freely share those kinds of academic goals and work together, with wide participation, to strengthen a vibrant atmosphere of teaching, learning, and advanced inquiry. Moreover, this University is a community that actively seeks diversity on campus and embraces the cultural diversity of its region. It conducts an ongoing examination of the value systems by which we guide our intellectual life, with particular reference to the needs and contributions of women and non-majority groups. It works to be a center of advanced

learning where civility is a hallmark of daily life. Its most constant aim is to be a caring and attractive community for students, faculty, and staff in which their many contributions to education, scholarship, the creative arts, and service are properly valued, supported, and recognized.

### **PRINCIPLES**

The Mission Task Force derives the following principles from the philosophy and values expressed in the mission themes. We offer all these principles, without prioritizing them, as essential guides to the Task Forces on Criteria as they develop standards and methods for program assessment. These principles, we hope, will help to ensure that the priorities and values inherent in the mission themes are enriched and advanced by other parts of the Assessment process. The Program for the Assessment of Institutional Priorities should seek to:

- Expand support for excellence in undergraduate education, focusing on general education courses, courses needed by majors, and any other elements required for timely graduation.
- Support critical graduate and professional programs.
- Support programs that have achieved national and international distinction.
- Support programs that are approaching national and international distinction.



- Support programs in which the expertise of faculty provides research and public service directed at critical issues important to the state, the nation, and the world.
- Identify and support emerging programs vital to state, national, and international priorities.
- Identify and support those functions and professional and classified staff roles that are critical to student success.
- Identify and support infrastructural units, facilities, and technologies which are critical to the achievement of the University's priorities in education, research, and service.

Thus, as we understand the University's sense of itself, the units and efforts most central to the University of Arizona mission are those which:

- Undertake research, scholarly activity, and creative achievement, usually in graduate programs, that are clearly of national and international significance;
- Provide strong undergraduate programs;
- Engage in those educational outreach and public service activities that apply the expertise of the faculty to important state, national, and international needs; and

- Serve the most pressing needs of students, faculty, and staff for support services, technology, equipment, and facilities.

### **SETTING PRIORITIES**

The two foregoing sections on themes and principles advance several underlying assumptions basic to further Assessment discussions. The Mission Task Force hopes that these statements will guide University priority-setting and decision-making as we plan for uncertainty and look to the future in a time of transition. This section now discusses ways in which these general statements might be transformed into meaningful priorities that will aid decision-makers in choosing between or among competing alternatives.

These suggestions, it should be noted, form a preliminary step in a critical activity which merits thorough and widespread discussion. Indeed, from now on, such priority-setting must constitute the very heart of any strategic planning effort, especially since that has not been the case in the recent past at this University. The aim of this process, however, should not be oversimplified into the "elimination" versus the "retention" of units. Instead, the aim should be to restructure and focus the activities of particular programs within larger priorities so that

each can do what it does best in relation to the University's mission.

In this last set of recommendations, though, we do not advocate a particular set of priorities. That decision must await careful reflection and deliberation on the part of all segments of the University community. Even so, we do believe it appropriate for us, given our task, to point out some alternative priority-setting mechanisms which can then be debated and assessed. In this spirit, we now describe three possible approaches to setting priorities among the various University programs and units. We also identify some competing arguments for and against each approach and the likely directions that program assessment might take if particular approaches were actually used. We hope this effort will serve as a starting point for longer-term, broader-based institutional planning.

The first approach, quite tempting in a time of constraint, would apportion resource shortages across all units equally. This course could be followed in a variety of ways and at several levels throughout the University, with decisions about the sharing of burdens within units perhaps being decided by the units themselves. For example, all academic colleges could receive the same percentage level of budget reductions, with departmental burdens determined at the dean's level. The assumption here would be simple: all units (here colleges) are equally meritorious and

priorities among them cannot be established. But such an approach, one could argue, tacitly reinforces past resource decisions and priorities. So-called "across-the-board" reductions would not really be across the board, since the "playing field" would not be level at the outset, and the reductions may therefore have very differential impacts and be accommodated quite differently in the various units and programs. In any case, this approach has been the one attempted, more or less, in recent budget reductions and has engendered widespread dissatisfaction. It implies that no University-wide priorities exist or can be set and that planning therefore requires no evaluation criteria. It has also led to priorities being set within colleges, but not within overall University goals.

A second approach to setting priorities is to make sure that existing areas of strength are protected and supported. This approach would establish a set of evaluation criteria that define excellence and strength and then apply those criteria to existing programs and units. Those areas evaluated most highly by those standards would be accorded top priority for support. Other programs would receive such support as was available, depending on their rankings in this scheme. One consequence of this approach could be the identification of a second tier of programs that were close to achieving excellence and could attain it with additional resources. These could comprise a second priority for funding. Other programs and units would then not be supported or would have

support levels reduced as necessary. Compared to the first approach, this one would protect those areas of the University that have achieved national or international prominence and help to insure that those programs continue to attract top scholars and students. Of course, there are or can be problems with this approach as well. It could just sustain past patterns and may not reflect desired future directions or potential growth areas. It might assume too easily that current areas of strength will (and should) be future areas of strength, whether or not they reflect important projections about the future.

A third approach would instigate a widely consultative discussion that would define where the University wants to be in the future in relation to changing conditions. It would then allocate resources to move the University in the desired directions. The principal advantage to this approach is that it would be mostly forward looking, endeavoring to assess the future needs of the state, the nation, and other constituencies, while also trying to anticipate shifting priorities. Another advantage would be the necessity of involving the entire university community in crafting a shared and cohesive vision of the future. Past decisions would not be the only determinant in developing future options, as would be the case under the first two approaches. There would be a possible disadvantage, of course (although, depending on one's perspective, this might also be seen as an opportunity): existing programs and units might be downsized,

eliminated, and/or reconfigured. Some programs and units, no matter how prominent, might not fit the defined future visions, while others (even if not prominent at present) might be seen as newly crucial and therefore worthy of increased support. The evaluation criteria for this approach would then include such measures as "centrality to the emerging mission" and "importance to projected future," rather than the sense of "centrality to mission" that defines it as synonymous with current strengths.

Undoubtedly, there are other approaches and mechanisms (including mixtures of those outlined above) that might be used to set priorities among the University's many programs and units. However, it is clear that some definite approach must be taken. For us to continue under the present procedures is for us to permit our University to be transformed, simply because of increasingly restricted financial resources, into an institution lacking too many of the attributes that have made it attractive to students, faculty, and staff. At that point, too, the University could lose its value and utility to society. Such a transformation would also occur by default, rather than through the open articulation of important social and educational values. We strongly recommend that this articulation now proceed, whichever approach to Assessment we take, in the direction of a future University in which we can all take pride.

The Task Force on Mission:

Roger Caldwell, Task Force Staff and Soil and Water Science  
Caren Deming, Media Arts  
Robert Glennon, Law  
Michael Gottfredson, Management and Policy  
Nancy Henkle, Social and Behavioral Sciences  
Jerrold Hogle, Humanities  
Colin Kaltenbach, Agriculture  
Jonathan Lunine, Lunar and Planetary Laboratory  
Christine Major, ASUA  
Ed McCullough, Faculty of Science  
Larry Medlin, Architecture  
John Reagan, Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Sue Sisley, Medical Student  
Carla Stoffle, University Library  
Marvin Waterstone, Geography and Regional Development  
Dudley Woodard, Task Force Chair and Center for the Study of  
Higher Education

10/1/92

CHAPTER 3  
 PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS  
 ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE 1992-93

| <u>Action Requested</u>                      | <u>Decision</u> |    | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> | <u>Minority</u> | <u>Non-Minority</u> |
|--|-----------------|----|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure | yes             | 45 | 30          | 15            | 5               | 40                  |
|  | no              | 5  | 3           | 2             | 1               | 4                   |
|  | pending         | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
|  | withdrawn       | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
| Promotion to Professor with Tenure           | yes             | 1  | 0           | 1             | 1               | 0                   |
|  | no              | 2  | 2           | 0             | 0               | 2                   |
| Promotion to Professor                       | yes             | 28 | 19          | 9             | 3               | 25                  |
|  | no              | 7  | 6           | 1             | 1               | 6                   |
|  | pending         | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
|  | withdrawn       | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
| Tenure                                       | yes             | 14 | 9           | 5             | 1               | 13                  |
|  | no              | 1  | 1           | 0             | 0               | 1                   |
|  | withdrawn       | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
| Retention after 2nd or 4th Year Review       | yes             | 1  | 0           | 1             | 0               | 1                   |
|  | no              | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
| Promotion to Assistant Professor             | yes             | 2  | 2           | 0             | 2               | 0                   |
|  | no              | 0  | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |



CHAPTER 3  
PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS  
ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1992-93

| COLLEGE                        | DEPT COMM |     | DEPT HEAD          |     | COLLEGE |     | DEAN |     | UNIV COMM |     | PROVOST |     | APPEALS |       | FINAL ACT |      |
|--------------------------------|-----------|-----|--------------------|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|-----------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-------|-----------|------|
|                                | pro       | con | pro                | con | pro     | con | pro  | con | pro       | con | pro     | con | total   | rev'd | app'd     | deny |
| Agriculture                    | 7         | 0   | 7                  | 0   | 6       | 1   | 7    | 0   | 6         | 1   | 6       | 1   | 1       | 0     | 6         | 1    |
| minorities                     | 1         | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| males                          | 4         | 0   | 4                  | 0   | 4       | 0   | 4    | 0   | 3         | 1   | 3       | 1   | 1       | 0     | 3         | 1    |
| females                        | 3         | 0   | 3                  | 0   | 2       | 1   | 3    | 0   | 3         | 0   | 3       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 3         | 0    |
| Architecture                   | 0         | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 0         | 1   | 0       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 1    |
| n/a:1 <sup>a</sup>             |           |     | n/a:1 <sup>b</sup> |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| minorities                     | 0         | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| males                          | 0         | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 0         | 1   | 0       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 1    |
| n/a:1                          |           |     | n/a:1              |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| females                        | 0         | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| Arizona Research Labs          | 1         | 1   | 1                  | 1   | 1       | 1   | 1    | 1   | 1         | 1   | 1       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 1    |
| minorities                     | 0         | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| males                          | 1         | 1   | 1                  | 1   | 1       | 1   | 1    | 1   | 1         | 1   | 1       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 1    |
| females                        | 0         | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| Business/Public Administration | 3         | 1   | 3                  | 1   | 2       | 2   | 2    | 2   | 3         | 1   | 3       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 3         | 1    |
| minorities                     | 0         | 1   | 0                  | 1   | 0       | 1   | 0    | 1   | 0         | 1   | 0       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 1    |
| males                          | 2         | 0   | 2                  | 0   | 1       | 1   | 1    | 1   | 2         | 0   | 2       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 2         | 0    |
| females                        | 1         | 1   | 1                  | 1   | 1       | 1   | 1    | 1   | 1         | 1   | 1       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 1    |

CHAPTER 3  
 PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS  
 ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1992-93

| COLLEGE  | DEPT COMM          |     | DEPT HEAD          |     | COLLEGE |     | DEAN |     | UNIV COMM |     | PROVOST |     | APPEALS |       | FINAL ACT |      |
|--|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|-----------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-------|-----------|------|
|  | pro                | con | pro                | con | pro     | con | pro  | con | pro       | con | pro     | con | total   | rev'd | app'd     | deny |
| Education  | 2                  | 0   | 2                  | 0   | 2       | 0   | 2    | 0   | 1         | 1   | 1       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 1    |
| minorities   | 1                  | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| males  | 1                  | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 0         | 1   | 0       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 1    |
| females  | 1                  | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| Engineering/Mines                                      | 14                 | 0   | 14                 | 0   | 10      | 4   | 12   | 2   | 12        | 2   | 12      | 2   | 1       | 0     | 12        | 2    |
| minorities   | 1                  | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 0       | 1   | 0    | 1   | 0         | 1   | 0       | 1   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 1    |
| males  | 14                 | 0   | 14                 | 0   | 10      | 4   | 12   | 2   | 12        | 2   | 12      | 2   | 1       | 0     | 12        | 2    |
| females  | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| Fine Arts (2) cand.<br>votes for Prof w/T<br>separated | 9                  | 1   | 9                  | 1   | 8       | 3   | 8    | 3   | 8         | 3   | 8       | 3   | 1       | 0     | 8         | 3    |
| minorities   | 2                  | 0   | 2                  | 0   | 1       | 1   | 1    | 1   | 1         | 1   | 1       | 1   | 1       | 0     | 1         | 1    |
| males  | 5                  | 1   | 5                  | 1   | 4       | 3   | 4    | 3   | 4         | 3   | 4       | 3   | 1       | 0     | 4         | 3    |
| females  | 4                  | 0   | 4                  | 0   | 4       | 0   | 4    | 0   | 4         | 0   | 4       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 4         | 0    |
| Health Related Prof.                                   | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 2       | 0   | 2    | 0   | 2         | 0   | 2       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 2         | 0    |
| minorities   | n/a:2 <sup>a</sup> |     | n/a:2 <sup>b</sup> |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| males  | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| females  | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| males  | n/a:1              |     | n/a:1              |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| females  | n/a:1              |     | n/a:1              |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| males  | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| females  | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |

CHAPTER 3  
PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS  
ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1992-93

| COLLEGE    | DEPT COMM          |     | DEPT HEAD          |     | COLLEGE |     | DEAN |     | UNIV COMM |     | PROVOST |     | APPEALS |       | FINAL ACT |      |
|------------|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|-----------|-----|---------|-----|---------|-------|-----------|------|
|            | pro                | con | pro                | con | pro     | con | pro  | con | pro       | con | pro     | con | total   | rev'd | app'd     | deny |
| Humanities | 3                  | 0   | 3                  | 0   | 3       | 0   | 3    | 0   | 3         | 0   | 3       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 3         | 0    |
| minorities | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| males      | 2                  | 0   | 2                  | 0   | 2       | 0   | 2    | 0   | 2         | 0   | 2       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 2         | 0    |
| females    | 1                  | 0   | 1                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
| Law        | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
|            | n/a:1 <sup>a</sup> |     | n/a:1 <sup>b</sup> |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| minorities | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
|            | n/a:1              |     | n/a:1              |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| males      | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0         | 0   | 0       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 0         | 0    |
| females    | 0                  | 0   | 0                  | 0   | 1       | 0   | 1    | 0   | 1         | 0   | 1       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 1         | 0    |
|            | n/a:1              |     | n/a:1              |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| Medicine   | 25                 | 0   | 25                 | 0   | 24      | 0   | 25   | 0   | 23        | 2   | 25      | 0   | 0       | 0     | 25        | 0    |
|            |                    |     |                    |     | split:1 |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| minorities | 5                  | 0   | 5                  | 0   | 5       | 0   | 5    | 0   | 5         | 0   | 5       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 5         | 0    |
| males      | 20                 | 0   | 20                 | 0   | 19      | 0   | 20   | 0   | 20        | 0   | 20      | 0   | 0       | 0     | 20        | 0    |
|            |                    |     |                    |     | split:1 |     |      |     |           |     |         |     |         |       |           |      |
| females    | 5                  | 0   | 5                  | 0   | 5       | 0   | 5    | 0   | 5         | 0   | 5       | 0   | 0       | 0     | 5         | 0    |



**CHAPTER 3**  
**PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS**  
**ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1992-93**

| COLLEGE    | DEPT COMM |     | DEPT HEAD |     | COLLEGE |     | DEAN |     | UNIV COMM |     | PROVOST  |     | APPEALS |       | FINAL ACT |      |
|------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|---------|-----|------|-----|-----------|-----|----------|-----|---------|-------|-----------|------|
|            | pro       | con | pro       | con | pro     | con | pro  | con | pro       | con | pro      | con | total   | rev'd | app'd     | deny |
| Totals     | 96        | 5   | 93        | 5   | 93      | 15  | 97   | 12  | 91        | 18  | 92       | 16  | 5       | 1     | 94        | 14   |
|            | n/a:9     |     | n/a:10    |     | split:1 |     |      |     |           |     | no dec:1 |     |         |       | no dec:1  |      |
| minorities | 11        | 1   | 11        | 1   | 11      | 3   | 11   | 3   | 11        | 3   | 11       | 3   | 1       | 0     | 11        | 3    |
|            | n/a:2     |     | n/a:2     |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |          |     |         |       |           |      |
| males      | 70        | 1   | 60        | 2   | 64      | 10  | 67   | 8   | 63        | 12  | 62       | 12  | 4       | 1     | 63        | 11   |
|            | n/a:2     |     | n/a:3     |     | split:1 |     |      |     |           |     | no dec:1 |     |         |       | no dec:1  |      |
| females    | 24        | 3   | 24        | 3   | 29      | 5   | 31   | 3   | 31        | 3   | 30       | 4   | 1       | 0     | 31        | 3    |
|            | n/a:7     |     | n/a:7     |     |         |     |      |     |           |     |          |     |         |       |           |      |

**FOOTNOTES**

- a. There were no departmental committee reviews.
- b. There were no department head reviews.
- c. There were no university committee reviews.

CHAPTER 4  
 CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION STATISTICS  
 ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1992-93

| <u>Action Requested</u>                      | <u>Decision</u> |   | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> | <u>Minority</u> | <u>Non-Minority</u> |
|--|-----------------|---|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Continuing Status                            | yes             | 3 | 2           | 1             | 1               | 2                   |
|  | no              | 0 |             |               |                 |                     |
|  | withdrawn       | 0 |             |               |                 |                     |
| Promotion                                    | yes             | 3 | 2           | 1             | 0               | 3                   |
|  | no              | 0 | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
| Continuing Status<br>and Promotion           | yes             | 7 | 5           | 2             | 0               | 7                   |
|  | no              | 1 | 0           | 0             | 0               | 0                   |
|  | split           | 1 | 1           |               |                 | 1                   |
| Retention after<br>2nd or 4th year<br>review | yes             |   |             |               |                 |                     |
|  | no              | 1 | 1           |               |                 | 1                   |







**CHAPTER 4**  
**CONTINUING STATUS AND PROMOTION STATISTICS**  
**ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1991-92 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1992-93**

| COLLEGE    | DEPT COMM |     | DEPT HEAD |     | COLLEGE |         | DEAN    |         | UNIV COMM |         | PROVOST |         | APPEALS |       | FINAL ACTION |      |
|------------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------|--------------|------|
|            | pro       | con | pro       | con | pro     | con     | pro     | con     | pro       | con     | pro     | con     | total   | rev'd | app'd        | deny |
| Totals     | 4         | 1   | 11        | 2   | 12      | 2       | 13      | 2       | 14        | 2       | 12      | 4       | 2       | 14    | 13           | 3    |
| minorities |           |     |           |     | split:2 | split:1 | split:1 | split:1 | split:1   | split:1 | split:1 | split:1 |         |       |              |      |
| males      | 3         | 1   | 8         | 2   | 8       | 2       | 9       | 2       | 10        | 2       | 8       | 3       | 2       | 10    | 9            | 3    |
| females    | 1         | 0   | 3         | 0   | 4       | 0       | 4       | 0       | 4         | 0       | 4       | 0       | 0       | 4     | 4            | 0    |

**FOOTNOTES:**  
a. There were no departmental reviews.  
b. There were no department head reviews.

FACULTY SENATE  
October 5, 1992 EXECUTIVE SESSION

Dr. Cox called the Executive Session to order at 4:51 p.m. to consider nominations for Honorary Degrees. Biographical statements were placed on Senators' desks, and Dr. Cox requested they be turned in when the meeting adjourned. The following candidates were placed in nomination (a copy of the biographical statements presented to Senators is appended).

Dr. K. Jane Coulter: Dr. R. Phillip Upchurch, College of Agriculture, nominated Dr. Coulter for the Honorary Doctor of Science degree, and reported that college faculty had approved the nomination on September 28, 1992. Dr. Upchurch summarized areas of Dr. Coulter's diverse and brilliant career. Senator Silverman commended the College of Agriculture for submitting a woman's name in nomination for an honorary degree. Approval was moved, seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-17).

Dr. Sol D. Resnick: Dr. Bill Cosart, Associate Dean of the College of Engineering and Mines, nominated Dr. Resnick for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science. He reported the nomination was unanimously endorsed by the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources, and further endorsed via mail ballot by the Engineering Faculty on October 1, 1992. Dr. Cosart cited Dr. Resnick's directorship of the University of Arizona's Water Resources Research Center and his distinguished career in desert hydrology. As a fellow alumnus of the University of Wisconsin, Senator Ewbank said he was happy to move approval; the motion was seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-18).

Camilo Jose Cela: Dr. Chuck Tatum, Head of the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, nominated Camilo Jose Cela for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters. He reported the Department faculty enthusiastically endorsed his nomination for the honorary degree, and the Faculty of Humanities ratified that nomination 53:3 with two abstentions today. Dr. Tatum reviewed Senor Cela's accomplishments and his artistic dedication, culminating in the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1989. Approval was moved, seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-19).

F. Daniel Frost, Esq.: Associate Dean Kay Kavanagh of the College of Law placed in nomination the name of F. Daniel Frost for the Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree. She reported that the faculty of the College of Law voted unanimously in support of the nomination. Dean Kavanagh summarized the reasons for this submission: his excellent contributions to the legal profession, to his community at large and to the College of Law at the University of Arizona. Approval was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-20).

A. F. Turner: Dr. Angus MacLeod, Professor of Optical Sciences, placed in nomination the name of Professor Emeritus A. F. Turner for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science. The faculty of Optical Sciences unanimously supported this nomination on September 28, 1992. Dr. MacLeod stated that Dr. Turner has continually made enormous contributions to the field. In 1988, at a major international research meeting in Tucson, an award that was created for him, Industrial Pioneer, was received with a standing ovation. Approval was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-21).

Robert H. Dicke: Dr. John McCullen, Department of Physics, stated that the Departments of Physics and Astronomy were submitting the name of Dr. Dicke for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science. Dr. Dicke's nomination was approved

at a meeting of the Faculty of Science on September 28, 1992. Dr. McCullen cited Dr. Dicke's outstanding accomplishments, noting that he is one of the great physicists of this century and is perhaps the most generous and gentlemanly physicist he has ever known. Approval was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-22).

Stanley Lieberman: Dr. David Snow, Department of Sociology, placed in nomination the name of Professor Stanley Lieberman for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Humane Letters. He reported that both the faculty of Sociology and the faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences voted enthusiastically to nominate Professor Lieberman. Currently a Professor at Harvard University, he served at the University of Arizona 1974-83, and was a major force in bringing the Department to its current standing as one of the nation's leading departments. His major scholarly contributions have been in the area of race and ethnic relations. Approval was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-23).

Norman E. Koelling: Associate Dean Christopher Leadum of the College of Medicine submitted Mr. Koelling's name in nomination for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Science. The nomination was unanimously approved by the College of Medicine on September 15, 1992. Dean Leadum cited aspects of Dr. Koelling's career as a Lecturer in the Department of Anatomy on this campus, including thirteen teaching awards in the past fifteen years. Approval was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 1992/93-24).

Senator Garcia: We have heard these presentations by the various colleges concerning their nominees for honorary degrees. We have no regularization of procedures for that process. Some colleges may have two people voting, other colleges have hundreds of people voting, and I think I'd like to urge the Senate Executive Committee to regularize the procedure used in the process of selecting candidates for honorary degrees. Dr. Cox: We will take that under advisement.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

---

Elizabeth Roemer  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate