

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 5, 1992 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, October 5, 1992, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-two members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Vivian L. Cox presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Atwater, Badger, Coons, Cox, Cusanovich, Dickinson, Elliott, Enos, Ewbank, Garcia, Hildebrand, Hill, Horak, Impey, Inman, Joens, Jones, Kaczynski, Konur, Lewis, MacDonell, Mautner, McElroy, Mitchell, Najor, J. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Reynolds, Roemer, Sergeant, Siciliano, Silverman, Songer, Spera, Tomizuka, Troy, Valenzuela, Warburton, Williams, Young, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Barrett, Dvorak, Fajardo, Hammond, Larson, Law, S. O'Brien, Reiter, Sullivan, Witte and Wright.

2. NEW UNIVERSITY OMBUDSPERSON PROGRAM: Jacqueline Schneider, Special Counsel to the President, reported that the ombudsperson program has been in existence since the beginning of the semester. Posters, which include the names of the committee members, have been mailed to building monitors. She said the purpose of the program is to work pro-actively to improve the environment on campus through dispute resolution. Any employee who has a problem and needs some help can contact any member of the Ombuds Committee. She added that some cases have already been resolved. An ombudsperson will listen and, if requested, attempt to mediate.

Senator J. O'Brien asked Ms. Schneider to state the objectives of the program. Ms. Schneider responded that the objective is to reduce the number of grievances that go through formal processes, and ultimately end in litigation, by resolving grievances at the level at which the dispute first surfaced.

Senator Mautner asked Ms. Schneider to define pro-active. Ms. Schneider said the term is not intended to indicate that ombudspersons will search the campus for individuals with a problem but, if contacted, will immediately jump in as neutral parties to try to bring both sides together in a pro-active way. Senator Mautner asked if, in this case, the term pro-active would indicate the committee would act in anticipation of problems. Ms. Schneider responded that committee action would consist of clearing up misunderstandings and acting in a manner to prevent a problem from arising.

Senator Silverman asked if the ombudspersons were trained in mediation. Ms. Schneider responded that training had been provided in the form of a three-hour session with Bruce Meyerson, a Phoenix attorney trained in alternative modes of dispute resolution, and Larry Mahan, assistant to the President of Arizona State University, who has supervised the ombuds program at ASU since 1984.

Senator Kaczynski asked if only employees can contact the ombudspersons, or is the program open to students as well. Ms. Schneider said the program is open to students, employees, and visitors or others who have contact with the campus.

Senator Dickinson asked if the committee has a chairman. Ms. Schneider reported that there will be a chairman. A nominating committee had been selected, had developed two nominations, and ballots were being mailed today. Results will be reported at the committee's next meeting on November 18. Senator Dickinson

asked how people become members. Ms. Schneider: "From the end of this year forward, members will be elected from the different units by their peers. Because we were very anxious to get the program underway, it was done differently this time. The President appointed an omnibus planning committee which had representatives from most of the constituencies. The membership committee went out to the various units and requested nominations of individuals who would be qualified, eligible, willing and anxious to serve, and it was from that group of names that the steering committee selected this group. There are areas on campus that are not represented, but persons were invited from all areas to be on the Ombuds Committee. Some, because of prior commitments, were unable to assume membership. From the beginning of the next fiscal year forward, hopefully, there will be an elected representative from every area of campus."

Senator Hill asked what was perceived to be the relationship between this new committee and the existing Conciliation Committee. Ms. Schneider said she viewed the new committee as being more a grass roots effort, a step to be taken prior to the stage where a Dean or Department Head has made a recommendation to the President.

Senator J. O'Brien: "Could you give us a scenario of how it works? I can envision having a grievance or concern and bypassing immediate supervisors, which could create a lot of ill will in a department. But that's certainly not what you intend, is it? Is it a last resort?" Ms. Schneider responded that, on the contrary, she viewed the ombuds effort as a first resort, not a last resort. Upon notification of a problem, the ombudsperson would listen to what the issue is, and perhaps be able to resolve the question themselves with the booklets and reference material provided, and if not, they could contact the other party to see what is required, and get the two parties together. Senator J. O'Brien said his concern centered on the fact that, as academics, faculty pretty much have a chain of command for this sort of thing. He wondered whether she was suggesting that "It's okay to do an end run." Ms. Schneider said she was definitely not suggesting that, but rather was suggesting a beginning run. Senator J. O'Brien asked if he was supposed to talk with an ombudsperson before he talked with his department head. Ms. Schneider responded that if individuals were to be contacted by an ombudsperson, the answer was yes, and that the ombudsperson is just a neutral party whose mission is to try to bring individuals together in response to a grievance. She said President Pacheco has sent a memorandum to all Deans, Directors and Department Heads to request their cooperation and to indicate his support for the program.

Senator Inman added that one important aspect is that "no records are kept. If the issue is resolved, then no one ever knows about it. Their names are not even reported to the Chair of the Ombuds Committee. The type of case is reported, but not the names. So it's a very non-threatening procedure." Ms. Schneider thanked Senator Inman for her comment, and agreed such discussions are all confidential: what the grievant and what the respondent tell the ombudsperson is confidential and cannot be used in any later proceeding.

3. OPEN SESSION: Dr. Dinshaw Contractor, Acting Head of the Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics Department (CEEM), said he wished to express his concerns about the reorganization of the Chemical Engineering Department as proposed by the Dean of the College of Engineering and Mines. "The reorganization deals with the transfer of four faculty members in our department, who specialize in environmental engineering, to the Chemical Engineering Department. CEEM faculty are concerned about this transfer, and the department should be regarded as an affected unit." He said the Dean should have consulted with the CEEM faculty.

He said that the Dean did circulate to all College faculty members his white paper on strategic directions and organization to meet the challenge of 1992 and into the 21st century, and the paper did contain a short description of this transfer. Dr. Contractor said that while the Dean did ask for comments from the faculty, CEEM faculty had had no opportunity for input or participation in the evolution of the reorganization proposal. Consequently, he believed that the clock for the reorganization procedures should be stopped for six weeks, to allow for consultation with CEEM faculty. He had transmitted those beliefs in letters to both President Pacheco and Chair of the Faculty Garcia, and he had drafted a proposed resolution for the Faculty Senate to consider:

"Whereas: The Faculty Senate procedures for reorganization stipulate that 'Regardless of the level at which a proposal for academic reorganization originates, it should always evolve from consultation with and participation by the faculty members in the units to be affected.'

Whereas the Department of Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics is one of the affected units,

Whereas the previous proposal by the Dean submitted under the budget reduction framework contained very brief descriptions, and was rejected by various committees,

Whereas the current proposal is new and is submitted in detail under the University's reorganization framework, and only one affected unit was consulted for this proposal, while the other has been left out,

And Whereas the faculty of the Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics Department were not consulted nor did they participate in the evolution of the proposal as required by the procedures,

Therefore, be it resolved that the clock for the Faculty Senate procedures for the proposed reorganization be stopped for six weeks to allow for participation by the Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics faculty."

Dr. Chandra Desai, Regents Professor, CEEM, said he would like to propose a change in the definition of affected faculty in the reorganization procedures. He said all faculty members in CEEM are significantly affected by this move, and therefore request that, in the procedures document, the definition of "affected faculty" should include the faculty from the parent unit, as follows:

"It is resolved that the definition of 'affected faculty' be changed to include faculty members in both the parent and receiving units."

Professor Roy Spece, College of Law, spoke as a member of the Executive Board of the University of Arizona Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). He said the Board wanted to be on record regarding a matter of grave concern to the faculty. "President Pacheco recently forwarded draft documents entitled 'Sanctions for Misconduct or Unacceptable Performance of Faculty, of Professionals and of Administrators' to all Vice Presidents, Deans and Directors and the Chair of the Faculty, asking them to share the documents with whomever they considered appropriate faculty governance representatives. He said the documents are flawed, and are in violation of the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty, State law, Board of Regents policies, and AAUP Guidelines. Professor Spece said the Sanctions document was proffered as a supposed response to the AAUP's call for "systematic attention ... to questions

related to sanctions other than dismissal, such as warnings and reprimands, in order to provide a more versatile body of academic sanctions." He stated that the AAUP recommendation is in the context of response to misconduct that injures individuals, disrupts classes, or damages an institutional facility, and was not intended to countenance the concept of faculty de facto losing tenure by actions such as a cut in pay or an administrator's perceptions of inadequate performance. He indicated that such use of the AAUP statement was intellectually and academically unacceptable, and could open the way to a vote of censure by the AAUP. If adopted, he said, the document would destroy the essence of tenure at the University of Arizona. Professor Spece added that the document was and is a product of administrators and attorneys, not the faculty. Senator Ewbank, one of two faculty members on the drafting committee, did not fully participate because the committee's work was completed while he was out of town, and he has not yet even received a copy of the most recent draft. Spece reported that Ewbank is now on record as opposing the document. In closing, Professor Spece said AAUP urges each faculty member to obtain a copy of the Sanctions document, to warn their colleagues what is happening, and to take appropriate, constructive action.

Senator Impey asked Senator Garcia if the results of the Faculty Workload Survey conducted by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC), recently published in the Wildcat, were available. Senator Garcia said a preliminary draft will be presented to the Regents on October 8. Dr. Cusanovich said the report is still technically the property of the JLBC, and could not be released until JLBC has so indicated.

Senator Silverman, noting that the Dean of the College of Law had distributed copies of the Sanctions document to Law faculty, asked if the Sanctions proposal is now being reviewed by a Senate standing committee. Senator Garcia responded that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee is reviewing it, and the matter is scheduled for discussion at the November Senate meeting.

Senator Silverman then asked if the first Civil Engineering resolution could be considered under New Business. Dr. Cox indicated that that would be appropriate.

4. REPORTS

- 4A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Pacheco said he intended to speak today on two matters: the proposed student computing fee and the faculty workload study.

"The proposed student computing fee is a contentious issue, as you know, with comment in recent weeks narrowing the focus: whether or not students have been adequately involved in drawing up this proposal, and whether the ultimate decision could be resolved by last week's student referendum.

"The issues are far wider than recent discussions might suggest. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to make a few of my thoughts known publicly for the first time. Student computing facilities are not a new problem. The campus has visited and revisited the topic a number of times over the years. In particular, I understand, some years ago the Lovelock Committee proposed long-term plans for correcting the situation. Unhappily, as the Instructional Computing Advisory Committee recently pointed out, we've fallen far short of that plan, largely because of a lack of funding to provide the equipment and the personnel that are needed. The results are obvious. Despite significant progress in some areas, the computing facilities and services available to our students are

completely and totally inadequate. We're behind many of our peer institutions and we have no immediate prospect of correcting the situation. We find ourselves in this position at a time when computing is becoming increasingly important to instruction and learning and at a time when society expects our graduates to be computer literate. This is an unacceptable situation. We need to solve the problem and solve it with minimum delay.

"For me, improved computing facilities for our students are an essential part of our efforts to improve the quality of the education that we provide. The only question is how to fund capital investments and operating costs. There are only four potential sources of funds: reallocation within our budgets, new money from the State, funds from federal and private sources, and charges levied against students. Given the inadequacy of our existing budgets, given the massive reallocation exercises of recent years, and given the list of worthy projects that might be funded through reallocation, I suspect no one is under any illusion about the difficulty of quickly finding substantial funding for computers in this mechanism. As for new monies from the State, we built five open access computer labs in this way in 1989, and we have asked for more money in 1993-94. On the other hand, in light of the economy, it's going to be difficult getting new monies from this source in the next few years. We've done a bit better in terms of money from federal and private sources, largely through the efforts of our departments and colleges. We are receiving several million dollars per year from such sources at this time, but I have to question how quickly and by how much this amount can be expanded. If we choose to use the fourth potential source of funding, in other words, charges levied against students, our options boil down to choosing between increasing tuition and registration fees, or imposing a separate fee. It is clear to me that no single one of these potential sources is likely to provide all our needs for improving computer facilities in the next several years. Similarly, it is equally clear to me that we cannot afford to sit back and ignore the problem for another two, three, or four years. So my conclusion is that we need to make our choices and piece together funding from several sources, and then act.

"This is not the kind of a choice that can or should be decided on the basis of a student referendum. I have no objection to such votes, and can see circumstances, such as the decision on a purely optional facility such as a recreation center, where a referendum would be useful. What we're talking about here, however, is the need for fundamental and essential academic facilities. Although I have not made a determination on this matter, it's not any secret that a separate fee is an attractive option because the University could retain all of the revenue and because it would be easier to ensure that all the revenue was spent on computing services and on nothing else. However, there are possibilities that should be considered with respect to a tuition and fee increase that is all rolled into one sum.

"The one question that I have not addressed is the question of student involvement in developing the proposal for a fee or whatever alternative is selected. It has been suggested that students have not been involved or at best have been involved to an inconsiderable extent. I have indicated I find this difficult to accept. The Instructional Computing Advisory Committee involves student members. In 1991, ASUA appointed a committee to work on this idea, and during Spring 1992 conducted an open forum to address the matter. The Instructional Computing Advisory Committee also conducted an open forum last spring, at which students were able to speak. And finally, the student members of the Senate have not been slow to make their views known. It seems to me that students have been involved in the process over the last year or two. On the other hand, I do not

see that this involvement necessarily forecloses further consultation before our final decisions are made. There are some points that have been made regarding the quality of that interaction. I don't see a problem, as we go forward with the process of making a determination, of involving students. At any rate, I would want to have some sense of where we're going before the beginning of the year. That's a fairly loose timeline, but it's one that I think is reasonable.

"Let me now turn to a different topic. As some Senators may be aware, later this week the Arizona Board of Regents is going to consider the matter of faculty workloads and teaching loads. Discussions will rely on two studies. One was conducted by a study group including representatives from higher education appointed by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, which is the group that Provost Cusanovich referred to a little bit earlier. The other is the result of a survey conducted by the three universities last fall. Basic data from these reports were published in today's Wildcat, and I shall of course keep the Senate informed of the Board's discussion and of any actions.

"That concludes my statement, except perhaps to add that with respect to the ombuds program that was described earlier, there are many universities that have adopted a similar approach with great success. While we are neophytes in this particular arena, I believe that getting to the root of potential grievances early on is something that is worthy of our consideration. We are using a model at this university that has been tried at another institution with great success. And while questions are being raised, I think they are very appropriate ones, and ones that need to be considered. I believe that there is room for improving that process as we find out what the shortcomings are and as we find out what is working and what is not working."

- 4B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Dr. Cusanovich said that, while he did not have much to report, he could add a little to the computing fee issue and provide more detail on the workload topic, with which he has been involved in some of the planning that has occurred relative to the Board meeting on October 8.

Concerning the computing fee, he was present as a member of the Senate last May when the Instructional Computing Advisory Committee (ICAC) presented its report. From the comments expressed during a long discussion, the mail he received, and consideration of all input, including student opinion, he put together a proposal for the President. Although he had to make a judgment call in incorporating to the greatest extent possible the many comments and recommendations, he believed the proposal did reflect those opinions. Dr. Cusanovich said he had no problem with continuing the dialogue on this topic because it is a critical issue requiring action in a reasonably short period of time--students are graduating without benefit of certain educational opportunities.

Concerning the workload issue, Dr. Cusanovich said he believed a panel will address the Board, with representatives from all three universities, including two representatives of our faculty, Senator J. D. Garcia and Dr. Martinez Hewlett of the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, and the Provosts from each of the three universities. He said Dr. Hewlett is one of the fathers of the undergraduate Biology course, 181A-B, and has been very involved in undergraduate education for the last few years. He said he would be glad to share what he has from the Board book, which is a sort of summary of the study that was done this spring, but he was not authorized to release more. "I think the workload that the faculty carries is incredible, and it's difficult, I think, to fully appreciate that. I hope that on Thursday we can transmit some sense of how our faculty work and the contributions they make to this State." He said he believed

the meeting would provide everyone a fair hearing and an opportunity to deal with some of the misperceptions so that discussion could focus on reality.

- 4C. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia noted that last May the Senate had voted unanimously to support the student computing fee, provided that the institution indicated its commitment by matching, dollar for dollar from not previously assigned dollars, the fees to be levied. He said he believed the matching represented an important commitment because the people who would administer the proceeds of the student fees were the very same people who had in the past not placed this issue high enough on the priority list to make things happen. "These administrators make choices, and they didn't choose to enhance computing resources. For that reason, it is important that the administration show a commitment to this very important matter. I agree with everything Senator Cusanovich and the President said about how far behind we are and the need for these additional monies, but I think we need to show that we're going to use them wisely, and we really do have a commitment to the subject."

Reporting on the Enrollment Growth Commission's agenda, Senator Garcia said it will consider how the State of Arizona will deal with the additional enrollments projected for the year 2010, which calls for 55,000+ students wishing to attend a university within this state and 90,000 additional students wishing to attend a two-year institution. The meeting held on September 15 was essentially an orientation, where Commission members were given a briefing by staff and heard some initial presentations by people from Sierra Vista and other places. He said he believed there are plans to conduct hearings across the state. As a member of the Commission, he said he would be glad to receive comments or input for Commission consideration. The next meeting will be held on October 13.

Senator Garcia reported he had participated in a conference call this morning concerning the Faculty Workload issue. The focus of the meeting on October 8 will concern the national trend to have faculty more involved in the teaching part of their duties and in the teaching of undergraduates. Participants in the discussion will include the chief academic officers and faculty members from each of the institutions, and the Regents.

Senator Garcia reported he has received five times the number of telephone calls that he generally receives on any single issue on the Sanctions document, which will be considered by the Senate on November 2. He said it was important that every Senator receive a copy of the proposal. The primary focus of the comments that he has received concerns the timing of this document: faculty morale is low, and the necessity for finding measures to deal with these particular problems at this time is not apparent to many of the people who contacted him. "In my view, the procedure we are going through is correct. We have a Senate committee that will consider it and prepare comments for the Senate. The Senate, in public session, will consider the document." Senator Garcia advised Senators to contact their constituents to obtain their comments and input prior to the November Senate meeting so they will be prepared to deal with this issue in a responsible way. He added that President Pacheco moved the original deadline for response to accommodate the Senate's November 2 meeting.

Concerning the health of faculty governance issues and Senate Bill 1106, Senator Garcia said he could report no progress on that issue at this time. Two letters were transmitted to the President, but a response had not yet been received. Senator Garcia wondered whether some retrogression might be occurring, because last week a committee on the Organization and Structure of the Arts and Sciences College was appointed and is now in place, without consultation with any elected

faculty governance officers in the construction of that committee. "There is a representative of the Committee of Eleven on that committee, but I certainly was not aware that such a committee was going to be appointed, much less consulted in its makeup. It is not accurate to say that SB 1106 is not needed because 'we are doing it.' This is an example of where we are not doing it. I hope we can get on with making the participation of the faculty in the setting of the policy of the institution a reality."

4D. REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: Secretary Roemer reported that the minutes of the September 14th meeting had been distributed to the list of vice presidents, deans, directors, and department heads, but she had not yet received feedback as to the success of members of the General Faculty in accessing those copies. Concerning the planned newsletter, she reported that Chestalene Pintozzi had volunteered to assist with composition. She said she would welcome input on the first draft, and contributions from Senate and General Faculty standing committees to ensure success in getting information into the hands of the General Faculty.

4E. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Cox reported she was delighted to have received correspondence from several deans, indicating they had introduced Faculty Senators from their units at their College Faculty meetings, and had also begun to identify continuing ways to utilize those Senators in terms of input in their respective units. She said such activity is warmly encouraged because it opens and broadens minds in relation to the issues discussed on the Senate floor, for which various units might want or require input. "One of the things that we have worked very hard toward is input into reorganization policies. I think we can say that the work the Senate has done has certainly been solid, it has certainly been important, and our job now is to continue to work in the direction of implementation in terms of those particular policies. We have several items that are coming up; you may find that your phone will ring, and we will ask you to assist us by participating on some ad hoc committees that we will be forming in order to address what continues to be a growing agenda. We hope that your response will be yes."

Dr. Cox reported that, after consultation with Dr. Beigel, it appeared October 26 would be the best date for the Senate's October special session, to ensure reports from the Task Forces on Institutional Priorities would be ready.

4F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Siciliano reported that ASUA is conducting a last-minute voter registration drive. Because today is the last day to register and still be eligible to vote in the general elections, ASUA would continue the registration in their offices and on the mall, and would drive the completed registrations downtown at 11:30 p.m. Thus far, ASUA has registered 4,200 new voters this fall.

Senator Siciliano introduced student Senators: Lori Kaczynski, a senior who has served on the Undergraduate Council and as the Academic Services Director for ASUA; Sonjay Konur, an undergraduate in Engineering, and a member of the University Budget Review Committee; Derek Lewis, a second-year ASUA Senator, who is a junior in Engineering and active in many endeavors; Scott MacDonell, a senior in Economics, who has served on a wide variety of committees, including Academic Integrity, and who continues to serve on the latter; Karen Sergeant, a new Senator, who is a second-year graduate student in International Relations; and one who could not be present today, Mike Najor, a graduate student in Business and the ASUA Graduate Student Association Director.

Senator Siciliano reported that ASUA believed it was important for students to be provided the opportunity to vote on the computing fees issue, and the result was 90 percent no, approximately 10 percent yes. He said that, in conversation with President Pacheco, they were able to agree on a wide range of issues: (1) There is more to talk about before the final decision is reached. (2) No decision should be made right away. (3) There is need to discuss the funding alternatives. He stressed that ASUA strongly favors better facilities for instructional computing, and recognizes our campus is behind in this area, but is desirous of identifying an alternative way of funding instructional computing. He commended the Instructional Computing Advisory Committee on its consultative process, but noted that students believe the focus of the 1991-92 discussions was not the funding issue, but rather was instructional computing. Senator Siciliano said he believes discussions with students now should focus on funding concerns, including financial aid aspects, so that the final recommendation can include their support. He added that he believes governing bodies on this campus would prefer consultative decision-making.

Senator Siciliano noted that the computing fee addressed instructional needs, while the recreation center fee was designated for non-instructional purposes. Additionally, the new proposal is not the exact same proposal that ICAC created, and he was not convinced that the new proposal contains new dollar matching funds from the administration. Additionally, "It is not clear that there is truly an oversight committee of students who will administer those funds and make sure they are utilized properly." As far as the Legislature is concerned, he believed it would be clear that a sum of money had been generated, and the institution would run the same risk of losing that money through a decrease in its General Fund appropriation whether a separate fee was imposed or tuition increased. "We have to join ranks to discuss with the Regents and with the Legislature the fact that, regardless, they have to prioritize funding for the universities and, if necessary, prioritize it for instructional computing because if we institute the fee and the Legislature acknowledges that we have created that additional money, and does not support our efforts to increase funding on our campus, they can decrease our General Fund appropriation just as they would if we created a tuition increase. The bottom line is that we have to cooperate to improve instructional computing. I hope these discussions will push us in that direction."

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Silverman asked about the fee-setting process. "I think there is concern among many people that during these difficult budgetary times the University administration may be looking to fees as a way to increase revenue." He wondered how the fee-setting committee is selected, who serves on it, and whether faculty or student governance has any input on committee membership. Dr. Cusanovich responded that this committee has been around for at least three or four years, and there are perhaps fifty fees campus-wide. He said he has not made appointments to the committee, and was not familiar with the appointment process, but was aware there are faculty, administrators and students on it. He added that fee proposals are generated in colleges and departments, and are quite specific, and he had sent a memo recently to remind people of the process. Senator Silverman recommended that an appropriate Senate standing committee review the fee-setting process, including committee composition and the appointment process, because the computing fee may be just the first of its kind to come before the Senate.

Senator Mautner said he believed the University of California and the University of Texas systems have adopted policies concerning faculty workloads, and he would be interested to learn how faculty at those universities viewed their systems, and particularly if any reports or studies exist, so this body could review that

material prior to its discussion on this topic. Dr. Cox said, "We will do our best to give you a response in written form."

Senator Impey stated that the report produced by ICAC last year dealt with the need for improved instructional computing. The idea of a fee was presented in a larger context that included alternatives. "It does seem that there should be enough negotiation and flexibility for an institutional commitment to be made by perhaps some combination of reallocation and new monies that might come from departments and colleges, given that those departments and colleges use their facilities for some open access that addresses all students needs." He asked Dr. Pacheco where we stand at the moment, what is the timescale, and what is the process to obtain closure on the issue? President Pacheco responded that it was his intent, if the decision is to implement an instructional fee, to have the recommendation completed by December or January, or if another mechanism is selected, then he assumed action would involve the tuition-setting process.

Senator Garcia asked Dr. Cox if she could provide the names of the Deans she referred to in her report so they could be commended, now or in the future. Dr. Cox responded she would like to do that, but had been holding off because she wanted to be able to report 100 percent cooperation.

Senator Lewis asked Senator Garcia for the anticipated timeline for the Enrollment Commission report, as well as any potential timeline for implementation, and whether there are perceptions that enrollment changes might affect the nature of entry-level courses offered at the University of Arizona. Senator Garcia noted that Senator Siciliano is also a member of the Commission, and might have comments beyond his own. He said the Commission is expected to finish its work before the end of 1992, and thus would have preliminary recommendations developed by then. Its final report is not due until April. He added that, in connection with the enrollment management issue, the Board of Regents has accepted the recommendations of the Presidents of the three major institutions. The idea, he said, is to continue to provide access to everyone in the State of Arizona who wishes an education.

Dean Sevigny, sitting in for Dean Sullivan, said he would like to respond to the question about the Texas Faculty Workload policy, having had experience with it at the University of Texas at Austin. He said the system worked very well, the one disadvantage that he experienced being that the questionnaires limited points for department heads to only six credits. On the positive side, he said, the Texas system was aggressively pushed by the University of Texas to protect the rights of a research institution and to allow for credits for independent study and research, which worked very well. He noted there are faculty on this campus who aren't getting such credit. He also noted that the Texas system was legally imposed, and results were directly transmitted to the Legislature.

Senator Siciliano said he wanted to make one other comment concerning the computing fee. Most students with whom he had communicated indicated that it was not unreasonable to pay more if they could be assured that the process by which they were charged more was fair, open, public and ensured that they were going to get what they paid for. Senator J. O'Brien asked Senator Siciliano for the numbers and percentages of students who cast ballots on the computing fee question. Senator Siciliano replied that a little over 2,600 students voted in the special election, representing 6.7 percent of the student body. He said these numbers represented the highest turnout ever of any special election in the PAC-10. The turnout was twice that at ASUA's previous special elections, and matched the normal turnout for regular student elections. "I think that

2,600 students saying anything about any single topic is a lot. I would say the voter turnout, by percentage, is low, but it still is an enormously strong indicator of student opinion."

Senator Impey, responding to Senator Siciliano's comments, said the committee proposed a mechanism whereby students would have perhaps an unprecedented degree of accountability and control over what happened to their dollars. He added that the Associate Vice President for Computing and Information Technology, Larry Rapagnani, and the committee worked together to demonstrate that within one year of fee implementation a substantial impact could be made, essentially doubling the amount of open access facilities.

Senator Williams said he was troubled to learn from Senator Garcia that the Arts and Sciences committee was appointed without the input of elected faculty, and in that spirit asked Dr. Pacheco if such action did not fly in the face of the spirit of the faculty governance law. He asked how Dr. Pacheco and Senator Garcia visualized the evolution of processes to conform to this law, and what the role of the Faculty Senate would be. President Pacheco: "What the Senate bill provides is unclear to us at the present time, and we are trying to get that clarified. Senator Garcia did not tell you that I am in the process of consulting with the other two universities to determine exactly what it means. With respect to the specific question, I do not know that it is necessary to have a process in which the Faculty Senate is involved in the selection of all committees, and that is one of the things that we have to clarify. When the A&S committee was appointed by Vice President Fernandez, he did clear the names with me, and I had no objection to the names that were proposed to me. I believe I did make a couple of recommendations as to additional people that could be considered. But I don't think that what is being proposed is designed to circumvent, ignore or to place in a subordinate position, the will of the Faculty Senate." Senator Garcia responded, "This isn't just any committee. It is concerned with a restructuring of one of the major pieces of our institution. The Senate has had discussions on this subject over the last two years on a regular basis. It is a very important topic. I believe that elected faculty governance should have been consulted in selecting names because it is an important move on the part of the institution. We were not consulted."

Senator Ewbank: "As a matter for the record, you were witness, as I was, when Senator Garcia said he had learned there is a representative of the Committee of Eleven on the Committee to Reorganize the College of Arts and Sciences. I, as Chair of the Committee of Eleven, can acknowledge that there may be someone who is a member of the Committee of Eleven on that committee, but would it not be polite to inform the Chair of the Committee when someone is named a representative of that group? If my nose sounds out of joint, I guess it is."

Senator Pitt said she was confused, because she had been a member of the University Committee for Restructuring Arts and Sciences, appointed by former Provost Cole. The committee was put on hold for a year. She thought she was still a member. "Am I still on it?" Senator Garcia responded that if she did not receive a letter last week, she was not. President Pacheco said that the committee appointed by Provost Cole was, to his knowledge, discontinued when there was objection that it might interfere with the work of another committee. He said he did not know whether members of the former committee had been informed of its discontinuance, but that it does not exist at the present time. He said he believed that some members of the previous committee were appointed to the new one, but he would defer clarification to Vice President Fernandez. Senator Pitt said she was never told the committee was disbanded.

Dr. Cox asked Vice President Fernandez to respond concerning the status of the initial committee. Vice President Fernandez: "It is no longer in place. You can consider yourself no longer in place." Senator Silverman asked Vice President Fernandez with whom he had consulted to appoint this committee. Vice President Fernandez responded that he had consulted with the Provost, the Deans and the President. Senator Silverman: "No faculty?" Vice President Fernandez: "The committee is an entirely faculty committee, chaired by a faculty member." Senator Inman commented that different committees would be appointed if only the Deans were consulted, or only faculty were consulted. "It seems to me that if you're going to reorganize the whole College of Arts and Sciences, that the faculty should be consulted, and not just the Deans." Vice President Fernandez responded: "Faculty are on the committee. And the charge to the committee makes it very clear that the committee should consult very closely with the faculty of the college."

In response to a question as to why the Senate was dealing with this question, Senator Garcia responded that state law calls for elected faculty representatives to participate in the setting of policy and the administration of the institution. "It is not enough to consult with a dean on the subject. It is a state law that says that the elected faculty representatives need to participate in that process." Vice President Fernandez said that he should mention another occasion when he did consult with Chairman of the Faculty Garcia and received no response regarding a request for recommendations for names for a committee. Senator Tomizuka said he hated to sound like a broken record, "but this evil stems from the fact that department chairs and deans are not elected by faculty. A great many problems will be resolved by having the faculty govern themselves by electing their own chair and their own dean."

Senator Impey said the information flow did not appear to be very good, because he was recently appointed to the Faculty of Science Advisory Council as Faculty Senate representative, and as such had hoped to represent "all of our interests" on that council, but he was not even aware of this reorganization committee.

Senator Ewbank: "My comments, Madame Chair, reinforce the state law argument and the elected representation argument by noting further that it is a matter of parliamentary tradition that committees hold allegiance to or act in response to their appointing agents. A committee that is intended to be representative of faculty should be at least to some degree responsible to the faculty as a source of their authority and the agency to whom they report."

Senator Silverman: "The whole concept of shared governance means just what it says. It doesn't mean that administrators, that is the deans and the vice presidents, choose committees, even if those committees are made up of faculty. I don't have any objection to deans and administrators choosing some members of a committee, but what shared governance means is that faculty governance has input and maybe even selection power of who should be on these committees. Just out of courtesy, if nothing else, you talk to people within elected faculty governance. That's what shared governance means. We don't have it here. We've never had it here. And if we continue on this road, we will not. I think that's why people holding elected faculty positions are disgruntled, because we see this happening over and over and over again. It just doesn't stop."

Senator Pitt: "I don't know whether it's appropriate or not, but can we know what the charge of this new restructuring committee is? Is restructuring of Arts and Sciences to include a discussion of whether Fine Arts fits in to Arts and

Sciences, or is it in fact a limited restructuring?" President Pacheco: "It's a limited restructuring, but I would defer further to Vice President Fernandez for the details. It is intended to draw on discussions that have taken place, I believe, over the last nine years concerning the structure of Arts and Sciences. It does not foreclose discussion about almost anything. It does direct the committee to take into account previously made recommendations." Senator Pitt: "One of the things that the first committee was charged with was to determine where Fine Arts fit in relation to Arts and Sciences. We did a lot of fact-finding about that within Fine Arts. I understand that is not an issue anymore. I am confused because that seemed to be a recurring issue over the past year and now it's not now under consideration. I'm quite concerned about that."

Dr. Cox: We have two guests who have been asked to discuss items with us that we are considering, and I understand that each of them has a schedule that says they need to get back to other duties as quickly as possible. With your consent, then, I would like to move directly to Agenda item 11, then to item 6. Once we have dispensed with those items, we will proceed to 7 and 8.

6. FURTHER DISCUSSION ON MISSION THEMES AND PRINCIPLES STATEMENT: Dr. Dudley Woodard, Chair of the Mission Task Force, noted that the Task Force's final draft, which had been placed on Senators' desks today, was delivered to the President this morning. He reported the committee met last Thursday to consider all the comments it had received, including those from the Senate, which it found very helpful, as well as some from the Staff Advisory Council. Dr. Woodard then reviewed some of the major additions, based particularly on the discussion in the Senate. In some cases it was felt no change was necessary. In other cases it was felt that the points were not appropriately included in the Mission and Principles statement. For example, the committee was concerned that a number of individuals really misunderstood the charge from the President, which was not to rewrite the mission statement, but to tease out mission themes and principles from existing mission statements. He said that was very important because some people really wanted the Task Force to rewrite the Mission Statement and include things the Task Force didn't think it had the authority to do. "Later on in that text we again talked about themes during periods of change, now and in the future, because that was an important concept that was expressed. Farther along, we considered again whether we had adequately captured, particularly from the President's Vision Statement, opportunities presented by our unique role in the Southwest. We felt the language was adequate, although we did change it to say 'must avail itself of and foster the unique physical attributes and cultural resources of the Southwestern region.' We don't see the Southwest region just confined to the U.S., but much broader than that, and felt 'Southwest region' addressed that concern." He said a whole new paragraph was inserted concerning recruitment and retention of a diverse staff. That suggestion came from the Staff Advisory Council. "We believe that strengthens our document because we want to be sure that everybody sees him/herself in this University. We have rewritten the land grant section and hope that this captures the spirit of the discussion. I reviewed about 15 land grant statements from other mission statements and we worked with those in developing the new wording. There were some very good comments from some of the Senators as well as from others on the Commission on the Status of Women, and the Task Force on Diversity. Some of this may also be credited to Senator Young: '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.' About three sentences down, we talk about governance, and that came out of a question that was raised by Senator Jones: 'share those kinds of academic goals and work together, with wide participation.' And then the last sentence, '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.' That new sentence captures some of the suggestions that were made. In the last section, the Prologue, on page 12, there was language that some found pejorative, although it wasn't intended to be pejorative. Our task was to lay out the issues for debate, not come to conclusions. We removed some of the language that some found offensive. There were some other words that have been either deleted or included to try to sharpen our points. Our task is now done. We have submitted our final report to the President. My understanding is that you may discuss this further and then provide the President with additional guidance."

Senator Lewis said he was somewhat unclear as to the Task Force's goal: was it to change the emphasis of certain areas? Dr. Woodard responded that the goal was "to come up with a statement of themes and principles that really reflect the character of this institution, and the values of this institution, as represented not only in mission statements, but also in major task force reports that have been submitted to the President during the past several years. Those missions and themes, then, were to be gathered into the development of criteria for program assessment and, more important down the line, would serve as the foundation for making choices in terms of priorities and allocation of institutional resources. That's part of the long-range strategic planning. We had a discussion about whether the document described the University of Arizona. Would you know it was the University of Arizona? We felt after much discussion that we had achieved what we wanted to, and that was really to express what we felt were our values and principles. They should be characteristic of any good university. But we felt that the University of Arizona is recognizable."

Senator Inman asked who will set the priorities. President Pacheco: "This is only one of, I believe, five task forces that have been appointed. Each task force receives information from the previous one, so this document will go to all the task forces. There is another task force that is working on the criteria, and another task force will look at the assessment process. Another task force then will look at the support services. This leads into a variety of other activities, all of which ultimately involve consultation with faculty and review by the Senate."

Senator Jones noted that, while reviewing the section in which the Task Force inserted wording that responded to the concerns he and others had expressed regarding both faculty and student governance, "I guess what you're saying is it might have been better for that section to precede rather than follow the discussion that went before about shared governance. I'm looking for that word governance there, and I don't see it. Am I just overlooking that?" Dr. Woodard: "We used 'wide participation' because, again, we felt this was not so prescriptive. Our task was to set mission and principles, then a criteria committee, for example that on program assessment, would have to define how that gets implemented. We really worked hard not to get very prescriptive except to express the idea of collegiality, which we felt included consultation and collaboration." Senator Jones: "I guess there is another dimension to governance that goes beyond participation that I was hoping to see in this document. I can perhaps understand where this was coming from, but the issue is shared governance, not just participating and reviewing comments or being a part of the discussion. Dr. Woodard: "I would like to respond and make it very clear that we felt as a committee that 'wide participation' expressed that spirit of collaboration and collegiality. Somebody else has to define how the spirit is to be implemented."

Senator Siciliano congratulated the Mission Task Force on completing what he

considered to be a very good document in an amazingly short time and in the very consultative nature of the process which utilized every constituency concerned in a number of forums. "The second point I want to make concerns the core responsibility for education. The relevant paragraph begins 'The core responsibility for education lies with the professorial faculty.' That's true, but nowhere in this document do you get the feeling that in some departments graduate students account for the majority of student credit hours. I think that should be acknowledged in some way whether it means that the faculty have responsibility to ensure the graduate students are well prepared for their assignments. Graduate students play an important role in instruction on this campus, and the document doesn't acknowledge that. I hope that can be addressed in some fashion." Dr. Woodard: "We addressed what we needed to address in terms of where we thought instructional responsibility lay. We understand your point, but didn't feel that we should address it explicitly."

Senator Ewbank said he shared the concern expressed by Senator Jones. "I was unable to participate in the earlier discussion, but I did spend an hour or so today looking at the earlier draft and responding to it. And now seeing this, I do not see in the description of the responsibilities of the faculty or in the discussion of core responsibilities the full range of responsibilities entailed in the traditional three missions of the university, 'teaching, research/creative achievement, and public service' which I see as including University service which is in significant part faculty governance. It's there in the first paragraph, but it disappears in the statement of responsibilities of the faculty. Individual faculty members who are willing to recognize the new state law and participate in faculty governance, which requires a reallocation of time usually otherwise devoted to research, are now placed at some jeopardy in any evaluations of merit and performance because that is not seen institutionally as important, and it isn't seen as important in this document." Dr. Woodard: "I don't think that is a conclusion that we as a committee would draw. I know people read things with different mental sets, and I can appreciate that. The spirit that we were trying to capture here was to state some very general principles and themes that could be used for further prescription, whether it's criteria for program assessment, or something else. We had a lot of debate on the point, and we believe that we've adequately covered it."

Senator Garcia said that, while he agreed heartily with the statement that the core responsibility for education lies with the professorial faculty, there is a question of allocation of resources, which is not always in the hands of the faculty. You can tell the faculty it is responsible for delivery of all this education, but if there aren't enough faculty, and the classrooms are not there, then you are going to charge the faculty with a responsibility that they cannot fulfill. That's a bit of a problem." Dr. Woodard said his response would be the same, in that the task force saw that as becoming overly prescriptive in terms of how to do it, or in terms of what shared governance means. "We felt we ought to say this is an important theme." Senator Garcia: "The important message that I am bringing is that there are other players, even though the core responsibility may be with the faculty. There is responsibility that lies elsewhere, and that is not addressed." Dr. Woodard: "We talked about that, and again I must say the committee felt that the document addressed that. I realize that may not be an adequate response." Senator Garcia: "Where does it address that?" Dr. Woodard: "The Task Force felt that specific statement should not be put in. It was not up to the Task Force to say who should allocate resources. I just want you to know we did discuss it."

Senator Tomizuka, noting that the last sentence on page 4 concludes, "to educate

the next generation of scientists, scholars, professionals," asked "Are scientists not scholars? I would like to see the word 'scientists' removed because either you imply scientists are not scholars or you prefer scientists over other living beings. By singling out scientists, you reflect a bias concerning institutional priorities." Dr. Woodard: There is a source document I think we borrowed this from. I'd have to go back to that source document. At this point in time, that comment would need to go along with other comments from the Senate to the President, since we've already submitted our final report."

7. DISCUSSION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION: Dr. Celestino Fernandez said he was appreciative of the opportunity to address a few comments to the Senate regarding the Task Force on Undergraduate Education. "If we are, in fact, to improve the quality of undergraduate education at the University, it will require the involvement of all of us. I should preface my remarks by underscoring the fact that the Task Force believes that we have a first-rate university. Frequently in the discussion of the problem areas, we overlook that fact. At the same time, we recognized that there are a number of problems facing American higher education, in particular the University of Arizona, in the whole area of undergraduate education. President Pacheco appointed the Task Force last year to make recommendations. Basically the charge had two components: one was to develop a statement of philosophy and a set of principles and the other was to look at the structure and organization of undergraduate education and to make recommendations that would help us improve what we at the University are doing. The Task Force submitted its report last May. Since then it's been distributed widely. I hope that you've all had an opportunity to read that report and to review it. There are approximately 67 or 70 recommendations. As you know, they are not numbered, and many of the recommendations actually are contained in paragraphs prior to a series of bullets. The President has received the report and accepted it. It is my understanding that he is in agreement with the principles contained in the report. That does not mean that he is in full agreement with each and every recommendation contained therein. He has, as you know, made undergraduate education a priority for the University, one with which I think all of us agree.

"Certainly the faculty of this university are prepared to address this issue. Students have been raising concerns over the year. We have heard from the public, and we certainly will continue to hear. Of the 67 or so recommendations, there are probably five recommendations that are most critical. If they do not get implemented, the rest will have little impact. What we're dealing with here is really a matter of trying to change an institutional culture that has developed over a number of years. This culture did not come about in one year, and I can assure you that we're not going to change it in one year. But I believe that all of us working together can make very important strides and very significant strides this year. One of the five areas that we consider to be most critical is teaching, and that includes the role of regular faculty in undergraduate education, including lower-division instruction. It includes also the role of TAs, adjunct faculty and instructors. We have to come to terms with that. I think it's fair to say that we'd like to see more regular faculty teaching undergraduate courses, including lower-division courses. The report of the Task Force is not an attempt to change the University's mission. I think what we're about is bringing greater balance to our work.

"The second area would be the evaluation and reward structure. Without some modification, chances are that we will continue to behave as we have and continue with the priorities that we've had.

"The third area is that of the curriculum. It includes general education, the majors, the minors; it includes the freshman year, in particular, and even issues of diversity in the curriculum.

"The fourth area has to do with enrollment management, particularly internal enrollment management, and the fifth concerns admissions. There is already a great deal of discussion occurring on this latter point at the state level. President Pacheco is leading the discussion concerning admissions requirements for the University of Arizona. There are many many other recommendations. I think most of them can fit under these five or so categories. I've been visiting with as many groups as I can as early as possible this academic year so that we can begin the discussions concerning implementation of the report. President Pacheco has asked me to develop recommendations for implementation, by around December. A group of faculty and students is working with me on a regular basis. I hope that all of you, at every unit or college level, will be involved."

Senator Silverman asked how the implementation committee was appointed, and how its members were selected. Dr. Fernandez: "Most were members of the Task Force, and I took Senator Garcia's advice to include a member of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee." Senator Garcia stated that after the committee was appointed, he learned of its existence. "Upon learning of its existence, I said you should not ignore the Faculty Senate. It has a committee whose job this is. A name was added. There was no consultation whatsoever on the names of that committee." Senator Young said that although he is Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, he was informed of the appointment only when Professor Pao Tao told him she had been appointed. He said it was the first he had heard of it. Dr. Fernandez: "It was at my request that we met for an hour and a half with the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee. I hope that we continue to meet, and that not just one individual is involved, but that in fact the entire Senate and the entire faculty of this University takes ownership and becomes involved."

Senator Lewis: "You listed five areas. That indicates to me that these are the priorities. Is that the case?" Dr. Fernandez: "No, I'm saying that I think those are five critical areas. If those are not addressed, all of the other recommendations, even if implemented, will not change the culture of the University."

Senator J. O'Brien, noting that President Pacheco had taken the Senate through four ways to make change relative to funding, said that the only one he perceived to be operable was reallocation, and he wondered if it would really work. Dr. Fernandez: "I don't think this report will sit on the shelf. It is a living document, and there is every intention to work with the recommendations. There are many recommendations contained in the report that do not require resources. To some extent, it's a rededication of the commitment to our work. There are others that do have resource implications." Senator Cusanovich noted that reallocation is already occurring. "Basically it has to come from the department level and work its way up. One department has a curriculum moratorium coming up. In anticipation of that, they reviewed their curriculum and reduced a number of graduate courses, freeing resources that could be redirected to improvement of the undergraduate program. This is beginning to happen in many arenas out there. That's the kind of thing that has to occur. There are 67 different things that should occur. But the process really has to begin at the departmental level where they have to decide what they're going to do about their programs. They have to bring forward proposals if they need more resources or want to reallocate existing resources or any number of motifs. It's already

started in some colleges. Things are happening, and you will be seeing evidence in your Curriculum Bulletins as the semester progresses."

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: There being no objection, the Minutes of September 14, 1992, were approved as distributed.
9. APPROVAL OF CURRICULUM BULLETIN: Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 14, No. 10, was moved (motion 1992/93-14), seconded, and unanimously approved on a voice vote.
10. ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVES TO BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Dr. Cox asked Senators to complete the ballots placed on their desks today for election of two Senate representatives to the 1992-93 Budget and Strategic Planning Committee. She asked Secretary Roemer and Parliamentarian Sankey to collect and count the ballots. [At the conclusion of the regular session, Dr. Cox reported that Virginia Horak and Stanley S. Reynolds were elected.]
11. ACCEPTANCE OF ANNUAL PROMOTION AND TENURE REPORT: Dr. Dipankar Chakravarti, Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, reported the committee examined and discussed the statistics in the annual Promotion and Tenure Report, and proposed Senate acceptance. Senator Zwolinski so moved (motion 1992/93-15), and the motion was seconded. A voice vote indicated approval.
12. REPORTS
 - 12A. ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. Chakravarti reported the committee had met three times this semester, and has discussed taking action on a variety of issues including the Constitution and Bylaws. It has also reexamined and is in the process of working out some modifications and new proposals concerning the Guidelines for Periodic Reviews of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units. A resolution was submitted to the Senate last spring, and will be reintroduced this semester. The committee is considering a request from the Faculty of Humanities for consideration of Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and it completed its review of the promotion and tenure report statistics. Dr. Chakravarti said that work of the Peer Evaluation and Joint Appointments Subcommittees continues, and its next agenda will include Faculty Workload and the Sanctions proposals.
 - 12B. INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Young reported the committee had met with Dr. Fernandez on September 11 and spent at least an hour discussing the Report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Education. A report summarizing many of the key points from the discussion was included in the material mailed with today's agenda. One matter that occupied much of the committee's attention was the statement in the Task Force Report, "All professorial faculty shall teach with distinction at the undergraduate level." He said this appeared to be at variance with the Mission Themes Statement that Dr. Woodard presented, in which it says it is the responsibility of professorial faculty to conduct instructional programs with distinction at undergraduate and graduate levels. "I understand that the implementation committee is considering the idea that all letters of appointment emphasize the responsibility of faculty to teach at the undergraduate level and the recommendation that the President ask the Provost to implement such a recommendation effective immediately. I think this is something that needs to be discussed. I think there are faculty on this campus who may be excellent at supervising independent studies, or graduate students, but would be a disaster in the undergraduate classroom. I would support the idea that there are a wide variety of ways in which faculty members

can contribute significantly to the University. They don't all have to be outstanding teachers at the undergraduate level. I would like to see the Faculty Senate discuss this."

- 12C. RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. Barry Ganapol said the committee's September 18 meeting began with a discussion of the Conflict of Interest policy, covering the following points: (1) The Research Policy Committee (RPC) should ask for faculty input on the Conflict of Interest issue, fully realizing the differing opinions of various units on campus. (2) The document should allow for at least two separate routes concerning any dispute regarding a particular conflict of interest. (3) The document should be a living document with potential for revision by the Faculty Senate on a regular basis. (4) The document should contain definitions of the relevant terms, the legal principles involved, pertinent examples, and procedures concerning grievances. The discussion then turned to the Ad Hoc Committee on Infrastructure from the last academic year. The committee agreed to invite the chair of that committee to meet with it in the near future. The committee will meet again on October 9.
- 12D. REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Warburton reported the committee has been reviewing the report of the Task Force on Undergraduate Education as well as the concept of mandatory syllabi implementation. The committee is also meeting with the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee concerning grades and grading, and working with Dr. Saundra Taylor, the Vice President of Student Affairs, on minority and diversity issues. In addition, the committee is working with Dean of Students LuAnn Krager on the student athletes' Code of Conduct, and it has spent a lot of time on the computer fees and fee structure.
13. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Hildebrand said he would like to be edified as to how the ballot for seats on the Budget Committee was assembled, so that there were exactly two candidates for two positions. "I feel that it is really not a meaningful election, and I'd like to know how the ballot was put together." Senator Garcia said he could speak to that. "A request for nominations was made at the May and September meetings. Two names were brought forward. They are on the ballot, and that's it." Senator Hildebrand: "I think we need a procedure that would guarantee that we have a meaningful election. Otherwise, we should just welcome the Executive Committee to make appointments." Senator Garcia noted that the Senate had participated in the nomination process and had elected the two members.
14. NEW BUSINESS: Senator Hill said that, as the only representative of the College of Engineering and Mines, he wanted to ensure that the two resolutions introduced during Open Session received consideration at some point. He asked if it would be necessary to make a motion on a subsequent agenda, or would that automatically occur? Senator Garcia commented that a subsequent agenda would not do for the resolution concerning the clock because of the time factor. Senator Hill then moved (motion 1992/93-16) that the clock on the Faculty Senate procedures for the proposed reorganization within the College of Engineering and Mines be stopped for six weeks to allow for consultation with the Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics faculty. The motion was seconded.

Senator Cusanovich said he had some real problems with this. "We adopted a process to allow things to occur in a reasonable timeframe, and now we throw in a six-week delay the first time we have a case. First, without making judgment on the merits of the case, and I have made none, one way or the other, I know there has been much consultation and discussion. It's more complicated than

people realize because the four people coming out of the department have also been in my office expressing their rights and desires. It strikes me we have an adequate process if the President chooses to proceed with it. If it's a bad idea, then the process will reject it. Throwing in a six-week delay does not accomplish anything." Senator Hill said he understood the problem brought forth by the faculty of Civil Engineering is that the department was not really consulted in the process, as asserted in their resolutions.

Senator Lewis said he did not feel comfortable voting on an issue he did not understand sufficiently, especially regarding the ramifications of a six-week delay. "If there is concern with the process, then what needs to be reviewed is the process, and not necessarily the decision."

Senator Garcia said he believed the question to be addressed is whether the procedures set in place by the Senate last spring are being followed. "If, in fact, everything is being followed according to plan, we should let it ride. If it is not, then we should ask the President to go back and instruct the Deans properly." Senator Cusanovich responded that perhaps the other faculty in the Civil Engineering Department with a different viewpoint should be invited to present their perspective. He said he was not taking sides, but rather than the Senate making a decision based upon one piece of information, perhaps it should conduct a hearing in order to hear both sides.

Senator Silverman asked what has occurred thus far, and where the process is now. President Pacheco: "I can respond to that. We are being very careful about following the process set forth by this body. There is a potential problem in that process that we have compensated for and are now following. I am required to appoint a review committee, and to inform all affected faculty members of the action...Because there is not a provision for a member of this particular affected group, which is not defined as an affected group in the policy, I have provided for one of those people to be on the committee, so that whatever problems there might be could be aired within the committee. I would propose that you move forward with the policy that has been approved and consider the fact that we are compensating for that. Then you can come back and change your policy so that this problem doesn't arise in the future."

A voice vote appeared to indicate the motion was defeated. Dr. Cox then called for a show of hands. Senator Garcia, on a point of information, noted that the President had just assured the Senate that he intended to abide by the spirit of the resolution by ensuring that the affected body which petitioned the Senate will be represented on the committee. The vote continued with a show of hands, and Dr. Cox reported that motion 1992/93-16 had failed.

15. At 4:50 p.m., the Senate recessed prior to going into Executive Session to consider nominations for honorary degrees.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

16. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 5, 1992:
 1992/93-14 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 14, No. 10, Section I.
 1992/93-15 Acceptance of Annual 1991-92 Promotion and Tenure/Promotion and Continuing Status Report.
 1992/93-16 Defeat of motion to stop the clock for six weeks regarding a reorganization process in the College of Engineering and Mines.