

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA®
TUCSON ARIZONA

Mailing Address:
Faculty Center
The University of Arizona
PO Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

email: facsen@u.arizona.edu


Location:
Faculty Center
1400 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

Phone: (520) 621-1342
FAX: (520) 621-8844

Chair of the Faculty

April 27, 1999

TO: Peter Likins, President

FR: Jerry Hogle, Chair of the Faculty and 
Chair of the Advisory Committee on the Naming of Facilities (ACNF)

RE: Proposal for the Transformation of ACNF into **The Naming Advisory Committee**

Due to the expanded issues involving the naming of entities -- as well as rooms and buildings -- at this University, I am writing on behalf of the ACNF, which just met yesterday (minus Sharon Kha), to propose the following transformation of the current committee. I want to convey our unanimous recommendation that it be renamed "*The Naming Advisory Committee*," that it continue making recommendations to you, and that it have the following altered and expanded composition starting May 1, 1999:

Vice-Chair of the Faculty (*Committee Chair*)
President of the UA Foundation
President of the Arizona Alumni Association
Vice-President for Advancement
President of the Associated Students (ASUA)
Provost of the University
Chair of the Staff Advisory Council (SAC)
Chair of the Appointed Personnel Organization Council (APOC)
A Representative from the Deans' Council (elected by the Deans)
A Representative from the Faculty Senate (appointed by the Chair
of the Faculty)

Larry Schooley, the newly elected Vice Chair of the Faculty, has expressed a strong interest in chairing this revamped committee, an offer most welcome to the Chair of the Faculty, who will also become the Chair of the Arizona Faculties Council this summer. The ACNF endorses that idea wholeheartedly, and Professor Schooley is completely supportive of this proposal, to the point of being ready to administer the new Committee as of May 1. The last two listed members could be put in place quickly by an action in the Deans' Council and an appointment arranged by me.

Within this proposed membership structure, the ACNF also recommends certain general ground rules. In the case of each person except the Committee Chair and the Faculty Senate representative, any member may send a representative to the Committee permanently or occasionally, as long as each area is represented by a person authorized to vote *in writing* by the initial designee. In the absence of the Committee Chair, the representative from the Faculty Senate would take charge temporarily. All matters currently vetted through the ACNF would remain a part of this new Committee's charge. In addition, this Committee would consider all proposals for granting the names of individuals or non-academic groups to programmatic or organizational entities (academic and administrative units at the department level and above) at The University of Arizona and any branch of it. We recommend that the President promise not to act on any such proposal until a recommendation of this Committee has been submitted to the President's Office.

The ACNF urges that the routing of proposals be very precisely administered. Any renaming proposal for units, as now, should be submitted first to the Registrar's Office. Those proposals involving the *conceptual and/or academic* renaming of a unit would continue to flow from there, as they do now, towards examination by a Faculty Senate Committee and a vote in the Faculty Senate, all of which would result in a recommendation to the President. Those proposals (or parts of proposals) concerned with naming *an entity after an individual or group* should be routed by the Registrar's Office to the Naming Advisory Committee through the Office of the President. Proposals to rename buildings or rooms for individuals or groups should continue to be sent to the Committee through the President's Office, as is now the case. Suggested namings of smaller spaces, such as hallways and terraces, need not come to this group unless the President wishes it to consider such proposals in individual cases.

Of those proposals that reach the Naming Advisory Committee, there will generally be two types, and each type will be handled differently by the Committee as follows:

- 1. Routine naming requests:* These will be for parts of buildings or the names of streets and will normally be discussed and voted on through E-mail. The E-mail message to Committee each time will contain the needed information and rationale provided by the proposer or the Office of the President. Members should e-mail votes back to the Chair.
- 2. Major, larger-scale naming requests:* These will be for whole buildings or for any programmatic or organizational unit including and higher than a department. These will be discussed by the Committee in more detail, either through mailings and responses to them or through actual meetings (which will occur in the most far-reaching cases at the discretion of the Committee Chair). A vote of a building's occupants or a entity's relevant employee membership will normally need to accompany, or be quickly added to, each proposal. If a proposal is based on a gift to the University, the key details about the gift and how it will be given must be provided in writing to the Committee, who will maintain

Peter Likins, President

April 27, 1999

Page 3

appropriate confidentiality (not being a public body). Information should be particularly thorough for any naming proposal that must go forward eventually to the Arizona Board of Regents for approval as per current or future Regents policies. The Naming Advisory Committee will judge proposals, in fact, on the basis of guidelines that stem directly from Board of Regents policies about the naming of buildings or entities at the state universities in Arizona. The result of every Committee vote will be a recommendation to the President.

On behalf of the ACNF, the Vice Chair of the Faculty, and myself, I urge you to approve this proposal and disseminate all its elements and guidelines through the Deans and Vice-Presidents to all relevant personnel at this University. I will include the final approved form of this proposal in my report to the Faculty Senate on May 3. I should add that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee has reviewed this whole idea, following a presentation of it by me, and decided (within the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty) that the Faculty Senate need not vote directly on naming proposals other than those involving conceptual and/or academic wording. At the same time, they recognize that the presence of both the Vice Chair of the Faculty and another Senate representative on the Naming Advisory Committee is designed to ensure continuous Faculty Senate oversight regarding proposals for the naming of buildings, rooms, and/or programmatic entities after individuals or non-academic groups.

Thank you very much for your careful attention to these matters, as to so many others. I look forward to your response.

The current Advisory Committee on the Naming of Facilities (through May 1, 1999):

Jerry Hogle, Chair of the Faculty (Committee Chair)

Elizabeth Armandroff, Provost's Representative

Richard Imwalle, President, University of Arizona Foundation

Sharon Kha, Associate Vice President, UA Communications

Kent Rollins, President, Arizona Alumni Association (represented by Jay Rochlin)

Tara Taylor, President, Associated Students of The University of Arizona

cc: Larry Schooley, Vice Chair of the Faculty

All members of the Advisory Committee on the Naming of Facilities

April 30, 1999
Friday 9:30 pm

Commitments Relating to Sweatshops
Peter Likins

I am actively committed to the elimination of labor abuses in factories known as "sweatshops."

Initially, I will work toward these ends by personal and institutional participation in the Fair Labor Association (FLA) and by authorizing representatives of the University of Arizona to participate in the work of the Collegiate Licensing Company (CLC) (see addendum) and the Living Wage Symposium in Wisconsin (June 1999).

I will also recommend to the Faculty Senate the formation of an advisory task force (see addendum) to specifically address labor and human rights issues. This task force will be composed and ready for its first meeting by September 1999, and will meet monthly.

Within the framework of the FLA and the CLC, I will strive to achieve the following goals:

1. Full public disclosure (see addendum) of factory addresses for apparel companies and their contractors.
2. Assurances that all workers will receive a "living wage" by definitions to be established through independent scholarly research and consensus among such scholars.
3. Provision for unannounced visits and unannounced independent monitoring (see addendum) of factories selected without the participation of the companies whose factories, or whose contractors' factories, are being monitored.
4. Enforcement of the rights of women workers to equal pay for equal work, for pregnancy and maternity leave, and for freedom from discrimination and sexual harassment.

In order to assure compliance with the living wage and women's rights principles and to be able to identify any abusive labor conditions on a timely basis, it is essential and of the highest priority that the disclosure and monitoring provisions be implemented with all deliberate speed. As a result, vigorous efforts will be made to adopt the disclosure and monitoring principles no later than March 1, 2000 and implement them by September 1, 2000.

The University of Arizona commits to withdraw from the FLA if the FLA has failed to adopt all four principles in its Code of Conduct by August 1, 2000, and seek alternative means (see addendum). Any goals adopted by the FLA must be implemented by six months after their respective adoption dates, and if all four goals have not been implemented by February 1, 2001, the University of Arizona will seek alternative means. If full disclosure has not been implemented

by February 1, 2001, the University of Arizona will withdraw from the FLA, and seek alternative means.

The disclosure and monitoring provisions are to be adopted by the CLC in a Code of Conduct by March 1, 2000, and implemented by September 1, 2000. Should the task force and the president address the need for extension of adoption and implementation dates in the case of small corporations (see addendum), the dates may be extended for adoption and implementation no later than the specified dates of May 1, 2000 and November 1, 2000, respectively. If the disclosure and monitoring provisions are not adopted and implemented by the said dates, the University of Arizona will seek alternative means, understanding that withdrawal from the CLC will not be required.

Beginning March 1, 2000 the University of Arizona's new and renewal licensing contracts will require that licensees release directly to the University task force the addresses of all factories involved in manufacture of finished products and/or pieces thereof. This location disclosure requirement must be implemented within 30 days of signing the contract with an additional 30 days allowed for licensees contracting with brokers. The special provisions in the preceding paragraph for delaying the adoption of this requirement to May 1, 2000, for small companies also apply here.

Beginning as soon as possible but no later than August 15, 1999, the University will notify its licensees through the CLC of the following:

1. The incorporation of the principles contained in a CLC labor code into all new and renewal university licensing contracts after 90 days.
2. The University of Arizona's intent to work closely and constructively with its licensees to develop a reasonable plan for implementation of the principles enumerated in the CLC code.
3. The content and purpose of this commitment and its addendum. If by the deadlines specified herein the CLC has not been found to be a viable option for implementation of the four goals, and the University has adopted an alternative means, the University will supplement or substitute the CLC labor code with the labor code of the alternative means that the University has adopted.

In my capacity as President of the University of Arizona, I hereby promise to adhere to the letter and spirit of this commitment and addendum.

Commitments Relating to Sweatshops-Addendum

Peter Likins

April 30th, 1999

Friday 4:15pm

CLC

The CLC covers all significant contracts regarding licensing of university names/logos in the apparel industry. The University will require the implementation of CLC standards by all licensees contracting with the University or CLC regarding licensed apparel. The university will apply the CLC standards to all new and renewed purchasing and/or supply contracts with licensees for the uniforms and equipment of all university organizations, with the exception of nonprofit student clubs or academic units.

Task Force

President Likins will recommend to the Faculty Senate the formation of a task force to specifically address labor and human rights issues in the following manner:

SAS and President Likins will each present to the Faculty Senate a list of twelve names of persons who have demonstrated interests and/or area of expertise in labor and human rights issues. President Likins and SAS will request that the Faculty Senate appoint six people from each list, for a total of twelve people in the task force. The task force will embody the necessary and sufficient conditions for deliberative democracy, for example, equal voting power. The task force must be composed and ready for its first meeting by September 1999. The task force will meet monthly and duly supply the president and SAS with copies of the minutes of the meetings. The task force will supply regular recommendations to the president regarding policies, charters and processes being considered by FLA, CLC, and other similar organizations. In addition, the task force will make recommendations (e.g. economic sanctions) regarding relations with apparel companies that are licensees of the University and which have not implemented the four principles of the Commitment and/or have been credibly identified as having abusive labor conditions in their factories or those of their contractors. The president should regularly inform the task force of the state and progress regarding implementation of the four provisions within the FLA, CLC or other similar organizations. The president will also meet with the task force on the dates of each relevant deadline, and, when possible, on other dates deemed necessary by the president and/or the task force. At these meetings, the task force will publicly supply the president with a copy of a report on progress toward implementation, the status of alternative means and its recommendations for university action directed at implementation.

Public Disclosure

With reference to the University of Arizona, this involves the release of factory addresses directly to the task force by University licensees. The University shall require such direct communication between licensees and the task force even if the monitoring mechanism of which the University is a member itself acts as a clearinghouse for public dissemination of such communications.

However, Goal #1 will be deemed to be satisfied even if the monitoring organization acts as a

clearinghouse with respect only to non-licensees of the University of Arizona. For small corporations, the flow of information will move to the task force through the most direct means, individual or collective. In all cases, each corporation will disclose the address of each of its factories, and identify those factories as its own.

Independent Monitoring

To be accredited as an "independent" monitor, the qualifying person or group shall have no monetary interest in the outcome of the monitoring process, although they can be paid for monitoring services. Independent monitors for unannounced visitations will not be chosen by the individual corporation whose factories or whose contractors' factories are being visited. In addition, independent monitors shall not be accredited or chosen by a group dominated by corporate interests, but rather by a group with fair and balanced representation of corporations, universities, human rights organizations, and preferably labor organizations.

Alternative Means

The alternative means must have substantial representation of universities, labor organizations, and human rights organizations. Decision making in said alternative means must embody the necessary and sufficient conditions for deliberative democracy. Said alternative means must include a code of conduct, and that code of conduct must be further along (and still moving) towards implementation of the four principles than the monitoring mechanism in which the university is at that time pursuing the four principles. It is understood that merely seeking alternative means does not require outright withdrawal from said mechanism. Once such means are identified, however, the University shall immediately withdraw from said mechanism and join the alternative means. This stipulation would not require withdrawal from the CLC as a licensing consortium, but it may require implementation of a code on behalf of the University of Arizona which is distinct from the CLC Code applicable to other schools, and may also require that the University would not rely exclusively on CLC or a general collegiate code to achieve its human rights goals. In the specific case of the FLA, finding alternative means need not trigger withdrawal; however, any withdrawal date specified in the Commitment must be honored. The task force should be in a position to identify alternative means whenever a relevant deadline arises. This is understood to require anticipatory action to inform itself of the existence and nature of alternatives.

Small Corporations

Small corporations will temporarily be defined as organizations with 25 or fewer direct or indirect employees. This definition may be modified by consent of SAS, the task force, and the president, all three in agreement.

SAS

SAS (Students Against Sweatshops) is understood to be a University-recognized student organization that embodies the necessary and sufficient conditions for deliberative democracy.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
Faculty Senate
May 3, 1999

Nominees for Membership on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee

5/1/99-4/30/01

One to be elected.

ZWOLINSKI, MALCOLM J., Professor, School of Renewable Natural Resources (1964). From 1993 to 1995 I served as your Presiding Officer and for the past four years as your representative to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. I support and endorse the role of the Faculty Senate on the campus of The University of Arizona, and would like to work with the Senate's leadership during the coming year. I will continue to seek stronger cooperative ties between the administration and the faculty and to be an advocate for shared governance on campus.

Nominees for Membership on the Committee on Conciliation

(5/1/99-4/30/01)

Three to be elected.

BIEGING, JOHN H., Associate Professor, Astronomy (1990). I am also the Undergraduate Program Director for the department, and am mainly concerned with the astronomy majors' program, including teaching and curriculum issues, student recruitment, undergraduate research opportunities, and leading our group of faculty advisors for undergraduates. From 1993-98 I also dealt with the introductory astronomy courses for general education, including teaching assignments, lab course graduate TAs, and undergraduate teaching support positions. I am also a member of the department's Academic Program Committee. As Undergraduate Program Director I have interacted with a variety of University administrative offices, including Admissions, Undergraduate Education, and Scholarships, and with other departments, particularly Physics. This work has given me some familiarity with areas of the University of particular importance to students, especially undergraduates. I obtained my Ph.D. in Astronomy from the California Institute of Technology in 1974. I held a postdoctoral fellowship and then a staff scientist position at the Max Planck Institute for Radio Astronomy in Bonn, Germany. Prior to joining the U of A faculty, I was a member of the research staff of the Radio Astronomy Laboratory at the University of California at Berkeley from 1978-90, where my work was principally in astronomical research, with some teaching duties.

BROWN, PAUL W., Extension Specialist and Research Scientist; Soil, Water and Environmental Science (1985). I serve as Extension Specialist in the area of biometeorology and oversee the operation of the Arizona Meteorological Network, which provides weather-related information to agricultural and horticultural interests in Arizona. My research examines the impact of the atmospheric environment on biological systems, and my teaching activities are focused on providing continuing outreach education. Open communication and unbiased interpretation of official policies and regulations should be the tools used to address and solve disputes/issues brought before the committee.

FRIEDMAN, RICHARD L., Professor, Microbiology and Immunology (1984). Ph.D. in Microbiology, Michigan State University, 1979. Served on the following University-level committees at The University of Arizona: Trainee Progress Committee, Cancer Biology Training Grant (1988-92), Research Project Review Committee, Arizona Agricultural Experimental Station (1986, 1988), Grant Reviewer, BRSB Committee (1987), Grant Reviewer, Small Grants Committee (1994), Graduate College Committee (1992-present), Arizona Arthritis Center (1991-present), Undergraduate Biology Research Program (1990-present), Member, Summer Research Program for Minority Undergraduate Students (1998-present). Since coming to the University I have also served on numerous college (past member of Student Appeals Committee, Code of Scholastic Conduct Committee, Curriculum Committee) and departmental committees (Past Chairman, Microbiology and Immunology Graduate Program, Promotion and Tenure

Committee). Serving on the Committee on Conciliation is an important responsibility to both the faculty and the University community as a whole. This committee plays a key role in arbitrating disputes and preventing their escalation into costly litigation and embarrassment to the University. I believe my past experiences make me well suited to serve on this important committee.

HENDERSON, JOYCE, Associate Curator, Art. Completing my twentieth year at The University of Arizona for the same department and in the same academic professional position gives me an interesting and well-informed view of the University community. I have known and worked with an extremely talented and productive faculty over these years as well as four Art Department Heads and three College of Fine Arts Deans. My position provides information and materials to a specific discipline as well as consultations with other University departments who need slides for their courses.

MC CRAY, JEANETTE CONOVER, Deputy Director, Arizona Health Sciences Library (1974); Librarian, continuing, College of Medicine. I've been involved in various departmental, college and University committees over the years. For the last three years, I've been a member of the University-wide continuing status and promotion committee, the last year as chair. I'm interested in continuing to participate at the University level, and I believe it is important to provide opportunities to mediate disputes in a non-threatening environment before they escalate further.

MC KEE, CECILE, Associate Professor, Linguistics (also appointed in Psychology, Cognitive Science, and SLAT). Ph.D. from the University of Connecticut, 1988. I came to the UA as a post-doctoral fellow in 1988. In 1991, I moved to the University of Washington as an Assistant Professor. I've been back here since 1994. Most of my service has related to faculty development and undergraduate teaching (e.g., Faculty Development Team, General Education program, and departmental curriculum committee). My research concerns children's language development. It has helped me connect to some local elementary schools—outreach activity that I want to increase. My teaching is split between courses on language development and a section of INDV101.

VERRAN, JOYCE A., Professor, Nursing. Ph.D., R.N., F.A.A.N.. Interim Director of the Nursing Systems Division at the College of Nursing. Dr. Verran has been a member of the faculty since 1982 and served from 1982 to 1995 as the Director for the Adult Health Division. She has served on a number of committees at the College level, including Promotion and Tenure, Faculty Recruitment and Graduate Student Admissions. Currently she is the Chair of the College of Nursing Faculty and served in the last academic year as Vice Chair. She is also a member of the Graduate Studies Committee. Dr. Verran received her B.S.N., M.S. and Ph.D. from The University of Arizona.

WRIGHT, EWAN M., Associate Professor, Optical Sciences and Physics (1985). Ph.D. in Physics, Heriot-Watt University, Scotland, 1983. Currently serving as a Graduate Representative. This is my first venture into service on University-wide committees so I can claim no particular experience. However, given that one must start somewhere, the Committee on Conciliation seems a unique opportunity since one is directly exposed to important issues that arise between the University and the General Faculty.

Nominees for Membership on the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment

Eight to be elected, varying terms. The top four vote recipients will serve three-year terms (5/1/99-4/30/02). The two candidates in fifth and sixth place will serve two-year terms (5/1/99-4/30/01). The two candidates in seventh and eighth place will serve one-year terms (5/1/99-4/30/00).

ANTIA, SHIRIN, Professor, Special Education, Rehabilitation and School Psychology. I received a B.A. degree from Calcutta University, and M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in Special Education at the University of Pittsburgh. I currently coordinate the teacher preparation program in the deaf/hard of hearing specialization in the Department. I teach courses in research in special education, language development in exceptional children, and language and literacy assessment and intervention for deaf/hard of hearing children. I have completed extensive research on peer interaction, social integration and inclusion of deaf and hard of hearing children in segregated and integrated school environments. Because of my belief in faculty governance, I have taken the time to serve on several committees at the University, College, and

Department level. At the University level I have served on the Committee on Conciliation and the Graduate Council. I have also been a member of the Department and College Promotion and Tenure Committees, College of Education Council, and chaired the College of Education research facilitation study group in 1998. I am interested in conflict resolution and ensuring that all members of the University community receive a fair hearing in all aspects of University life.

BESSELS, DAVID G., Associate Veterinary Specialist (continuing-eligible), University Animal Care; Adjunct Associate Research Scientist, Veterinary Sciences and Microbiology. I joined The University of Arizona in 1995 after completing my D.V.M. and Ph.D. degrees and a residency in laboratory animal medicine at the University of Missouri. My current position entails many activities which include research animal support, collaborative and independent research, and teaching and mentoring at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. I have interacted with numerous faculty, staff, and students on campus, and through these interactions I have gained an appreciation for the diversity and talent on our campus as well as an understanding of the inner workings of our University system. I have a keen interest in getting more involved in University service to continue to learn about our University system and to contribute to its excellence. I would therefore gladly serve on the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment. My approach to this committee would be to provide the benefit of doubt to the party involved while strictly maintaining the integrity of our University.

COATES, WAYNE, Research Professor, Office of Arid Lands Studies. Received Bachelor's in Agriculture (1969) and Master's in Agricultural Engineering (1970) from the University of Alberta, and Ph.D. in Agricultural Engineering (1973) from Oklahoma State University. Joined The University of Arizona in 1981 as an Associate Professor, following eight years working in Canada for federal and provincial governments. Was promoted to Professor in 1991. His research program has been heavily involved with new crops, with the principal emphasis being development of equipment to facilitate diversification of agricultural production on a commercial basis. In addition he has worked on production agricultural mechanization issues and has developed several pieces of equipment. His research program has been international in scope, principally in the U.S., the Middle East and Latin America. He has served on a number of departmental committees, including promotion and tenure, continuing appointment, and post-tenure reviews. Statement: I believe that the tenure system has a valuable role in protecting faculty members who reflect diverse cultures, viewpoints, and teaching/research programs.

CROISSANT, JENNIFER L., Assistant Professor, Materials Science and Engineering. Program on Culture, Science, Technology, and Society. Research activities include the sociology and anthropology of science, knowledge and technology, and issues surrounding ethics and values in science and engineering practice. Specific projects include a study of organizational culture and technological change in the U.S. steel industry, an examination of the political economics of bioengineered flavorings, and ongoing work on information technology and change in academic life. Currently serving on the Council for the Society for Social Studies of Science (4S), and past Council member for the American Sociological Association Section on Science, Knowledge, and Technology (ASA-SKAT). Series editor for SUNY Press in Science, Technology, and Society, and Program Chair for the 1997 and 1999 4S Annual Meetings.

FISH, PAUL R., Head, Archaeology Division, Arizona State Museum; Professor, Anthropology. Ph.D., Arizona State University, 1976. Prior to coming to The University of Arizona in 1979, he taught at the University of Georgia. His current research focuses on subsistence and settlement patterns among prehistoric agriculturalists in southern Arizona and northwest Mexico and early fishermen in coastal Brazil. He coordinates the Southwest Studies program in Anthropology and oversees Arizona State Museum responsibilities in administering the Arizona Antiquities Act. Projects in Latin America provide extensive exposure to the ethics of multinational collaborative research. His experience as an archaeological administrator has developed skills in balancing the concerns and values of diverse constituencies including researchers, students, Native Americans, government agencies, and land developers.

HOLCOMB, MARY, Assistant Librarian, AHSC Library. I have been Head of Technical Services for the Arizona Health Sciences Library for about two years. Prior to taking this position and after completing my MLS in 1986 I worked as a catalog librarian on temporary assignments, first at the UA Main Library and later at the AHSL. In addition to the M.L.S., my academic credentials include a B.S. in biology from Abilene Christian University and an M.A. in Near Eastern Studies from The University of Arizona. My professional credentials include service on several AHSL committees, currently including our peer review committee and our web advisory committee, as well as membership in several professional organizations. My personal credentials include a strong interest in and commitment to ethical issues. I look forward to an opportunity to participate in University-level service on the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment.

JONES, ELAINE G., Associate Professor and Director of Clinical Scholarship, College of Nursing. I have been a faculty member for more than 15 years. I have served as a member and chair of the Undergraduate Council, a reader for UDWPE, and a member of "Heads Up" organization for department heads. I have considerable experience with resolving controversial issues among faculty at the departmental level. For example, I conducted annual faculty evaluations, and negotiated faculty teaching assignments and workloads for two years as an interim Director for the Nursing Systems Division. Most recently, I served as chair of the Merit-Salary Committee, which included formulation of criteria for ranking faculty performance and percentages of salary increases. The role of the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment is crucial; I would welcome an opportunity to participate on the committee.

KRELL, MARC, Assistant Professor, Committee on Judaic Studies. He received his doctorate from the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, CA in May, 1998 in the Cultural and Historical Study of Religions. His particular area of expertise is Jewish intellectual history with a special emphasis on Modern Jewish Thought. He received a Master's Degree in Jewish Studies from the University of Judaism in Los Angeles, CA. Professor Krell's research focuses on Jewish-Christian dialectical symbiosis in the twentieth century as it appears in the work of Jewish theologians in Germany and the United States prior to and following the Holocaust. He has published an article in *Shofar* entitled, "Comparative Philosophical Approaches toward Salvation" and presented papers at various conferences sponsored by the Association for Jewish Studies and the American Academy of Religion dealing with Jewish-Christian symbiosis. His dissertation is entitled "Intersecting Pathways: Jewish Appropriations of Christian Motifs in the Twentieth Century" and is presently under review as a manuscript with Syracuse University Press. Professor Krell is currently constructing a dialogical post-Holocaust theology of the Jewish-Christian reality, drawing primarily upon the metaphysical cosmology of process thought, post-modern feminist theory, and Emmanuel Levinas' "ethics of alterity."

LARSON, CAROL, Associate Professor, Teaching and Teacher Education (1976). I have served on the following University-level committees at The University of Arizona: Committee on Graduate Study (1979-83), Committee on Academic Integrity (1981-84), Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (1988-91), Committee on Committees (1991-95), Inter-College Science Education Committee (1989-94), Committee on Conciliation (1995-97), Science and Mathematics Education Center (1994-present), and University Hearing Board (1998-present). I have also served on numerous college and departmental committees, e.g., peer review, salary issues, College Council, P & T, curriculum, etc. I am a mathematics educator whose research focus is on students' development of rational number concepts. I have a lot of experience in reviewing research articles and grant proposals in my field; I've chaired an editorial board for a research journal, and was vice president for publications of a professional organization. I believe in the importance of faculty governance at this University and our need as faculty to participate in difficult endeavors. My previous work on CAFT and the Committee on Conciliation has made me aware of many issues that can arise around misunderstandings and lack of clear guidelines. I would bring this knowledge to bear on my work for this committee.

LUPRECHT, MARK, Director, Humanities Program. Mark Luprecht has been teaching for the UA Humanities Program since 1987, and was elected as its Director in 1997. As a member of the Program, he has taught undergraduates exclusively, and has been concerned mainly with issues relating to the undergraduate

experience. He has served on the College of Arts and Sciences Grade Appeal Committee (1992-95) and the Core Curriculum Faculty Development Committee (1994-95). More recently Dr. Luprecht has been a member of the University-wide General Education Committee (1995-present), and has acted as faculty advisor for the Golden Key National Honorary Society (1995-present). The Humanities Program reports directly to the Vice President for Undergraduate Education. Therefore, Mark Luprecht has no "college" agenda—he can serve as an impartial, objective member of the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment.

OCHMAN, HOWARD, Professor, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. I joined the faculty at The University of Arizona in August 1998. I am seeking membership on the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment because this would be a useful way for me to serve the University community.

PATZER, DAVID R., Assistant Professor, Psychiatry. David Patzer, M.D., grew up in the Chicago area and Central Illinois. After graduating Magna Cum Laude from Illinois Wesleyan University, he attended Northwestern University College of Medicine from 1985-89. Dr. Patzer graduated there, earning membership to the honor society of Alpha Omega Alpha. He then began residency training in General Surgery at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. Dr. Patzer completed three years of surgical training but decided to change careers, entering a Psychiatry residency training program. He completed his first year of Psychiatry training at the University of Alabama, then transferred to Yale University College of Medicine, where he completed his last two years of General Psychiatry residency. Dr. Patzer then completed a Child Psychiatry fellowship at the Yale Child Study Center. He joined the faculty of the Yale Child Study Center, where he was Assistant Medical Director of the Yale-New Haven Hospital child psychiatry in-patient service. He also worked as a supervisor in the Yale Developmental Disability Clinic, where he was involved in evaluations, treatment, and research. In August 1998 Dr. Patzer joined the faculty of The University of Arizona College of Medicine in a tenure-track position as Assistant Professor of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. He is currently an attending psychiatrist on the Palo Verde Hospital Youth Unit and seeing children in community clinics. In addition to teaching, Dr. Patzer is establishing a Child Neuropsychiatric/Developmental Disabilities clinic at The University of Arizona, and he is leading research projects involving treatment of ADHD and Autism. Dr. Patzer has co-authored several textbooks and journal articles on the Pervasive Developmental Disorders.

PETERSON, MARY A., Associate Research Social Scientist, Cognitive Science Program. Dr. Peterson received her Ph.D. from Columbia University in January, 1984. Her first academic position was at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. She moved to The University of Arizona in 1988, where she is both a faculty member in the Psychology Department and a Research Social Scientist in the Cognitive Science Program. Since the spring of 1995 she has been the Director of the Cognitive Psychology Program within the Psychology Department. Over the years she has served on numerous department and college committees, including the Human Subjects Committee in the Psychology Department, and is currently the Honors Advisor for psychology majors. In addition, she has served her field as Associate Editor of the *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* since July, 1996. Her research concerns visual perception and cognition. She has had an abiding interest in ethics since the beginning of her training as a research scientist.

TURZILLO, ADELE M., Assistant Professor, Physiology. I received my Ph.D. in Physiology from Cornell University in 1992 and completed postdoctoral training at Colorado State University. I joined the faculty at The University of Arizona in August of 1998. My current responsibilities include teaching physiology to undergraduate and graduate students and basic research in reproductive physiology. I was a member of the Advisory Committee at Colorado State University. I have also served on the Animal Care Committee and the Education Committee for the Society for the Study of Reproduction (an international society that focuses on important problems in human and animal reproduction as they relate to medicine, agriculture, and basic biology). I was the independent recipient of a major federal research grant during my postdoctoral training and thus am familiar with the management of federal research funds and proper use of research facilities. I am firmly committed to promoting professional integrity and ethical conduct in

the academic research community. As a new independent investigator, I believe I can offer a fresh approach to the issues faced by the Committee on Ethics and Commitment.

WILSON-SANDERS, SUSAN E., Director, University Animal Care; Veterinary Specialist, Continuing, COM; Adjunct Professor, Veterinary Science and Microbiology. Previous service: departmental, college and University continuing status committees; Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee, University and Clinical Radioisotope Committees, Pre-Health Professions Committee, Committee on Conciliation, Faculty Senate. Much of my career with the University has been devoted to helping ensure that our biomedical research programs adhere to the highest ethical standards. As a result, I have become very familiar with research integrity issues. In 1996, I drafted the IACUC's SOP for investigating complaints from the University community and public to meet the Federal Animal Welfare Act's whistle-blower's clause. These experiences have prepared me for service on the UCEC, and I look forward to having the opportunity to serve our faculty, professionals and staff as their representative on this important committee. [Dr. Wilson-Sanders is currently serving on the Committee on Conciliation; her term expires 4/30/00.]

Nominees for Membership on the University Hearing Board

Five to be elected—four for three-year terms (5/1/99-4/30/02) and one for a special one-year term (5/1/99-4/30/00) to fill a vacancy. The top four vote recipients will serve three-year terms; the candidate in fifth place will serve the special one-year term.

CLASSEN, ALBRECHT, Professor of German Studies (1987). Dr. Classen teaches and researches medieval and early modern German literature and culture with an emphasis on women's studies, history of mentality, and comparative approaches. He served as Undergraduate Advisor from 1992 to the present with only one year intermittent, and as Advisor to the German Student Club since 1991. He won the El Paso Natural Gas Foundation Faculty Achievement Award in 1995, and the Provost's General Education Teaching Award in 1999.

COX, EMILY R., Assistant Professor, Pharmacy (1995). Dr. Cox's research focuses on medication usage among geriatric patient populations, the impact of drug benefit design on medication usage among geriatric patient populations, the application of pharmacoeconomic evaluations to health technology, and the psychosocial factors influencing patient and provider decisions regarding drug therapy. Within the College of Pharmacy she has served on the Curriculum Committee, Pharmaceutical Sciences Graduate Affairs Committee, and is currently co-chair of the Admissions Committee. Statement: I have worked extensively with undergraduate and professional students at The University of Arizona in many different facets. I understand the importance of maintaining excellence in academic standards while also providing a fair and judicious process of review for all those involved in individual cases.

HEYNING, KATHARINA E., Assistant Professor, Teaching and Teacher Education (1997). Dr. Heyning received her Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, her M.Ed. from National-Louis University and her B.S. in Education from Central Michigan University. She has worked in various capacities since arriving at the UA, including being a Graduate Student Representative on final oral examinations for the Graduate School and serving as the membership treasurer for the Association for Women Faculty. She teaches a variety of courses in the College of Education and has been involved in the restructuring of the undergraduate teacher education program to meet current state certification standards. Her research focuses on teacher education reform, history, and the sociology of education.

LANGENDOEN, D. TERENCE, Professor, Linguistics. I received my Ph.D. in Linguistics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1964. I taught at Ohio State University from 1964 to 1969, City University of New York from 1969 to 1988, and University of Arizona since 1988. I was Executive Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Linguistics at the CUNY Graduate Center from 1971 to 1978, Director of the Program in Linguistics at Brooklyn College, CUNY, from 1979 to 1986, and Head of the Department of Linguistics at U Arizona from 1988 to 1997. I currently edit *Linguistics Abstracts* published by Blackwell in both print and electronic form. I was president of the Linguistic Society of America in 1998,

and am currently chair of Section Z, Linguistics and Language Science of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a member of the advisory board for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics administered by the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, D.C.

MAY, KATHLEEN M., Associate Professor, Nursing (1987) (1993). After serving on the faculty 1987-90 I did a postdoctoral fellowship, after which I returned to the faculty in 1993. My University service has included College of Nursing Admissions, Curriculum, and Research Committees, Executive Committee of the Arizona Graduate Program in Public Health, Governing Board of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, and the University Committee on Graduate Study. My research interests are in public health, particularly with underserved populations, and partnership with communities for disease prevention and health promotion. Through teaching I have experience with supporting the Code of Conduct and the Code of Academic Integrity.

MC GRATH, DOMINIC V., Assistant Professor, Chemistry (1998). Dr. McGrath joined the University after four years as an Assistant Professor at the University of Connecticut, Storrs. He received his B.S. degree in chemistry from Yale University (1986) and his Ph.D. (1992) from the California Institute of Technology. After two postdoctoral appointments, one at the Scripps Research Institute (1992-94) and the second at the Beckman Institute at Caltech (1994), he joined the faculty at the University of Connecticut, Storrs, in 1994. He has been with The University of Arizona since August, 1998. His research interests include the preparation of new organic macromolecular architectures and transition-metal catalyzed asymmetric synthesis. Dr. McGrath's University service has included a position on the University Laboratory Safety Committee (UConn), and he has served as chair of the Department of Chemistry Graduate Affairs Committee (UConn). He is a member of the American Chemical Society Younger Chemist Committee.

QUINTERO, GILBERT, Assistant Professor, Mexican American Studies and Research Center. I am a cultural anthropologist. My major research interests are in medical anthropology, including cultural aspects of addiction, the political ecology of disease, the semantics of illness, and the social contexts of HIV risk behaviors. I have an active interest in undergraduate curriculum issues and have presided as Chair of the Center's Undergraduate Program for the last two years. In this time I have led efforts to establish two new General Education courses, coordinated the overall development of the Center's Student Assessment Plan, and am currently working to revise our major requirements. My interest in serving on the University Hearing Board stems from these experiences in undergraduate curriculum issues and from the desire to maintain the integrity, objectivity, and fairness of procedures relating to alleged student violations of the Code of Conduct and the Code of Academic Integrity. In addition, I am interested in serving on the University Hearing Board since it will provide an opportunity for interacting with colleagues from a variety of other backgrounds and disciplines.

REGNIER, JAN P., Director, Office of School Accreditation (1987). Dr. Regnier is the Arizona State Director of the North Central Association and has been a voting member of the NCA Commission on Schools for 20 years. Prior to assuming the leadership of the Arizona NCA activities in 1987, Dr. Regnier was a member of the Indiana NCA State Committee for 12 years. As State Director of the Arizona NCA, more than 90% of his professional responsibilities involve working with K-12 schools throughout the state. These include numerous consultant activities, workshops, conferences, and inservice activities relating to school improvement efforts, all of which are research-based. Other collegiate assignments include: Grader for Upper-division Writing Proficiency Exam (UDWPE); member of Administrative Council, College of Education (1991-92); and member of University Hearing Board (1996-97). Dr. Regnier is again seeking election to the University Hearing Board.

REID, EDWARD F., Assistant Professor of Music (1994). Professor Reid also serves as Principal Trumpet of the Tucson Symphony Orchestra, where he has played for 12 years. He received B.M. and M.M. degrees from the Eastman School of Music, where he studied with Barbara Butler, Sidney Mear and Allan Dean. In addition to his University and TSO duties, he is also Principal Trumpet of the Flagstaff Festival of the Arts Orchestra, a member of the New Sousa Band, and has performed with the Grand Teton Music Festival Orchestra in Jackson, Wyoming, the Phoenix Symphony Orchestra and the Heidelberg Castle

Festival Orchestra in Germany. He has appeared as a soloist with, among others, the Tucson Symphony, Dallas Brass, the Arizona Symphonic Winds and The University of Arizona Wind Symphony. At the University, Professor Reid has been serving on the Parking and Transportation Committee and acted as Master of Ceremonies for a School of Music benefit concert. He also serves on several School of Music internal committees. Within the Tucson Symphony, Professor Reid has been a member of the Negotiating Committee for three separate contracts. He also served on the TSO Board of Directors' Finance Committee for five years. He is married to Hannah Albrecht, a violinist in the TSO, and they have one son, Harrison.

Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
For possible Faculty Senate action on May 3, 1999

Academic unit reorganization (effective 7/1/99): Section of Orthopedic Surgery in Department of Surgery to Department of Orthopedic Surgery.

Justification: The purpose of this change is to establish a Department of Orthopedic Surgery in the College of Medicine. Most medical schools have orthopedics as a separate academic department. Currently, the Section of Orthopedic Surgery is a section within the Department of Surgery and the head of the section of Orthopedic Surgery reports to the head of the Department of Surgery. As a Department of Orthopedic Surgery, the head will report directly to the Dean of the College of Medicine. The charge to the new department head will be to strength the research mission of the department while maintaining its superb teaching and service accomplishments.

Over the past six years, since retirement in 1992 of its former section chief, the Section has lost much of its research focus. Surgeons have switched from the tenure eligible track to the clinical track and newly recruited surgeons have been hired on the clinical track primarily because the demands of clinical care have left little time for scholarship. Three of the present surgeons (one tenured associate professor and two assistant professors of clinical surgery) will be leaving for private practice because of lack of research/scholarship in the present orthopedic section. At least four of the six surgeons who will be recruited over the next three years will be tenured or tenure eligible.

No new state appropriations are requested. Existing state funds will be reallocated. Research grants and contracts and endowments are identified as other sources for funding.

Approvals: ICPC 4/13/99.

Delete degree (effective 7/1/99): BS in Biochemistry from College of Agriculture.

Currently a bachelor's degree in biochemistry is available through either the College of Agriculture or the College of Science. Deleting the BS in Agriculture leaves the biochemistry degree available through the College of Science.

Approvals: Undergraduate Council, 4/13/99
ICPC, 4/13/99.

Degree name change correction (effective 7/1/99): B.A. with a major in Dramatic Theory to BA with a major in Theatre Arts.

The Faculty Senate at its January 22, 1996 meeting approved degree name changes: "the B.A. degree in Art to the B.A. degree with a major in art; the B.A. degree in Media Arts to the B.A. degree with a major in media arts; the B.A. degree in Music to the B.A. degree with a major in music; and the B.A. degree in Theatre Arts to the B.A. degree with a major in theatre arts." This action was approved by ABOR at its May 31, 1996 meeting. A technical issue has surfaced in that the major name in use in the Theatre Arts Department at the time this degree name change was proposed was not theatre arts but dramatic theory. While the Theatre Arts Department uses the wording B.A. degree with a major in theatre arts for all their publications, the actual degree awarded and appearing on transcripts is B.A. with a major in Dramatic Theory. The Theatre Arts Department requests a degree name change to correct this oversight.

Approvals: Undergraduate Council, 4/13/99
ICPC, 4/13/99.

New Degree (effective 7/1/99): BA in Physics.

[Source: Supporting documentation by Doug Toussaint] The physics department currently offers a BS degree, which is designed for students requiring an intensive preparation in physics, and provides the necessary background for graduate studies in physics or related fields. However, just as in any other field, not everyone wanting to major in physics is planning a career as a researcher in physics for a similar field. Another group of students may desire a physics degree as part of a more general education.

In the past, we try to serve both groups by keeping our requirements fairly general, but advising graduate school bound students to follow a more intensive course. This did not work. We decided to strengthen our BS requirements and add a BA degree for students planning on a career outside of physics, or who simply wish to pursue a broader education. The proposed B.A. is not a lesser degree; is a more flexible degree. It offers the possibility to explore other fields, and even to double major in physics and an unrelated field.

Physics departments in many other universities offer both BA and BS degrees with a distinction similar to that proposed here.

Approvals: Undergraduate Council, 4/13/99
ICPC, 4/13/99.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE

A Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate

ANNUAL REPORT 1998-99

Committee Members:

Anne E. (Betty) Atwater, Co-Chair, Physiology
Timothy Troy, Co-Chair, Center for Creative Photography
Dennis Larson, Agricultural & Biosystems Engineering
Andrew Lyons, ASUA
Mitchel McClaran, Renewable Natural Resources
Robert Mitchell, University Library
Gerald Monsman, English
Andrew Silvernan, College of Law

ACTIVITIES:

The Academic Personnel Policy Committee met numerous times this last academic year to grapple with a number of issues, most notably the Interim Whistle-blower Policy.

PROMOTION & TENURE STATISTICS:

Promotion and Tenure statistics for 1997-98 were presented at the December Faculty Senate meeting. It was noted that the pattern of these statistics conformed to patterns of previous years.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY:

A discussion was begun at the October 1998 Faculty Senate meeting on the interim Sexual Harassment Policy brought forward by the UA Affirmative Action Office. Discussion was continued at the November meeting, but the Senate decided not to vote for the policy's adoption until certain points within the document were clarified or resolved. These issues centered primarily on due process, conflict of interest, anonymous complaints, and confidentiality. It is doubtful that the revised policy will be brought forward to the Faculty Senate for its consideration again until the 1999-2000 academic year.

WHISTLE-BLOWER POLICY:

A new draft of the UA Whistle-Blower Policy was brought forward by APPC for discussion at the January 25, 1999 Faculty Senate meeting. Additional comments were called for at the February 8, 1999 Senate meeting. Comments and suggestions also were solicited from the Staff Advisory Council and Appointed Personnel Organization Council. Debate continued at the March 1, 1999 Senate meeting and at a special March 22nd meeting devoted entirely to the whistle-blower issue. The key issues discussed are summarized in the minutes of the Faculty Senate meetings and include the following: the issue of inherent conflict of interest by the UA Attorney's Office; what constitutes "adverse personnel actions", the expansion of the "University officer" definition, the selection process and role of the proposed independent hearing officer, and the absence of a *de novo* review following the finding of the independent hearing officer. A revised (amended) version of the Whistle-Blower Policy was adopted by the Senate at the conclusion of the March 22 meeting.

Submitted by Co-Chairs Atwater and Troy

**University of Arizona - Faculty Senate
Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
1998-1999 Annual Report**

Committee Members: Roger Dahlgran, Chair; Peter Foley; Wanda Howell; Lynn Joens; Ted Laetsch; Tsianina Lomawaima; Kaleen Love (ASUA); and Peter Medine.

ICPC members had additional responsibilities as each served on Undergraduate Council (UGC), as a member of one of the three standing subcommittees of the Undergraduate Council, and P. Foley, L. Joens, and T. Lomawaima chaired the Programs, Policies and Curriculum Subcommittees of UGC.

Issues considered by ICPC come from Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. In accordance with the Curriculum Procedures Memoranda (rev 6/90), the flow of business in this structure is (1) topics referred to a UGC subcommittee (Policy, Curriculum, or Programs) for initial consideration, (2) subcommittee brings actionable items to the full UGC, (3) Provost's Management Group considers resource requirements of UGC recommendations, (4) after Provost's Management Group resolves resource issues ICPC brings UGC and Graduate Council business to the Faculty Senate as necessary. Note that ICPC is far more involved with curriculum, programs and policies for undergraduates than for graduates.

Undergraduate Council met the third Tuesday each month during fall semester, the third Tuesday of each month during spring semester. Undergraduate Council subcommittees met on Tuesday two weeks prior to the full Undergraduate Council meeting. Full and subcommittee meetings of the Undergraduate Council meetings were held from 3:30 to 5:00. ICPC generally met for 1 hour following the meetings of the full UGC. The meeting dates for the 1998-99 academic year that were relevant to ICPC business were:

<u>Graduate Council</u>	<u>UGC Subcommittees</u>	<u>UnderGrad Council</u>	<u>ICPC</u>
		Aug 20, 1998	
	Sep 1, 1998	Sep 15, 1998	Sep 15, 1998
Sep 18, 1998	Sep 29, 1998	Oct 13, 1998	Oct 13, 1998
Nov 6, 1998	Oct 27, 1998	Nov 10, 1998	Nov 10, 1998
	Nov 24, 1998	Dec 8, 1998	Dec 8, 1998
		Jan 7, 1999	
	Jan 19, 1999	Feb 9, 1999	Feb 9, 1999
Feb 19, 1999	Feb 23, 1999	Mar 2, 1999	Mar 2, 1999
	Mar 23, 1999		
	Apr 6, 1999	Apr 13, 1999	Apr 13, 1999
Apr 16, 1999			

Summary of ICPC's Agenda for 1998-99.

Issue:	On ICPC Agenda	Fac Sen Action
1. Change requirement for graduation with honors	9/15	10/5
2. Name change College of Architecture to College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture	9/15	10/5
3. Alter academic calendar so commencement does not always occur on Saturday	9/15, 2/8	
4. Class sizes in general education courses	9/15, 10/13, 11/10	

5. Drop deadlines for 10-week summer courses same as for 5-week courses	9/15	
6. Delete BA in astronomy	10/13	11/2
7. Allow College of Nursing to increase credits required for graduation from 120 to 122 until Fall of 200	10/13	11/2
8. Consolidation of undergraduate majors in Ag Technology Management and Agricultural Education	10/13	11/2
9. Ph.D. minor in Conflict Analysis and Resolution	11/10, 12/8	1/25
10. New degree BA in Studio Arts	12/8	1/25
11. Continuous Enrollment and Leave of Absence Policies for Graduate Students	11/10, 12/8, 2/8, 3/2	
12. Rename Honors Center to Honors College	12/8, 2/9	3/11
13. Name change: Section of Orthopedic Surgery in Department of Surgery to Department of Orthopedic Surgery	4/13	5/3
14. Establishment of diploma for AIC	4/13	5/3
15. Delete BSA in Biochemistry, College of Agriculture	4/13	5/3
16. New degree: BA in Physics	4/13	5/3
17. Degree name change: BA in Dramatic Theory to BA in Theatre Arts	4/13	5/3

Issues Remaining for the 1999-2000 Academic Year:

If actions taken at the April 13, 1999 ICPC meeting are on the May 3 Faculty Senate Agenda, ICPC will have no actionable items left at the end of this academic year. However, several issues will need ICPC attention in the 99-00 academic year. These items are:

Academic Calendar Initiative: The president has requested proposals to resolve the problem of perpetual Saturday commencement. A proposal from ICPC currently under consideration allows Sunday commencement for the fall semester together with a Tuesday semester start for spring semester. The Tuesday start of spring semester requires that one actual Tuesday must be declared as a virtual Wednesday. With this adjustment spring commencement can be held on Friday or Saturday.

Upper Division Writing Program Examination: Undergraduate Council has been afforded a preview of the WRIMCAT program and has expressed support for effort to clarify the details. Presumably, with these details, the proposal will be acceptable to various committees and will be ready for Faculty Senate approval in the near future.

Continuous Enrollment/Leave of Absence for Graduate Students: ICPC considered this topic at length this year. Graduate Council is receptive to an alternative policy that might be more accommodating of the concerns of women, minorities and economically disadvantaged students. Also of concern is impact of the continuous enrollment requirement on students whose program of study is not amenable to continuous enrollment (for example teachers), graduate students who become employed before or while finishing a degree, and students doing field research that does not require university resources.

Grading standards and grade inflation: Undergraduate Council is ready to report on a year long fact finding effort. One idea that has been floated is for grade distributions be considered in conjunction with student evaluations as part of peer evaluation of teaching.

Course Syllabus Policy Consideration: Should the university policy on course information sheets be broadened to alert students to course content that they may find objectionable?

Course Materials Source Policy Consideration: Should instructors be required to notify the ASUA bookstore of materials required and recommended for a course? Such action would insure that the materials are available from a source that does not create a conflict of interest for a course instructor.

Recommendations:

Initiatives brought before Undergraduate Council, Graduate Council, or the Curriculum Office should have routing sheets attached at the outset. These sheets should indicate agreement as to where the initiative should be sent and the steps that must be taken in order to obtain ultimate approval. This will allow the initiator to determine where the process will lead and will make deadlines apparent to all. Approval dates, comments and revisions should be noted on the routing sheet. This system will create a more orderly flow of business coming before ICPC and will reduce the likelihood that initiatives will be overlooked.

Coordination between Graduate Council and ICPC needs to be strengthened. An ICPC member should serve on Graduate Council. This will create increased awareness within ICPC of Graduate Council issues.

Proposals to merge ICPC with Undergraduate Council need to address the following issues in searching for an effective structure: (1) Graduate Council requires a vehicle to take proposals to Faculty Senate. Direct submission overlooks ICPC's role in packaging Graduate Council proposals in that ICPC tries to anticipate information required for consent agenda passage by Faculty Senate. (2) ICPC packages UGC proposals by anticipating information required for consent agenda passage by Faculty Senate. (3) ICPC receives initiatives from Undergraduate and Graduate Councils after the Provost's Management Group. It's possible that resource considerations might cause the PMG to alter a proposal substantially from the form approved by UGC. ICPC serves to ensure that proposals going before Faculty Senate are close to the proposals approved by faculty curriculum committees.

It has been an honor to serve on ICPC and doubly an honor to serve as its chair. The members of the committee have been conscientious, dedicated, and extremely helpful in the conduct of our business. The efforts of the support staff for the Undergraduate Council have greatly eased the workload of serving as chair of both Undergraduate Council and ICPC. I thank them, my fellow committee members and the Faculty Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Dahlgran

Faculty Senate
Research Policy Committee Annual Report, 1998-9

Committee Members

Stephen Coons, Pharmacy Prac

Raphael Gruener, Chairman; Physiology

Charles Hurt, Info Resources

Robert McDaniel, Plant Science

Ralph Fregosi, Physiology

Juan Heinrich, Aerospace & Mechanical Engineering

Paul Johnson, ASUA

Gordon Tollin, Biochemistry

The Research Policy Committee (RPC) concentrated its efforts on two major tasks: 1) revisions to the **Conflict of Interest & Commitment Policy (CICP)**, and 2) the elaboration of the **Code of Research Ethics**.

1) We are pleased (and relieved) to report that after considerable deliberations with the VPR and UA Attorney offices, the RPC has presented to Faculty Senate a revised policy for input and a vote. On Nov. 2, 1998, the Faculty Senate has adopted the policy. The CICP is now an official policy at the University.

Being a working document, the CICP is currently under review by Judith Leonard, Chief attorney in the UA Attorney's office and the RPC. A document detailing responses to concerns raised by Ms. Leonard is now being elaborated. If these responses still leave serious questions on the part of the Attorney's office, the Policy may have to be slightly revised, with such revisions presented to Senate for its approval in the Fall, 1999. We hope for an informal resolution of these outstanding issues in the near future.

2) At the urging of, and assistance from, the VPR's office (Michael A. Cusanovich), the RPC drafted the **Research Code of Ethics** for deliberation and consideration for approval by the Faculty Senate. During its December, 1998 meeting, the Faculty Senate adopted the Code without reservation.

The RPC anticipates receiving a charge from the VPR's office (Dick Powell) to evaluate the **Intellectual Property** policy which is currently undergoing extensive revisions by the Office of Technology Transfer Advisory Committee and the ABOR. The RPC plans to bring the IP policy, for input and adoption, to the Faculty Senate in the Fall of 1999. In anticipation, senators are urged to become familiar with the IP policy in its current format: <http://vpr2.admin.arizona.edu/ott/IPOLDGP.HTM> . We welcome your comments and suggestions. Please send them to: rgruener@u.arizona.edu .

The Chair of the RPC has continued to participate (as an *ex-officio* member) in the deliberations of the Executive Committee of the Science and Technology Park of the UA and in the deliberations of the Advisory Committee to the Office of Technology Transfer Office. At the recommendation of the Chair, the Faculty Senate invited the CEO of the Science/Technology Park, Mr. Bruce Wright, to present an update on the Park's activities to the Faculty Senate. Mr. Wright presented a detailed report indicating that the Park is doing well financially and is fulfilling its mission as a University Research Park.

Recently, the RPC discussed the issue of **student representation** on the Committee. The committee urges Faculty Senate to consider nominating a student with direct interests in research. Because of the nature of the issues deliberated by the Committee, it would appear that a graduate student would best represent the student body on this committee. We recommend that either a graduate student replace the undergraduate representative (perhaps on alternate years), or that a graduate student be added as a student representative.

1998 – 1999 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate from the **Student Affairs Policy Committee**

Terry Badger, Nursing
John Garcia, Political Science
Robert Gore, Physiology
Alexis Hernandez, Office of Dean of Students
Jennifer Jenkins, Humanities
Noah Knauf, ASUA
Kaleen Love, ASUA
Helle Mathiasen, Humanities
Mary McCaslin, Educational Psychology
Sheila Pitt, Art
Steven Smith, Plant Science
Donald Davis, Hydrology and Water Resources, Chair

This year SAPC looked at the Code of Academic Integrity, recruitment, and retention with emphasis on advising and mentoring. There was considerable examination of the final draft of the white paper “STUDENT RETENTION ‘Toward a Culture of Responsibility’”, prepared by the offices of Undergraduate Education and Student Research on behalf of the University Enrollment Management Committee. The committee’s prime interest is the faculty role in activities affecting retention, mainly advising and mentoring.

In regard to the Code of Academic Integrity SAPC decided that the “use of the same paper in more than one class” should not be designated as prohibited conduct but remain a rule that a faculty member may establish for a particular class. As such it remains a faculty responsibility to notify students of rules regarding multiple uses of student work.

The number of Bachelors degrees awarded in the academic year 1997-98 was at an all time high, exceeding the previous year by over 10 percent. The six year graduation rate increased one percent to 53 percent, the four year graduation rate increased four percent to 27 percent. First year retention remained at 77 percent. Bachelors degrees awarded to minority students also showed a large increase, reaching all time highs. While the graduation rate for Native American and African American students increased, there was a slight drop in graduation rate for Hispanic and Asian American students.

Recruitment went well last year. Enrollment was up, as well as the SAT’s and placement test scores of the new students. This reflects the new stronger admission requirements and UA’s new broader index for assessing an applicant’s preparation for college. Minority enrollment increased very little. While the yield from Maricopa County was up UA still seems to be losing the enrollment battle to ASU. The Office of

Admissions and New Student Enrollment is emphasizing increasing enrollment by transfer students, those from Maricopa County, and minorities. The committee was reminded that it is the “personal touch” that sets UA apart from other Universities with more resources and that contact with faculty is the most persuasive part of the recruitment process.

The personal touch is also important for students at UA. Surveys done by the Dean of Student’s Office indicate students feel positive about their relations with faculty, both in and out of the classroom, but have serious concerns about advising and administrative bureaucracy at UA. While most students surveyed by the Center for Research on Undergraduate Education indicate they are satisfied with their advisors, 75% for major advisors and 60% for college advisors, 8% of surveyed students do not believe their advisors give them correct information about the classes they need. Over a third of the students surveyed were not satisfied with the mentoring received from their advisors. More than half the students surveyed indicated that they had met with a professor less than once a semester for advising or mentoring, one in six had never met with a professor for advising or mentoring. Over half the students indicated they have to talk to many different advisors and counselors before they can find the information they need.

“Advising” is viewed as being different from “mentoring”. Advising can be, and often is, done by staff professionals. Advising mainly pertains to academic questions such as course selection, graduation requirements, choice of major, transfer issues, etc. A mentor is a “ trusted counselor or guide: tutor, coach”. Mentoring implies a personal commitment, i.e. getting to know someone outside of the practicalities of coursework and advising details. Mentoring is seen as an important faculty role in the university community.

Dissatisfaction with advising and mentoring at large research universities is often considered to go with the territory. If UA is to be a “student centered” research university advising and mentoring activities need more resources, need to have resources used efficiently, and need a change in culture about advising and mentoring activities from top to bottom. Advising and mentoring is labor intensive, for faculty it requires time that must be taken from other activities. In a time of diminished resources it seems disjunctive to call for more student advising and mentoring. A limited amount of additional resources, better use of the resources available, and a change in university culture concerning advising and mentoring could lead to improvement. Arizona State University has the resources to institute one on one advising for all freshmen prior to their registration for the second semester. They have twice the number of freshmen advisors per freshman than UA. Faculty time could be used more efficiently in a mentoring role if staff professionals relieved the faculty of some of their academic advising. Another way to help increase efficiency would be to centralize advising resources in each college so that students could have easy access to the information they need. The Academic Affairs Office of ASUA has presented a proposal to restructure advising along those lines; it deserves careful consideration. Extension of SAPR capabilities to indicate requirements remaining to attain goals other

than graduation, such as upper division standing, could help efficiency. A culture change is needed: currently SAPC believes that for many faculty large amounts of time spent advising and mentoring is detrimental to career advancement, junior faculty with heavy advising loads are in peril.

The “STUDENT RETENTION ‘Toward a Culture of Responsibility’” white paper put out by the Offices of Undergraduate Education and Student Research, September 1998, gives a large amount of information about factors affecting retention and lists an impressive number of programs at UA that help retain students. Even so in the paper’s conclusions include the statements “We can, however, do more” and “Needed, we believe, is a commitment to a ‘culture of responsibility’ for retention – among faculty, staff and students.”

The executive summary and plan for action in the retention paper give statements of student, faculty, and university responsibilities and lists 14 recommendations for improving retention. While agreeing in general with the broad goals behind the stated responsibilities and recommendations SAPC is concerned that as stated they are not realistic. At least six of the recommendations require additional resources. Committee members felt the responsibilities to be both onerous and overly idealistic, and more suited to a small liberal arts college than a large university. In its report last year SAPC stated that advising and mentoring activities are neither recognized nor rewarded at UA. The statement in the retention paper, under the heading university responsibility, that “The University has a responsibility to recognize and reward faculty and staff commitments to student retention.” is a step in the right direction. The committee is concerned, however, that this may just lead to an advising/mentoring category in annual evaluation and merit review and not instigate the real culture change needed. A commitment is needed, as stated in the retention paper conclusion, but not to responsibility and the fear of getting a negative rating; rather to one of developing a university encompassing system that provides the advising and mentoring needed by our students. Is such a system possible with resources as currently constrained? Perhaps, but not to the extent envisioned in the executive summary of the retention paper. More staff advisors to cover class and curricular advising, as suggested by the ASUA, would free faculty time for mentoring. Better information systems for students and advisors could save both student’s and advisor’s time. And a difficult change in the departments and colleges, where the advising and mentoring is done, is critical: this begins with a commitment to providing the necessary advising and faculty mentoring to their students without overloading individual faculty members to their detriment.

Referring to recommendation 2 of the retention paper, SAPC recommends changing the phrase “and assess the quality of faculty advising.” to “and reward high quality faculty advising.”

The white paper on RETENTION is a step in the necessary dialog within the university community on retention and advising/mentoring in the context of a “student centered research university”. The Faculty Senate and its committees should continue to be active in this discussion.

A final concern is recommendation 6. SAPC is concerned that raising SAT requirements for admission may keep out students whose talents are not reflected directly in that test such as those in the arts.

Committee of Eleven
The University of Arizona

Annual Report
1998-1999

Members:

Roger Caldwell (Chair), Soil, Water and Environmental Science
Andy Silverman, (Vice-Chair), Law
Larry Aleamoni, Special Education, Rehabilitation and School Psychology
Billie Raye Erlings, Music (Emeritus)
Robert Feltham, Chemistry (Emeritus)
Hope Greenwell, Graduate Student and Professional Association
Susan Heckler, Marketing
Jerry Hogle, English
Kaleen Love, Undergraduate Student
Jack Marchalonis, Microbiology and Immunology
Shitala Mishra, Special Education, Rehabilitation and School Psychology
Jeffrey Warburton, Theatre Arts
Marlys Witte, Surgery

Overview

The Committee of Eleven held 17 meetings this year, generally on a two-week cycle. There are 11 faculty and one undergraduate and one graduate student. The Chair of the Faculty is ex-officio and 5 faculty are elected each year. From the Constitution -- The Committee of Eleven shall:

- a. Initiate, promote, and stimulate study and action dealing with and looking toward solution of situations and problems of interest and concern to the faculty and to the University.*
- b. Make reports to the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate.*
- c. Speak for the General Faculty as and when authorized by the General Faculty.*

There were minor revisions in the Committee Home Page (<http://w3.arizona.edu~c11>); now following each meeting the approved minutes from previous meetings are posted. The page also collect faculty governance links and posts the University of Arizona co-governance documents.

The Committee retreat in May 1998 discussed possible issues for the coming year. Three topics emerged as most appropriate: 1) revise the faculty governance process, 2) discuss changes in how intellectual property is defined and addressed, and 3) sponsor a Millennium Forum, on the role of faculty and the changing university. In addition to these committee oriented topics, there was discussion of issues of concern to the two student representatives on the committee, including 1) undergraduate student mentoring and advising, and 2) special issues relating to non-traditional students (raised because of the topic discussed at the 2nd Harvill Conference: "Invisible Scholars: Returning Students at American Universities", November 1998).

The Committee participated, along with the Senate Executive Committee, in interviews with candidates for the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies position. Committee guests included Arizona Board of Regent's Chair Judy Gignac, Vice President Janet Bingham and President Peter Likins. The committee is represented on the Arizona Faculties Council, the Senate Executive Committee, and the President's Advisory Committee.

Faculty Grievance

The Committee spent most of its time on faculty grievance procedures (within the broader area of faculty governance). We reviewed concerns about the current process that had been raised by others, reviewed relevant portions of the Constitution, Bylaws, and University Handbook on Appointed Personnel (UHAP), reviewed committee guidelines, and committee actions over the last 10 years. Working with the University Attorney's Office we evaluated legal mandates related to faculty governance and policies and procedures of peer institutions. We also worked with the Constitution and Bylaws Revision Committee, using some of their materials on inconsistencies related to the grievance process. This information caused us to conclude that it would be better to begin fresh, by defining guiding principles on what our faculty governance procedures should accomplish, rather than change the detailed sections of the Constitution, Bylaws, and UHAP relating to faculty governance.

A draft set of guiding principles, along with a summary of current grievance committees and types of grievance actions, was shared with the committees and university offices which deal with faculty grievance. Following revision of the guiding principles, an open meeting was held with these same representatives. Finally, at the March 1999 meeting, revised guiding principles were shared with the Faculty Senate. A detailed analysis of the ASU faculty grievance procedures was made to take advantage of their being governed by the same Board of Regents.

Following the May 1999 Committee of Eleven retreat, the then draft of guiding principles will be shared with all the relevant committees and university offices and drafting new policies and procedures will begin, by collaboration with these committees and offices.

Intellectual Property

We discussed a range of issues on how the role of intellectual property is changing within the academic and commercial worlds, as well as substantial changes in federal law. Copies of the current University Intellectual Property policies and the revisions currently underway by the three Arizona Universities were also reviewed. Because of the time involved in focusing on faculty governance, we decided to address intellectual property as a topic in the Millennium Project (see below).

The Millennial Year Project

This is a possible future activity of the Committee and would take place in the 1999-2000 academic year. Its focus would be on faculty impacts of some of the transformations taking place in higher education. One example is the changing definition of intellectual property. For example, "intellectual property" rests within a philosophical framework, which determines how faculty, human resources, and the university are viewed, and may determine what is considered "property." The Millennial Year Project would allow campus discussions, debates on key underlying principles, and involve experts from the campus and guest speakers. The details of the project will be pursued next year.

Annual Report, May 1999
Intercollegiate Writing Committee

The Chair of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee (IWC) is charged with the production of an annual report dealing with matters pertaining to undergraduate writing proficiency at the University of Arizona. This year the committee has focused on issues pertaining to Writing Emphasis Courses (WECs) across campus, proposed changes to the Upper Division Writing Proficiency Exam (UDWPE), and making the IWC a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. The aim of the committee is to effect an overall comprehensive improvement in undergraduate writing through examination of and support for initiatives in the areas of curriculum and faculty development. The following is a synopsis of committee activity during the 1998-99 academic year.

1. The committee met periodically throughout the Fall and Spring semesters.
2. The chair tried unsuccessfully, for the second year in a row, to constitute a full committee, with representatives from every college granting undergraduate degrees. See attached roster of members.
3. Fall semester was taken up with orienting new members to the committee and reorienting continuing members to current issues.
4. On February 12 the committee discussed and then voted unanimously to endorse a proposal to replace the current UDWPE with a new Wrimcat Program with the understanding that the IWC might play a major role in the administration of that program.
5. The chair of the committee sent a memo to all undergraduate unit heads at the university requesting copies of their unit's Writing Emphasis Courses for the IWC to review. Syllabi were received from approximately 20 departments in 6 colleges. Review of the syllabi revealed that:

-- Most syllabi did not even identify the course as a Writing Emphasis Course.

-- Very few of the syllabi showed any particular attention to writing other than in the percent of the final grade to be determined by written work. A few syllabi did not even meet the requirement that more than 50% of the final grade in WECs be determined from students' written work.

Committee members agreed that the WEC program is in dire need of attention, but it was felt that a voluntary, faculty development approach, rather than any kind of top-down legislative approach, should be taken. Planning and implementation of faculty development focused on the WEC program was left for another year, when interest in the committee will hopefully be higher.

6. The committee spent considerable time during the year discussing its mission and position at the University. There is considerable frustration among members (many of whom are long-time members who will leave the committee at the end of this year) at the lack of the IWC's ability to effect any real change. This in turn affects members' sense of the value of the time they spend meeting and is thought to be one reason attendance at meetings was so light throughout the year. It may also be reflected in the lack of interest on the part of several colleges in providing members for the committee.

The committee did not elect a chair for 1999-2000 at its last meeting of the year, as its bylaws state that it should. All members at that meeting felt strongly that the purpose of the IWC should be reexamined in the current context of undergraduate writing at the University and that the IWC should either be dissolved or be assigned specific tasks pertaining to the improvement of undergraduate writing that will be recognized as its mission. Simply making the IWC a standing committee of the Faculty Senate "in charge of undergraduate writing" will not remedy the situation unless it is accompanied by redefinition of the purpose of the committee and clarification of its reporting lines.

7. The results of the Upper Division Writing Proficiency Exam for the period September 1997-July 1998 are attached.

22% of the students who took the exam during that time received a score of Unsatisfactory, and 60% received a score of Unsatisfactory or Low Satisfactory. These numbers are only slightly different from the 1997-98 results (20% and 61% respectively). The fact that 60% of our upper division students write at only a minimally satisfactory level or less indicates the need for continued attention to student writing.

Submitted by:

Elizabeth G. Harrison
University Teaching Center & East Asian Studies
April 21, 1999

1998-99 Intercollegiate Writing Committee

Agriculture

Angela Taylor <artaylor@u.arizona.edu>

Family and Consumer Resources

Architecture

Fred Matter <matter@u.arizona.edu>

Architecture

ASUA

Maura Olivieri <meo@u.arizona.edu>

Business and Public Administration

Education

Kathy Carter <kcarter@mail.ed.arizona.edu>

Teaching and Teacher Education

Dana Fox <dfox@mail.ed.arizona.edu>

Language, Reading and Culture

Engineering and Mines

Glen Gerhard <gerhard@ece.arizona.edu>

Electrical and Computer Engineering

Fine Arts

Bill Lang <wlang@u.arizona.edu>

Theatre Arts

Keith McElroy <mcelroy@u.arizona.edu>

Art

Health Professions

Humanities

Malcolm Compitello <compitel@u.arizona.edu>

Spanish and Portuguese

Beth Harrison <eharriso@u.arizona.edu>

East Asian Studies

Nursing

Judy Ayoub <jayoub@rn1.nursing.arizona.edu>

Nursing

Science

John Cocke <jcocke@as.arizona.edu>

Astronomy

Gene Mash <emash@u.arizona.edu>

Chemistry

Social and Behavioral Sciences

Karen Anderson <karena@u.arizona.edu>

History

Ex Officio Members

Marvin Diogenes <diogenes@u.arizona.edu>

University Composition Board

Tom Miller <tpm@u.arizona.edu>

Freshman Composition Program

UPPER-DIVISION WRITING-PROFICIENCY EXAM STATISTICS

PERIOD: September 1997 - July 1998

College	Total	Unsat 2	Unsat 3	Low Sat 4	Mid Sat 5	High Sat 6	Excell 7	Excell 8
AGRI	410 8%	63 15%	36 9%	167 41%	79 19%	51 12%	8 2%	6 2%
ARCH	41 <1%	4 10%	5 12%	16 39%	11 27%	3 7%	-	2 5%
A + S	2654 54%	336 13%	166 6%	1009 38%	558 21%	391 15%	135 5%	59 2%
FA	338 7%	56 17%	21 6%	140 41%	69 20%	29 9%	15 4%	8 2%
GEN	379 8%	52 14%	23 6%	167 44%	70 19%	46 12%	16 4%	5 1%
HRP	38 <1%	11 29%	1 3%	12 32%	2 5%	12 32%	-	-
HUM	239 5%	13 5%	12 5%	83 35%	49 21%	46 19%	24 10%	12 5%
SCI	514 11%	56 11%	29 6%	199 39%	120 23%	67 13%	35 7%	8 2%
SBS	1146 23%	148 13%	80 7%	408 36%	248 22%	191 17%	45 4%	26 2%
BPA	1055 22%	193 18%	82 8%	399 38%	230 22%	100 10%	45 5%	6 <1%
EDUC	246 5%	50 20%	28 11%	96 39%	49 20%	18 7%	5 2%	-
EM	422 9%	93 22%	38 9%	156 37%	68 16%	45 11%	18 4%	4 1%
NRSR	39 <1%	5 13%	3 8%	11 28%	14 36%	4 10%	2 5%	-
PHAR	29 <1%	7 24%	5 17%	10 35%	6 21%	-	-	1 3%
TOTALS	4896	751 15%	363 7%	1864 38%	1015 21%	612 13%	213 4%	78 2%

NOTE: The figures highlighted in gray are a breakdown of A+S totals.



Mailing Address:
Faculty Center
The University of Arizona
P.O. Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

email: faesen@u.arizona.edu

Location:
Faculty Center
1400 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

Phone: (520) 621-1342
FAX: (520) 621-8844

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CORPORATE RELATIONS

1998-1999 Annual Report

Dr. Thomas P. Davis (Chair), Pharmacology
Mr. Tom Berresford, Alumni Association
Ms. Janet Bingham, Administration
Dr. J. D. Garcia, Physics
Mr. Michael S. Low, Intercollegiate Athletics
Mr. John Perrin, Intercollegiate Athletics
Mr. Richard Roberts, Budget Office
Mr. Andrew Silverman, College of Law
Ms. Tara Taylor, ASUA
Mr. Bruce Wright, Economic Development

The establishment of the new University of Arizona Committee on Corporate Relations (U.C.C.R.) occurred on March 31, 1998, at the request of President Likins. On December 7, 1998, the Faculty Senate passed the new University of Arizona Policy and Mission Statement on Corporate Relations developed by the U.C.C.R. The membership of the U.C.C.R. includes representatives from the faculty, administration, staff and student body of The University of Arizona.

Since March 31, 1998, the U.C.C.R. was very busy studying and reviewing the proposed Nike contract with The University of Arizona. On August 4, 1998, the U.C.C.R. reported to President Likins that the Nike contract did not violate the philosophy, intent or conditions of the U.C.C.R. "working" policy. Additionally, several questions were posed and answered regarding the contract which was then signed by President Likins.

During the period of August 1998 to the present time, the U.C.C.R. has studied and continues to discuss the Collegiate License Code of Conduct (CLC), discussed the establishment of a new joint venture, studied the Duke University Code of Conduct for consideration/adoption by The University of Arizona, discussed contracts/agreements/licenses where trademark or UofA logo use is considered, discussed corporate relationships and the use of corporate symbols in the Student Union, discussed the concerns of Students Against Sweatshops and finally, voted to endorse the proposed "Collegiate Code of Conduct for CLC Licensees," on January 14, 1999, in a letter to President Likins.

The U.C.C.R. continues to provide a forum to discuss and study relationships between The University of Arizona and various corporations or similar entities per the approved policy of the U.C.C.R.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the University Committee on Corporate Relations.

Thomas P. Davis, Chair

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ARIZONA®
TUCSON ARIZONA

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure

Mailing Address:

Faculty Center
The University of Arizona
PO Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473
E-mail: facsen@u.arizona.edu

Location:

Faculty Center
1400 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721
Phone: (520) 621-1342
Fax: (520) 621-8844

**ANNUAL REPORT TO THE FACULTY SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND TENURE
1998-99 Academic Year
Nathan Buras, Chairman**

CAFT Members:

Term ending 5/99:

Nathan Buras, Chairman, Hydrology and Water Resources
Li-Zhi Fang, Physics
Shitala Mishra, Special Education, Rehabilitation and School Psychology
Hamid Saadatmanesh, Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics

Term ending 5/00:

Albrecht Classen, German Studies
Jeffrey Haskell, Music
Juan Heinrich, Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering
Allan Matthias, Vice Chairman, Soil, Water and Environmental Science

Term ending 5/01:

Victoria Mills, Library
Marek Rychlik, Mathematics
Edward Williams, Political Science
Amy Williamsen, Spanish and Portuguese

Term ending 5/02:

Adela de la Torre, Mexican American Studies and Research Center
Elizabeth Glisky, Psychology
John Maré, Veterinary Science and Microbiology
Joseph (Jay) Stauss, American Indian Studies Program

Ad Hoc:

Richard Cortner, Political Science
Alice Paul, Teaching and Teacher Education
Alfred Quiroz, Art

Charge:

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry and to conduct hearings in two general areas, namely: in regard to those matters contained in the Conditions of Service dealing with the contractual employment relationship between the General Faculty member and the University/Board of Regents; and in regard to any internal matters relating to grievances against or by any member of the General Faculty. The Committee shall consider the protection of academic freedom and tenure as a principal obligation. (Constitution of the General Faculty of The University of Arizona, Article V, Section 9b).

Case Requiring Panel:

A case of denied tenure was initiated before May 1, 1998, and continued during the 1998-99 academic year. The case was brought by a faculty member in the College of Humanities. As soon as the complaint was submitted to CAFT and the panel was appointed, the Head of the relevant Department and the Dean of the College were contacted in order to start gathering the information necessary for the case. The Head of the Department and the Dean refused to establish any contact with CAFT and to transfer to the panel any documents.

Instead of the relevant documents, the chairman of the panel received a memorandum from the Office of University Attorneys stating that they are studying the jurisdiction of the panel in this case. In addition, the memorandum stated that the University Attorneys' Office will recommend to the panel a private legal office to assist them. The response of the panel chairman was that the panel will fulfill its task according to the letter and to the spirit of the policy as formulated by ABOR and appearing in the UHAP.

The material regarding this case existed in a voluminous confidential file in the Provost' Office. This file was studied in all its details and a number of incongruities were discovered. For example, a few days after the College P&T Committee voted unanimously to deny the complaining faculty member promotion and tenure, the Head of the Department signed an excellent overall performance evaluation.

Since the CAFT panel had only one-sided information (provided by the complainant) and given the incongruities appearing in the Provost's file, the panel could not reach a routine recommendation. Instead, it recommended to the President of the University a non-conformist solution to this case: one more opportunity should be given to the complainant so that the faculty member could do unhampered scholarly work. The results of this effort will then be evaluated and a final recommendation be made by the evaluating committee. This recommendation, which was formulated with the concurrence of a senior member of the University Attorneys' Office, was accepted by the President. The complainant was offered an additional year and the faculty member accepted.

Other Items:**1. Grievance Procedures:**

The Faculty Grievance Procedures are currently under review by the Committee of Eleven. A number of principles were drafted. The proposed new procedure will be submitted to the Faculty for review and comments.

2. A CAFT Website:

A website for CAFT was prepared and it is posted at <http://w3fp.arizona.edu/caft>

Final Comment:

CAFT could not have worked without the close support and cooperation of the Faculty Center. Special thanks are given to Pamela S. Bridgmon, who not only took accurate notes and prepared minutes of our meetings, but also pointed out some of the pitfalls so that we could avoid them.

COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION

Annual Report

1998-1999

<u>Committee Membership</u>	<u>Department</u>	<u>Term</u>
Philip C. Keller, Chair	Chemistry	5/97-4/99
Keith McElroy	Art	5/98-4/00
Susan Wilson-Sanders	University Animal Care	5/98-4/00
Mary McCaslin	Educational Psychology	5/98-4/00
Robert Mitchell	Main Library	5/97-4/99
Alfredo Huete	Soil, Water, and Environmental Science	5/97-4/99

Seven formal written grievances were submitted to the Committee on Conciliation during the 1998-1999 academic year. There was one additional telephone contact, but this never materialized into a written grievance.

Two cases involved denial of promotion in academic departments. After preliminary investigation, the committee decided that both situations were far beyond conciliation and referred the cases to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. A third promotion denial grievance was submitted, but, after appointment of an investigating panel, the person initiating the grievance refused to meet with the committee.

A case involving termination by a supervisor was submitted, but, on the advice of the University Attorney's Office, the grievance was not pursued because the person initiating the grievance was no longer a University employee.

One case involving conflict between a faculty member and the department head was successfully resolved after several rounds of negotiation. A second grievance of this type was submitted to the Committee, an investigating panel was appointed, but the department head refused to meet with the Committee representatives. Finally, a third conflict of this type went unresolved in spite of good efforts by the Conciliation panel. The case has been taken up by attorneys.

Submitted on behalf of the Committee on Conciliation

Philip C. Keller
 Chair



Mailing Address:
Faculty Center
The University of Arizona
PO Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

email: facsen@u.arizona.edu

Location:
Faculty Center
1400 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

Phone: (520) 621-1342
FAX: (520) 621-8844

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION PURSUANT TO ABOR POLICY 6.912

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT

1998-1999 Annual Report

Neal R. Armstrong (Chair), Chemistry (5/97-4/00)
Thomas P. Davis (Co-chair), Pharmacology (5/94-4/00)
Carol Barnes, Psychology, (5/98-4/01)
Don P. Bourque, Biochemistry (Ad Hoc Member)
John Bradley, LRC, Education (5/95-4/01)
George Frantziskonis, Civil Engineering (Ad Hoc Member)
William Hubbard, Lunar and Planetary Laboratory (1/98-4/99)
Sam James, Internal Medicine (5/96-4/99)

Ten allegations were brought before the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment (U.C.E.C.) in 1998; six were resolved by the U.C.E.C., two were referred to the University of Arizona Auditor's Office after inquiry by U.C.E.C. was completed, and one was referred to the Provost's Office. One allegation which was brought before the committee in February of 1999, is still in the inquiry phase.

The University of Arizona, in partnership with the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Research Integrity, hosted the *Management of Biomedical Research Laboratories – A National Conference*, on October 1-3, 1998. Dr. Tom Davis, co-chair of the U.C.E.C., and Dr. Lawrence Rhoades (Office of Public and Science) were co-organizers of this national conference which attracted over 100 participants from across the country. An excellent article on the conference is in *Chemical and Engineering News* 76, 43:31-35, 1998.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee on Ethics and Commitment.

Neal R. Armstrong, Chair

NRA/rkd

f:\msoffice\winword\ethics\1998-99\annlrept.doc

Mailing Address:
Faculty Center
The University of Arizona
P.O. Box 210473
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

email: facsen@u.arizona.edu



Location:
Faculty Center
1400 E. Mabel St.
Tucson, AZ 85721-0473

Phone: (520) 621-1342
FAX: (520) 621-8844

April 20, 1999

TO: The Faculty Senate
FROM: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee
RE: Clarifying amendments to the "Whistle-Blower Policy" passed March 22—
To be voted on at the Senate meeting of May 3, 1999

WE MOVE that:

1. The word "public" be struck from the second line under "Whistle-blower/Complainant" (page 3 of the current document).

Reason: The inclusion of "public" is inconsistent with amendments made on March 22, especially the one to "Policy" on page 1, where the first paragraph now includes "mismanagement involving a gross waste of monies."

2. Under "Whistle-Blower Hearing Procedures" (page 5 of the current document), the first sentence should be rewritten into two as follows: "The University President or a designee shall contract with a qualified external service provider based on a recommendation from a committee consisting of the chairs (or their designees) of the Faculty, Staff Advisory Council, and Appointed Personnel Organization Council. This provider shall then provide qualified external hearing officers and a hearing process for complainants who are dissatisfied with the University's decision."

Reason: The current wording in this section, as now amended, does not make clear the exact role of the "committee of chairs" in this provider-selection process. This rewording would make more precise what we understand to be the Senate's intent on March 22 regarding this particular section.

dl

Further Proposed Amendments to the Senate Draft Whistle-Blower Policy

To be moved by Senator Hogle at the Senate meeting of May 3, 1999.

1. (Page 5). Add a six-month time limit after adverse actions for filing a whistle-blower complaint by amending the first sentence in the section on whistle-blower complaints to read as follows:

An employee *who believes that he or she* has been subjected to an adverse personnel action based on his or her prior disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct may protest the action by filing a written whistle-blower complaint with a University officer *within six months of the adverse personnel action*.

2. (Page 9) Replace the last paragraph of the policy with the following:

The hearing officer's decision and subsequent actions of the University are subject to judicial review as provided by A.R.S. § 12-901, et. seq. Notwithstanding that section, an employee or former employee who has been dismissed is entitled to a trial de novo in the superior court.

dl

4-28-99

WHISTLE-BLOWER POLICY

PURPOSE

This policy is intended to protect any employee who engages in good-faith disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body or to a designated University officer.

SOURCES

Arizona Revised Statutes §§ 38-531 through 533.

University policy.

APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to anyone employed by the University, however categorized, who alleges wrongful conduct, as defined in this policy, and is then subjected to an adverse personnel action as a result of their disclosure. It also applies to the supervisors of such employees.

POLICY

No adverse personnel action will be taken against a University employee in knowing retaliation for a disclosure of information by the employee to a public body or to a designated University officer, which information the employee in good faith believes evidences: (1) a violation of any law, or (2) mismanagement involving a gross waste of monies, or (3) an abuse of authority (items 1, 2 and 3 are collectively referred to herein as "alleged wrongful conduct").

If an adverse personnel action is taken against a University employee in knowing retaliation for his or her good faith disclosure of information to a public body or to a designated University officer concerning alleged wrongful conduct, and if the employee's conduct or performance did not warrant that action, then the adverse personnel action will be reversed.

Any employee who is found to have knowingly retaliated for disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body or to a designated University officer shall be subject to discipline, up to and including termination, in accordance with existing University rules, policies and procedures.

In order to permit the University an opportunity to review allegations of wrongful conduct and take necessary action as appropriate, all personnel are encouraged to make such allegations to a University officer.

At any stage in the process, the parties may choose conciliation as a means to attempt a mutual resolution of the matter.

DEFINITIONS

Adverse Personnel Action:

Any action negatively affecting one's employment such as, but not limited to:

- a. termination of employment.
- b. demotion with or without salary reduction.
- c. imposition of suspension with or without pay.
- d. issuance of written or oral reprimand.
- e. decision not to promote.
- f. decision not to grant tenure.
- g. decision not to grant continuing status.
- h. unsatisfactory performance rating in any single item of performance.
- i. withholding of appropriate salary adjustments.
- j. elimination of the employee's position unless reasonably required by a reduction in force, reorganization, or insufficient funding, monies or workload.
- k. other significant change in duties, responsibilities, resources, grade level, or salary.

Alleged Wrongful Conduct:

- a. A violation of any law, Board of Regents' Policy, UHAP Manual provision, or other written policies of the University;
- b. Mismanagement involving gross waste of monies; or
- c. Abuse of authority.

Day:

Day is defined as a calendar day excluding Saturdays, Sundays, holidays, and University vacation periods. In cases of faculty and other employees appointed on an academic year (nine-month) basis, day does not include summer, semester, or other similar academic break periods.

Discloser:

A discloser is an employee who reports alleged wrongful conduct to a public body, as defined herein.

Disclosure:

Disclosure means a written or oral report by an employee to a public body, including a University officer, of alleged wrongful conduct, as defined above. If the report is oral and the person to whom the disclosure is made requests a written, signed affirmation, there must be such a written, signed affirmation to create a disclosure.

Disclosure Investigation:

Disclosure investigation means review and determination made by the University officer or designees of a disclosure made by an employee.

Filing:

Filing under this policy shall mean actual receipt by the office where the filing is required.

Knowing Retaliation:

Knowing retaliation means that, in taking adverse personnel action, the supervisory employee acted, in whole or in part, because of his or her knowledge or belief that the employee made a good faith disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body or to a designated University officer.

Personnel Action:

An employment-related act or decision which impacts an employee positively or negatively.

Public Body:

Members of the Arizona Legislature, a member of the Arizona Board of Regents, or offices of the Arizona Attorney General, the Governor of Arizona, a federal, state, or local law enforcement agency, or the University president, provost, vice-provost, a vice-president, or a dean.

Service Provider:

Individuals or entities qualified by education and experience to administer and conduct whistle-blower hearings, using an independent hearing officer. The service provider has a contractual obligation to provide a neutral and independent hearing officer for whistle-blower hearings. The hearing officer shall be chosen by mutual agreement between the University and the complainant.

University Officer:

University of Arizona president, provost, vice-provost, vice-president, or a dean.

Whistle-blower/Complainant:

"Complainant": A current or former employee (1) who disclosed alleged wrongful conduct (a violation of the law, or mismanagement/gross waste of funds, or an abuse of authority) to a public body, and (2) who subsequently is subject to an adverse personnel action as a result of making the prior disclosure.

Whistle-blower Complaint:

A written complaint filed by a complainant with a University officer alleging that an adverse personnel action was taken in knowing retaliation for his or her prior disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body.

Whistle-blower Complaint Review:

A review by a University officer of a whistle-blower complaint, resulting in a written decision which the University officer provides to the complainant.

Whistle-blower External Hearing:

A hearing conducted by an external hearing officer approved by the complainant and University to conduct a hearing if the complainant is dissatisfied with the decision of the University officer following a whistle-blower complaint review. The hearing shall include both parties and shall be conducted in accordance with these rules and applicable procedural rules of the University.

MAKING A DISCLOSURE

Any employee may make a disclosure to any public body as defined herein. In order to allow the University an opportunity to review alleged wrongful conduct and to take necessary corrective action, employees should report in writing a disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct (see definition above) to a University officer so that a University investigation may commence. The University officer or designees will conduct an investigation into the allegations of the disclosure and will take any necessary corrective action. At the conclusion of the investigation, the University officer will notify the discloser and other affected employees in writing of the results of the investigation and the decision reached and retain a copy. A disclosure and disclosure investigation is not a whistle-blower complaint or review. A discloser must suffer adverse personnel action after and as a result of making disclosure to be covered under this policy.

FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGFUL CONDUCT

Any University employee who knowingly makes false allegations of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body shall be subject to discipline, up to and including termination of employment, in accordance with University rules, policies, and procedures.

LEGITIMATE EMPLOYMENT ACTION

This policy may not be used as a defense by an employee against whom an adverse personnel action has been taken for legitimate reasons or cause under University rules and policies. It shall not be a violation of this policy to take adverse personnel action against an employee whose conduct or performance warrants that action. If a supervisory employee proves to the satisfaction of the body investigating and considering a claim of "knowing retaliation" that the adverse personnel action was taken for legitimate reasons or cause, under University rules and policies, irrespective of the disclosure of information, then the supervisory employee shall not be disciplined under this policy, and the fact of disclosure shall not alter the adverse action.

WHISTLE-BLOWER COMPLAINT

An employee who has been subjected to an adverse personnel action based on his or her prior disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct may protest the action by filing a written whistle-blower complaint with a University officer. The University officer or designee, on receipt of a whistle-blower complaint, will review the complaint expeditiously to determine: (1) whether the complainant reported alleged wrongful conduct to a public body before an adverse action was imposed; (2) whether the complainant suffered an adverse personnel action after reporting alleged wrongful conduct to a public body; (3) whether the complainant alleges that the adverse action resulted from the prior disclosure; and (4) whether the adverse personnel action was the result of knowing retaliation for the employee's disclosure. Within thirty (30) days after receipt of the complaint, the University officer will notify the complainant in writing of the results of the review and whether the adverse personnel action is affirmed, reversed, or modified, with a copy of the decision to the employee's supervisor. The supervisor will implement the decision within seven (7) days after receipt of the University officer's decision.

WHISTLE-BLOWER HEARING

A complainant who is dissatisfied with the decision of the University officer on the whistle-blower complaint may file a request for a whistle-blower hearing and proceed under the following procedures. An employee who has invoked this policy to the hearing stage may not also utilize, or have utilized, any other University policy or procedure with regard to the same facts, set of circumstances, or personnel actions. If additional adverse action comes after a whistle-blower complaint, the employee can pursue other internal and external remedies.

WHISTLE-BLOWER HEARING PROCEDURES

The University President or a designee shall contract with a qualified external service provider based on a recommendation from a committee consisting of the chairs (or their designees) of the Faculty, Staff Advisory Council, and Appointed Personnel Organization Council. This provider shall then provide qualified external hearing officers and a hearing process for complainants who are dissatisfied with the University's decision. The purpose of the hearing is to determine whether adverse personnel action resulted from the complainant's prior disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct. No other issues or determinations are authorized or appropriate. The hearing officer cannot be a University employee and, except for the contractual arrangement to provide hearing officer services, cannot have a substantial interest in the University. The hearing officer shall be chosen by mutual agreement between the University and the complainant. This step is the final stage of the University administrative procedure for whistle-blower complaints. No suit, claim, or judicial review may be brought alleging violation of the whistle-blower policy until this step has been completed.

Request for Hearing

An employee dissatisfied with the determination of the University of that employee's allegation of an adverse personnel action as the result of the employee's disclosure of alleged violations must file a written request for a hearing by an independent hearing officer with the University's Office of Human Resources within fifteen (15) days of the date of the mailing to the employee of the University decision.

Failure to timely file a request for a hearing with Human Resources deprives the independent hearing officer of jurisdiction to hear the matter and renders the prior decision the final administrative decision of the University.

Contents of Request for Hearing

A request for a hearing must contain the following:

- a. A specific statement requesting a whistle-blower hearing by an external hearing officer.
- b. The name, work address, work telephone number and position of the complainant.
- c. The name, work address, work telephone number, and position of the involved University officer who issued a decision on the complainant's whistle-blower complaint.
- d. Copies of (1) the employee's prior disclosure, (2) results of the disclosure investigation, and (3) the University officer's decision on the whistle-blower complaint.
- e. A statement of the reasons for requesting a hearing including the objectionable portion of the University officer's decision.
- f. A brief statement of the reasons the decision to be reviewed is believed to be legally or factually incorrect.
- g. A statement of the specific relief or remedy requested.

Appointment of Hearing Officer

Within twenty (20) days of the filing of a request for a hearing by an independent hearing officer, the University Human Resources department shall:

- a. Acknowledge receipt of the request to the person requesting a hearing.
- b. Notify the appropriate University officer or administrator of the receipt of a request for a hearing by an independent hearing officer and provide the University officer with a copy of the hearing request.
- c. Notify the service provider to begin the process of selecting an external hearing officer and conducting a whistle-blower hearing.

Submission of the Record

Within this same twenty (20) days of the filing of the request for a hearing, the service provider shall notify the University Human Resources Department, the complainant and the identified University officer that the request for a hearing is accepted and assist the parties with the mutual selection of the hearing officer, the procedures for a pre-hearing conference in person or by telephone, and the procedures which will be followed in conducting the hearing, including submission of evidence, documents and witness lists. The hearing officer may require the parties to submit summaries of their positions before the hearing commences.

The University Human Resources Department shall be available to provide the staffing, office space, communication services, and other necessary support services and facilities such that the hearing may be promptly and smoothly conducted.

Conduct of Hearing

Hearings before the hearing officer shall be conducted according to this policy and the rules and procedures of the service provider. The procedures designated in this policy supersede the rules of the service provider, if there is a conflict. The formal rules of procedures or evidence do not govern the hearing. Generally, the party advocating a particular point or fact has the burden of proof on that point or fact. Generally, the person seeking review has the burden of persuading the hearing officer that the adverse action was based on a prior disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct to a public body.

The hearing will be conducted within ninety (90) days after the request is received by the service provider, unless the hearing officer extends the time for good cause.

The hearing officer may at any time lengthen or shorten the time for any action to be taken. The hearing officer may also direct that matters connected with the hearing of the matter, whether by formal or informal hearing, be completed within a prescribed time. Such authority shall extend to actions to be taken by the hearing officer within a prescribed time so long as the hearing officer makes a written record of the reasons for extending such time.

The hearing shall be recorded or transcribed at the University's expense by such means as will result in an accurate, written rendition of the hearing.

Attorneys or Advisers

Either party may be represented by an attorney at any stage in the process including the hearing. At the hearing, the attorneys may participate and present the case on behalf of the parties. In lieu of being represented by an attorney, either party may be advised by a non-attorney advisor at any stage of the process. If the complainant will not be represented by an attorney at the hearing, the University representative will also participate without an attorney at the hearing.

Resolution by Agreement

At any time after the appointment of an independent hearing officer, the parties may agree upon a resolution of the matter. In such event, the agreement shall be presented in writing to the hearing officer who shall dismiss the matter and notify the service provider, the parties, and the president in writing that the matter is "resolved by agreement."

Hearing Officer's Decision

Within thirty (30) days after the close of the hearing, the hearing officer or service provider will provide a written report to the parties and to the University President. The report will contain findings of fact and the evidence relied upon to sustain those facts, conclusions including reference to applicable law, rules or policies, and a decision by the hearing officer that the adverse personnel action was or was not based on a prior disclosure. The University will implement the decision of the hearing officer within ten (10) days after receipt, except that the hearing officer may not direct that the University grant renewal, tenure, continuing status, or promotion at the University to an individual. If the hearing officer finds that any of these personnel actions were taken as the result of knowing retaliation for the disclosure of alleged wrongful conduct, the hearing officer shall direct that the application be reconsidered by the appropriate University faculty bodies and acted upon without regard to the disclosure.

The hearing officer's decision and subsequent actions of the University are subject to judicial review *de novo*. An appellant may also choose judicial administrative review.