

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 3, 1977 Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session on Monday, October 3, 1977, in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Sixty-seven members were present with Vice President Weaver presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Altschul, Arenz, Atwater, Bartlett, Beach, Benjamin, Blackwell, Boghosian, Boone, Butler, Caldwell, Carr, Chin, Crist, Dinham, Dresher, DuVal, Edwards, Ehrenkranz, Elliott, Epperson, Finical, Garcia, Graham, Guptill, Hall, Hawkins, Henderson, Heusinkveld, Hull, Inman, Johnson, Jones, Kassander, Kettel, Kneebone, Laird, Lebowitz, Malik, Manes, Manning, Matlock, Matter, Mautner, Myers, Nelson, Nigh, Peterson, Pickens, Ridge, Rosenberg, Rosenblatt, Roubicek, Rush, Rusk, Seibert, Sigworth, Steelink, Sumner, Svob, Townsend, Weaver, Webb, Windsor, Witte, Woloshin, and Wrenn. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Briggs, Clark, Cole, Coxon, DeWalt, Gaines, Hyland, LaBan, Linkhart, Marchello, Meredith, Munsinger, Odishaw, Paplanus, Paulsen, Prosser, Rehm, Schaefer, Skinner, Sorensen, Stairs, Tomizuka, Wenders, and Wiersma.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of September 12, 1977 were approved as distributed. (Comment by Secretary: In the September 12 minutes on page 3, in the last sentence of the third paragraph, Dr. William Noyes was identified as Chairman of the Undergraduate Council. As Coordinator of Curricular Matters, Dr. Noyes serves as Executive Secretary of the Undergraduate Council, not as Chairman.)

INTRODUCTION OF NEW STUDENT MEMBERS: Dr. Weaver presented the names of the new student members of the Faculty Senate who had been selected since the September meeting. Those present were recognized and welcomed to the Senate. The new student members are Mike Arenz, Don Beach, Perry Benjamin, Doug Ehrenkranz, Scott Finical, Janet Guptill, and Doug Linkhart.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Dr. Weaver recognized Senator Mark Webb, President of the Associated Students. Mr. Webb said he wanted the Senate to realize that the Associated Students of the University of Arizona see themselves as a service organization to the institution and he would welcome suggestions from the faculty at any time about ways in which student government could be of greater service to the institution.

He announced that in an arrangement developed between ASUA and the City of Tucson SunFran bus passes are now available for sale on the University campus at the ASUA offices in the Student Union Building. Faculty and staff members as well as students are invited to take advantage of this service.

Mr. Webb remarked that he had recently come across an editorial in the Arizona Wildcat published in February of 1935 commenting that one of the

gravest problems facing the University was the matter of parking automobiles. He said that parking and traffic concerns continue to be major problems facing the University. On November 1 and 2, student government will conduct a "Student Parking Garage Referendum" to obtain expression from the student body about supporting a program to develop a parking garage. Following the referendum, Mr. Webb said that ASUA may be bringing a specific proposal to the Senate.

Mr. Webb said he would like to state again how much student government appreciates the opportunity to express student voice within the Senate. He hoped the Senate would use ASUA in any way possible in any area of University concern.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Myers announced that a state conference on retirement legislation would be held at Apache Junction on October 15. Invited to participate in the conference are all members of the Arizona Public Employees Retirement System which includes all public school teachers as well as all state employees including all University personnel.

The cost of participating in the October 15 meeting will be \$25 which includes the cost of the meeting room, luncheon, and all materials.

Dr. Myers informed the Senate that the Executive Committee, with the approval of the Committee on Committees, had selected the seven members of the University Planning Committee. Seven members had been chosen but subsequently one had been found to be ineligible and another had resigned. The five members remaining on the committee are as follows, Dr. Myers announced: Dr. Clark Hawkins, Economics; Dr. Roger Caldwell, Plant Pathology; Dr. William Matlock, Soils, Water and Engineering; Mr. Marshall Townsend, University of Arizona Press; and Dr. Cornelius Steelink, Chemistry.

Dr. Myers said the two additional members would be selected at an early time and the Senate would be informed of their appointment.

Dr. Steelink asked Dr. Myers if he had any late information about the University's health insurance program. Dr. Myers said it was his understanding that the new insurance program was still being studied by the State Personnel Board and an announcement is expected very soon.

ELECTION OF REPLACEMENT FOR COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS SENATOR: Mr. Windsor informed the Senate that Dr. Jeffrie Murphy, a College of Liberal Arts senator, had found it necessary to resign from the Senate. The Senate then elected Dr. Joseph Malik to fill the vacancy created by Dr. Murphy's resignation. Dr. Malik was the next eligible runner-up in the balloting at the last election of senators from the College of Liberal Arts.

ELECTION OF REPLACEMENT ON FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: Dr. Myers pointed out that inasmuch as Dr. Jeffrie Murphy had been named to the Senate Executive Committee but had now resigned from the Faculty Senate, it now would be necessary to replace him on the Senate Executive Committee. Chairman Weaver opened the floor to nominations for the position. Dr. Billy Jo Inman and Dr. Charles Rosenberg were nominated. Election by ballot followed and Dr. Rosenberg was elected to replace Dr. Murphy on the Senate Executive Committee.

"UNIVERSITY CREDIT" PROPOSAL, APPROVAL OF: The presiding officer asked Dr. Noyes, Coordinator of Curricular Matters, to lead the Senate discussion concerning the proposed "university credit". All Senate members had been provided in advance of the meeting the report of a committee of administrators who had given long study to the matter of residence credit for off-campus work, the report of a faculty committee appointed to study the same question, and a set of joint recommendations that had been developed following completion of the reports of the two committees concerned. The administrative committee had included Dean Herbert Rhodes as chairman, Registrar David Butler, Continuing Education Dean Lawrence O. Nelson, Education Dean F. Robert Paulsen, and Dr. Andres D. Onate, formerly Assistant Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. The faculty committee had included Dr. William Noyes, Chairman, and the members had been Dr. Ruth Beeker, Elementary Education; Dr. Donald Ray, Animal Sciences; Dr. Thomas Rehm, Chemical Engineering; Dr. Robert Sankey, Speech Communication; Dr. Gerald Swanson, Economics; and Dr. Edward Williams, Political Science.

The joint recommendations had then been approved by both of the above-named committees, as well as by the Undergraduate Council and by the Graduate Council.

(Comment to General Faculty readers of these minutes: Every member of the faculty was mailed a set of the joint recommendations under date of September 26, 1977.)

Dr. Noyes explained that the study process resulting in the joint recommendations had been a careful process spread over a period of two years. It was hoped that the results, if adopted, would in time lead to more off-campus offerings with off-campus work more directly controlled by the academic departments and the colleges.

Dean Manes asked if the recommendation that courses offered should fit within a "program" context meant that courses must have direct applicability to particular curricula or did it simply mean that courses must be usable toward graduation in some way, if only as electives. Dr. Noyes said that what was meant was that a course should be applicable in some appropriate way to a student's overall program, but this would include use as elective credit. He noted that the word "should" had been used in the recommendation rather than the word "would". Every effort must be made, he said, to see that credit courses are not given which have no applicability to any degree program. This would not mean that certain individual courses that might be of value in their own right would not continue to be offered. These, however, would probably be offered as "extension credit" rather than "university credit". He pointed out that the idea of extension credit was not being abandoned. Rather, it was proposed that the term "residence credit" be dropped, with the term "university credit" being used where appropriate for any course meeting the outlined criteria, whether taught on or off campus. It was hoped that virtually all off-campus work would now become university credit, he said.

Dean Hull asked if it was correct to see the retention of extension credit as an escape valve for use occasionally when it is decided to offer a course that is not related to a particular program. Dr. Noyes answered **yes**. The thread that must be maintained throughout the concept of university credit,

Dr. Noyes said, is that of comparability.

Dr. Altschul asked what was meant by the remark under the recommendation concerning facilities and resources which stated that "student access to library reference materials and other resource materials must be comparable to that available to campus students in similar course offerings". Dr. Noyes explained that it was hoped that the result of approval of this recommendation would be that faculty members involved would evaluate what library resources were needed well in advance of taking a course off-campus, working with library personnel so that the appropriate books could be made available to the off-campus students concerned. Further, attention would be given to the technical means of getting other appropriate material to the off-campus sites.

Miss Guptill asked if field work would be available through off-campus university credit. Dr. Noyes said that field work and individual studies could be so offered. However, such work may be taken now through on-campus registration although the actual activity often, of course, must be carried on in other locations. Certainly there was no reason why field work or individual studies could not be registered for as a university credit offering. Again the test would be that of comparability, Dr. Noyes said.

Dr. Myers referred to the statement that all off-campus academic offerings for university credit must be taught by regular on-campus faculty or by adjunct faculty selected and certified by procedures essentially the same as those used for certification of regular faculty. He asked how feasible it was to anticipate meeting the cost of implementing this policy. Dr. Noyes answered that Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University are at present using their regular faculty for all their off-campus teaching, at a higher cost. He noted, however, that as a result the University of Arizona was losing out "in the market place" since many people preferred to take offerings by ASU or NAU for residence credit rather than U of A classes for extension credit.

Dr. Noyes said that ~~this~~ adoption of this recommendation would mean that the regular faculty would lose the opportunity to teach a credit overload off-campus for extra pay. To revise present procedures in this area must be done delicately, he said. If the faculty member agreeing to teach off-campus cannot be compensated by additional pay, perhaps he or she can be compensated by extra credit in the teaching load--perhaps four credits in the teaching load for a three-credit off-campus course. It is realized, Dr. Noyes emphasized, that planning and implementing of these recommendations would require care and finesse. The document, however, cites directions it is felt the University should be aspiring toward.

Dean Manes said he felt the Senate must be realistic. He said the College of Business and Public Administration is now offering, for residence credit, nine courses in Sierra Vista most of which fall short of meeting the University's equivalent standards when compared with on-campus work. Some of them meet considerably fewer hours than on-campus offerings. Three, for example, extend over a period of only 12 weeks. If the proposal is approved, great effort must be made to adhere more closely to the equivalent standard in the amount of class time required. Further, it is proposed that all university credit courses be taught by regular faculty members and that

their off-campus teaching be part of their regular load. Of the nine courses in question, Dean Manes said only three are taught by regular faculty members and none of them are doing this off-campus teaching as part of their regular load. "You can't send the regular faculty out to teach in off-campus locations as part of their regular load and then request authorization for additional home campus faculty," he said.

Dr. Noyes said that appointing qualified adjunct faculty is also provided for. The hope is, Dr. Noyes said, that the off-campus university credit offerings will be taught by faculty of whom the University is proud enough to list them in the University catalog. The off-campus adjunct faculty should meet the same standards required for on-campus faculty appointments.

Dean Manes responded that this simply is not going to happen. What will continue to happen, he felt confident, was that the off-campus teaching would still be either done by graduate students, or by regular faculty for extra compensation. To believe otherwise is simply not realistic, he said. Dr. Noyes said that of course the University should not allow the proposed "university credit" for a course that is being taught by inferior faculty members. He pointed out that his office now has the responsibility of reviewing the number of contact hours for all courses offered off-campus. The intent is certainly to require a minimum of 40 hours for a three-credit course. If this is not the case the course certainly should not be available for university credit, he emphasized. It could be taught for extension credit. The effort, however, would be to "beef up" the number of contact hours, Dr. Noyes stated. It is true that to recognize this proposal would present the University with certain financing problems. What is proposed is what the University should do, however.

Dean Rosenblatt spoke in agreement with Dean Manes. Using teaching in Yuma as an example, he said, an individual traveling to that city to teach a course should plan to remain overnight. If comparability is to be maintained, the professor must be available for office hours so his students may consult with him. Thus, an on-campus professor would have to plan on contributing the better part of two days in order to teach a course in Yuma. As for adjunct faculty, there is a question of how many qualified adjunct members would be available in Yuma. It is unlikely that many would be. Therefore it is difficult to see how comparable quality could be maintained. He did not see how the recommendations under consideration would in any way provide for the means to support the proposal.

Dean Manes said he saw the document as a good statement of policy and he would like to vote for it. He said he must say again though that a number of off-campus courses which do not meet the standards as outlined in the document are available right now for residence credit, as distinct from extension credit. He said he simply could not see how the standards of the recommendations for university credit could be established and maintained. What good is it to say we should be doing something if there is no likelihood that we can do it in the foreseeable future? He saw a complete gap, he said, between the procedures proposed and reality.

Mr. Laird said he assumed that the college deans would enforce the new policy if it became official policy and it would be up to them to get rid of

courses of the type described by Dean Manes.

Dr. Roubicek referred to an article concerning off-campus courses offered by the Division of Continuing Education carried in a recent issue of the faculty-staff newspaper gUe pAsa?. This referred in part to the geographical areas in the state where each of the three universities would offer off-campus courses. He wondered how that official statement of Regents' policy related to the proposal before the Senate. Dr. Noyes said that of course anything adopted as Regents' policy was policy with which the University must comply. In implementing the proposed recommendations before the Senate, if adopted, the administration would work within the framework of any established Regents' policy.

Dr. Noyes said that a large proportion of the University's off-campus teaching at present is numbered in the 9000 series (the prefix 9 indicates an off-campus course being taught for residence credit)--especially in the programs at Yuma, Sierra Vista, Silverbell, and Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, as well as the offerings through Microcampus. It had been indicated through some of the remarks heard today that what was being done as off-campus residence work was in fact of a low quality. He as a member of the faculty found this very upsetting. He said it had been felt by the study committees as well as by the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils that it would be better to have a U of A policy established whereby the academic departments and the colleges would administer the program, than to have a policy simply mandated by the administration.

Dr. Steelink asked Dr. Noyes to elaborate on the comment that the "U of A was losing out to NAU and ASU in the market place." Dr. Noyes said he had meant that students will not enroll for U of A courses if the credit is only extension credit if they can enroll for similar courses with either of the other two universities for residence credit. This is what has happened in the Phoenix area. He said he would like to emphasize again that the proposal before the house would provide for the off-campus teaching program to be controlled by the college deans and the academic departments. "We do not want to compete in the market place," Dr. Noyes said, "by simply lowering standards."

Dr. Rosenberg said it was difficult for faculty members of the Senate to vote for something that would be very difficult for the deans to implement. Dr. Noyes said it need not be that difficult. The deans would have greater responsibility and control. He said he believed that at the present time the dean of a college is involved in an off-campus situation only if the course is to be available for residence credit. Dean Nelson said that this was not correct. Any time there is an off-campus offering, he said, the dean is asked to help find and must approve the instructor hired.

Dr. Kassander asked at the present time how much of the off-campus teaching effort of the University is for residence credit and how much is not, leaving out of consideration of course noncredit offerings. Dean Nelson said he would estimate that 80% of the University's present offerings are for residence credit and 20% are not. Dr. Noyes explained that frequently now the place where a program is taught determines whether or not it will carry residence credit (Yuma, Sierra Vista, Silverbell, Davis-Monthan) and not the quality of the offering.

Dr. Myers asked how ASU and NAU had made off-campus teaching attractive to their faculty, since it is part of the regular teaching load. What prerequisites are provided? Dr. Noyes said that a great proportion of ASU's off-campus teaching is in the Phoenix basin. The U of A of course could do equally well if its off-campus teaching was limited to the Tucson basin. He said he did not know what prerequisites NAU offers to attract faculty to teach in Phoenix, where NAU does conduct a substantial teaching program.

Dean Manes said he must point out once again that the off-campus courses offered by the College of Business and Public Administration at this time for residence credit simply do not conform with the standards outlined in the document before the Senate. He said he had to be honest about it. He said his office had not been involved in setting up the schedule of teaching time. He said that in all candor he could not believe that if a course is taught more than 15 miles from Tucson, the faculty concerned will be of comparable quality to that of the same class taught on campus. If it will make people feel better, they should go ahead and vote for a good document, he said. Referring to Dr. Noyes' earlier comment that remarks about the realities of off-campus residence credit courses were upsetting to him as a faculty member, Dean Manes said he should be upset. Dr. Noyes said the situation should upset Dean Manes even more than it did the faculty.

Dr. Noyes said that the two study committees had accepted the fact that at present there are a number of things about off-campus residence courses that do not conform with on-campus ones. It was felt a statement should be developed that would express the ideal toward which the University was striving. Adoption of such an official policy would indeed provide a more potent argument than presently is available to raise standards. And isn't it better, Dr. Noyes asked, to have the faculty control this? "Granted, it will cost some money but if the deans and departments have the control of the situation it is felt that the support in time can be obtained."

Dr. Robert Johnson asked if the document was approved, became official policy, and was implemented would not this eliminate the offering of the questionable courses described by Dean Manes? Dr. Noyes answered that indeed it should.

Dr. Peterson said that he felt the proposal if adopted would indeed help correct the situation described by Dean Manes. Dean Manes and the academic departments of the College of Business, for example, could then insist that the standards proclaimed in the document be enforced. They could overrule any arrangement for anything less. He said he would like to comment on the matter of adjunct faculty. An adjunct faculty member is a specialist in a narrow area, he said, and as such probably would not be considered for appointment to the regular faculty. Have in mind that adjunct faculty members frequently are appointed to the faculty of the campus in Tucson. In selecting personnel for adjunct positions in the off-campus program, the question should be asked, "Would we let this man teach this course on the campus in Tucson?" In other words, the same standards for adjunct appointment to both teaching situations should be applied.

Dean Manes said that with proper authority, indeed the deans could correct the matter of uncomparable contact hours. However, what can a mere dean do about the structure of pay? It is sometimes very hard to convince the powers-that-be to provide adequate financial support in any instance. Simply calling the off-campus work "university credit" won't accomplish this in itself.

Dean Hull moved adoption of the report. Dr. Edwards seconded the motion. Dr. Bartlett asked, if it was adopted, when the new policy would be implemented. After a conference among Dr. Noyes, Dr. Weaver, Dean Windsor, and Mr. Butler, it was suggested that the motion provide that implementation be effective July 1, 1978. This was agreed to by Dean Hull and Dr. Edwards.

Dr. Peterson asked how this action would relate to Section 7 of the recommendations which pointed out that degree residence requirements should be carefully reviewed and considered for modification and/or restatement at the same time the recommendations of this committee report were considered. Indeed the recommendations of this report had been made contingent upon such review. Dr. Noyes said that if the document was adopted, then recommendations concerning residence requirements would have to come to the Senate later. Dean Hull said he thought that Section 7 would be strengthened if the last sentence read, "Indeed, implementation of the recommendation of this report should be contingent upon such review," or "Indeed, implementation of this report should be contingent upon such review."

The question was called for and the motion carried with no negative vote heard.

(Since the two committee reports and the statement of joint recommendations were furnished each senator prior to the meeting and since the joint recommendations were sent to each member of the faculty, duplicate copies are not being distributed with these minutes. Copies are being attached to the official file copy of the minutes.)

RECOMMENDATION TO DISCONTINUE REQUIRING USE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER AS AN IDENTIFICATION NUMBER ON UNIVERSITY TRAVEL ORDERS, APPROVAL OF: Dr. Steelink said he would like to raise his voice in opposition to the University's using Social Security numbers for purposes other than for identification for participation in the Social Security system. An example, he said, was the University's now requiring the Social Security number as an identifying feature of a University travel order and on an expense account. Dr. Steelink said he continued to be concerned about any evidence of invasion of privacy and he thought that it would be appropriate if the Senate would express in even one small way opposition to the practice of using Social Security numbers for other purposes of identification. He then moved that the administration of the University of Arizona be requested not to require Social Security numbers on travel orders. Several seconds to the motion were heard. Dr. Weaver said he would like to know what use is made of the Social Security number by the state's central administration in Phoenix. Dr. Steelink said this could be looked into but he didn't think any policy imposed by the state of Arizona would make him change his mind about the Senate action he had proposed.

Dr. Kassander said that if the use of the number is not otherwise needed by federal law he would favor support of the motion. Under the University's former accounting system the reimbursement for travel expenses and the honorarium for a visiting consultant were frequently lumped together in one payment. This presented a confounding situation indeed for the individual since the reimbursement for travel expenses would in no way be classified as income as would be the honorarium. Vice President Carr said that while honorariums must be reported to the Internal Revenue Service, he did not know why such payments as travel reimbursement need be. He did not know how travel expense reimbursement was tied in with payroll activity but he would look into the matter. He said he also would be against expanding use of the Social Security number unless absolutely necessary. Dr. Kassander commented that he didn't see why the University internally could not use the employee number just as effectively.

Dr. Lebowitz said that many agencies are moving away from use of the Social Security number as an identification number, for example, the National Institutes of Health.

The question on Dr. Steelink's motion was called for and the motion carried with one negative vote heard.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR, QUESTION RE: Dr. Peterson asked Dr. Weaver what the status was of the review at the Regents' level of the recommendations made by the Faculty Senate concerning the University academic calendar. Dr. Weaver said this matter is now before the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Regents. He hoped that body would shortly be making a recommendation to the Regents Long-Range Planning Committee. He hoped further information would be available in the near future.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary



David Butler, Assistant Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 1977:

1. Approval of minutes of September 12, 1977.
2. Election of replacement for College of Liberal Arts senator.
3. Election of replacement on Senate Executive Committee.
4. Approval of "University Credit" proposal, to become effective July 1, 1978.
5. Approval of motion requesting University administration not to require Social Security numbers on travel orders.

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

1. Study of question of developing means of review of institution's administrators at the college and university level.
2. Development of Faculty Manual statement concerning the status of tenured personnel being released because of the lack of financial support, because of the curtailment or termination of a program, or because of a redirection of the goals of department.
3. Review of curricular material ("Curriculum" bulletin, Vol. 6, No. 10, issue date of April 28, 1977) pertaining to the Reorganization of the School of Home Economics and the proposed change in the title of the School of Home Economics.