

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, January 17, 1977 Kiva, Room 211 College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3 p.m. on Monday, January 17, 1977, in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Seventy members were present with President Schaefer presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Atwater, Bartlett, Blackwell, Boghosian, Briggs, Butler, Caldwell, Chin, Clark, Coxon, Davis, DeWalt, Dresher, Edwards, Fahey, Federhar, Gegenheimer, Graham, Hawkins, Hetrick, Heusinkveld, Hull, Hyland, Ingram, Inman, M. Johnson, Kassander, LaBan, Laird, Lebowitz, Livermore, Lytle, Manning, Matlock, McConnell, McCullough, McMillan, Meredith, Munroe, Munsinger, Myers, Nigh, Odishaw, Paplanus, Peterson, Picchioni, Rehm, Rhodes, Ridge, Rosenberg, Rosenblatt, Roubicek, Rush, Rusk, Schaefer, Seibert, Sigworth, Sivo, Stairs, Steelink, Sumner, Svob, Thompson, Townsend, Weaver, Webb, Wiersma, Windsor, Witte, and Wrenn. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Carr, Ceballos, DuVal, Flores, Gaines, Garcia, Gerhard, R. Johnson, Kneebone, Manes, Marchello, Mitchell, Murphy, Nelson, Paulsen, Peacock, Prosser, Selke, Smith, Sorensen, Tomizuka, Vanselow, Wenders, and Woloshin.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of December 6, 1976, were approved as distributed, with the following modification. Dr. Gerald Peterson asked that in those minutes, in the next to last paragraph on P. 130, his quoted comment be corrected to read, "It has been said today that you cannot legislate everything in relation to use of the University's name. It should be pointed out that you cannot legislate everything in the matter of a grading system either." The President indicated that this correction would be made.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: President Schaefer said that the Executive Committee of the Senate had asked that in his report to the Senate each meeting he henceforth include a summary of actions by the Board of Regents since the Senate's last meeting. He said he would be glad to do this. He noted that affairs concerning academic matters at the Arizona universities will be moving rather slowly in the next few months due to the death in December of Dr. Tom Moore, Academic Planning Coordinator. Certain academic reviews unavoidably now will be temporarily interrupted. Dr. Schaefer said the Regents would be seeking a replacement for Dr. Moore in the near future.

The President reported that the Regents had approved the contract for the construction of the addition to the Nursing building which is to be funded by state, local, and federal funds. Construction will take the better part of a year. The expansion will relieve crowded conditions in the Nursing building and will also make it possible for the College of Nursing to expand its graduate program.

Dr. Schaefer said that the University's oldest building, Old Main, had suffered from the toll of time and it had recently been discovered that some of the building's main beams had cracked. Temporary support is being provided by steel jacks. The Regents will provide funds, he said, to install new steel beams which will make the building structurally sound again. Cost will be between \$75,000 and \$90,000.

The President said the Regents had been giving increased attention to the matter of continuing employes beyond the normal retirement age of 65. Some Regents feel that the University of Arizona is continuing the employment of too many persons in this situation. The question has been assigned to the Board's Policy Committee for study and guidelines will be developed soon. President Schaefer said he felt that the University of Arizona administration is indeed looking at the best interests of the institution and the departments concerned as they consider each individual retirement case.

The President referred to the announcement at the January 14 Regents' meeting that study was being given to opening a School of Health Related Sciences at the University. This had been long discussed, the President said, the idea being to bring into one administrative group a number of health related sciences now taught in various divisions of the institution. No new teaching areas would be involved at present, the President said. The programs of such a school might be expanded later. The first step, if approved by the Regents, would be to organize the administrative unit of the school. The President said that the academic direction the school would take, as well as consideration of additional academic areas to be added to the offerings, would of course call for input from the academic units of the University as appropriate. This would include whether or not the school should be developed into a college, for instance, and if so, when.

The President said the Board of Regents had been informed that already during the current fiscal year the University of Arizona has received \$20,000,000 in gifts and grants. This again may be a record year in gifts receipts, he said.

President Schaefer asked if any senators had questions about his remarks. Dr. Steelink asked if the question of continuing the employment of people beyond age 65 referred only to full-time personnel. Dr. Schaefer said that the situations ranged from 4% time to 100% time. Half of the persons presently employed who are over age 65 are working half time or less. The President explained that persons over 65 working less than 50% time do not need the approval of the State Personnel Board; however, in any instance, no matter how small the proportion of time worked, employment beyond age 65 must be approved by the Board of Regents. Dr. Steelink asked Dr. Schaefer what his personal attitude was toward continuing people past age 65. Dr. Schaefer said that each case must be treated as an individual matter, taking into account the best interests of both the institution and the department concerned. Such matters as the importance of a particular position to a department's total program, the availability of a replacement, etc., must be considered.

Dr. McCullough said he had noted that the Governor was recommending a reduction in the number of faculty positions at the U of A and asked President Schaefer to comment. Dr. Schaefer said this was related to the drop in FTE enrollment at the University of Arizona in the current academic year. Dr. McCullough asked if the President anticipated an effort by the Regents to reduce the FTE student/faculty ratio of 22 to 1. The President answered in the negative. He said he hoped the proposal to reduce the number of faculty is negotiable.

Dr. Paplanus asked if he correctly understood that opening the proposed School of Health Related Sciences was three years away. President Schaefer said that certainly there would be no programmatic additions for at least 3 years. The initial organization of the school might come sooner, perhaps as soon as next fall. This of course will happen only if the Board of Regents approves.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE SENATE SECRETARY: Dean Windsor called the Senate's attention to the distribution at this meeting to each senator of an interim report for 1976-77 of the Committee of Eleven. He said the report would be incorporated in the minutes of this Senate meeting.

Dean Windsor announced that the Senate Executive Committee had agreed that in the future as a standing item on the agenda of Senate meetings there would be a report from a representative of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona, in addition to reports from the President, the Secretary, and the Chairman of the Faculty.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Steelink reported that faculty representatives from the three Arizona universities would meet with State Legislators on Friday, January 21, 1977, to discuss various aspects of higher education in Arizona. Entitled, "The Legislature and The Universities: Catching Up On Communications," the conference will be held at the Adams Hotel in Phoenix from 1 p.m. until 5 p.m. Sponsors for the affair are the Arizona Universities Faculty Council and the Arizona State Conference of the American Association of University Professors. Financial support for the conference is provided by the Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado, which has sponsored many similar meetings in other states. Keynote speaker will be Dr. Lawrence Powell, University of Arizona Professor of Library Science. His topic will be "These Things are Priceless." Dr. Powell is the author of a recent bicentennial history of Arizona. Five faculty representatives from each University will be present. It is anticipated that an equal number of legislators from the Education Committees of both houses will attend. The purpose of the Conference is to initiate a dialogue between state legislators and faculty members. Included in the list of discussion topics will be Class Size and Teaching Effectiveness, Role of Research at the Universities, Admission Standards, Counseling and Advising of Students and Faculty Experts as Resources to State Legislators.

Dr. Steelink announced that the University of Arizona representatives to the conference would be Dr. Don Myers, Dr. Robert Mautner, Dr. Paul Johnson, Dr. Frank Wiersma and Dr. Steelink.

The President asked if this activity would be considered lobbying. If so, all university participants should register officially as lobbyists.

President Schaefer commented that at the recent Regents' meeting President Walkup of Northern Arizona University had indicated that the NAU faculty had reservations about the appropriateness of the meeting. Dr. Steelink said that the faculty at NAU did have a different view of the role of faculties from that of the faculty of Arizona State University and of the University of Arizona. A question had been raised about the appropriateness of NAU faculty members meeting with Legislators without their president and local regents being present. The ASU and U of A representatives had suggested that perhaps the NAU President and a Flagstaff Regent could attend the meeting as two of the Northern Arizona University representatives.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: President Schaefer said that no outstanding committee reports were ready for presentation at this time. He understood several would be ready for consideration by the Senate at the February meeting. At this point Dr. Weaver said he had had opportunity to read part of the interim report of the Committee of Eleven. He referred to Section 4, titled "Sick Leave Policy", and said that the

policy of sick leave for staff members is carefully described in detail in the Staff Manual.

Dr. Sigworth said he was aware of an inquiry by a member of the staff of the Home Economics Extension Division concerning the status of University employes who are neither tenure-eligible faculty or classified staff and he wondered if a committee was at work to develop grievance procedures for such persons. Registrar Butler said that such a committee had been appointed by the President, of which he was chairman. He said the committee had completed its study and submitted a report to Vice President Weaver who in turn had referred it to the Committee of Eleven. Dr. Weaver said the report had been reviewed by both the University legal staff and Personnel Department officials. Following its review by the Committee of Eleven it again would be submitted for review by Mr. Butler's committee before being implemented, Dr. Weaver stated.

PROPOSED REVISIONS IN GRADING SYSTEM: Dr. Peterson said that he understood that further discussion of the proposed changes in the University grading system was to be delayed until the February Senate meeting to permit college deans opportunity to review the subject in college faculty meetings. He said however he thought the Senate members would be interested in knowing that he had received a number of letters concerning limiting the period of time during which a W could be awarded in a course. While some of these recommended the imposition of a short time limit, two others emphasized it would be inappropriate to have a short withdrawal period in a foreign language course. In a language course a considerable period of time is needed before it can be determined whether a student can appropriately handle the foreign language study or not. Dr. Peterson said that the Undergraduate Council would be considering the various recommendations that have been received about the proposed grading changes and that body's recommendations in turn would reach members of the Senate prior to the February meeting.

ENDORSEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION OF PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS AT SPEEDWAY AND OLIVE AND OF COST SHARING BETWEEN U OF A AND CITY OF TUCSON: Mr. Federhar presented the following statement to the Senate:

"The intersection of Speedway Blvd. and Olive Road is the most dangerous pedestrian school crossing zone in the city of Tucson. From 1972 through 1976, 43 pedestrian-related accidents occurred at that intersection--more than twice as many as at any other location. In a September 7, 1976 memo the City Transportation Department calls Speedway and Olive the worst pedestrian school crossing area in Tucson. A March 12, 1976 memo from Hurvie Davis, Director of Transportation, states '....two locations in the University area, along Speedway, have been identified as high priority locations for an overpass.' One of these locations is Speedway and Olive. Mr. Davis goes on to say 'I feel that the University has helped create the problem, therefore, should share in the cost...' of an overpass.

"We, the Associated Students of the University of Arizona, agree. That is why the ASUA Parking and Traffic Committee is going before the Mayor and Council.

"The situation at Speedway and Olive is unacceptable. Both the city and the University realize that something must be done. Yet, because of past misunderstandings between the respective planning staffs, no action has been taken

at this intersection. We, at ASUA, ask that the City of Tucson and the University of Arizona begin immediately to plan, construct, and jointly finance a pedestrian overpass at Speedway and Olive.

"This recommendation is not made lightly. We realize that there are significant costs involved, around \$70-120,000. We realize that communications between the city and the University have been strained at times in the past. Yet, we hope that the urgency of the problem can overcome these obstacles.

"In making this recommendation we realize that there are alternatives to an overpass at Speedway and Olive. To help understand why we at ASUA feel an overpass is the best solution, I would like to deal with the alternatives listed in the September 7 report to the Mayor and Council on pedestrian school crossing.

"There are four alternatives listed in the report. The first calls for an overpass to be part of a parking structure at Speedway and Olive. The long-range expansion plan for the University, approved by the Arizona Board of Regents in November of 1976, calls for classrooms to be built at this intersection; an expanded Fine Arts and Liberal Arts complex is envisioned-- not a parking garage.

"The second recommendation calls for restricting all parking north of Speedway for use by the proposed Law School at Mountain and Speedway. Since the Fine Arts and Liberal Arts complexes are supposed to expand north of Speedway, this solution does nothing to restrict pedestrian traffic from the main campus to the new complex. Also, the large number of students living north of Speedway assures that there will be a flow of traffic across Speedway that parking restrictions cannot deal with.

"Thirdly, the report calls for the removal of the crosswalk at Speedway and Olive and the placing of signs to deter pedestrians from crossing at the intersection. One cannot easily imagine a student in a hurry obeying such a sign. In fact, just the opposite would occur. Students would be likely to cross at the intersection since there is a sign there. Also, expanded classroom facilities at this location and nighttime use of the University theater and art gallery ensure a flow of traffic across Speedway and Olive.

"Finally, the report recommends as an alternative to an overpass, the installation of a pedestrian-activated yellow flasher light--in effect, another stop light. Once the computerized system for stop lights is instituted, a yellow light slowing traffic would only serve to foul up the efficiency of all other stop lights along Speedway.

"While these alternatives are less expensive than an overpass, they do nothing to solve the problems of pedestrian traffic. Some selections will only exacerbate the problem. A pedestrian overpass, with guard-railing of some nature, along Speedway is the only effective way of dealing with the problem.

"For the past 10 years, study after study has been conducted on pedestrian traffic problems in the University area. Each study has recommended a pedestrian overpass at Speedway and Olive as an intermediate solution to the problem at that intersection. We, at ASUA, ask that no more studies

be done; there have been more than enough studies already. We ask that the City of Tucson and the University of Arizona act now to solve the problem of Speedway and Olive, to prevent the 44th pedestrian-related accident. We ask that a pedestrian overpass be built at Speedway and Olive."

Mr. Federhar then moved that the Faculty Senate "endorse the concept of cost sharing with the City of Tucson for a pedestrian overpass at Speedway Blvd. and Olive Road and ask the City of Tucson and the University of Arizona to begin immediately to plan, construct, and jointly finance a pedestrian overpass at that intersection." Mr. Federhar's motion was seconded by Dr. Steelink.

Dr. LaBan asked if the proposed action was within the province of the Senate. President Schaefer said that the Senate indeed could go on record with an expression of the body favoring the proposed procedure or not. Dr. Peterson said he was shocked to learn that a city official had said that the University has helped create the problem, therefore it should share in the cost of an overpass. What precedent is there for this? When overpasses were constructed to provide access to Tucson District No. 1 schools, was the cost shared by the school district and the city? He said he understood that the cost was borne by the city alone. Mr. Federhar said that School District No. 1 before expanding the system to the new areas where overpasses were built did consult with the city as to the location of the new schools.

Dr. Peterson said it seemed to him that if an overpass at Olive and Speedway were constructed it would be necessary to construct appropriate fences or other barriers of considerable length to provide proper access to the overpass itself. If so great a length of fence is going to have to be constructed, why not build such fences now, thus forcing students to walk one short block to the traffic light at Park Avenue and Speedway. This would solve the problem comparatively cheaply.

Don Myers said that the Committee of Eleven at its meeting on January 13 had passed a motion urging the Senate to approve Mr. Federhar's motion.

Dean McConnell said he and his colleagues in the College of Architecture were sympathetic to the problem because "we hear the screams of the injured" when accidents occur. The real problem, he said, is the entire Speedway strip from Park Avenue to Campbell Avenue. The intersection at Speedway and Vine is also an intersection with a high accident rate. He said he personally could support the idea of an overpass only if it were one feature of a larger plan to take care of the entire area. It would be unwise to develop solutions a piece at a time, he said.

Dr. Gegenheimer referred to an eastern campus with which he is acquainted where a similar problem had been solved by submerging the street level. Dr. Schaefer said that he and Mayor Murphy have talked about that very possibility, perhaps submerging Speedway the entire distance from Campbell to Park.

Dr. Kassander said he could not let stand the implication that the University had developed its expansion plans without consultation with the city. The long-range expansion plan for the U of A campus was first made public in the offices of city planning officials in 1967. It would be very unfair to let city officials, some of whom were not even present at the time, put forth the idea that the University's expansion plans had been developed without consultation with city officials.

Dr. Heusinkveld asked if the proposed overpass would be one that could be negotiated by handicapped students. Mr. Federhar said that the concept called for access ramps which would make it possible for persons confined to wheelchairs, for example, to negotiate the overpass satisfactorily.

Dean Hull asked if the University was participating in an ongoing study of the traffic problems on the streets bordering the campus. President Schaefer said yes.

Dr. Steelink asked what was the source of the suggestion that the overpass be financed by cost sharing. Mr. Federhar said that city officials had proposed this, reporting further that University officials had said they would not so participate. President Schaefer said this is an inappropriate conclusion. The University has indeed shared with the city the cost of other enterprises, for instance, the installation of traffic lights on streets bordering the campus.

Dr. Steelink asked President Schaefer if he personally was opposed to the concept of cost sharing. President Schaefer said, "Not necessarily." He said, however, he could not express a firm opinion until he had seen specific plans and knew the approximate cost. He certainly is not in a position "to endorse a blank check." Seventy-five thousand dollars is something quite different from one half million dollars, he noted.

Dr. McCullough asked if it was the feeling of the administration that an overpass would not work sufficiently well to alleviate the problem adequately. Dr. Schaefer said University officials held no hard attitude on this point to his knowledge. Certainly it is a very real problem, he said. Would an overpass be the best solution?

Dean McConnell said that he sat on the University Parking and Traffic Committee and that committee is certainly aware of the problem and has given it attention. City officials feel that an overpass would be the best solution to the problem at Speedway and Olive. Dean McConnell said he would have to emphasize again, however, that it was his judgment that a proper overall solution for the entire Campbell-Park corridor should be developed.

Mr. Webb said he thought there were two issues here and that they should be thought of separately. One is the entire corridor and what should be planned long-range. The other is the specific problem at Olive and Speedway where it is proposed that an overpass be constructed as soon as possible. He felt it was appropriate to address only the second problem at this time.

Dr. Lytle said he was aware of how slowly all bureaucratic machinery moves, including that of the city of Tucson. Meanwhile the danger at Speedway and Olive continues to be very real. He said he would like the University to assume leadership in this specific matter.

Dean Hull said he was not sure that the motion of Mr. Federhar would provide the correct solution to what is a real problem. He said he and his Fine Arts' colleagues were situated almost as close to the intersection in question as was Dean McConnell and he too was aware of the seriousness of the matter. He said he would like to propose a motion to amend Mr. Federhar's motion. He said his motion would ask the University to take the leadership in seeking a solution

to the total problem of pedestrian traffic on Speedway Boulevard by beginning a thorough study. Parliamentarian Sankey said the correct thing to do, if the Senate wished to follow Dean Hull's suggestion, would be to vote down the Federhar motion and then pass a motion to request a study.

Mr. Webb asked if the University had not been involved in such studies before. Dean McConnell said that studies have been made including one measuring the amount of time it takes to cross Speedway in relationship to the time interval between passing automobiles. The trouble is, he said, that a human body cannot cross that amount of space in the brief amount of time that exists between cars.

Dr. Gegenheimer said that the city's traffic light system is computerized. Perhaps the light change intervals on Speedway intersections between Park and Campbell should be revised.

Mr. Federhar said that student representatives had met the previous week with officials of the city of Tucson. It had been agreed that a University-City of Tucson long-range plan concerning traffic on streets bordering the campus should be conducted. Meanwhile the danger on Speedway and Olive continues to be a very real threat each class day right now.

The vote was called for on Mr. Federhar's motion and it carried.

COMMENDATION OF LIBRARY STAFF: On motion by Dr. Rosenberg the Senate went on record by acclamation expressing itself as follows: "The Faculty Senate expresses its gratitude to the members of the library staff and all others concerned with the move to the new building. These persons worked diligently, arduously and gave extraordinary service during a period when many of us were on vacation. They deserve our thanks and our commendation."

The meeting adjourned at 3:55 o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary



David Butler, Assistant Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF JANUARY 17, 1977:

1. Approval of Minutes of December 6, 1976.
2. Endorsement of cost sharing by the U of A and city of Tucson for pedestrian overpass at Speedway and Olive and of requesting city and U of A to begin planning and construction of such an overpass.
3. Commendation of University library staff on recent move to new Library building.

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

1. Review of University policy which restricts higher administrative officers and certain faculty members from working for advanced degrees at this University (referred back to committee).
2. Review of University procedures concerning dishonest scholastic work.
3. Study of question of developing means of review of institution's administrators at the college and university level.
4. 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.
5. Proposed revisions in grading system.