

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
 Monday, May 2, 1988 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, May 2, 1988, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-nine members were present. Secretary of the Senate George W. Ridge, Jr. presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Atwater, Austin, Barrett, Beigel, Bernstein, Blank, Braden, Brainerd, Butler, Chase, Chen, Conway, Cosgrove, Dean, Epstein, Ewbank, Fagan, Fulginiti, Ganapol, Garcia, Goetinck, Hartse, Hasselmo, Hetrick, Irving, Jones, McGraw, Papetti, Paplanus, Patterson, Phipps, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Sanders, Silverman, Smerdon, Stedman, Steelink, Stender, Swaim, Tuchi, Vuturo, Warner, Wilkening, K. Williams, Witte, and Woodard. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Andreas, Aquilano, Bernhard, Bilsen, Bootman, Boynton, Chiasson, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Drake, Fahey, Fenstermacher, Fleming, Gall, Hershberger, Koffler, Kruttsch, Larson, Marcus, Mautner, McCullough, O'Brien, Parsons, Peterson, Rehm, Ruiz, Sander, Sigelman, Smith, Tomizuka, L. Williams and Wright.

WELCOME EXTENDED TO NEW SENATORS: Professor Ridge welcomed newly elected and appointed College and Student Representatives Bruce Barrett (Arts & Sciences), Scott Bernstein (Student), Jacqueline Blank and Carrie Jo Braden (Nursing), Charles Brainerd (Education), William Conway (Arts & Sciences), Robert Dean (Student), J. D. Garcia (Arts & Sciences), Merri Hartse (Non-College), Randy Papetti, Jay Sanders, Jenny Vuturo, and Randy Warner (Students), and Karen Williams (Non-College). New Senators not in attendance were also welcomed: Victor Bernhard (Medicine), Ieva Bilsen (Student), Robert Chiasson (Agriculture), Robert Gall (Arts & Sciences), Dennis Larson (Agriculture), Louis Williams (Student), and Stephen Wright (Medicine).

MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 1988: There being no requests for changes or additions to the minutes of April 4, 1988, Professor Ridge declared them approved as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Hasselmo said the President, who is in Washington to testify before the Senate on the supercollider, extends his apology for his absence. He said probably everyone has read about the regrettable departure on September 1 of Dr. Laurel Wilkening, Vice President for Research; on the other hand, he said, she is going to take up a delightful job at the University of Washington, that of Provost. He said a search committee is being appointed so that her replacement would be in place by September 1. Although concentration will be on an internal search, the possibility exists that the search may be extended to a national search.

"A couple of major developments in one of the important areas of research at the University. The casting of the first three-and-a-half-meter mirror by Professor Roger Angel and his colleagues was apparently successful, although we will not know until the mirror has cooled down about three or four weeks from now. So far, so good. We have just received word from NASA that they have funded, to the tune of \$7 million, a space engineering center.

"On the budget front, there is no news, and I don't even know whether that's good or bad. We have had hearings before both the House and the Senate. It is impossible to predict what is going to happen since our budget is very much dependent on the ability of the Legislature in an election year to raise taxes. We are waiting with bated breath, even more so because the enrollment picture for the fall is promising, or threatening as the case may be, to be approximately the same as last fall, that is, we would expect to have a very major enrollment increase again.

"I have received a report from a Committee on Teaching Evaluation that I appointed last fall. We are reviewing that report and its recommendations together with some material and information gathered by one of the Senate committees under the leadership of Senator Atwater. I expect that over the next few months we will have an opportunity to come back with the recommendations and questions that have come forward and been identified through those channels."

CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY REPORT: In Dr. Rehm's absence, Secretary Ridge read the following comments:

"The Drug Testing Committee is not fully formed yet, due to difficulties in finding a student representative from Intercollegiate Athletics. Therefore, the report will be delayed until sometime in the Fall.

"At the April meeting, it was the Senate's wish that the Presiding Officer appoint a two-person committee to investigate the Yang matter and report back to the Senate with recommendations. Both members were designated to be Faculty Senators who were attorneys. One has agreed to serve on the committee. I must obtain Senate guidance for selection of the second member. Do you prefer a Senator who is not an attorney, or an attorney who is not a Senator, there being no other choice." In response to the question, a show of hands and ensuing comments indicated Senators would favor selection of a member of the faculty who is an attorney, but not a member of the University Attorney's Office.

"Faculty Senate standing committees are being appointed now. Senator Ewbank has agreed to serve as Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, and Senator Hetrick, the Research Policy Committee. The Budget Policy Committee will not be appointed until September, when a report should be available of the full membership of the other four standing committees. Annual reports of the standing committees will be appended to the Minutes of this meeting. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held September 12, and written notification of the 1988-89 meeting dates will be sent within the next few weeks."

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Stender said he was a member of the Faculty Senate last year, and he looked forward to serving a second term as President of ASUA. He said the ASA delegation recently went to Phoenix to lobby the Legislature's Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for the continuation budget. Some of the goals for ASUA in the 1988-89 academic year are: continuing to strive for improvements in the quality of undergraduate education; continued lobbying at the State Legislature for the new State financial aid bill and the instruction portion of the continuation budget; and continuing efforts on behalf of improved recreational facilities on campus.

Senator Stender said that a revised proposal for the Student Affairs Policy

Committee had been placed on Senators' desks today, and attached to that is a resolution passed by the ASUA Senate last week, supporting this proposal. He said he would be glad to respond to any questions regarding it.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Epstein said she noted that September 12, announced as the date of the next Faculty Senate meeting, falls on a major Jewish holiday. She requested consideration of this conflict. Secretary Ridge said the matter will be taken under advisement.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Jones said the committee had arranged a meeting with Dr. Wilkening on May 13 to discuss the issue of professionals' eligibility for intramural research funds.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Atwater reported that the committee concluded its main project less than one week ago, and the final report will be prepared during the summer. She commented on some of the highlights of the committee's accomplishments:

The committee met monthly during the Fall, and every two weeks during the current semester. In the Fall, the committee responded to concerns raised by Faculty Senators regarding restructuring of the IRAD office and the potential changes in the services IRAD had once offered. Three approaches were taken in this study: (1) the history of IRAD and its activities and services were reviewed; (2) a special meeting was scheduled with Dr. Celestino Fernandez, to learn the plans envisioned for the scope, structure and financing of IRAD under the half-time directorship of Dr. Tom Volgy; and (3) after Dr. Volgy assumed the directorship of IRAD in January 1988, and the unit was renamed the University Teaching Center (UTC), he was invited to a committee meeting. He described several specific projects to be undertaken, with goals of increasing the visibility of good teaching on campus and increasing faculty participation in the services and activities of UTC. Rather than presenting a summary of Dr. Volgy's plans and ideas to the Senate in person, the committee is asking him to prepare a report summarizing the current status and future plans. This report will be appended to the committee's final report, she said.

Senator Atwater said that during the Spring semester the committee focused all efforts on preparations for its third annual symposium, "Teaching and its Role in the Reward Structure," co-sponsored by the Provost's Office. To provide a basis for discussion of this topic, the committee gathered information from three sources: (1) Deans were requested to send descriptions of the procedures used in their college and departments to evaluate teaching performance, both for merit and promotion/tenure. She said the response was excellent: material was received from all but one college. Analysis of these materials by committee members provided a picture of the elements of teaching evaluation that are common in most units, as well as some very good ideas developed by some units to evaluate a wider variety of components of teaching than are typically examined. (2) A survey of faculty members was conducted by campus mail concerning their perceptions of how broadly teaching might be defined as well as how it is rewarded at the department and university levels. The committee worked closely with the Student Affairs Policy Committee in preparing the survey because of mutual interests concerning definition and reward of teaching. She said that committee had attached to its report a preliminary draft of the survey data. Returns on this faculty survey were about 36% (687 faculty).

Perceptions of how well good teaching is rewarded have not changed significantly from those expressed on the same topic in 1981, when a Survey of Teaching Evaluation was conducted by the Committee of Eleven; namely 80% of the faculty still feel that good teaching is rewarded only occasionally or scarcely rather than well at the department level, while 93% feel that it is only rewarded occasionally or scarcely at the college and university levels. Further analysis of the survey data is being conducted by the committee and will be included in its final report.

Senator Atwater said the committee's third source of information about teaching reward was obtained from a survey of Department Heads, which produced a return of approximately 65%. The committee learned that: most departments require student evaluations as a component of the annual merit evaluations, a component mandated by the Arizona Board of Regents; most departments use peer evaluations as a component of annual merit evaluation, as required by Arizona Board of Regents policies; and actual percentage weightings for teaching, service and research for annual merit evaluations have considerable range in their weightings across departments. Most departments use weightings that are fixed for all faculty members in that unit, but there are several departments in which the weight is varied among different faculty members, according to their appointment responsibilities. The final report of this survey, including further statistical analysis of the data, will be submitted to the Senate at a later date.

She said the discussion of these surveys at the Symposium on Teaching held last week was received with great interest by approximately 60 to 70 faculty members and administrators in attendance, and the committee received excellent suggestions for follow-up activities. She said the committee will most likely continue to study the topic of "evaluation and reward of teaching" during the coming academic year.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Witte said the committee's major activities focused on the Technology Transfer items on today's agenda, and its annual report would be submitted with the Minutes of this meeting.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. Merle Mishel said the committee's activities this month concerned its proposal, scheduled later on today's agenda.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Paplanus said he would like the Senate to take this opportunity to thank Senator Doug Jones and members of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee for the enormous work they put in on the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. The Senate responded with a spontaneous round of applause.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: Secretary Ridge said that in Section I of Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 12, No. 8, the Nursing degree revision has been submitted for approval because it changes the number of units required for graduation. It was then moved (motion 88/89-1) that the Bulletin be approved. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR COMPLETION OF DEGREES ON MAY 14, 1988: Secretary Ridge said the last time he presided over a Senate meeting he found himself in a position of conflict of interest, and there is a Ridge name on this list as well. He suggested he step aside. There being no agreement to this sugges-

tion, he called for discussion.

Senator Butler pointed out that this is a list of students who have reported they plan to graduate; the list that he presents in the fall will be an accurate list of those who did meet the requirements. Senator Steelink said this will be the first time since he has been a Senator that he will vote against the list. For five months, he said, he has been denouncing the use of Social Security Numbers (SSNs) for identification of students and, particularly, the making public of those numbers. Senator Steelink said he found this public listing of 2400 student SSNs appalling.

Senator Butler said he didn't believe the Faculty Senate is equivalent to public distribution. Senator Witte said this is a public meeting and the list could be distributed to the press. Senator Jones asked if it would be possible and practical to suppress the student ID number on the printing of future lists for Senate consideration. Senator Butler responded that it would be both possible and practical. Senator Garcia said he had an objection to labeling the Social Security Number as the student ID number; while it may be used for internal purposes, it must not be referred to as an ID number. Senator Butler said that it is an identification number for internal purposes.

There being no further discussion, Secretary Ridge called for a motion to approve the degree list. Senator Garcia asked if this implied approval of use of the Social Security number. Secretary Ridge said he didn't know, but he thought approval implied merely the list of candidates for graduation, not the use of the number. Senator Steelink said that under New Business the Senate could vote on whether to use these numbers again or not. Secretary Ridge responded that the Senate has probably resolved it because assurance has been provided it won't be done again. It was then moved (motion 88/89-2), seconded and passed by voice vote to approve the preliminary degree list of candidates for graduation May 14, 1988.

REPORT FROM UNIVERSITY CALENDAR COMMITTEE REGARDING A MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

HOLIDAY: Senator Butler said that two months ago a resolution was introduced by Senator Carranza to the effect that the Faculty Senate strongly urge President Koffler to seek a paid University holiday in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The matter was referred to the University Calendar Committee, which reports to Vice President Woodard, for further refinement and recommendation to President Koffler. He said the committee discussed the ramifications, and recommended that it be held on a Friday in January as a culmination of the traditional week of campus activities to honor Dr. King. He said the committee discussed several alternatives. Because the official holiday is the third Monday in January, the committee felt this date might not be appropriate for the University because it would generally be the first Monday of classes after the start of school the previous Thursday, and it might have the effect of many students not returning to campus until after that day. Secondly, he said, the Faculty Senate has, in several instances in the past, expressed concern over the loss of Monday teaching days. President's Day is now observed on a Monday, and if an additional Monday is missed, it would seriously handicap those students who have labs and various discussions which meet once a week on Monday. A Friday observance would appear to be more satisfactory to the faculty, the committee believed. He said the committee did not discuss the issue of whether this should be an additional paid holiday, or should take the place of an existing State holiday: that matter should be referred to the Staff Advisory Council or the Personnel Office.

In summary, Senator Butler said, while the committee realizes its recommendation may be inconsistent with the rest of the state, it believed it would best serve the needs of the University community by being the culmination of the traditional observance week, by eliminating the problem of Monday labs and discussions, and by moving the holiday a little further away from the first day of classes. However, he said, since the matter is now before the State Legislature as official State policy, it was his understanding that the President's Council has reserved judgment on this until the matter is resolved in the State Legislature. Therefore, the information presented to the Senate today is only a report of the committee's deliberations, with the suggestion that the Senate wait until the Legislature reaches a determination on this issue.

ELECTION OF 1988-89 PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Secretary Ridge opened the floor for nominations. Senator Paplanus nominated Thomas Rehm, and it was seconded. There being no further nominations, Senator Ewbank moved nominations be closed. Secretary Ridge called for a voice vote on election of Dr. Thomas Rehm Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate for 1988-89, and the vote was unanimous.

ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Ballots were distributed by Dr. Sankey and Senator Aleamoni, and then were counted and results announced prior to adjournment. Those elected to one-year terms (5/88-4/89) on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee were Henry Ewbank and Samuel Paplanus.

ELECTION OF COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION MEMBERS: Ballots were distributed by Dr. Sankey and Senator Aleamoni, and then were counted and results announced prior to adjournment. Those elected to two-year terms (5/88-4/90) on the Committee on Conciliation were Janis Burt, Bob G. Johnson, and William H. Thweatt.

ELECTION OF NOMINEES FOR UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD: Ballots were distributed for election of nominees for one-year terms on the University Hearing Board. Results were tallied and announced prior to adjournment. Those elected were Francisco Avalos, H. Bruce Fowler, Merri Hartse, Mary H. Marion and Robert Mautner.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE PROPOSAL: Dr. Merle Mishel, Chair of the Student Affairs Policy Committee, reviewed the committee's endeavors in developing its proposal, "Designation of Merit Funds Exclusively for Teaching," a revised copy of which was placed on Senators desks along with a copy of a resolution unanimously approved by the ASUA Student Senate in support of the proposal.

She said the committee is relatively new, now in its third year of existence. In its first year, the committee investigated whether students were satisfied with their life at the University. It reviewed surveys conducted nationally as well as University reports, and it became clear early in its deliberations that one of the most important factors that determines student satisfaction with their education had to do with the type of teaching they receive and their satisfaction with it. The committee focused on this, looking at ways student satisfaction with teaching could be enhanced, which led to examination of the role of teaching and its place in the reward system. The proposal presented to the Senate a year ago had two components, one of which was endorsed by the Senate, enlarging the definition of teaching to include student/faculty interaction outside of the classroom. The second part of the proposal was for the University to support the designation of a separate portion of merit funds

exclusively for teaching, and it had been the consensus of the Senate that the committee should rework this portion.

Dr. Mishel said the committee completed that redrafting this year, working together with the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to gather information through a survey which examined teaching and its place in the University's reward system. Data from that survey supports the current proposal, and is remarkably similar to a survey conducted by the Committee of Eleven in 1981. The present proposal was reviewed by some Senators and the revised proposal placed on Senators' desks today includes modifications from that review.

She said there are two parts to this proposal:

That the University of Arizona recognize the significance of the faculty's teaching obligation by requiring the inclusion of teaching in the determination of a faculty member's annual merit evaluation in compliance with the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual.

And furthermore, that, on a yearly basis, each faculty member negotiate the weighing of teaching, research and service for the performance evaluation upon which merit is based.

"The new proposal emphasizes the negotiation of these three areas for the performance evaluation. It addresses some of the concerns of students and faculty as demonstrated by the increased attention that has been given to the importance of teaching and the evaluation of teaching, by two Senate committees, and by the University task forces which have been formed in the last year. This proposal attempts to equalize the importance that we place on both teaching and research. It comes to you today as a seconded motion (motion 88/89-3) from the committee, which makes it immediately open for discussion."

There was some discussion on Senator Goetinck's suggestion that the word "publication" be added to the phrase '...teaching, research, and service...' but there was consensus that the phrase should be left in its broadest form, i.e. without adding "publication."

Senator Jones asked if the committee envisioned this wording being inserted in Chapter 3 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, and he inquired about the significance of the fact that in the revised proposal, second paragraph, departmental negotiation had been removed, leaving only faculty negotiation. Dr. Mishel said, in response to the first question, that the committee's primary concern was to obtain approval for the significance of teaching in merit considerations. Senator Atwater said, in response to his second question, that this point was added when the proposal was discussed with Senators. "We found there were many faculty members who have had experience in their department with such an implementation, and anyone with a computer can enter percentage weightings for different faculty and come up with individual, weighted evaluations. We've done it in our department for three years. I am confident it is possible."

Senator Barrett asked why the Senate has to vote on something already mandated by the Board of Regents. Dr. Mishel said the purpose is to reaffirm and support that policy. Senator Atwater said some of the faculty survey comments indicated department heads are saying good teaching is expected, and everyone should do it; therefore, we will call everyone even on that matter, and add

merit only for research and service. Dr. Mishel said survey results clearly indicate that many faculty feel teaching is not being included as a component.

Senator Silverman asked why it was recommended that each faculty member negotiate the weighing of teaching, research and service. He said he has concern for non-tenured faculty members because of their vulnerability; this proposal would force them to negotiate with their department head or dean, and "if they push teaching, they will give a message to that department head or dean." He said he was not necessarily closed to the proposal, but this portion concerned him. Dr. Mishel said this was exactly the point the committee was making--this would allow faculty to weigh these factors according to where they are in their career: if the emphasis is on research, they can set it that way. She said the committee wants those whose emphasis is on teaching to be rewarded for that, and this proposal would be more sensitive to the individual's position than a department policy would be.

Senator Goetinck said there is a danger of confusing merit evaluation and promotion/tenure evaluation in this paragraph. Dr. Mishel said the proposal does not move or affect any of the formal or informal faculty mentoring or advising systems or promotion/tenure guidelines already in place.

Senator Garcia asked if this leaves the door open for someone to permanently negotiate 5 percent for teaching and 95 percent for research. He said he believed it shouldn't be up to an individual to be able to do that, and that each faculty member should be required to be a good teacher. Dr. Mishel said that is why the word "negotiate" is in this paragraph. Senator Witte thought that such a situation might invoke the conflict of commitment policy, affecting other individuals disproportionately. Senator Atwater said there are several considerations that need to be taken into account: (1) guidelines could be accountable to the extent that the negotiation would place greater weighting on the part of the faculty member's load that is allocated greater percentage and time; and (2) department heads and faculties may agree there would be an upper limit and a lower limit on each of the three components, for instance one couldn't go above 80 and below 10--a variety of guidelines could be used. Dr. Mishel said if the faculty and department head could take the work load into consideration as a responsibility of the department, imbalance could be not allowed. Senator Silverman said he agreed with Senator Garcia: what this may do is downplay teaching, and that concerned him. He believed the most powerful in the department or college, the ones the college doesn't want to lose and who may not care about teaching, could find this a powerful tool to set merit at 90 or 80 percent for research, and no longer have to worry about teaching. Although the intent was to increase the focus on teaching, he believed the effect would be to decrease it.

Senator Swain said she thoroughly appreciated Senator Garcia's and Senator Silverman's concern that some might use it as an excuse to be uninterested in teaching, but the committee discovered that in actual practice both the data and the horror stories indicate that those who have sufficient status or power to do nothing but research are already doing it. What is lacking, for those members of a department who are doing virtually nothing but teach, is the mechanism by which they can participate in the merit process. She said this is what the committee is trying to correct.

Dr. Hasselmo said he had a couple of comments. "First of all, I think that this policy is a useful step in the implementation of what is already Univer-

sity and Board of Regents policy, that is that faculty members should be evaluated on teaching, research, artistic activity or scholarship, and service. I see benefit in this particular proposal because it emphasizes that the proportions should, to the extent possible, be made explicit, and that there should be an understanding between a faculty member and the department as to what the faculty member's responsibilities are and the basis that would be used for evaluating merit. I have informally encouraged this kind of negotiation and I believe that there is great benefit in making the agreement explicit. If there are problems that have to do with disproportionality in one direction or another, there is an appeals process that can be used by faculty members to get rectification. If the agreement is in writing and explicit, it is easier to deal with such matters in an appeals process.

"Secondly, I should also say that the very decentralized system that we have doesn't work unless there is a measure of reasonable judgment at the levels where decisions are made. We are trying to have corrective mechanisms for deviations from reasonable judgment. But I think that we still, given the system we have, have faith in that system working with the safeguards that we have in the department itself, the faculty passing judgment on the appropriateness of the grievances that are reached, and then, if necessary, through an appeals process up the ladder.

"I should also say that I would help promulgate these suggestions in whatever form may be crafted."

Senator Silverman asked if the committee had ever considered language regarding a minimum percent for teaching, for example, 25 percent. He believed it would provide a more positive statement indicative of the importance with which teaching is viewed. Dr. Mishel said the committee does not wish to specify a percentage.

Senator Atwater said that if this approach was tried and did not work, the committee would want to come back to the Senate with another proposal, but right now, approval of this proposal would represent a great improvement and clarification of situations that are not clear. Senator Jones noted that in the Board of Regents policy there is a clause which says "concentration in any one of the areas, teaching, research or service, is permissible and may in fact be encouraged during any given year." Senator Garcia said the Board of Regents policy was constructed and debated by this Senate and its committee; it was then sent to the Board of Regents, where it was modified appropriately. He said he agreed with Senator Silverman, and would like to see a minimum value of some sort. The difference between a national laboratory or a research institute and a University is that the people at the University are engaged in transmitting that knowledge and educating young people. The people at a research institute may or may not be. In keeping with our central mission, it is necessary to put an emphasis on the teaching function. For that reason, he said, he would support a minimum percentage in the value of teaching in the merit evaluation.

Dr. Mishel said the committee believes that the proposal, as it stands, has a greater chance for approval than ever before. Senator Woodard said he hoped the Senate would take Senator Atwater's advice and vote to reaffirm the role of teaching at this University, and revisit it at a later date to see if improvements need to be made, at which time the committee could be charged to bring back a proposal with a reshaped policy.

Senator Witte suggested the Senate consider the first part of the proposal, which didn't seem to generate disagreement, and postpone action on the second part. She said she was totally in agreement with the committee, but she feared the same thing that Senators Garcia and Silverman feared, i.e. that the policy would end up either being insignificant or actually working against what the committee was trying to do. Dr. Mishel responded that the proposal came as a seconded motion from the committee, and should be voted as one item.

Senator Iwbank said this is the last meeting of the Senate this year, and this is the Year of the Undergraduate, it would be thoroughly appropriate to adopt both paragraphs of the motion. He, therefore, urged the vote be taken. The seconded motion (88/89-4) was then approved overwhelmingly by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS: CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE REVISED

PROPOSALS--FACILITIES USE POLICY AND RESEARCH FRAUD POLICY: Senator Witte said the committee and the administration had done a lot of work in the past month to come to a meeting of the minds. Included in Senators' meeting calls was a redraft of Facilities Use and Research Fraud, as well as a revised Alternative Proposal on Research Fraud from the administration. She requested an organized form of discussion today, perhaps setting a precedent, beginning with philosophical differences, ending with practical considerations of the mechanics and grammatical changes. She proposed that, as discussion came to a close at the end of the meeting, a motion be made to accept changes made this afternoon; amended documents could then be used until final wording changes could be worked out next fall. Senator Witte said she believed these policies represent the "cutting edge" of enlightened policy on misconduct for major universities. They may require adjustment in the future after they have been in use for a period of time.

Senator Witte said the revised Facilities Use Policy incorporated all changes suggested at the April meeting, and it came as a seconded motion from the committee (motion 87/88-39, tabled at the April meeting). There being no comments or questions, the vote was called, and the Senate approved the revised Facilities Use Policy unanimously on a voice vote (copy appended to these Minutes).

Senator Witte distributed to Senators a "2:15 p.m." revision of the Research Fraud Policy, entitled "A Revised Alternative Proposal concerning Misconduct in Research, Scholarship or Creative Endeavor." She said this revision was based on the deliberations of the Research Policy Committee members and represents their response to the President's "An Alternative Proposal concerning Misconduct in Research, Scholarship or Creative Endeavor" distributed with today's meeting call. She said there is agreement now on the most important area of difference, the central role of the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment. The second item agreed upon is the broadening of the scope of the committee so that it deals not just with 'misconduct in research' but as the President's proposal suggests, with 'misconduct in research, scholarship or creative endeavor.' Thirdly, she said, the committee applauds the President's proposal for having streamlined the wording of the committee's proposal.

Senator Witte said because of the committee's views on issues current in the media, and Congressional interest in criminal penalties for those who commit fraud and in the protection of whistleblowers, the committee believed certain provisions should be included in the proposal. Therefore, an insert was added to the second sentence, paragraph three, of the President's Alternative Proposal: The inquiry will be confidential to the extent permitted by the due

process rights of the accused person(s) **and prevention of retaliation against the complainant**, and will ordinarily include interviews with the complainant and the accused, reviews of... Another item that was considered at length, and does represent a difference of opinion, avoids premature notification; in the second paragraph of the President's document, there are two sentences following the first sentence: The committee should inform the Vice President for Research of each charge. In the event that a sponsoring agency is involved that requires notification of such complaints, the Vice President will inform the agency accordingly. Senator Witte said she knew of no government or other agency that wants to deal with malicious gossip. Regarding the first of these two sentences, she said that if the faculty is going to have some type of honor system that works, there has to be the ability to write in, call in, and deal with the committee directly, and not have charges go directly to the Dean or Vice President if they are totally unsubstantiated. She said it is the function of U.C.E.C. to sift through the complaints and if there are any grounds, to then transmit them to the Vice President. The committee recommends deleting the two sentences referenced above. The committee does not object per se to the expression of charges in writing, only when those charges go forward.

Senator Witte said the next area is one where the committee is making a substantial compromise. Extensive discussion occurred as to reasons why the investigation should be conducted by U.C.E.C. rather than CAFT. However, the alternative proposal could work quite well, also. The committee would prefer to use the expression "inquiry", as used in the federal guidelines, rather than "preliminary inquiry." Senator Witte said if U.C.E.C. could do a full inquiry in 30 days, that would obviously be preferable to a preliminary inquiry in 30 days before notifying the sponsoring agency. Although it would place more pressure on U.C.E.C. to complete its inquiry within 30 days, everyone would be happier having a fuller inquiry. She didn't believe that would present too much of a problem.

A second matter, in paragraph 5 of the alternative proposal, third sentence: "If the complainant does not accept this decision, an appeal may be lodged with the President, in writing, within 10 days of receipt of the Vice President's notice." She said the committee suggested substituting Provost for President; an event of this nature would occur when a charge has been found groundless by the committee and the Vice President for Research has communicated the results, and the complainant wants to pursue the matter further. Since the President would receive the CAFT report, and in order to maintain the President's impartial position, it made sense to have the appeal be directed to the Provost. Senator Witte asked Dr. Hasselmo how he felt about this. Dr. Hasselmo: "I don't know how I feel about it. I think that clearly the normal appeals process is through the President, but maybe as an intermediate stage it could come through the Provost, but we would have to see if this would be acceptable as a practical matter."

The final item, she said, was an omission in the alternative proposal: the final paragraph of the Research Policy Committee original proposal, dealing with the educational function of U.C.E.C., had not been included.

Hearing no philosophical comments, Senator Witte called for practical and mechanical changes. Senator Jones asked, regarding the complainant having an appeal, after the Vice President for Research had indicated charges were dismissed, how this action would fit into the diagram on page 3 of the President's alternative proposal. Senator Witte said it is not mentioned in

that diagram.

Senator Irving asked if Senator Witte would expand a bit on the second paragraph, related to U.C.B.C.'s responsibility for receiving charges of misconduct. He said the Committee is not an officer of the institution in the way the President, the Vice Presidents or the Deans are, and he wondered what the official position of the committee might be to receive such charges. Senator Witte said the committee's official position is that it is a faculty representative group; she noted that administrators might also receive such complaints. Senator Garcia noted the Senate already agreed to the establishment of the committee at its April meeting.

Senator Roemer noted that in the committee's revised alternative proposal, in the last paragraph, next to last line, she would suggest co-investigators rather than co-authors. Senator Goetinck suggested, in the same document, in the third paragraph, "imposition of sanctions," rather than "and sanctions." Senator Austin asked for clarification of the following phrase in the same document, third paragraph, second sentence: "The inquiry will be confidential to the extent permitted by the due process rights of the accused person(s) and prevention of retaliation..." He wondered whether "by the" should be inserted before "prevention." Senator Witte said that due to the haste of the last minute revisions, it should read "permitted by the due process rights of the accused person(s) and will assure non-retaliation against complainant(s) acting in good faith. It will ordinarily include..."

Senator Epstein commented that the Senate's work was made much easier today by the Research Policy Committee's incorporation, in the document it distributed today, of all the changes.

The question was then called on motion 87/88-41 (tabled at the April meeting), to approve the revised alternative proposal, Misconduct in Research, Scholarship or Creative Endeavor, as amended. A voice vote indicated unanimous approval. (Copy of final proposal attached to these Minutes.)

OLD BUSINESS: Senator Witte said that a number of months ago, she brought to the floor of the Senate to be considered at some future time, the naming of buildings or parts thereof in honor of individuals. As a continuation of Faculty Senate interest in making Honorary Degrees and other honors more meaningful by having faculty approval of them incorporated in the proper procedure, she said she was not bringing a motion to the floor, but instead was providing information. Regarding the naming of the largest auditorium in the College of Medicine, she said the procedure appeared to be invalid from the onset, in that the item was not placed on the agenda in the College of Medicine faculty meeting but was nevertheless voted on and transmitted all the way up to the Board of Regents, who approved it. She said she would like to focus on the fact that she believed there should be a better way for the University to name buildings or parts thereof. She suggested the Senate consider how a procedure might be obtained that does depend on faculty input, and a policy be developed that truly honors individuals who deserve to be honored and who bring honor to the institution.

The meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF MAY 2, 1988:

- 88/89-1 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 3, Sections I and III.
- 88/89-2 Approval of preliminary degree list for May 14, 1988 graduation.
- 88/89-3 Approval of Student Affairs Policy Committee proposal, "Designation of Merit Funds Exclusively for Teaching."
- 87/88-39 Approval of Research Policy Committee proposal, "Facilities Use Policy."
- 87/88-41 Approval of Research Policy Committee proposal, "Misconduct in Research, Scholarship or Creative Endeavor."

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THESE MINUTES:

Facilities Use Policy

Policy on Misconduct in Research, Scholarship or Creative Endeavor

Designation of Merit Funds Exclusively for Teaching

Addendum to the February 1988 Report to the Faculty Senate from Dr. Mary J.C.

Hendrix, Faculty Senate Representative to the Intercollegiate Athletic Committee

Academic Personnel Policy Committee Annual Report 1987-88

Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee Annual Report 1987-88

Research Policy Committee Annual Report 1987-88

Student Affairs Policy Committee Annual Report 1987-88