

FACULTY SENATE, EXECUTIVE SESSION  
Monday, October 6, 1986

Dr. Thomas Rehm called the Executive Session of the Faculty Senate to order at 3:20 p.m. Secretary Ridge and Dr. Sankey distributed copies of background information on Honorary Degree candidates.

Associate Dean Pete Dewhirst, standing in for Dean Cardon who was out of the country, nominated Mr. John R. Norton for the Honorary Doctor of Science; Mr. Norton's nomination received approval by the faculty of the College of Agriculture on October 3, 1986. Senator Rollins moved for approval (motion 86-48), and the motion was seconded and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Senator Kenneth Smith, Dean of the College of Business & Public Administration, reviewed briefly the material contained in the document distributed to the Senate, and then nominated Mr. William P. Reilly for the Honorary Doctor of Laws degree. Approval of the faculty of the College of Business & Public Administration had been obtained September 30, 1986. Senator Tomizuka wondered if there was a conflict of interest involved, since Mr. Reilly was a member of the Board of Regents, and the Regents had to approve conferral of this degree. Senator Smith responded that he saw no conflict, since the nomination had originated in BPA; he also felt the Board would manage its role in the approval process so as not to place Mr. Reilly in a position of conflict. Senator Smith then moved for approval (motion 86-49); the motion was seconded and approved on a voice vote.

Senator Smith then placed in nomination the name of Grace Murray Hopper for the Honorary Degree Doctor of Law; Admiral Hopper's nomination had been approved by the Faculty of the College of Business & Public Administration on September 30, 1986.

Senator Peterson said that while he had no objection to this individual, he would raise a point that had been raised in the past: there appeared to be no connection between Admiral Hopper and the University of Arizona. He said he believed a firm policy should be established that Honorary Degree recipients should in some way have been connected with the University or with the State, so there is a rationale for selecting one computer scientist over another distinguished computer scientist; he said he could name a dozen others whose accomplishments have been just as admirable in this field as Admiral Hopper's. Senator Mautner said he agreed with Senator Peterson. Senator Smith said he believed there are two distinct points of view on this issue; his own feeling, he said, is that there are two reasons why you select someone for an honorary degree: (1) the recognition it provides that individual, and (2), the association with their distinction in terms of that area of the University. One could take either point of view, he said.

Senator Heires asked for clarification on how a person is nominated for an honorary degree. Senator Smith said that BPA has a committee which consists of representatives from departmental faculty, from their National Board, and from alumni, which meets to consider nominations for Distinguished Citizen Awards, Alumni Achievement Awards, and Honorary Degrees. Suggestions proposed to that committee come from a variety of sources; in this particular instance, the recommendation came from the Department of Management Information Systems. It was endorsed and sent forward by the BPA Committee to the University Honorary Degree Committee, where it was approved; it was then approved by the College

Faculty, and forwarded to the Senate for consideration; it will then go to the General Faculty and then to the Board of Regents. Secretary Ridge added that each Faculty has its own process; theoretically, any member of the faculty can put forth someone in nomination before their College. From there, he said, it goes to the President's Honorary Degree Advisory Committee, which he chairs ex officio as Secretary of the Faculty. The Committee then sends recommendations to the President, and the Senate receives it following the President's approval. Senator Mautner asked Secretary Ridge if the Honorary Degree Committee had considered the matter of nominations on behalf of members of the Board of Regents or of the State Legislature. Secretary Ridge responded that the Committee feels it is bound to the Arizona policy but if a college nominates someone sufficiently eminent in the Committee's estimation with no particular ties to Arizona, the Advisory Committee would approve it; it would be up to others to decide what they want to do about it.

Senator Witte said she believed Senator Peterson's comments should be at least an advisory note to future boards in the sense that there may be ways some of these recipients could be tied to Arizona that haven't been mentioned here; for example, Senator Smith mentioned that perhaps the area of development in MIS is particularly in this area, or perhaps the Women in Science and Engineering might like to cite her, and every effort should be made to do so. President Koffler said that regarding the question on William Reilly, an explanation is in order. "We also do not believe that incumbent Regents ought to be honored in this manner. In this case, it is the timing that is critical..." Senator Garcia: "This is not a pro forma vote, right? This is an honest expression of opinion by this body on what it thinks of the issues before it, is that right? We're not just rubber-stamping what the colleges have sent us." Dr. Rehm: "That's right. What we do here is one step in the process." Senator Paplanus: "I'd like to think that we're a national University in that it is irrelevant whether the individual is closely associated with Arizona, that we should not bend over backwards to find some superficial way in which we can technically tie an individual to Arizona, and I think we should decide on the basis of which individuals anywhere we would want to honor with an Honorary Degree from the University of Arizona."

Senator Ganapol said he agreed with Senator Paplanus, and that he had one question: why is it a Doctor of Laws? He said it seemed more like a Doctor of Science than of Laws. Senator Smith responded that that could be a valid point; traditionally, the BPA College has awarded the Doctor of Laws degree, but he would accept the argument that in this particular case the Doctor of Science would be a more appropriate recognition.

Senator Peterson said he would like to say a few more words on this matter. Not wishing to appear provincial, he nevertheless had concerns about placing no bounds on this or adopting a policy of bending over backwards to make a tenuous connection. He said he believed the process had become pro forma: He said that not one single honorary degree had been turned down by the Senate since Senator Goldwater, and that today's "nay" votes were the first he had heard in this body in the ten years he has served in the Senate. Senator Peterson questioned whether Senators were qualified to judge, if they were not in the computer or mathematics areas, whether Admiral Hopper really deserved this honor. He added that he could list a dozen computer scientists at least as eminent as Admiral Hopper whom no one had bothered to nominate. He didn't believe there was any rationale for this kind of nomination unless there was localized support in some college for some particular individual because "in

this Senate, historically, it has been 100 percent pro forma."

Senator Silverman said that if the Senate does develop a rationale, he hopes it will not be based on an Arizona connection; perhaps some criteria could be established, however. Senator Smith said he would not argue that Grace Hopper is the only eminent person in the field of development of management information, but neither is this a casual consideration based on the off-hand remark of one faculty member. Senator Smith said the MIS Department has national standing and has supported this nomination with enthusiasm, as has the College's review committee; serious thought was put into the recommendation, he said. He thought the matter came down to the first point: do we want a policy that assumes the Arizona connection, or do we want a policy based on the fact that we are a national institution and can identify and recognize national figures in the various fields in which we are prominent.

Senator Hetrick asked Senator Smith if he wished to amend his motion to read "Doctor of Science." Senator Smith indicated he would accept that. The motion (86-50) was seconded and then approved on a voice vote.

Senator Swalin placed in nomination the name of William R. Sears for the Honorary Degree Doctor of Science. Professor Sears' nomination had been approved by the faculty in the College of Engineering/Mines in a ballot completed October 2, 1986. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 86-51) to approve this nomination.

Senator Silverman placed the name of Barbara Jordan in nomination for the Honorary Degree Doctor of Laws. Ms. Jordan's nomination was approved by the faculty of the College of Law during the Spring Semester, 1986. Senator Silverman's motion for approval (86-52) was seconded and approved on a voice vote.

Senator McCullough then placed the name of George C. Pimentel in nomination for the Honorary Degree Doctor of Science. Professor Pimentel's nomination had been approved by the Faculty of Science on October 1, 1986. It was moved, seconded, and approved on a voice vote (motion 86-53) to approve the Honorary Degree nomination of George C. Pimentel.

Due to the confidential nature of the material distributed to the Senate concerning these Honorary Degree nominations, Dr. Rehm requested that all copies be turned in now to Secretary Ridge and Dr. Sankey.

The Executive Session was adjourned at 3:44 p.m.

This report was prepared by the Provost's Office,  
 reviewed by the Academic Personnel Policy Committee,  
 and presented to the Faculty Senate on 10/6/86.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

CHAPTER 8

Promotion and Tenure Statistics  
 Actions Taken in 1985-86 to be Effective in 1986-87

	<u>Decision</u>		<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Minority</u>	<u>Non-Minority</u>
Promotion to Professor	Yes	18	17	1	2	16
	No	12	11	1	0	12
Promotion to Professor with Tenure	Yes	2	2	0	0	2
	No	0	0	0	0	0
Promotion to Associate Professor with Tenure	Yes	31	20	11	4	27
	No	9	6	3	1	8
Promotion to Associate Professor	Yes	0	0	0	0	0
	No	0	0	0	0	0
Tenure	Yes	11	10	1	2	9
	No	2	1	1	0	2
Promotion to Assistant Professor	Yes	7	5	2	0	7
	No	0	0	0	0	0
Terminal Year Appointment Before Determining Year	Yes	3	2	1	0	3
	No	0	0	0	0	0



PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS  
ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1985-86 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1986-87

COLLEGE	Dept. Comm.		Dept. Head		College Committee		Dean		Univ. Comm.		Provost		Appeals		Final action	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Total	Reversed	Approved	Denied
Nursing	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
Organized Research	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Pharmacy	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Science	6	1	0	5	2	0	5	2	4	2	5	2	0	0	5	2
Social and Behavioral Science	9	2	0	10	2	0	7	4	5	5	9	3	1	0	9	3
	split: 1				abstention: 1d				split: 2							
TOTALS	79	7	7	79	10	6	70	16	81	14	70	25	5	0	70	25
	split: 2 withdrawn: 1		split: 0 withdrawn: 1		split: 8 withdrawn: 1 abstention: 1		split: 0 withdrawn: 1		split: 4 withdrawn: 1		split: 0 w/drawn: 1				withdrawn: 1	

Footnotes

a There was no departmental committee review.

b There was no department head review.

c In this case, an acting department head was being considered for tenure; hence, no department head review was required.

d In this case, the college committee declined to make a recommendation.

CHAPTER 10

Promotion and Tenure Statistics  
 Actions Taken in 1985-86 to be Effective in 1986-87

	<u>Decision</u>		<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Minority</u>	<u>Non-Minority</u>
Continuing Status	Yes	5	3	2	1	4
	No	3	2	1	0	3
Promotion	Yes	3	3	0	0	3
	No	0	0	0	0	0
Continuing Status and Promotion	Yes	6	3	3	1	5
	No	1	1	0	0	1

CHAPTER 10  
CONTINUATION AND PROMOTION STATISTICS:  
ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1985-86 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1986-87

COLLEGE	Dept. Comm.		Dept. Head		College Committee		Dean		Univ. Comm.		Provost		Appeals		Final action	
	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Pro	Con	Total	Reversed	Approved	Denied
Agriculture	2	1	2	4	0	0	4	1	3	1	1	4	1	0	4	1
Arizona State Museum	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0
Education	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Engineering and Mines	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	2	0
Library	0	0	5	0	5	3	2	0	2	3	0	2	3	0	2	3 <sup>e</sup>
Medicine	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
Science	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Social and Behavioral Sciences	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>

Footnotes

<sup>a</sup>There was no departmental committee review.

<sup>b</sup>There was no department head review.

<sup>c</sup>There was no college committee review.

<sup>d</sup>There was no University Committee review.

<sup>e</sup>Two individuals denied continuing status resigned from the University.