

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 6, 1986 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:04 p.m. on Monday, October 6, 1986, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Sixty-four members were present. Presiding Officer of the Senate Thomas Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Alcorn, Aleamoni, Atwater, Beigel, Bollerman, Bootman, Butler, Cardon, Cartee, Chase, Chen, Chisholm, Cole, Culicover, Cusanovich, Dickstein, Drake, Duncan, Emery, Ewbank, Fenstermacher, Fleming, Ganapol, Garcia, Gourley, Hasselmo, Heires, Hetrick, Irving, Jones, Kettel, Kinkade, Koffler, Laird, Larson, Marcus, Matter, Mautner, McBryde, McConnell, McCullough, Mishel, Muramoto, Murphy, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Patterson, Peterson, Reed, Rehm, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Silverman, Smith, Sorensen, Stein, Streitmatter, Swalin, Tomizuka, Weiss, Wilkening, and Witte. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Andreas, Aquilano, Boynton, Cunningham, Epstein, Fahey, Fernandez, Garrett, Goetinck, Horak, Kosinski, Ruiz, Sacamano, Sampanes, Scott, Sharkey, Tollin, Tuchi, and Woodard.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1986: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 86-47) to approve the Minutes of September 8, 1986.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Hasselmo reported that the Finance Committee of the Board of Regents approved Decision Packages at the level of nine percent of the base budget, or approximately \$18 million (30 packages). They had originally asked for Decision Packages at the level of twelve percent (\$25 million, 40 Packages). He said this is a generous action, compared with the eight percent of the base budget which was authorized last year. Dr. Hasselmo said he did not know whether this recommendation would be approved by the full Board.

Dr. Hasselmo said the administration expects the Board of Regents to take action at its meeting Friday in Flagstaff concerning the distribution of salary funds. He felt sure he would have the distribution formula available next week.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm reported that the Budget Policy Committee had elected a chair, Senator Robert McConnell, and that Senate ratification would be requested later on in the meeting. He said the Committee on Committees had also elected a chair: Dr. Donald Myers will chair the committee during the Fall semester, and Dr. Jay Angevine will chair the committee for the rest of the year, while Dr. Myers is on a leave of absence.

Dr. Rehm said he and President Koffler are presently working on a revision of the Honorary Degree Policy to streamline the timetable and actions; it will be presented to the Senate as soon as it is ready.

The Committee on Elections is in the process of filling the BPA Senate position vacant due to the death of Dr. James Wert, Dr. Rehm said; and the Committee has thus far received 550 ballots in the Constitution and Bylaws balloting, and results will be available at the November Senate meeting.

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Senator McBryde said that in last month's report she had referred to a faculty/student interaction plan; ASUA hopes to have it in operation within the next month, and she wished to share some of the ideas with the Senate. Applications would be available either in the ASUA office or in the Student Resource Center, as well as appearing in Lo Que Pasa and the Wildcat. The activities are designed, she said, to promote faculty/student interaction outside of the classroom; awards will be made to activities that a department would not normally sponsor. Emphasizing retention efforts, attendance must include 50 percent freshman or sophomore transfer students--the "high-risk" category. Faculty participants will include instructors, tenure-track faculty, and graduate teaching assistants who have responsibility for the course and who come recommended by the department. Fifty percent of available funding will be awarded to activities that encourage intellectual faculty/student interaction--brown-bag seminars on a topic that the class will be discussing, for instance--and the other 50 percent will be awarded to activities that encourage social faculty/student interaction--trips to the museum, football, or basketball games. A promotion plan has not yet been developed, but Senator McBryde hoped members of the Faculty Senate would lend their support to this new program in their departments/areas.

Ms. McBryde said she had hoped to report on ASUA's proposal for next year's tuition rate, but she was unable to do that because the cost of education calculations are not available to ASUA. She said this was frustrating as it places their proposal on hold, but she hoped to be able to report fully on this subject at the November meeting.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Jones said the committee had met several times in the last month in preparation for today's discussion on Chapter 3.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator McConnell reported that the committee has studied its charge, and there were so many items in the charge that it was not possible--without a large staff--to deal with all intelligently. The committee will focus on the one or two items where it can be most effective in serving this body. He said the committee continues to welcome consultation opportunities with the administration, which has consulted this committee in the past.

INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Garcia said the committee had met twice since the last Senate meeting, has set some priorities for issues it will examine and report to the Senate, hopefully this semester. He said those issues are: funding for undergraduate student research; the increasing communication among researchers; research faculty appointment policy; overhead return policy; and policy for encouraging high-risk pure research; and technology transfer.

STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mishel said the committee had met twice since the September Senate meeting, with Dr. Lytle and Dr. Fernandez. Work is continuing on the proposal for student/faculty interaction, which is different, she said, than the ASUA proposal. She said the committee hopes to bring their proposal to the Senate by December.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: No questions.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: The Senate went into Executive Session at 3:20 p.m. to consider Honorary Degree nominations; that session was adjourned at 3:44 p.m., and the Senate returned to regular session.

RATIFICATION OF BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR: Dr. Rehm called for ratification of Senator Robert McConnell as Chair of the Budget Policy Committee. It was so moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (motion 86-54).

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: Senators had received Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 15, sections I and III for approval. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve section I (motion 86-55). It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve section III (motion 86-56) minus the Fine Arts and Music sections on page 4, and the Radio-Television section on page 7.

REPORT ON PROMOTION/TENURE, CONTINUATION/PROMOTION DECISIONS EFFECTIVE 1986-87: Senator Jones reported that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee had received this report from the Provost's office and had reviewed it. The committee wished to convey to the Senate that there seems to be, at least with regard to some colleges and, in particular, Agriculture, Education and to some extent Fine Arts, a considerable difference of opinion between the recommendations of the College Committee and the Dean's recommendations and those of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee. The APPC did not draw any conclusions, he said, but wished to draw that fact to the Senate's attention.

DISCUSSION ON CHAPTER 3, UNIVERSITY HANDBOOK FOR APPOINTED PERSONNEL: Dr. Rehm asked Senator Jones to come to the podium to lead discussion on Chapter 3. Senator Jones, referring to a list of changes recommended by APPC, said he would go through the recommendations for change one by one. Senator Hetrick referred to a list of four changes being recommended by the College of Engineering and Mines Advisory Committee, and distributed at this meeting. Dr. Rehm said he was cognizant of these recommendations and would refer to them at the appropriate times.

1. Senator Jones read the first change (Section 3.01, p. 3-4, line 4): change "appointment is preceded by" to "title includes". No comments heard.
2. Section 3.04, p. 3-5, lines 17-20: change "unlawful discrimination or was based on other unconstitutional grounds may request of the Provost and Affirmative Action Office or other appropriate investigation or invoke the procedures..." to "unlawful discrimination, or was based on other unconstitutional grounds, may request an investigation by the Provost, by the Affirmative Action Office or by another appropriate body, or invoke the..."

Dr. Hasselmo said that he had been unable to think of "another appropriate body", and counter-suggested "...may request an investigation by the Provost's Office or by the Affirmative Action Office, or invoke the procedures..." which

would delete "or by another appropriate body." Questions and discussion followed. Dr. Rehm introduced Dr. Roger Henderson, who had chaired the 1985-86 UHAP Committee and agreed to be present to answer any questions about the committee's intent. Dr. Henderson said that "or by another appropriate body" was inserted in case the General Faculty Constitution/Bylaws, which was undergoing revision in 1985-86, ended up with addition of some committee which would be applicable; he said the Constitution/Bylaws is undergoing General Faculty balloting at present, and the jurisdiction of committees had now been clearly defined; he saw no reason to object to deletion of the phrase "or by another appropriate body." There seemed to be consensus on the following version of 3.04, p. 3-5, lines 17-20:

"unlawful discrimination, or was based on other unconstitutional grounds, may request an investigation by the Provost's Office or by the Affirmative Action Office, or invoke the procedures..."

3. Section 3.04 (p. 3-5, lines 23-24): Change "where an Affirmative Action Office or other investigation is conducted under the auspices of the Provost, a recommendation..." to "If the Affirmative Action Office or another body conducts an investigation under the auspices of the Provost, a recommendation..."

Senator Jones suggested making the wording of this section parallel with the wording of the section just amended. Dr. Hasselmo proposed the following wording: "If the Provost's Office or the Affirmative Action Office conducts an investigation, a recommendation..." Senator Jones asked if there were any objections to striking reference to "another body." Senator Goetinck asked if this precluded all possibility of another body being set up should the Provost wished to do so. Senator Jones said that as he understood it, either the Affirmative Action Office or the Provost's Office can set up committees to investigate allegations of discrimination and to report back to him. Senator Goetinck wondered whether the Provost might want to have a third possibility, since this section provides him with only two. Senator Jones said he did not understand this distinction. Senator Hetrick said that the sentence at the bottom of 3-5 and continuing at the top of 3-6, says the Provost's decision shall be final and is not subject to further administrative review. However, he said, based on actions before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT), he was concerned about this apparent foreclosure. Dr. Henderson said there is no way the Provost's Office can foreclose on a faculty member's going to CAFT--that is in the Board of Regents Policy Manual. This would give the administration a chance to get onto these problems before they develop into major problems, and try to rectify the situation. Rather than sitting here trying to draft this, you have the sense of the previous change. Senator Jones said that the committee will re-draft this section so that it does not differ from what was agreed to previously. Dr. Hasselmo said that even with a committee appointed to report to the University Attorney's office, it would still be appropriate to indicate Provost's Office, because this is strictly an administrative review, but that he would be quite amenable.

4. Section 3.10.02, p. 3-10, lines 21-24, delete sentence beginning "When teaching..." and substitute the following: "The evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall include both a systematic assessment of student opinion and peer evaluation."

Senator Jones felt the location of "both" creates ambiguity, and if he had the

approval of other members of APPC, he would change the position so it would read: "The evaluation of teaching effectiveness shall include a systematic assessment of both student opinion and peer evaluation." Senator Paplanus suggested that he did not want to do that, because he would be implying that there was to be a systematic assessment of peer evaluation, and he wasn't sure that was what was really meant. Senator Hetrick suggested that, before revising this sentence, it be replaced in its entirety by several sentences contained in the College of Engineering and Mines Advisory Committee's recommendations: "Criteria for excellence in faculty performance evaluations require a broader and stricter scrutiny and in more depth than is required for other University personnel. Excellence must be evidenced across the full range of the University's objectives: teaching, research and public service. When teaching effectiveness is evaluated, a systematic assessment of student opinion shall constitute one component of the evaluation; when research effectiveness is evaluated, refereed publications and their peer review shall constitute a component." He said the feeling is that Chapter 3 should include an explicit recommendation of the fact that review for tenure-eligible faculty appears to be a deeper and broader undertaking than it is for administrators or academic professional positions--that is why this substitution is brought to the Senate today, he said. Senator Garcia asked if he was reading correctly that the College of Engineering/Mines proposal would eliminate peer evaluation of teaching? Senator Hetrick responded certainly not. Senator Garcia said he did not see it included. Senator Hetrick said that it reads "systematic assessment of student opinion shall constitute one component..." Senator Hetrick said there was no intention to exclude it, even though it's not clearly spelled out. He added that they would be happy to incorporate that, so that the third sentence would reflect the APPC proposal, and he would be quite happy to accept that change. Senator Ewbank said the committee was trying not to lose the proposal for peer evaluation of teaching, and suggested adding to the final sentence in the proposal some wording to the effect that "In the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, a systematic assessment of student opinion shall constitute one component of the evaluation, peer assessment shall constitute another.", and asked if that was agreeable to the proposer of the substitute motion. Senator Hetrick said it was agreeable. Senator Cusanovich asked if "systematic" was defined anyplace, or is it implied, or can it be read any way one wants to interpret "systematic"? Senator Jones did not recall a definition of systematic. Dr. Henderson said he believed the word systematic is in the Board of Regents Policy Manual, but it only requires a systematic assessment of students. It is being proposed that peer evaluation be added, he said, and this matter had been discussed; the way it was left by the UHAP Committee, and this might address the point from the College of Engineering, is that a College can define its own criteria. If Engineering wants to add this to its own unit's criteria--fine, but he wasn't sure if they wanted to impose it on every other unit. Lastly, he said, regarding the substance of the Engineering proposal, "when you start talking about requiring criteria for excellence in faculty performance evaluations, requiring broader and stricter scrutiny and in more depth than is required for other University personnel, do you really mean that? You have professionals, for example, a researcher: wouldn't you want to have their research scrutinized as carefully as you would faculty members? Why would you want to make a distinction between a faculty member and a professional member? Once again, each unit can define its own criteria." Senator Hetrick said he understood the question, but he would point out that a tenured faculty member of the University is a little bit different than an academic professional or an administrator by the simple difference of tenure. He said tenure usually implies the view of a national or an international

level, which is not usually done in the case of academic professionals or administrators. Dr. Henderson reminded everyone that this section deals only with annual performance evaluations, not promotion and tenure.

Dr. Rehm called for a straw vote on the amendment from Engineering/Mines, to include the modification: "In the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, a systematic assessment of student opinion shall constitute one component of the evaluation, peer assessment shall constitute another." A voice vote proved inconclusive, and a show of hands was requested: 24 favored approval, 23 were opposed.

5. Section 3.11.01, p. 3-13, line 10, add the following sentence to the end of the first paragraph: "If committee members are appointed, they shall be subject to confirmation by vote of the faculty in the unit concerned."

Senator Jones said this proposed modification is in the Promotion/Tenure section. Senator Drake said he was opposed to this change from a philosophical and a practical point of view. He said there is a dangerous tendency in democracies to do everything by vote, and to get down to the lowest acceptable common denominator. From a philosophical point of view, he felt one would be likely to get in trouble if one insisted upon a vote in different colleges, by getting down to the lowest common denominator; and from the practical point of view, "we know from the General Faculty meeting scheduled to start in 20 minutes how difficult it is to get any group of faculty together, and impossible to get any meaningful vote on memberships in College Promotion/Tenure Committees." He felt this addition should be struck. Senator Witte said that Senator Drake had concern for mediocrity which might result from elected committees; she doubted he had evidence that there is less mediocrity in appointed committees. Senator Peterson said he would prefer to leave this issue to units to decide for themselves. A straw vote by voice indicated defeat; a challenge called for a hand vote, and that vote indicated defeat of the addition.

6. Section 3.11.01, p. 3-13, line 16, change "Standing committees have the right to meet..." to "Normally, standing committees shall meet..."

Senator Hetrick said that the second recommendation from the College of Engineering and Mines Advisory Committee was to insert a new paragraph after line 17 and just before the next APPC insertion: "When an individual not of faculty rank holds an appointment involving either accredited teaching or the direction of research, faculty members from the appropriate faculty standing committee shall participate in the performance evaluation to assess the contributions to teaching or research proportionate to the extent of the candidate's academic assignment." Dr. Rehm said he wanted to comment that this properly belongs in Chapter 4. Senator Hetrick said the only purpose for bringing it up at this time is in reference to people who are not members of the faculty, or are temporarily involved in doing what are normally faculty responsibilities; he acknowledged that Dr. Rehm's point was well taken, however. There being no further comment on this section, Senator Jones moved to the next recommendation for change.

7. Section 3.11.01, p. 3-13, insert new paragraph after line 17: "A University Standing Committee on Faculty Status will be appointed by the Provost. It shall be the responsibility of the Committee to advise the Provost in all promotion and tenure considerations. In fulfilling this role, the

Committee shall carefully and systematically review, in accordance with the University level criteria, all pertinent materials provided by departments and colleges regarding recommendations for promotion and tenure to ensure that high standards of academic accomplishment and professional performance are maintained in all units of the university. The committee shall be composed of a minimum of nine members and an effort shall be made to ensure representation of diverse disciplinary areas as well as of minorities (ethnic and gender) on the Committee."

Senator Hetrick asked the chair if the Engineering/Mines recommendation for insertion was ruled out of order. Dr. Rehm responded that the material contained in their section labeled APPC-6 refers to "an individual not of faculty rank", or someone not covered in Chapter 3. He explained that the Promotion/Tenure section being discussed applies only to faculty members, and that the category of individuals "not of faculty rank" would refer to either Chapters 4 or 5. Senator Hetrick said he wanted to respond that this was in connection with the activities of the same committee referred to here. Dr. Henderson said that if one wanted to find out how to review academic professionals, he didn't think one would look in Chapter 3, but in Chapter 4.

Senator Jones said the title of this committee may sound strange, but it is the new name for the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, assigned to it in the Board of Regents document. Senator Paplanus said he wanted to question the appropriateness of mandating minority membership on the Standing Committee on Faculty Status. He said he thought we could all agree that only high standards of academic accomplishment and professional diplomacy are the criteria; it seems inappropriate to imply there are other criteria by including "minorities (ethnic and gender)", and he felt it should be stricken from the proposal. Senator Silverman said he believed it is appropriate for this institution to take the position that one of the factors to consider in appointing a committee is ethnicity and gender. He said he feels it is a very important factor, and an important statement for this University to make, especially at this time. Dr. Vincent Fulginiti, sitting in for Senator Kettel, said that having chaired many committees, he would suggest this language be kept, because it assumes the quality is equal, but that attention should be paid to these two groups. Senator McConnell asked if the phraseology is as clear as it could be, i.e., "minorities (ethnic and gender)". Senator Jones said the committee wrestled with what would be the most appropriate way to phrase that and, given other options, this was the best they could come up with. He invited any improvement. Senator Fleming said that technically women are a majority, not a minority, but suggested something like "Attention should be given to appropriate representation from appropriate gender and ethnicity." Senator Jones suggested APPC work on the wording to see if it could be improved. Senator Cole wondered where the idea of nine members for the University Committee on Faculty Status originated. Dr. Hasselmo responded that nine is the size of the existing committee. As discussion on wording of the minority phrase continued, Senator Laird said he wondered whether it was really aimed at just these two categories or all protected categories, and whether the committee could draft a statement that would include all. Senator Jones said the committee will try to do that. Hearing no further comments, he proceeded to the next recommendation for change.

8. Section 3.11.02, p. 3-13, line 23, insert after "department", "reviewed by the appropriate College Standing Committee on Faculty Status, the University Standing Committee on Faculty Status,"

Senator Hetrick withdrew the College of Engineering/Mines recommendation numbered APPC-8. Senator Jones acknowledged that withdrawal. Dr. Hasselmo said that he thinks it is a good idea to have review of the criteria from time to time, but asked if he was correct in understanding they would be reviewed annually. Senator Jones said the intent was to ensure that those who are directly involved in working with those criteria would be engaged in reviewing them. Dr. Hasselmo said that, as a practical matter, the P&T Committee does review the criteria and has made recommendations concerning issues that have occurred in those criteria; he expressed concern about setting a requirement that this must be done every year by both College and University-wide committees. Senator Ewbank said that when this was discussed in the committee, it was felt that such encouragement would refresh the review committees at the college and the University level in their acquaintance with the criteria developed at the departmental level so that as they reviewed the recommendations from the department, their review would not be guided by standards that were irrelevant. He said this was a review not so much for proposing change as an annual review to get the voting criteria in mind. They thought this might reduce the idiosyncratic reward from the University-level committee that seemed not to agree with department- and college-level committees.

Dr. George Davis, Vice-Provost, said that it seemed to him that we are in the process right now of sending in our criteria before the individual is reviewed, and he thought this was the intent of this section. He said he hoped the same thing would be true at the college level: before you review an individual, the college committee would have had the criteria. But he said he wasn't sure that that's what was being said in this phrase: a review was being requested, and Dr. Davis felt that the committee wanted to ensure familiarity with the criteria before review took place, and if this was true, he suggested alternative wording be put in place.

After further discussion, Dr. Rehm asked the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to review this and other sections and have some revised wording ready for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m. so that the General Faculty meeting called for this time to review Honorary Degree nominations could be convened.

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 6, 1986:

- 86-47 Approval of Minutes of September 8, 1986.
- 86-48 Approval of candidate for Honorary Degree.
- 86-49 Approval of candidate for Honorary Degree.
- 86-50 Approval of candidate for Honorary Degree.
- 86-51 Approval of candidate for Honorary Degree.
- 86-52 Approval of candidate for Honorary Degree.
- 86-53 Approval of candidate for Honorary Degree.
- 86-54 Ratification of Budget Policy Committee Chair, 1986-87.
- 86-55 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 15, section I.
- 86-56 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 15, Section III, as modified.

MATTERS PENDING:

1. Completion of discussion on Chapter 3, UHAP.
2. Discussion on Chapter 4, UHAP.
3. Policy regarding use of a textbook in a class directed by the author.