

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, September 9, 1985 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:14 p.m. on Monday, September 9, 1985, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Sixty-nine members were present. Presiding Officer of the Senate Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aamodt, Alcorn, Aleamoni, Andreas, Aquilano, Atwater, Bootman, Boynton, Brand, Butler, Chiasson, Chen, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Dickstein, Drake, Duncan, Emery, Epstein, Ewbank, Fahey, Farr, Fernandez, Finkler, Fleming, Fox, Garcia, Garrett, Giffin, Goetinck, Hasselmo, Hegland, Heigl, Hill, Jones, Kettel, Kinkade, Koffler, Matter, Mautner, McCullough, Mishel, Myers, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Obst, Paplanus, Peterson, Phipps, Roemer, Rollins, Rund, Sacamano, Sacken, Salzman, Sampanes, Sharkey, Silverberg, Smith, Sorensen, Steelink, Tomizuka, Torres, Tuchi, Weiss, Wert, Wilkening, Witte, and Woodard. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian. Senator Jacqueline Sharkey served as Secretary.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Beigel, Cardon, Cole, Ebeltoft, Fenstermacher, Gourley, Hetrick, Irving, Laird, Marcus, Muramoto, Swalin, and Zukoski.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBERS: Presiding Officer Rehm welcomed returning Faculty Senators and introduced new members of the Senate: Agnes Aamodt, Nursing; Rosalind Andreas, Dean of Students; Robert Chiasson, Agriculture; Gary Fenstermacher, Dean of the College of Education, who was unable to attend today's meeting due to a time conflict, but who had expressed his desire to participate in Senate meetings later in the semester; Margaret Fleming, Education; and Laurel Wilkening, Vice President for Research.

MINUTES OF MAY 6 AND 13, 1985: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 85-48) to approve the minutes of the meetings of May 6 and 13, 1985, as submitted.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: President Koffler also extended a welcome to returning and new Faculty Senators. This year, he said, as in past years, he will look to the Senate for its considered and timely advice in dealing with the problems that the University faces. He said he looked forward to continuing and expanding the positive working relationship that had been established. President Koffler said that this afternoon he wanted to comment primarily on several actions taken by the Board of Regents at its meeting in Flagstaff this past Friday and Saturday.

"The Board continued its discussion of university investments in South Africa and approved several motions that have attracted considerable media attention. Let me summarize. First, the three Arizona universities were directed to proceed to divest themselves of stock in companies doing business in South Africa in an orderly manner and as soon as possible. Secondly, the universities were instructed to develop a new policy which would retain the traditional investment criteria of safety and yield, but would incorporate also the new criteria of social considerations in selecting stock. Finally, the

Regents agreed to communicate their concerns to the Arizona Congressional delegation and to the White House. In a separate motion, the Board made it clear that divestiture was not intended as a blanket criticism of companies doing business in South Africa, many of which were to be commended for their progressive policies and actions. The Board can be expected to adopt revised investment policies later in the year, including the criteria of social considerations.

"The Board also made several decisions which have a direct and I think very marked significance for the kind of physical facilities we can shape in the coming one to three years. First, the Board allocated a total of \$3.7 million appropriated by the 1985 Arizona Legislature for maintenance, repairs, and safety improvements on the three campuses. The University of Arizona is to receive out of that amount \$1.2 million to be used, together with other available funds, for the improvement of the electrical distribution system. Secondly, the Board allocated a total of \$125 million in bonding authority, which was also granted by the 1985 Legislature. Of this \$125 million, the University of Arizona received \$57.5 million of this total. This will be used to proceed with the early stages of the Ten-Year Capital Facilities Plan, which we brought to the Regents' attention in January. Thirdly, the University received permission to advertise for proposals from bidders who wish to lease or purchase 95 acres of the former experimental farm in Mesa. And apart from 15 acres of the property, which will be retained for a Center for Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, this farm is now no longer needed for the purposes of the College of Agriculture. The proceeds of the sale or lease will go to the Agriculture Endowment Fund and will help to finance the first two phases of the development plan for the College of Agriculture, which heavily involve the experiment stations, and one of the projects will be to build an Agriculture Building, which is included in some of our bonding authority. Finally in this group of actions, the Board authorized the three universities to seek legislative approval for additional bonding authority for certain projects, as soon as the Legislature is in session. In our case, the project involves a major recreational center which will be quite largely directed toward student use, but of course will also be available for faculty, and one or more parking garages. The proposal for a recreation center has been developed in conjunction with student leaders and reflects several surveys of student opinion in the past. Before proceeding further with this project, there will be a referendum on current student opinion, which will be out later this semester.

"Taken in conjunction, these four decisions by the Regents, concerning allocation of maintenance funds, allocation of bonding authority, permission to sell or lease property, and permission to seek additional bonding authority, represent a major step forward in creating the capital facilities which the University needs. As I have said publicly very often, in addition to salaries for faculty and staff, our physical facilities are the most urgent priorities we have.

"I want to stress the considerable progress we are making in improving our capital facilities. At this moment, we have projects under way totaling approximately \$80 million. These range from some projects in which we are only now selecting an architect, to others as far advanced as the Science Building. Since so much is going on, you may not have a full understanding of the impact, but approximately \$80 million worth is going on right now. We also have the

authorization of the Board of Regents to proceed with additional projects totaling approximately \$120 million. In some cases we still need final approval from the Board and from the Legislature on the specifics involved, but it is fair to say that we are now engaged in approximately \$200 million worth of building programs. Compared to other institutions, that is quite remarkable. This will have a major impact on our capabilities for teaching, research, and public service. In this respect, compared to many of our sister institutions elsewhere in the country, we are doing remarkably well.

"On a very different topic, I would like to draw the Senate's attention to the Centennial Academic Convocation which is to be held this coming Thursday, September 12. The academic procession will begin at 1:30, and the ceremony at Gallagher Theater will start at 2 o'clock. Several honorary degrees will be conferred, and I shall speak on the topic of 'A Vision for the Future: Toward the Year 2000.' Since I propose to outline some of my intentions and ambitions for the University for the next fifteen years, although I will doubtless be not the one to see them through those fifteen years, I invite you all to attend, regardless of your participation in the academic procession. Some of you may think that only those who participate are encouraged to attend, but I would urge you to alter that, because this will be a relatively important statement.

"As you may know, for this Centennial Year the academic convocation has replaced the General Faculty meeting which traditionally has begun each semester. I am apologetic for that, but the timing of the various events has made that necessary. That traditional meeting has been valuable to campus communication since it was used for the President to review the state of the university and talk about recent developments. As such, it is not an occasion to be foregone lightly, and at the suggestion of Professor J. D. Garcia and with the help of Professor Rehm, we have arranged to use the second half of the Faculty Senate meeting on November 4 for the customary review of the state of the university. As I understand it, the Senate will meet from 3 o'clock to 4 o'clock and the General Faculty from 4 o'clock to 5 o'clock. I am very happy to see you back, and very happy to be with you."

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Dr. Hasselmo announced that Professor Roger Henderson of the College of Law had accepted the position of Acting Vice Provost, and will serve in that position until a permanent appointment can be made, probably November 1. He said that Professor Henderson was not a candidate for the permanent Vice Provostship. Deadline for application and nomination for the position is September 15, and material should be submitted to Dean Gladys Sorensen. Dr. Hasselmo said he hoped the selection committee will make its recommendations in early or mid-October so that the appointment could be made November 1. He said that one of the primary responsibilities he has asked Professor Henderson to take on in the interim is the final preparation of the Personnel Manual, so that there will be, finally, a single volume. Professor Henderson was, he said, having discussions with Professor Rehm concerning the appropriate method of bringing the Personnel Manual before the Faculty Senate for review.

"We are involved in the implementation of salaries, and as you undoubtedly know, the Legislature appropriated funding not for July but for January. The various units have been asked to state their claim to funding, and we are in the process of reviewing those recommendations, and over the next two months the salary distribution will take place. As part of the salary implementation, we have again an equity review for cases where unlawful discrimination may have

influenced salary-setting. There is an open invitation to anyone who feels they have been unlawfully discriminated against to submit a request for an equity review through the Department Heads, and so forth. The procedure is similar to what we did last year with review by Department Heads, Deans, and a University-wide committee.

"We have been in discussion with the Senate's Budget Policy Committee concerning the development of an academic planning process, which is an effort to integrate the various elements in the planning process into a more coherent whole. It is our intention to finish the preparation of that process within the next five to six months. This also will involve a review of our Mission and Scope statement, the document that was prepared last spring, as part of our general planning process.

"We have finished and submitted to the Board of Regents a set of decision packages for 1986-87. We received an abundance of proposals from various units, and we have reviewed them in light of University priorities and have submitted a total request for decision packages of approximately \$18.5 million for review by the Board of Regents. As you probably know, the decision packages focus on programmatic developments, not specifically on workload related requests. In position number one of the decision packages, we have one focusing on the quality of undergraduate teaching; this package, we hope, will make it possible for us to strengthen further some areas that need strengthening in the undergraduate curriculum. We have included components focusing on English composition, hoping to take yet another step in the implementation of the University Composition Board program that was adopted by the Senate. We have funding for strengthening of entry-level Mathematics courses along lines established by a committee that was developed last year. We have some other components focusing on, for example, the Honors program, the strengthening of courses in the Humanities program as part of what we expect to be an upgrading of our General Education curriculum. We also continue among the decision packages to focus on some of the critically needed computer systems; again, the student information system has a prominent place in the list of decision packages. There are also some other packages focusing on related financial and personnel management, but most of the packages, again, focus on academic program development. We have moved up a number of projects that were not funded in the last round, and we hope they will be fundable this year. We are also undertaking a major thrust that relates to technical staff and technical equipment for a variety of programs, an issue that has been brought to our attention repeatedly by Deans and Department Heads.

"The enrollment report is encouraging in that we seem to have stabilized the enrollment; I certainly look forward to a year when I don't have to cut faculty positions, having over the last two years cut 74 positions. We hope that we are not only attracting students to the University in somewhat increased numbers, but that we will also be able to serve them adequately, especially with courses such as English composition and entry-level Mathematics, which have in the past tended to be severe bottlenecks.

"Finally, I will make a report to the Senate later this fall concerning our experience with the four Dean's Reviews that were completed this past year. In connection with that report, we will also raise some of the procedural issues that have been brought to my attention on several occasions. I expect that this will be within the next couple of months or so that this report will be finished."

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm reported that Senator Jacqueline Sharkey had agreed to act as Secretary pro tem while George Ridge is on sabbatical, beginning with this meeting.

He reported that the Committee on Elections is conducting an election for college representative from the College of Education because Senator Robinson had to resign because of newly assigned administrative duties in the college.

Dr. Rehm thanked Dr. Hasselmo, on behalf of faculty governance, for providing the Faculty Center with a photocopy machine, which will greatly ease the workload and provide for greater efficiency.

He noted that on Senators' desks today was a list of members of the five Faculty Senate standing committees. Four of the committees were completely formed, and the fifth was awaiting the decision of one more member. Two of the chairs had been ratified by the Senate in May, and the remaining three were now being presented for ratification: Budget Policy Committee, Senator Shirley O'Brien; Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee, Senator Carl Tomizuka; and the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, Senator Samuel Paplanus. It was moved and seconded to ratify those chairs. Senator Drake reminded the Presiding Officer that in May he had requested that the Senate be provided with written material on such matters prior to rather than on the day of the meeting. Dr. Rehm responded that he clearly recalled Senator Drake's comment at the May meeting; he explained that the process of setting up these committees began in May, but because of various problems, the process could not be completed until after this semester began. To provide information that was as helpful and as accurate as possible, the information on committee membership had been provided in writing at this meeting, which was an improvement over the announcement from the podium in May. It was then moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (motion 85-49) to ratify the appointment of the three chairs.

Dr. Rehm next announced that the Committee on Elections had been formed, and consisted of Dr. Shirley Taylor (Chair), Dr. Suzanne Van Ort, and Dr. Robert Chiasson. The Committee on Committees had also been formed. Although they had not yet met to select a chair, the members are: Dr. Adele Barker, Dr. Billie Jo Inman, Dr. Carl Tomizuka, Dr. Don Myers, Dr. Jay Angevine, and Dr. Janice Monk.

When the new Faculty Directory telephone book is published, Dr. Rehm said, there will be a new listing in the front pages that indicates the telephone numbers for the Faculty Governance Center, the Faculty Senate, and for all the Senate and General Faculty standing committees. This information will greatly assist persons with questions for the Senate or the Committees.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Heigl said he was glad to be a part of the Faculty Senate, and he reviewed the many activities ASUA sponsors for campus safety and well-being. Some of ASUA's principal priorities this year will include campus safety and a long-term solution to the lack of recreational facilities. He said ASUA would be working hard with the administration, faculty, staff, and students to help solve common problems, in many cases through the Faculty Senate. He next introduced the new student Senators, most of whom were not in attendance at the May 6 Senate meeting: David Duncan, Kira Finkler, Greg Garrett, Shawn Giffin, Tim Obst, Marina Sampanes, Danny Silverberg, and Rex Torres. He urged approval of a later agenda item, ratification of two faculty representatives to the Student Senate.

DISCUSSION ON CURRENT PARKING PROBLEMS: Dr. Rehm said that at this point he would like to insert an item into the agenda, dealing with the parking situation. He had invited the principals involved (Bill Varney, Associate Vice President for Administration; David Nott, Chairman of the Parking and Transportation Committee; and Janie Nunez, Director of Parking) to present their side of the story. Hearing no objection, he invited them to step to the podium.

Mr. Varney reviewed the background of the parking problems, and actions taken by the administration and Board of Regents to begin solving them. He said, "I received more phone calls in the past month than I have in my 27 years at the University. It's really a lot of fun to be here now. I want to tell you something: it's probably going to get a little worse until we build those two big parking garages that we hope to build in the future. President Koffler told you a moment ago about the new buildings we're going to build on this campus, and every time we build a building, we lose a parking lot. But the Board of Regents did say one thing: when we build a building and remove 40 or 400 or 1,000 spaces, the cost of that building must be part of that process to build more parking elsewhere." He then introduced the other two principals, Professor Dave Nott, the Acting Head of Radio-TV, and Janie Nunez, Parking Director. He said that the committee had spent approximately 140 to 150 hours in committee session, and then called upon Professor Nott to speak.

Dr. Nott reviewed the committee's early meetings and his initial reluctance to accept the chairmanship. He noted that the committee's plans differed substantially from anything previously proposed, and he had wondered about that. "I guess when I answer that question I think I know why that is: it's simply because the bottom line is that everybody has to pay, and they can't really be sure that they're really better off now than they were last year and in times past. We had tried to take away all of the 'perks' had been distributed, parking 'perks' that is, that had been distributed to faculty and students over the years. In order to do that, about the only procedure that we could follow was to make sure that every person who wanted a permit to park on campus was somebody who was willing to pay for that permit, and willing to pay for the privilege of parking on campus. So the bottom line is, either the user pays or the administrative unit who wants the user to park free pays. But it's one or the other. The user pays or the administrative unit. We will talk very quickly about the parking conditions, and then I will turn the floor open to any questions that you might have.

"Last year, we had on campus 1,706 fewer spaces than we have right now. We've added 340 new spaces for students north of Speedway; by October 15 we should have our first of 300 parking meters coming in; and we have developed 1,066 spaces within the system. So the totals, that is actual totals for students, faculty/professional staff, classified staff, and others, are 8,686, up from 6,980 last year. Now I know those totals are far less than the totals that you see in the papers; and certainly the totals that you see in the papers of 10,804 spaces are accurate. But once you take away all of the visitor spaces, the patient spaces, the pay lots, the handicapped spaces, the designated street spaces, that's all we're left with: 8,636 up from 6,980. The point is, we have improved the parking ratio. Last year, for instance, we had one student space for every 6.25 students. This year we have one space for every 5.56 students. And that does not count the 300 parking meters which are available for student use. Of course, when you look at classified staff, the faculty/professional staff, and the administrators, you now have to group all of these personnel together. Because the translation from last year to this

year is not the same. In order to come up with an appropriate comparison, we do have to group. But last year for that group, there were 2,227 spaces, and the population was 9,863, which meant that last year there was one space for every 4.35 personnel. This year, we have 3,114 spaces for the same population, which means that we now have one space for every 3.15 personnel. So there is an improved ratio. In addition, we have an improved ratio of spaces to permits. Now please bear in mind that we can't give you an exact ratio for classified staff and faculty/professionals and administrators because all of those permits are not yet purchased. But we think we have a pretty good idea of what's going to happen, based upon what the students have done in responding to their permit deadline. For instance, last year there were 21,344 permits awarded for 4,753 spaces. That was one space for every 4.5 cars. This year, of course, the number of spaces has increased to 5,272 spaces. It appears that what we've been able to do is to reduce the demand for the number of permits, so we are in pretty good shape as far as the students are concerned. If you look, for instance, at all the translations for classified staff, faculty/professionals, and administrators, the totals last year were 7,577 permits for 2,227 spaces. There was one space for every 3.45 cars. This year the increase in spaces is at 3,114, and if we use the exact number of permits issued last year--it won't be that many, but if we use the exact number--we can see you now have one space for every 2.44 cars or permits. We are estimating that we will have 1/3 fewer permits in those categories. If that's the case, we will issue, as an estimate, 5,076 permits, which means that we will end up with one space for every 1.64 cars or permits. That looks like an improved condition for that group as well. I realize that this is not a perfect situation. I also realize that we've got a long way to go. I hope in the process that all of you realize that this is an experimental year, and we are trying to do a number of different things in order to create better parking conditions on campus. I think we've got ourselves a pretty good start, and certainly with the support of the administration and the Faculty Senate, it seems to me that we can get the job done. Thank you."

Dr. Rehm then called for questions. Senator Peterson asked whether Dr. Nott could give the Senate a breakdown, in terms of ratio of permits to space, for the three categories of CS, F/P, and AD; he said there were some strange figures in the Wildcat. Dr. Nott said the CS spaces have a population group of 4,615 personnel, and 2,282 spaces are allocated to that group. Faculty/Professional Staff and Administrators number 4,958, and 832 spaces have been allocated. He said these are extremely conservative figures, and do not include the 300 parking meters nor other kinds of designated spaces such as those for handicapped persons. Dr. Nott explained that the Faculty/Professional Staff and Administrators were still being grouped together because it was currently impossible to separate them. He said it appeared there will be about 275 spaces allocated to the administrative group. He said there were some administrative spaces carried over from last year. He said the committee tried not to change the groupings. The point is, he said, committee members would not know until they saw how many people in each classification applied for permits before the October 1 deadline. In responding to the question about whether there will be an adjustment in the distribution, Dr. Nott stated that there has been an adjustment on a weekly basis. He then called on Janie Nunez to talk about changes that had been made.

Ms. Nunez summarized the changes that had been projected: W's would change into CS's; A's would turn into F/P's; and C's would be AD's. The committee knew that many Faculty/Professionals who were holders of W permits

would be put into F/P's, and many C and A holders would fall into the CS category. During September, she said, the committee would be looking at the distribution of Faculty/Professionals and Classified Staff and making a judgment about how to accommodate Faculty/Professionals who held W permits. She said adjustments will be made daily. Administrators work in buildings throughout the campus, she said, so the traditional C areas behind the Administration Building and the Law School have been eliminated. Instead, administrators' spaces have been allocated in various lots; most happen to be around F/P areas. She said they haven't covered all the F/P's; for example, the Library has a large number of W holders who are becoming F/P's. When the committee has been alerted about that type of problem, it has made immediate changes. She urged Senators to let the committee know if they are encountering problems so adjustments can be made in their lots. Meanwhile, campus police are being lenient about enforcement and are allowing cross-over parking until October 1.

Senator Cusanovich: "Just a quick question. As I understand what you said, the ratio would be 1.64 or something like that if the numbers came down the way you anticipated." Dr. Nott: "Yes." Senator Cusanovich: "Then you are talking about 800 spaces available--and I am confused by your numbers--for the 4,900 faculty. That doesn't work out to 1.64 by my calculations." Ms. Nunez: "The translation will not be exact." Senator Paplanus: "Dr. Nott, you said all these permits would be paid for by individuals or by administrative units. I'm just curious to know what you meant by administrative units picking up the tab for parking. Obviously I am not asking you for names of individuals." Dr. Nott: "There are approximately 290 administrative units, that is, by classification. We are allowing the heads of those administrative units the opportunity to pay for parking. Now that would mean that if there is a volunteer worker that is donating services to that administrative unit, then quite possibly that administrative head would want to pick up the tab for that individual and pay for that parking. The same holds true for visitors. We are allowing the administrative unit on campus to pay for visitors who park on campus. Frankly, we think that's a better system than what we've had in the past."

Senator Fleming: "Some of us in the College of Education must, as part of our responsibilities, go out to supervise student teachers in the public schools. Even if we're lucky enough to get a parking place in the morning, then if we go out and come back, it's likely to be gone. One of the people that I was talking to asked me if I didn't think that problem could be partially solved by continuing to allow cross-overs, so that an F/P sticker could still park in a CS lot even after October 1." Dr. Nott: "Well, it's quite possible to answer your question directly. We may end up going that route anyhow. But we want to try a number of other things first. The committee has talked at length with Dean Fenstermacher about student teaching supervision and the kind of problem he faces; we called in Phil Rector, who's the Director of Physical Resources, and asked for some kind of support to provide service to those student teacher supervisors. I am pleased to say that we have been able to come to a reasonably good agreement. What we have done is assign special service spaces to the College of Education, and Phil Rector has permitted, on an experimental basis, the College of Education to have the right to use some cars at any time of day or night on a leased basis. This leased price is less than half of what the regular lease rate would be, just to see whether or not faculty members would in fact use University vehicles to do University work that is required of them. Now, this is an experiment. We think that it will provide a real answer to some of the intracampus travels

that are required, and some interorganizational travel that is required as well. It's possible this will provide an answer for a number of different colleges on campus."

Senator Aquilano: "Regarding the parking spaces around the hospital, does the new hospital management pay for parking spaces for their personnel, or do individuals still pay for their own?" Dr. Nott responded that there is a separation between the University Medical Center and the rest of the University of Arizona. The parking spaces at the hospital have been divided between the University Medical Center and the University of Arizona, with a consequent loss of spaces. Ms. Nunez said that the hospital does pay for the parking of its employees; University of Arizona employees must pay their own parking costs. Senator Paplanus: "To clarify that answer, faculty members of the College of Medicine pay at the same rate as everyone else. It is only hospital employees who receive free parking."

Senator Chiasson: "I have two questions. Are University cars to be provided in the same way? For instance, would the people in Agriculture be guaranteed cars to conduct University business off-campus as is the case with the College of Education?" Dr. Nott: "Well, I can't answer that here, in this forum. We are trying to work with the problems on a case-by-case basis, and it is our intent not to penalize people who are required to do work and provide service; it's just the other way around. We are trying to work this system with the College of Education simply because Dean Fenstermacher was the first one who came to us with a well-documented problem, and so we immediately went to work on it. This week we are meeting with Assistant Dean Cosart in the College of Mines and Engineering. There are similar problems there, and we're going to be attempting to work out those concerns as well. I think it is quite possible that the College of Agriculture may get a similar deal." Senator Chiasson: "I have one more question. When you were quoting figures a moment ago, you said there were 4,958 Faculty/Professional, 832 parking places for that group, and of that group, 275 parking places were to be designated to Administration. That's nearly 1/3 of the parking places that will go to the Administration from that pool. Does the Administration make up 1/3 of that 4,958?" Dr. Nott responded that it did not. Senator Chiasson asked whether he knew what percentage of that group they did constitute. Dr. Nott: "There are approximately 290 administrators, according to personnel classification." Dr. Chiasson: "Actually, the approximately 4,600 Faculty/Professionals have 550 parking places." Dr. Nott said that was not entirely true. "Not all of those are full-time Faculty/Professionals. If you deal with the full-time figure, you are dealing with a number that is considerably less. But I don't have those figures with me." Ms. Nunez said that the 275 are also going to come out of the CS spaces; they are not all coming out of F/P spaces. The committee is looking at proximity to buildings and location of administrators' offices. The Faculty/Professionals will probably be gaining spaces simply because they must be accommodated. "As I indicated before, we have a lot of holders of W permits who are becoming F/Ps, and there are others with C and A who are going to be CS. We don't know how that's going to fall out, but the numbers cannot remain constant." Senator Chiasson: "But the fact remains that when you adjust these figures, you've got about nine or ten faculty for every parking place." Ms. Nunez: "I think when we see the number of permits that are issued and the distribution of these permits, then in fact we are not going to see that kind of ratio." Mr. Varney asked Dr. Hasselmo how many members of the teaching faculty there are. Dr. Hasselmo responded that approximately 1,600 persons are regular faculty. Mr. Varney: "Thank you. I think some of the figures we had

are misleading, even though they are figures they work with."

Senator Rollins: "It's very sad when we get this kind of ratio that we are talking about; this is terrible." Mr. Varney: "I tell you what. Let's come back to the next Faculty Senate meeting and we'll give you some different figures." (Much laughter.) "As we said a moment ago, we'll be changing a number of lots over the next month, so those figures will be different a month from now." Senator Rollins: "One other thing. At the present time, we must travel from buildings here on campus to experimental stations, and we have to transport lots of heavy stuff; you can't park in a loading zone without buying a \$100 vendors license for the department. Why should the University have to pay \$100 to conduct their business?" Dr. Nott: "In the first place, it seems to me that you don't have to pay the \$100. For instance, it's entirely possible that you have a permit that will allow you in the space available where you don't have to use a loading permit for the unloading zone. Secondly, it's the committee's feeling that if the University requires you to use transportation to do your job, then the administrative unit should be required to pay for that transportation. So we're suggesting very strongly with our policy, very strongly indeed, that we use University vehicles for University business, not private vehicles for University business. Now there are two ways to do that. First, it seems to me you can hire or lease a University vehicle to get that job done. Or, if you wish to permit private vehicles to work at a much less expensive rate, you can then purchase a vendors permit to be coupled with the regular parking permit, enabling that person to get the job done. We are not trying to inhibit University personnel from doing University business; we are trying to expedite it under some very difficult situations and circumstances." Senator Rollins: "Number one, the vehicle already has a private permit. Number two, twenty-odd years ago when I came here, one of the requirements of the job was to use your own private vehicle to do the extension work. It still is a requirement. You have made no recommendation there when you say use University vehicles." Dr. Nott: "That is correct--we have not." Senator Chiasson asked whether the Board of Regents would provide a larger budget in order to buy these extra cars. Dr. Nott: "I think that's a question we have to ask the Board of Regents. What we are strongly suggesting is that parking needs to be very much an integral part of the budgeting process within the administrative units throughout the campus. That's the only way we are ever going to get this problem solved: if we pay for parking and pay for transportation, as it was intended. We just have to do it." Senator Epstein: "How are you coming with clearing up the computer backlog? I cannot buy a new sticker because of an outstanding ticket that was given to me the day this whole thing started. And it has been accepted up and down the line that this was an erroneous ticket. But I can't get the computer cleared, and they said there was a two-week backlog." Ms. Nunez: "I suggest that you contact me directly later, and we'll talk about your personal problem."

Responding to the question "Why can't Second Street be changed back to a parking zone?" Mr. Varney referred this question to Senator George Cunningham. Senator Cunningham: "That's been reviewed. The University would assume a risk, but the pedestrians would assume a greater risk. The potential for pedestrian/automobile conflict increases as you have larger numbers of pedestrians and larger numbers of automobiles, which you have on Second Street. The counts indicated that the risk was very high to have automobiles located on Second Street. And we did review this a number of times. It was suggested by the City of Tucson that we reinstate those parking spaces. Based on the information that was provided, we decided not to do it because of the risk

involved."

Senator Mishel: "Let's say you work out all the problems, and we all buy our permits as we are supposed to. What happens to all the funds that you collect with this procedure? How are they going to be used in the future?" Mr. Varney: "We will probably be starting construction within a year on a new parking garage, and another one hopefully a year after that. That's going to require a lot of money, and that's where a lot of these funds will go. Currently, we have used some of the funds to add to our staff. How many staff do you have today, compared to a year ago?" Dr. Nott: "Eleven new staff; there were four a year ago." Mr. Varney said that the University has increased its subsidy to Sun Tran. A year ago, he said, there were 700 students and employees subscribing to the Sun Tran bus pass program; there are now 2,500. Senator Mishel stated that she hoped plans for building additional facilities involved not only the main part of campus, but other parts of campus as well.

Senator Myers said he had several questions: "You mentioned administrative units being able to buy parking. Your example referred to visitors and volunteer workers. Does that permit a department head to buy parking for the department head?" Dr. Nott: "No, it does not. What we are expecting is, if the use of a car is required to carry out a job, that a University vehicle be leased or a car found that can be used. Senator Myers: "What if a person who is not connected with the University in any way parks on campus in a parking lot? What happens?" Mr. Varney: "We ticket them." Senator Myers: "How do you collect?" Mr. Varney: "We can't. But if he comes again, he'll be towed away or booted." Senator Myers: "Then you have discriminatory action, because you have people who could be parking in our lots who have not paid fees and to whom nothing happens." Mr. Varney: "That's not going to happen this year." Senator Myers: "Third question. Your actions with Sun Tran are commendable; it's long overdue. When are you going to do something about bicycle paths?" Dr. Nott: "We discussed, in our last few committee meetings, bicycle transportation. Quite frankly, we've talked about the problems of bicycles going the wrong way on one-way streets on campus. But at the moment, that's not the most important element we have to consider. We haven't done anything about it at this moment except to talk about it. We anticipate having bicycle paths. We also are in the process of putting in 750 new bike racks for ease of storage and security of bicycles. We want to encourage bicycle transportation, but at the moment we've done nothing about that issue."

Dr. Rehm indicated he would accept two more questions, one from each side of the room. Senator Tomizuka: "I can't find justification for assigning a higher number of parking spaces to administrators than faculty." Dr. Nott: "I have no direct answer to your question, but I have a justification for what we've done. Last year we had a set number of spaces for a set number of faculty groups. What we've tried to do to ease the pain of transition is to maintain about the same number, with some improvement, in categories. We think we're going to be able to solve this problem, not only for the administrators, but for faculty and professional staff, and for classified staff and students."

Senator Peterson asked whether this would be an appropriate time to make a motion. Dr. Rehm: (Pause) "I'll listen to it." (Much laughter.) Senator Peterson: "I think the committee is to be highly commended for obviously a great deal of work with an extremely difficult problem. There are at least a couple of aspects of this situation which make no sense at all, however, and need to be changed. Part of the problems have come about because we have a

committee which was not constructed in ways to be properly representative. That is not a criticism of the committee, who worked very hard. But as such, they had no role in reporting back to anyone else. We didn't know what was going on, and it was laid on us--as usual--in the middle of the summer. It seems to be the pattern of this administration to make very important announcements in the middle of the summer, and that's unfortunate. In any event, I think that some of the discontent and anger could have been alleviated had the committee had representatives of this body and Staff Council and students who would have had the duty to report regularly, so we could know what was going on. I will further point out that I think that the business of eliminating cross-over is very, very foolish. They're not going to settle the problem by the 1st of October--they just started issuing permits today. It's obvious it's not going to end the 1st of October." Dr. Rehm: "Your motion, please." Senator Peterson: "Whereas the new parking regulations at the University of Arizona were formulated without adequate input from the University community and were published too late to allow timely reaction, the Faculty Senate hereby resolves that: (1.) The regulations concerning eligibility for parking permits and the privileges associated with such permits shall be preserved in the previous form as nearly as possible for the 1985-86 academic year. Specifically, (a) Choice of permit shall be retained; that is, persons eligible for AD permits shall have the option of choosing F/P or CS permits, and persons eligible for F/P permits shall have the option of choosing CS permits; (b) Crossover privileges shall be retained; that is, persons with AD permits will be allowed to park in F/P or CS areas, and persons with F/P permits will be allowed to park in CS areas. (2.) The Parking Advisory Committee shall be reconstituted to include members of the Faculty selected by the Faculty Senate, members of classified staff selected by the Staff Advisory Council, and students selected by ASUA. This committee shall work with the Parking Administrator to develop a new parking system. This proposed new system will be submitted to the Faculty Senate, Staff Council, and ASUA in a timely manner for review and comment prior to adoption." The motion was seconded. Senator Heigl asked who the members of the Parking/Transportation Committee are. Dr. Nott responded that there were two faculty members, two students, and two classified staff who were appointed by Associate Vice President Varney. Dr. Rehm asked whether there would be further discussion. Senator Tuchi: "I was the one responsible for the appointment of the committee. I would suggest that it is very easy to criticize the timing of occurrences, because hindsight is really quite worthless. The problem was simply that the students had to be treated prior to their departure. Secondly, the actions to take place if we were to tackle the parking problem in a substantive way had to occur within a time frame which necessarily cut short our desire to observe an appropriate, parliamentary procedure. Thirdly, it would have been easy to simply make the parking changes by administrative decision, obviously open to other forms of criticism, but it was determined that the amount of thought that should precede the complex work involved in a major change in our parking situation would require a number of willing participants. It was truly a matter of choice and chance, if you will, that the committee was constituted as two faculty, two staff, and two students. They certainly were not chosen in some representative form that might have occurred had there been a debate in the Senate. Nonetheless, they were chosen with the expectation that two willing members from each of the appropriate segments would be able to provide some better input and be able to reach some more representative conclusions that would have occurred had we approached things by administrative decision. The situation on parking and transportation at the University is that there are too few parking spaces. That cannot be changed, whatever the allocations. Second, parking

spaces on campus are not located exactly or even close to where people would desire; no amount of allocation will change that. Finally, it was determined that a hump would occur which we would have to negotiate in the event that we were to arrive at a permanent parking/transportation problem resolution a couple of years down the road. That resolution will occur as the result of the addition of new spaces, the construction of new spaces, a complete examination of alternative forms of transportation, some method of causing market crisis to allow parking choices and, finally, some difficult decisions about allocation, which would change over time in perhaps a system of concentric circles, such as that at ASU. All of that could not take place in the relatively short time allocated. I would request, very simply, that while the current situation is difficult, and while I know you appreciate the work done by Bill Varney and the committee thus far, which can probably never be conveyed in terms of the amount of strain they encountered, I would request that you allow the committee your forbearance for the year, that we share some of the difficulties, and that the committee be allowed to do its work as it is structured for this year of experimentation. Should you find it completely unacceptable or even partially unacceptable, then you must take more drastic measures, which might involve complete reconstitution of the committee, which has its work cut out for the year." Senator Sacken: "Just to support what Senator Tuchi is saying, I'm having a problem with the notion of selection criteria, although the notion of requiring the committee to submit its reports to its constituent bodies prior to adoption is pretty terrifying, considering the Faculty Manual history. The other thing is, Senator Peterson's recommendation simply takes three categories and reduces them to two. What I mean by that is, if I can choose as a faculty member between F/P and CS, and I can park in either F/P or CS, why would I ever pay the additional money for F/P? So it really adds more substantive implications, and that may have been the intent, but it does destroy the notion of categories by that act. I suggest that we do not as a body try to throw away the experience that the committee has gained in a very short period of time, nor the intensity of the amount of experience that they are going to gain during the year by replacing them now or within months." Dr. Nott: "I would like to respond as well to Senator Peterson. When this committee assumed its responsibilities in May, at that point the fee structure had been passed by the Board of Regents, and the classifications had already been set. We had at that point two choices: we could either reinvent the wheel--reconsider classification and fee structure--or we could go ahead and try to make it the best possible system under the circumstances. I told the committee very quickly that if we were going to go back and reconsider the work the previous committee had done--and that was approved by the President's advisors and the Board of Regents--I would not stay on and chair the committee. I would resign right now. It seemed to me to be ludicrous to reconsider the whole structure all over again. So, while I appreciate your support, from Vice President Tuchi and others, I also want to go on record as saying that I feel very strongly about staying with a system that had been approved prior to the establishment of this committee." Senator Peterson: "I'd like to clarify some of the points I made. First, all I'm asking is for the system we had last year, where if you were eligible for an A permit, you could choose the permit you wished. Why would you choose an A permit? Because an A permit got you better parking. You got something for your money. You made a consumer's choice, if you will; you decided whether it was worth it to you to park. Now this feeling has been totally taken away from us. If I want to park, I pay \$150 or maybe \$250; I don't know which category I'm in, and I can't find anybody who will tell me. I have no choice, and I have no freedom. I'm not asking for something radical, I'm asking for what we had last year, with some degree of choice. I'm afraid I

made too much out of the timing of the thing. I understand what Vice President Tuchi is saying. But I would like to see that in the future there is time to consider this thing before everything goes haywire." Dr. Nott responded that faculty still have a choice; the choices are just different.

Senator Garcia: "A point of information. Wouldn't this current committee report back to the Senate in say, four months, so they would have enough time to shake out the system?" Dr. Nott: "Yes." Senator Garcia: "My feeling is that to change horses in midstream would be difficult and not what is needed. I think that no matter what committee you have, it's going to be a painful thing to do. I move that we table this motion." That motion (85-50) was seconded. The motion was passed on a voice vote. Senator Steelink then moved that the Parking/Transportation Committee come back to the Faculty Senate at the first meeting in January to report on progress. That motion (85-51) was seconded and passed unanimously by voice vote.

\* \* \* \* \*

Information Provided by Parking/Transp. Committee After Senate Meeting, 9/9/85

Number of Spaces Avail. for AD & F/P

1984-85	697
1985-86	832

Number of Permits Issued for AD & F/P in 1984-85: 7,577 (includes the "second vehicle" permits issued)

<u>Full &amp; Part-Time AD &amp; F/P Personnel</u>		<u>Full-Time Only</u>	
AD	290	AD	278
F	1,908	F	1,549
P	<u>3,050</u>	P	<u>871</u>
Total	5,248	Total	2,698

Number of Permit Applications Anticipated in 1985-86: 5,000

Ratios, Permits/Spaces:

Actual 1984-85:	7,577/697 = 10.9 to 1
Projected 1985-86:	5,000/832 = 6 to 1

\* \* \* \* \*

BOARD OF REGENTS TO CONDUCT FTE AUDIT: Dr. Rehm said he had omitted one item from his earlier report. The Board of Regents will, on September 16, conduct an audit of the University's FTE report by choosing a sample of classes from the Registrar's records to confirm enrollments with instructors by telephone. He urged faculty cooperation in clearing up the enrollment status of all classes by that date.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Shirley O'Brien reported that the Committee had received its charge from Dr. Rehm: (1) to represent the faculty in discussions with University administration on policy and planning; (2) to be active and constructive in their discussions; and (3) to present reports to the Faculty Senate. Members of the committee are: Stanley Alcorn, Plant Pathology; Gerald Bierwag, Finance & Real Estate; Thomas Burks, Pharmacology; Nat de Gennaro, Economics & Business Research; Ruth Dickstein, Main Library; Leslie Flemming, Oriental Studies; and Tim Obst, student member. Senator O'Brien urged Senators with concerns to contact any member. She reported that Provost Hasselmo had met with the committee several times, and plans to use the committee as a sounding board for proposed programs and resource allocation. He would like the committee to be involved in two levels: early stages of drafts, and final versions of proposals. So far they have had one major task: the academic planning process agenda. At their next meeting, which will be held without administrative personnel present, they will begin to draw up a list of the top ten priorities, for the next fifteen years, from the committee's point of view in the areas of teaching, research, and public service. She said that they will be meeting the last Monday of each month, in Student Union 102, and Faculty Senators are welcome to attend any meeting to express their views.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Garcia reported that the Research Policy Committee has met once this fall, and that it has not yet determined a full list of its priorities. The charge to the committee is that which was discussed by the Senate at the May meeting. Members are: William Boynton, Lunar & Planetary Laboratory; Michael Cusanovich, Biochemistry; Charles Peyton, Associate Vice President for Research; Michael Schiffer, Anthropology; Rodger Thompson, Steward Observatory; Marlys Witte, Surgery; and Marina Sampanes, student member.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mishel reported that the committee held its first meeting last week. They reviewed the Ad Hoc Committee report presented to the Senate last May. The committee has identified the major focus for the year, which is the quality of student life. After that, they will be examining the following four areas: living conditions; student/faculty relations; the learning environment; and recruitment/retention activities. Members will spend the first few meetings of the year becoming informed about the University's activities in these areas.

QUESTION PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEMS 4 AND 5: No questions.

ELECTION OF TWO FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES TO THE STUDENT SENATE: A short biographical statement for each of the two nominees, Dr. James O'Brien and Associate Dean of Students Joshua Miheuah, had been distributed to Senators with their agenda material. Senator Garcia asked whether these nominees were to be faculty representatives to the Student Senate. Dr. Rehm responded affirmatively. Senator Garcia asked whether the second person was a faculty member. Senator Duncan said that in the past, the representative wasn't required to be a faculty member as long as they had a good sense of the faculty's feelings and interacted closely with students. It was then moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 85-52) to ratify Dr. James O'Brien and

Associate Dean of Students Joshua Mihesuah as faculty representatives to the Student Senate.

CURRICULUM BULLETIN, VOL. 11, NO. 4, AUGUST 28, 1985: Senator Myers stated that he felt that Vol. 11, No. 3, which was distributed during the summer, should have come to the Faculty Senate for approval. Although it stated it was for information only, he believed that Course Changes required Senate approval. Dr. Sankey explained that all the material contained in Vol. 11, No. 3, was indeed for information only, and the Senate had never approved Course Changes, because they were only departmental- and college-related. What the Senate has traditionally been asked to approve are items that are fundamentally curricular in nature, i.e., New Courses, or Course Deletions. These are deemed to have potentially widespread academic importance. He said there was no reason why the Senate couldn't also approve Course Changes if it wished. Dr. Rehm returned the discussion to Vol. 11, No. 4, which contained two sections for approval. Senator Drake asked about the September 11 date on the bulletin, which was the last day for General Faculty to voice concerns about curricular material contained in that bulletin. Senator Drake pointed out that the date came after the date of the Senate meeting at which the curricular material was to be voted on. Dr. Sankey said that the Curriculum Office doesn't want the final date for comments to fall after the Senate meeting at which the curricular material is to be considered. He said the only time this was justified was during a catalog year. In this case, he said, the office hadn't processed it in time to meet Mimeo's deadline. He said they do allow 14 days to receive faculty input; should there be an objection between now and the 11th, the Curriculum Office would accept that, and would report that back to the Senate. However, usually few objections are submitted. It was then moved, seconded, and voted (motion 85-53) to approve Section II. Approval for Section III (which was modified to eliminate Astronomy 304, on page 2) was then approved unanimously (motion 85-54).

ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN: Senator Garcia said that the report had been sent to Senators with the Senate agenda, and that he was available to answer questions. Senator Brand said he had a problem with the Arts & Sciences College section on page 1, because he thought the College had made some significant strides forward; he believed the committee's perceptions simply were not accurate. Senator Garcia said that he committee had believed that the matters noted in the report were, indeed, of concern and that the report did in fact reflect the committee's beliefs. Senator Brand said he did not doubt that the report expressed the committee's beliefs.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

---

Jacqueline Sharkey, Secretary pro tem

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 9, 1985:

- 85-48 Approval of minutes of May 6 and 13, 1985.
- 85-49 Ratification of chairs of three Senate standing committees: Budget Policy (Shirley O'Brien); Instruction & Curriculum Policy (Carl Tomizuka); and Academic Personnel Policy (Samuel Paplanus).
- 85-50 Tabling of motion to replace Parking/Transportation Committee.
- 85-51 Approval of motion to request Parking/Transportation Committee to return to Senate in four months.
- 85-52 Election of two faculty representatives to Student Senate (James O'Brien, Music, and Associate Dean of Students Joshua Miheuah).
- 85-53 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 4, Section II.
- 85-54 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 4, Section III.

PENDING:

Report from the Provost of the University on Dean's Reviews.

Report from the Chairman of the Faculty regarding (1) Senate election in College of Education and (2) chairmanship of the Committee on Committees.