

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, March 5, 1984  
Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, March 5, 1984, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Fifty-three members were present. Chairperson Kellogg presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Altman, Antinoro, Atwater, Battan, Beigel, Butler, Chiasson, Cole, Demorest, Dickinson, Dickstein, Dinham, Duncan, Eisner, Epstein, Fahey, Farr, Fleming, Flemming, Foster, Fox, Gallagher, Garcia, Goetinck, Hasselmo, Hegland, Hetrick, Irving, Kellogg, Kettel, Kinkade, Koffler, Lamb, Longman, Marcus, Mautner, Mayersohn, McCullough, Myers, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Parmenter, G. Peterson, Proctor, Reeves, Roemer, Rollins, Shanfield, Sorensen, Steelink, Thompson, Witte, and Woodard. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Anthony, Antley, Berliner, Brand, Bried, Cardon, Chen, Cosart, Dufficy, Gimello, Gourley, Heigl, Jensen, Jones, Laird, Levitt, MacLeod, Maddock, Maher, Munsinger, Nevins, J. O'Brien, Pellman, R. Peterson, Prosser, Rehm, Roby, Schneider, Scott, Smith, Spece, Stevenson, and Zukoski.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of February 6 were approved as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: President Koffler made the following remarks:

"In recent weeks I have taken action towards the establishment of three new councils which can be expected to improve the quality of the University's work. I want to bring the Senate up to date on these developments.

"First, I have asked seven members of the classified staff to serve as a nominating committee to provide me with a list of names from which I can appoint the initial membership of the Classified Staff Advisory Council. The campus can benefit from a clear channel of communication between the administration and the classified staff, and I want to see the Council established and working before the end of this semester.

"I know that when the Faculty Senate last met there were comments in favor of an elected membership for the Advisory Council. The disadvantage of that idea is that, given the size, the complexity, and the fragmentation of the classified staff, an election is not likely to create the breadth of representation which the Staff Council must have to do an effective job. Any faculty member who examines the structure of the classified staff in detail will be struck by the absence of the kind of broad common responsibilities which link the General Faculty and make elected Faculty Senators appropriate. The Staff Advisory Council needs to be representative not merely of administrative units (such as Physical Resources or Student Services) but also of numerous employment groups (such as secretaries, electricians, and mechanics). In addition it will contain representation of both sexes and of minority groups. It is unlikely

that an election would spontaneously yield this result in a body of twenty-four members.

"From personal experience, however, I can vouch for the fact that an appointed system can be effective.

"Last week I also appointed an Economic Development Council and a Cultural Enrichment Council. Both groups have a broadly representative membership of administrators and faculty members. The Economic Development Council, which is to be chaired by Vice President Beigel, is expected to advise me on what the University should do to help the state face its development problems. The Cultural Enrichment Council, which will be chaired by Dean Donald Irving, is expected to advise me on how best the cultural resources of the campus can be made available to the people and communities of the state. Senators will appreciate that Arizona must be prepared to accommodate a massive growth in population over the next twenty years. The University, as a public land grant institution, has a responsibility to help ensure that the state's economy can sustain those greater numbers and provide them with a high quality of life. These new councils will help to coordinate our thinking and actions as we discharge these outreach responsibilities.

"Although the Staff Advisory Council, the Economic Development Council, and the Cultural Enrichment Council have very dissimilar purposes, they are linked by a common theme. They will all provide focal points for developing advice about the ways in which the institution goes about its business. As a result they can be expected to help us create a better University."

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Dinham stated that the faculty had just received in the mail an invitation to order academic costumes for May Commencement. She urged the deans to impress upon their faculty the importance of this event. She also said that members of the Faculty Senate should plan to attend.

"Senate faculty members--I am sure that all members do consider themselves obliged by virtue of their position, and I am sure the students will be delighted to see faculty members at what I understand will be a morning ceremony," she said.

Senator S. O'Brien said that she needed 50 marshals to assist with Commencement.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Senator Proctor announced that Senate Bill 1061 setting in-state tuition at 20% of the cost of education and out-of-state tuition at 85% of the cost of education had passed the Senate Education Committee and was approved by a two-to-one margin in a standing vote in the Senate last week. He said the bill would come up for a final vote this week.

He further said the student Regent bills have both been passed. The House bill authorizes no vote while the Senate bill has a vote. ASUA hopes to amend both bills in conference, to remove the "sunset clause" so the position is permanent.

Senator Proctor said he wanted to pay tribute to Dean Gallagher. He said Dean Gallagher has always been helpful to Associated Students and to all students and they wished him well. (The Senate echoed Senator Proctor's remarks with a round of applause.)

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE SENATE: Senator Kellogg announced the results of the recent petition process for Faculty Senate elections. They are given below:

<u>COLLEGE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF SEATS AVAILABLE</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PETITIONS</u>
Agriculture	4	4
Architecture	1	0
BPA	2	0
Education	2	1
Engineering	2	2
Law	1	0
Arts and Sciences	8	6
Medicine	4	5
Mines	1	1
Nursing	2	1
Pharmacy	1	0
Non-college	4	4

She said the Executive Committee at its next meeting will consider recommendations to college deans regarding vacant seats.

APPROVAL OF CATALOG MATERIAL AS FURNISHED SENATE MEMBERS IN "CURRICULUM" BULLETIN:

Items I, B and II of the "Curriculum" bulletin, Vol. 10, No. 7, issue date of February 24, 1984, were approved as distributed to the faculty.

ELECTION OF UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD NOMINEES: A written ballot containing the names of the nominees was distributed. The following were selected as University Hearing Board nominees: Michael D. Bradley, Associate Professor, Hydrology and Water Resources; Virginia J. Miller, Associate Professor, Nursing; Donal M. Sacken, Associate Professor, Educational Foundations and Administration; William H. Thweatt, Counseling Psychologist, Student Counseling Service; Charles W. Weber, Animal Science, Nutrition and Food Science.

REPORT FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SALARY DETERMINATION IMPLEMENTATION PROCEDURES:

Senator Garcia said the charge to this ad hoc committee was to establish provisions for implementation of the Regents' Guidelines on Salary Procedures for this campus. He remarked that this committee does not expect to be ready to report back to the Senate with such guidelines or procedures for several months. He said the committee has been monitoring the various offices on campus that are in the process of implementing the guidelines for this year and each department has been asked to develop a set of evaluation guidelines and those are now back at the academic vice president's office for review and for examination of their appropriateness. Senator Garcia further said the committee is looking at these materials and will use them in determining their final recommendation to the Senate but would not expect to finish with its process for quite some time. He said the committee feels that the most important issue associated with all of this procedure is the coupling of the evaluation with various monies, but that is not clear in all cases in Regents' policy statements; and that is one of the issues on which the committee hopes to spend a substantial amount of time.

Senator M. Fleming asked if it was anticipated that there would be uniform guidelines for every department and college in the University. Senator Garcia replied that it is anticipated that there will be a set of minimum requirements but each department is to set its own evaluation procedures because of the diverse nature of their various units.

Senator Shanfield asked if perhaps Senator Garcia could refresh his memory as to how this came into being. Senator Garcia replied that the Board of Regents in its December meeting passed a set of guidelines for evaluation to be used at all three institutions. Those guidelines paralleled the material which had been developed by a committee of this body starting with a meeting last summer. He said that an ad hoc committee worked on methods for distribution of salary monies, one phase of which was a uniform system of evaluation so that merit raises would be assessed in a more appropriate manner. So this body has been involved and there have been a number of sessions some of which have been totally devoted to this subject.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS: Senator Reeves stated that in response to a comment by Senator Battan at our special meeting on February 20 the committee would like to make one change to the fourth line from the bottom of page 1 of the Proposed Changes in the Constitution of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona. He said the words "the first Monday in" should be deleted and "first" inserted after the word "May". Thus the sentence would read, "The term of membership of elected members shall be two years, and shall begin on May 1 of the year in which the member is elected."

Senator Kellogg said she wanted to take each one of these items separately so we should start with Section I, C(4) of the Constitution.

Senator Garcia asked if there had been any further resolution of the staffing of this office? Senator Dinham replied that matter was still under discussion. She said that since we have to vote on this today, her recommendation would be to adopt the new wording and then if the Senate would sometime decide that the Secretary of the Faculty should be the Presiding Officer of the Senate or the Secretary of the Faculty should be separate and the Presiding Officer of the Senate and the Chairman of the Faculty should be the same person, the Constitution could be changed at that time.

The revision passed.

The revision of Section III, A(1) passed without discussion.

Discussion of the revision of Section III, A(5) follows.

Senator Dinham raised a question concerning an earlier discussion regarding the filling of vacancies. Senator Kellogg said in the past three to three and one-half years when a vacancy in a college occurred the Executive Committee had indeed, as a courtesy to the colleges, referred that vacancy to the college to fill and the college had come forth with a nominee. That person's name was then brought to the floor of the Senate to be confirmed. Senator Kellogg said when there had been an at-large vacancy, that position had been filled by the next candidate having the highest number of votes in the previous election.

Senator Battan asked what the Constitution said about the situation where there weren't enough nominees to fill the vacancies that exist. Senator Kellogg replied it was eloquently silent about such matters.

Senator Paplanus said this situation occurred about five years ago when one college did not fill its quota in an election and there was a precedent of a special election being held with those colleges being offered the opportunity to put forth nominees again.

Senator Myers said the practice of filling vacancies in colleges has not always been one of reverting back to the college in the manner Senator Kellogg described. He said we should not have two systems--one which says that for at-large vacancies we go back and look at the next candidate and for college vacancies we refer it to the colleges.

Senator McCullough moved that the last sentence of Section III, A(5) be changed to read, "The Faculty Senate shall elect a successor to fill any vacancy that occurs."

Senator Fahey said what this means is that if there are not enough candidates, the vacancy would be filled by the Senate. She said she was not sure that is what we ought to be doing and would oppose the motion. Senator Dickstein remarked that a major concern of the committee was not how to fill vacant seats but was the date when terms began.

Senator Antinoro said that since we had a small number of petitions, we need to do something quickly about the vacant seats. He said Senator McCullough's amendment would take care of that.

The amendment failed.

Senator Dinham said since we are trying to provide for the May transition, and we know the committee will continue to work, she wished to call for the question.

The motion to close debate carried.

Revision of Section III, A(5) carried.

Revision of Section III, B carried.

Revision of Section III, C carried.

Revision of Section III, G discussion follows.

Senator Myers asked with respect to standing committees, has the Committee on Academic Procedures given consideration to altering the way in which the standing committees are selected, specifically to provide for election at-large. Senator Reeves replied they had not. Senator Dickstein said she remembered discussion. She said the committee believed the issue of naming the committees was something that should be in the Bylaws and the Constitution should not be specific as to the naming of committees.

Senator Battan said he wished to refer to a point he raised at the last meeting concerning the phrase "... at the beginning of each new Faculty Senate." He said that senates don't begin, senates exist. He then proposed that we add "term" after "Faculty Senate" on the last line of the suggested revision as an amendment.

The amendment passed.

Revision of Section G of the Constitution as amended passed.

Revision in the Bylaws of Section 5, c(i) passed.

Senator Myers asked for some clarification. He said senators' terms do not end with the May meeting but on June 30 and perhaps we need a transitional statement indicating that Senate terms end April 30. Senator Thompson said this statement is placed on as an addendum to the proposed changes in the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty because this is a procedural matter which affects primarily the coming spring. He further said the committee's mandate was to deal with the issues that affect the upcoming election and not to completely revise the Constitution and Bylaws.

Senator Hetrick said he raised his question as to the necessity of this addendum because he was under the misapprehension that the old Senate would end on April 30 and he thought that was the purpose of these changes. Senator Kellogg replied that it was, but Senator Myers had a valid point because technically the elected senators' terms are to run through June 30. Senator Hetrick stated the Senate had just approved an amendment stating that Senate terms should begin on May 1 and end on April 30 and that superseded the previous terms of office. Senator Dickstein said the committee had been told that there were certain reports that had to be given to the old Senate at the May meeting. Senator Hetrick replied that it seemed to him that there is only one Senate and it makes no difference whether the old or the new Senate receives the report.

The Senate then expressed itself as agreeing to operate under the newly adopted procedure, assuming faculty approval. (A copy of the proposed revisions in the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona as approved by the Faculty Senate is attached to these minutes.)

HONORARY DEGREE MOTION: Senator Myers said that following the January Senate meeting and the subsequent General Faculty meeting, the Committee of Eleven was concerned about the way in which honorary degrees are being handled, in particular the way in which the faculty participated in the approval of honorary degrees. It became clear that colleges were not holding faculty meetings, and the intent of the motion is to reiterate that honorary degrees should have the approval of the faculty at each of the levels. Senator Kinkade asked if the intent was that none of this could be done by mail ballot. Senator Myers replied that is not a meeting and it does not provide for an opportunity for the faculty to discuss the candidates; and further it may well violate the privacy which has usually been required, because in order for the candidate to be considered, you will need to distribute vitas or resumes, and supposedly the department head or the dean would present the candidate to the faculty so that if necessary there could be a discussion of the candidate.

Senator Dickinson said this was probably a cynical point of view but he would be highly dubious about getting out a quorum at a faculty meeting to consider honorary degrees. Senator Myers replied then it seemed to him that it said something about the importance of honorary degrees--that maybe the faculty does not want to award them. But we ought to preserve the sanctity of degrees in general, he continued, and one way to convince the faculty to turn out for a meeting is to convince them that it is important for them to participate. Senator Myers said if we find ways to detour around the faculties, then they will become convinced, if they

haven't already, that it is not very important - that their participation is not considered important or serious.

Senator Antinoro asked how we would handle the non-college group under this system? He said the Physical Education faculty or the Library staff may wish to present a candidate for an honorary degree, and he wondered if this would be covered by the guidelines. Senator Kellogg asked if the Committee on Honorary Degrees had considered this. Senator Cole replied that the committee has a number of issues just like this one Senator Antinoro described that must be considered. However, Senator Cole emphasized, they are just dealing with the honorary degrees under the established policy and later will come back to the Senate with recommendations.

Senator Kettel said he would like to speak against this resolution on the grounds that the time frame that we have at the moment is such that it would be very difficult to accomplish. He said he was sympathetic to the point Dr. Myers stated and believed it to be a faculty prerogative, but the immediacy of the current situation relating to the Centennial Year is that if we add something more cumbersome to the procedure we may very well find ourselves in the position of not being able to award honorary degrees. Senator Kettel moved that the Senate refer this matter to the Honorary Degree Committee to make a proper recommendation after thoughtful consideration. The motion was seconded.

Senator Battan said it appeared to him that this resolution, although it seeks a worthy aim, was written in such a way that it would not achieve that goal. First of all, he said, to call for a quorum of the faculty of a college or of the General Faculty is totally unrealistic based on past performances. Senator Battan raised a second point concerning the opening phrase of this resolution. He said it brings into question the actions of the University in the recent past in terms of the awarding of degrees--suggesting perhaps that those awarded in the recent past were not worthy and he did not think that was the intention.

Senator Witte said in the name of expedience the Senate approved honorary degrees for this Commencement, but she thought the expediency argument should not be extended. Senator Thompson said he thought Dean Kettel had an excellent solution. He said it is inappropriate for the Senate to develop an additional honorary degree mechanism while the Honorary Degree Committee is working on a full-scale revision of that policy which will take care of these and other kinds of concerns. Therefore, he urged support of the motion. Senator Thompson further said with respect to the Centennial honorary degrees this motion will not affect the plans of the Centennial Committee in any way because the adoption two meetings ago of an accelerated schedule for decision making solved the Centennial Committee's problems. He stated that at that time we indicated, and he and Dean Cole promised definitively, none of the proper procedures for the awarding of honorary degrees would be bypassed in that process. The only concern was to speed the process up a little bit.

Dean Cole said that he had reassured the Senate at a previous meeting that the Honorary Degree Committee would follow the policy as it was established by the Senate and any exceptions would be brought to the Senate for advice and consent.

The motion passed.

FORMATION OF STAFF COUNCIL: Senator Parmenter said he was a bit surprised that President Koffler had not seen fit to await making his decision regarding the election rather than the appointment of representatives to the Staff Council until the Senate had had an opportunity to discuss this matter where a quorum was present. He said he did not wish to dispute the fact that it was President Koffler's decision to make, but he believed we needed perhaps a bit more discussion on both sides of the issue and to his best recollection at the meeting we had before there was no discussion on one side of the issue. Senator Parmenter continued that he thought the President made the wrong decision which will lead to serious long-range difficulties at this University. He pointed out that at Arizona State University the majority of the members of the Staff Council are elected and that arrangement seems to be working well.

Senator Myers said it seemed to him that all the reasons that were given for appointed Staff Council were exactly the reasons for having elected staff council, that is, to insure breadth of representation, to insure that the Council adequately represents the staff, and to insure that the Council has credibility. He stated only an elected Council can have that.

Senator Antinoro said that those of us who have had anything to do with faculty elections know there is a tendency for bloc voting. He further said we have too many of these large blocs to have any decent distribution in an elected council.

Senator Garcia stated he thought the problem of proper representation of all segments of the staff could be handled by having a mixture as Arizona State did, elected and appointed, with the majority being elected and any imbalance being corrected with careful appointment. He said the problem which the institution faces is one which has not yet been addressed here and that is the problem of unionization. Senator Garcia said an appointed Council will lead to distrust on the part of the staff and ultimately leads to long-term trouble. Thus it is very important that the staff be given a voice in the affairs of the institution because without that vote the staff will feel alienated and we will eventually see unionization of the staff.

Senator Hetrick said he would like to endorse that. An appointed Staff Council will begin its operations in the face of a very difficult psychological barrier--the feeling that such an organization would not have any real credibility, he stated. He urged the President to reconsider.

Senator Witte stated that some of us have dreams that the University might be a model democracy and if that is not possible, at least we can draw from the pattern of democracy in America. She said Rhode Island has its voice in the United States Senate and it has its voice in the House of Representatives, no matter how small it is; and it would seem like we could construct something like that here to accommodate, she thought, the weak concerns of the administration and respond to the very strong and important concerns of the staff.

Senator Hegland suggested it would be appropriate for staff to vote on whether or not they would like to have an appointed Council to give them the representation or an elected--let them decide.

Senator Demorest said that Senator Thompson at our non-quorum meeting suggested that the staff be added to this body and the body become not a Faculty

Senate but a University Senate. Rather much in the same vein, he said, he didn't see why the Staff Council could not have a representation similar to this one with some elected and the rest appointed or ex-officio.

Senator Steelink said he has held for a long time that staff should be included in this body and it should be called a University Senate, and he also felt that the staff should be allowed to elect their own representatives.

Senator Witte stated that what is desired is two-way communication. At this meeting and the previous meeting we have only had one-way communication, that is, only the arguments against an appointed council, and we have not heard any arguments for it, she said.

Senator Koffler said the question of representation is complicated in a university. He continued, the faculty is homogeneous in terms of function because the three missions of the university--teaching, research, and public service--dominate their actions. Even in these circumstances the convention is to have mixed representation in the Senate, with both faculty positions and administrative positions allowing close communication, he said.

Senator Koffler stated the students also have homogeneity in the sense of a common interest in their education and in the services they receive.

He said the purpose of representation is to provide collective wisdom to make the University a better place. Over a period of time it is not the legal form of a body but the quality of its advice which determines its influence.

In terms of the proposed Staff Council, many senators are perhaps pre-occupied with the example of the Senate's own collegiate elections, Senator Koffler continued. But the homogeneity of the faculty is not true for the staff which is an aggregate of very diverse groups, sharing little in common professionally. The Staff Council should have a matrix of representation, including unit representatives and representation by employment categories, not to mention representation by gender and ethnicity. Such complex representation is not likely to occur by an elective process.

Senator Koffler said the nominating committee is to provide 48 names from which 24 persons are to be selected by the administration. This eliminates the chance of a Council of "administration types" who do not feel free to speak out.

He stated some of us have had experience with appointed councils. They can work exceedingly well. The administration was seeking such advice long before the matter became an issue here. We are convinced that the mechanism proposed will produce the input desired.

Senator Koffler said he was flexible to change with experience on all issues. If the Council does not establish the credibility which we all desire, he would consider other mechanisms in a year or two.

Senator Witte said Senator Dinham had brought a seconded motion from the Committee of Eleven to the floor, but it is not listed on the agenda for our meeting. She asked if it was appropriate at this time to bring the motion which was brought previously to the floor.

Senator Chiasson asked for a point of order. He asked if we had a quorum. (At this point it was determined that the Senate did have a quorum.)

Senator Dinham said the action that we might take today is advisory, as she understood it, to whomever would listen--that would presumably be the President. She then moved that the sense of the Senate is that the University community would be best served by an elected Staff Council. The motion was seconded.

Senator Kellogg asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Senator Mautner moved to amend the motion to read, "The sense of the Senate is that the University community would be best served by an at least partially elected Staff Council."

Senator Witte said she would second it in the spirit of the discussion that took place.

Senator Myers said he did not think the amendment was very specific because partial could mean one.

At this point Senator Kellogg said we had to have a ruling from the Parliamentarian as to whether or not under the Constitution we have a quorum. It was determined that since some persons in attendance were substituting for Senate members, the Senate did not have a quorum.

Senator Dinham said since this vote would have been advisory, and since by the time it will be discussed in April the matter of the staff council will have evolved, it might be closing the barn door. She said perhaps we could just ask the President whether he has heard the sense of our discussion and now would take our thoughts under advisement. Senator Koffler said he would.

Senator Witte said this is the spirit in which we almost left this motion at the last meeting and she thought it should be dealt with formally at the next meeting.

Senator Thompson said it seemed to him that the sense of the discussion here today is very strongly in support of a Staff Council and the motion should in fact applaud the idea of a Staff Council but mention that there is a basic flaw that many members of the Senate see, that is, the method of choosing representatives to the Council. He said it almost sounds as though the Senate is against the Staff Council but the concept is one that seems to be very much supported by the members of the Senate.

APPORTIONMENT OF ARTS AND SCIENCES COLLEGE REPRESENTATIVES TO FACULTY SENATE:

Before the discussion began Senator Myers raised a point of order. He said the Constitution takes care of apportionment and it is not a Senate question unless the Senate wants to discuss amending the Constitution, in which case recommendations should come from the committee which makes recommendations about amending the Constitution. Senator Kellogg responded that the Senate asked that the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences discuss the matter of apportionment and let us know what they discussed. Senator Myers said it was not an administrative decision but a faculty decision. He further said it was not Senator Kellogg's prerogative to ask the deans to make a recommendation and she was out of order to make such a request.

Senator Kellogg replied that the Senate was not out of order in asking to hear anything discussed on this floor. Senator Myers said Senator Kellogg had made the request, not the Senate. Senator Kellogg said she did indeed make the request and wished to hear what the deans discussed. She stated there had been a challenge to the Chair, and there is no quorum.

Senator Battan asked what was the problem with hearing the report because objections can be raised after hearing the report. Senator Myers replied it was not the prerogative of the deans to make recommendations about the apportionment. Senator Battan said the Senate is hearing a report from the deans.

Senator Myers stated that first of all, the Constitution apportions senators among the colleges, not within the college. Senator Hetrick said he hesitated to raise a point of order, but he would like to do that. It seemed to him that the deans are senators by virtue of their position, and it seemed to him that the senator had been challenged and told he had no right to speak. He did not understand that at all.

Senator Kellogg said she ruled that the Senate can hear a report, this particular report having come from the Coordinating Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences on behalf of the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Senator Irving made the following report.

In responding to the Faculty Senate's request, the deans of the College of Arts and Sciences asked one senator from each of the four faculties to meet and make a joint recommendation. Senators Maher, Fine Arts; Demorest, Humanities; Battan, Science; and Gimello, Social and Behavioral Sciences, made the following recommendations:

"That for the purpose of the forthcoming elections, the eight seats earmarked for the College of Arts and Sciences be apportioned as follows: One seat to each of the four existing faculties; four seats for candidates-at-large belonging to the College of Arts and Sciences."

The deans also considered the proposal made at the January 16 Faculty Senate meeting for the proportional representation based on the number of faculty members in each of the four faculties, with Science receiving three seats; Social and Behavioral Sciences receiving two; Fine Arts, one; and Humanities, one. The remaining eighth seat would be at-large within the college. According to Senator Antinoro's office, there are six candidates for the eight college seats; one from Fine Arts; one from Humanities; and four from Sciences. The deans of the college have agreed that one of the vacant seats will be allocated to Social and Behavioral Sciences for its faculty representative; three of the four remaining at-large seats will be filled by the three remaining science candidates. We have agreed that the fourth remaining seat will be allocated to Social and

Behavioral Sciences based on the size of its faculty, if agreed that deans can make such decisions!

The deans also recommended that the Faculty Senate review the Constitution and Bylaws as regards to definition and purview of the academic units now known as college and faculty. We have just sent a request to the faculty members of the college asking that they express their opinion on the proposed definition of "college". The definition and the results of the survey will be forwarded to the Committee on Academic Procedures for their consideration.

#### NEW BUSINESS

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES STATISTICS: Senator Eisner said he had something for the April agenda which he would mention now and speak further to in April. He said he had the new Association of Research Libraries statistics and wished to tell the Senate about this in some detail in April. At this time he said he wished to say that the University of Arizona has dropped because of the budget cut in 1982 from 17 to 21, a drop in ranking of 19 per cent. On the other hand, he said, Arizona State in the same period has risen from 48 to 41, a rise in ranking of 15 per cent. He said he just wanted the Senate to ponder these facts for the next month.

FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE: Senator Myers said he had indicated to Vice President Hasselmo that he wanted to ask him to comment on the evaluation procedure because it seemed to him to be non-uniform in terms of the way departments were responding to the memos Dr. Hasselmo sent out. He stated that some department heads, either because they misinterpreted the instructions or because they were given other information, seemed to think it was not necessary to have the faculty participate in the drawing of the standards or the criteria. He said he thought it would be useful if Dr. Hasselmo would reiterate the extent to which faculty participation is important and the extent to which the evaluation process in general is important.

Dr. Hasselmo said the answer was simple. The exercise is important and it is serious. He stated that important decisions are going to be based on these evaluations. He said the University is required by the Board of Regents to institute such procedure. The Board of Regents was inspired to develop those procedures at a rather direct admonition of the Arizona Legislature, he continued. It specifically requests in the Regents' guidelines that there be faculty participation in the development of standards and procedures and to the extent that such participation is not involved, then the matter is not addressed in an appropriate way, he said. He stated he would mention this at the next Deans' Council meeting to be sure that we get full participation because it is an extraordinarily important matter.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 o'clock.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Butler, Secretary pro tem

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Herman Carrillo, Assistant Secretary pro tem

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF MARCH 5, 1984:

1. Approval of Item I. B (2.5 GPA Requirement for Transfer Students - College of Engineering) and Item II of "Curriculum" bulletin, Vol. 10, No. 7, issue date of February 24, 1984.
2. Approval of revision of Sections I. C.(4), III. A(1), III. A(5), III. B, III. C, and Section III. G as amended in the Constitution, and approval of revision of Section 5. c(i) in the Bylaws.
3. Approval of motion that the manner in which honorary degrees are being handled, in particular the way in which faculty participate in the approval of honorary degrees, be referred to the Honorary Degree Committee to make a proper recommendation after thoughtful consideration.

ACTION ITEM PENDING:

1. Recommendation from the Honorary Degree Committee regarding the manner in which honorary degrees are being handled, in particular the way in which faculty participate in the approval of honorary degrees.