

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, March 3, 1986 Room 146, College of Law

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

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Alcorn, Aleamoni, Aquilano, Atwater, Beigel, Boynton, Butler, Chen, Chiasson, Cole, Cusanovich, Dickstein, Drake, Duncan, Epstein, Ewbank, Fahey, Fenstermacher, Goetinck, Hasselmo, Heigl, Hetrick, Hill, Horak, Irving, Jones, Kinkade, Koffler, Laird, Matter, Mautner, McCullough, Muramoto, Myers, S. O'Brien, Obst, Paplanus, Peterson, Phipps, Rehm, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Rund, Sharkey, Silverberg, Smith, Sorensen, Tomizuka, Torres, Weiss, Wert, Wilkening, and Witte. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Aamodt, Andreas, Bootman, Brand, Cardon, Cunningham, Ebeltoft, Emery, Farr, Fox, Giffin, Gourley, Hegland, Kettel, Marcus, Mishel, J. O'Brien, Sacamano, Sacken, Salzman, Sampanes, Steelink, Swalin, Tuchi, Woodard, and Zukoski.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 20 AND FEBRUARY 3, 1986: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 86-5) to approve the Minutes of January 20 and February 3, 1986, as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Koffler said the most recent meeting of the Board of Regents resulted in several decisions of importance to the UA campus, and he would like to review them.

"The Regents authorized continuation of the Long-Term Care Gerontology Center, with a new sunset review date of Fall 1988, and authorized the University to offer an M.A. degree in History at Sierra Vista.

"The Board also discussed the matter of registration fees in the College of Medicine and adopted a new policy establishing fees for 1986-87. In the future, the registration fee will be established by taking the current year's fee as a base figure, and adjusting it by the average of the change over the last three most recent years in the median tuition reported for all state-supported colleges of medicine, using that as a standard and adjusting it for the average increase, buffered over a three-year period. The fee for 1986-87 will be \$4,267.

"The Board also devoted much time to a proposal to improve traffic conditions on Speedway and for its implications for the University. In view of the fundamental importance of this proposal, for the future development of our campus, I think it is important that the Faculty Senate have a full understanding of the situation. Two years ago, the University and the City of Tucson concluded an historic cooperative agreement designed to improve parking and transportation services to the University area. A portion of this agreement called for the City to widen Speedway and to provide two pedestrian overpasses by 1989 or 1990. The University agreed to pay \$1 million in 1989 as

its share of the cost of all improvements called for in that particular agreement. Last summer, prior to beginning its design of Speedway widening, the city officials upon the recommendation of the City Transportation Advisory Committee contacted the University to determine if we would agree to delay so that the city consultants could study the situation to determine if an alternative other than widening might be more suitable. It was recognized that widening may only lead to more traffic on Speedway, impacting on the University-area neighborhoods, and would provide only a limited relief as the city grows. The consultant recommended two additional alternatives. Although both cost more than widening, their long-term safety and transportation benefits would be more economical, the consultant knew, and would justify the additional expense. The University clearly preferred the tunnel alternative, rather than the open-trench, depressed roadway because of its significant environmental benefit for our campus. For this reason, the University has agreed to pay a major share of the additional cost of the tunnel alternative over the depressed roadway alternative. The financing plan was approved by the Board of Regents, and the City Council subsequently approved the project. It will now be scheduled for a city-wide vote in accord with the requirements of the Neighborhood Protection Act. The Speedway neighborhood safety and traffic improvement project is a creative, long-term solution to a significant safety and transportation bottleneck along the major arterial serving the city and the University. Not only does it benefit the total environment of several of the community's oldest neighborhoods, but it also contributes to enhancing the attractiveness of our campus to the staff, students, and visitors. The tunnel will provide a second traffic route for the Speedway area. The value of detouring Speedway traffic is going to be in the University and the neighborhood sections and the through-traffic section. In spite of our efforts to widen Speedway west of Euclid toward downtown and the west side, the project will provide the ultimate in safety enhancement. Students and staff will be able to cross at ground level with no threat to oncoming traffic, and no temptation to challenge oncoming traffic such as might be the case with a simple widening and overpass. The project will provide the University with a net gain of 5.4 acres, which will be used for facilities, parking, and recreational space. In addition, the city has indicated that we can have access to other land which the city will acquire through the strictures of rights-of-way for the project. The availability of additional land within the University planning area will enable us to prepare a campus development plan which takes advantage of new flexibility. The vote which is required by the Neighborhood Protection Act is not a bond election. The bonding requested for this project is already available to the city. The vote would allow all city residents to exercise a voice as to whether this project is consistent with the objective of the Act, namely, neighborhood protection. If voter support is forthcoming, we anticipate that detailed design work would begin immediately and that construction will begin in 1989. When the project is completed, we believe safety and traffic will be significantly improved, neighborhoods will have been protected, and the University's ability to continue its significant contribution to the community will have been enhanced. From the University's perspective, these are all highly desirable benefits from a project that has as its main objective improved east-west traffic flow as the city grows. Vice Presidents Beigel and Cunningham and Tuchi have assisted in the planning of this project on behalf of this University, along with Regent Pitt. They are to be congratulated on an imaginative, promising proposal, and I would like to thank them for this publicly. I think this is a very far-reaching project having significant historical impact, and I hope that we can all support it with spirit."

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Hasselmo said that the Senate has heard in its reports from the Budget Policy Committee that the University is involved in a planning effort, and the Board of Regents has also undertaken such an effort. In the interest, he said, of trying to involve a broader segment of the University community in these planning activities, "we have planned a series of forums on critical issues in planning." The days and times:

The first forum, on Financial Issues, will be held on Friday, March 14, at 2 p.m. in the Modern Languages Auditorium. Speakers at that forum will be Dr. Larry Leslie, from the Center for the Study of Higher Education; Mr. Marshall Vest from the Division of Economics and Business Research; and Dr. Ben Tuchi, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance.

The second forum will be on demographic issues, and will be held in the same place, Modern Languages 350, on Monday, March 24, also at 2 p.m. The speakers there will be Dr. David Plane from Geography and Regional Development, Dr. Alberta Charney from the Division of Economics and Business Research, and Dr. Celestino Fernandez, Associate Vice President with responsibility for Undergraduate Affairs.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm announced that Molly Corbett Broad, the Executive Director of the Arizona Board of Regents, will address the Faculty Senate at the April 7 Senate meeting.

He said that at the April 7 meeting, elections would be conducted for Senate Executive Committee and Presiding Officer of the Senate. Nominations should be submitted to any member of the Senate Executive Committee (Dr. Rehm, Dr. Terence Burke, Dr. George Ridge, Dr. Shirley Fahey, Dr. Gerald Peterson, Dr. Robert Sankey, and John Heigl) by mail or telephone, or directly to the Faculty Center (1-1342) by Friday noon, April 4.

Dr. Rehm reported that Agenda Item 7, Dr. Ben Tuchi's address regarding the UA's capital financing plan, will be deferred until the April 7 meeting so that he will have more complete information to present to the Senate.

He said an all-employee picnic is being planned for next fall. Two Senate members were requested by the Staff Advisory Council to serve on the organizing committee; Senator Epstein and Senator Mautner have agreed to serve on that committee, he reported.

Dr. Rehm announced that the Committee on Committees is presently preparing recommendations for membership on Senate standing committees for 1986-87, terms to begin May 1.

He also reported that the General Faculty Elections ballot has been sent to Printing/Reproductions, and it will be mailed soon. Offices scheduled for election are: Secretary of the Faculty, Committee of Eleven (five members), Committee on Academic Freedom & Tenure (three members), and College Representative Senators.

Chapter 3, he said, was distributed to Senators with their agenda material. The Academic Personnel Policy Committee plans to initiate discussion at the April 7 meeting. Dr. Rehm said he hoped the Senate could complete work on the Constitution & Bylaws before moving on to Chapter 3, and that in order

to accomplish that, he recommended an additional Senate meeting be scheduled for March 24. It was moved, seconded, and voted (motion 86-6) to schedule this meeting. Dr. Rehm further suggested a second April meeting (on April 21) to complete discussion on Chapter 3. It was moved, seconded, and voted (motion 86-7) to so schedule this meeting if it is necessary.

Dr. Rehm said that Senators may have noticed an announcement in campus publications regarding a \$20,000 award fund which will be used to encourage faculty members to develop new teaching methods. Dr. Rehm congratulated Provost Hasselmo for making this program available.

Dr. Rehm noted that Senators had received on their desks today a report from the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee's subcommittee on the utilization of classrooms with 100 or more students; this will be discussed during that committee's report to the Senate today. Also distributed today was a census of the current Voting Status of Faculty and Professionals, and a census that would include all Continuing/Continuing-Eligible (C/CE) and Tenure/Tenure-Eligible (T/TE) which Dr. Rehm had prepared as requested at the February 3 meeting. He noted that numbers may not be completely accurate, because people are being added and are leaving on an ongoing basis, but that they are reasonably close enough for discussion.

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Heigl said that student government is continuing to study budgetary matters such as Decision Packages and other items of interest to the University and the Legislature. The Recreational Committee chaired by Vice President Woodard is moving along well now, with tentative designs being shown to various groups for input. The next Regents meeting, scheduled for Tucson, will include a presentation/discussion on financial aids. Preliminary activities in connection with student elections will begin this week.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Paplanus said that, as Dr. Rehm indicated, the committee will continue discussion of the Constitution & Bylaws today and at the March 24 meeting, with hopes that action will be concluded in time to begin discussion on Chapter 3 at the April 7 meeting.

He said the committee had met twice with Provost Hasselmo and Dr. Celestino Fernandez concerning the proposed new category of faculty, Non-Tenure Eligible. He said he believed Dr. Fernandez would send on to the Senate at a later time details on this proposal. He said the committee listened and made suggestions, and it was a worthwhile exchange.

He said the committee had also met with the Provost on several occasions concerning the periodic review of Deans and Department Heads. Item 9 on today's agenda would initiate Senate discussion of the proposal, which was distributed with agenda materials; in addition, the committee had prepared recommendations concerning this proposal, and which were placed on Senators' desks today.

Senator Paplanus said the final matter he wanted to call to the Senate's attention is Textbook Profits. The committee had discussed this matter and the concern expressed regarding textbooks written by professors and assigned to

classes they teach and by which they profit. He said a proposal has been drafted, and placed on Senators' desks today, which would be placed on the agenda for the April 7 meeting. He asked that the Senate review the committee's proposal prior to the next meeting so that discussion and action can take place then.

BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator S. O'Brien reported that the committee had met last Monday with Vice President Beigel. Two main issues were on their agenda, one of which they were aware, and the second one they were not. The first was the tax-reform legislation which she reported in October. House Bill 3838, which affects this campus in terms of bonding for the future, scholarships, tuition and fees, and the TSA issue. Vice President Beigel provided the committee with an up-date on developments since October. She said the committee also met with Marshall McDonald, Director of Federal Relations. They learned the issue is now in the Senate, the House having passed the bill, and there are two different versions in the Senate and the House, and the matter will be going to a Conference Committee soon. Basically, she said, the issue is that there will be a limitation on the TSA's limits (a \$7,000 limit, minus the IRA \$2,000, which means there could be a \$9,000 limit) as well as the way they look. But anything could happen in the Conference Committee. She said the three universities have provided a fairly strengthening lobbying effort. When the tax bill is finished, she said the administration will provide the committee with an information sheet and will probably publish the information in *Lo Que Pasa*.

The second issue on their agenda, she said, was the Speedway tunnel. She said there was a lot of interest from the committee in that suddenly the tunnel was alive and well and going before the City Council, and this was the first thing the committee knew about it, although through the news media they had heard about various prospects. She said the committee asked the Vice President why suddenly this occurred in this fashion, and they were told that in the last two years these particular options were not available, and that it was a very recent decision to proceed with the tunnel option. She said the President, in his report, covered much of the material she was going to report. She said that this is a critical issue for the University of Arizona, and as the committee examined this matter, they came to the consensus that it could only be very beneficial to the University to link both sides of Speedway in a creative and aesthetic manner. They came to the conclusion, she said, that if for nothing else, they could be on time for Faculty Senate meetings.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Atwater said that Senator Tomizuka had reported at the December 2 Senate meeting on the Committee's interest in determining most effective ways to improve teaching. She said that one of the projects has been to learn more about teaching of large-enrollment classes because these classes obviously affect a large number of students. At a relatively small cost, she said, the Registrar's office provided the committee with data from Fall 1985 of all the undergraduate courses and class sections with an enrollment of 100 or more. The report which had been distributed to Senators' desks today summarizes some of the data gathered and provides for the Committee information on which their next steps will be based. Some primary objectives are to learn more about certain aspects of teaching. The report indicated that 88 class sections involved more than 15,000 students during the fall. The committee will be interested in classroom management techniques which successfully accomplish daily tasks related to instruction such as distributing materials, grading homework, administering

tests, obtaining student feedback, etc. She said the committee would also like to learn about instructional methods that have proved to be effective in teaching large classes in different disciplines.

The committee's second objective, she said, is to arrange an agenda for a symposium on teaching in large classes. Provost Hasselmo has made a commitment to sponsor such a symposium, probably during the month of April, she said.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Garcia said the committee had recently begun to meet weekly, and that one of the issues being studied is that of technology transfer. He reported that the committee was appalled to learn, by reading about it in the Wildcat, of the technology transfer bill sponsored by this University in the Legislature. After reading of it in the Wildcat, he said, the committee received a copy of the bill. He said the committee had thus had no opportunity to provide any input, and was now considering the University's technology transfer policy.

Another issue before the committee is Chapter 2 of UHAP, which deals with research policy issues. He invited comments on these matters by any faculty member, by phoning him or any member of the committee.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Horak, reporting in Senator Mishel's absence, said that the committee is focusing on methods for increasing student/faculty dialogue and interactions. He said the committee is in the process of contacting all departments to ascertain what methods, procedures and facilities they are using in order to enhance dialogue. He said activities have been narrowed to four specific areas; subcommittees have been set up to gather information for preparation of proposals. The four areas they are examining deal with: (1) specifying the part of the teaching area of Promotion and Tenure criteria, listing criteria that relate to student/faculty interactions; (2) the possibility of tying student/faculty interaction criteria to merit increases for full professors; (3) development of guidelines that would include a reward system for colleges and faculty that are involved with quality and quantity of student/faculty interactions within colleges; (4) development of guidelines for a brochure for detailing methods that have been proven successful for faculty contact with students, so that faculty or colleges who are interested would have an idea how to get started.

QUESTION/ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Peterson referred to the report submitted by the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee. He said that a class he taught last semester, which had 250 students enrolled, was not listed. Senator Atwater said that course may have been overlooked, but the committee had requested information on all sections that had enrollment of over 100. Senator Peterson felt that possibly many classes had been omitted from the list. Senator Atwater acknowledged that might be true, but noted that the report had provided the committee with a lot of material to work with.

Senator Garcia asked Senator Atwater if the committee had looked at room availability and the disappearance campus-wide of classrooms for under 35 enrollments, as he felt this to be an alarming situation. Senator Atwater said the committee had not. Senator Garcia asked Senator S. O'Brien if the Budget Policy Committee had made any recommendations concerning the Speedway tunnel before the proposal was taken to the city. Senator O'Brien responded that the Budget Policy Committee did not discuss the Speedway project until its meeting on Monday, when the material was presented to them, and at that meeting they

reached a consensus of approval; since Monday evening was the Council meeting, she said, there was only about three hours' notice. Senator Dickstein said that in partial explanation of that action, the concept of the underground tunnel did not exist the previous month; it was plain to the committee, she said, the agreement reached three years ago had concerned an overpass; very recently the City Council approached the University with the proposal for an underground tunnel, thus the seemingly hasty action.

He asked Senator Atwater if the committee had conducted a survey as to classrooms used for these large-enrollment classes, and if the committee would be looking at the quality of the physical environment in which these classes are taught. Senator Atwater responded that the committee might pursue this line of investigation if time was available. She said the committee is primarily interested in teaching methods, but if something comes out involving the classrooms possibly limiting teaching, they might want to pursue that subject. Senator Myers said he believed they were intimately connected: anyone who has ever taught in Social Sciences 100 would know what he meant. Senator Myers also suggested that the committee consider interviewing instructors who taught the course in question in previous semesters as well.

Senator Beigel said that as a point of information on the Rodeo Day holiday, a series of surveys has been conducted relative to class attendance the Friday after Rodeo Day and participation by University employees in Rodeo Day activities. He said the results (both this year's and last year's) will be made available to the Senate when they are ready, because the Senate will be making recommendations regarding the 1987-89 academic calendar prior to the 1987 Rodeo Day weekend; the 1988 Rodeo Day holiday represents the first opportunity for change.

ACTION ON CURRICULUM BULLETIN VOL. 11, NO. 10: Dr. Rehm noted that Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 9 was for information, and No. 10 required approval. It was moved, seconded and voted (motion 86-8A) to approve Vol. 11, No. 10, Section I. It was then moved, seconded and voted (motion 86-8B) to approve Vol. 11, No. 10, second Section I.

REPORT ON CURRICULAR MATTER REFERRED TO UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL AT LAST MEETING: Senator Garcia recalled that at the February meeting, action was delayed on one curricular matter until Undergraduate Council consideration had been sought. He asked if the Council had as yet had an opportunity to review that material. Senator Peterson reported that the matter is currently under consideration, and will be taken up at the meeting scheduled for tomorrow; he will report to the Senate as soon as an answer is available.

DISCUSSION ON CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS: Senators Ewbank and Roemer proposed that discussion proceed through the remaining Bylaws, and then return to the Constitution to consider proposed alternatives to areas which created concern. Senator Ewbank then referred to the section in the Bylaws where the February discussion ended: Article II, Section 2, and called for any comments. Senator Fahey said that she knew it has always been the case that in the event of absence or incapacity of the Chair of the Faculty that those duties are assumed by the Chair of the Committee of Eleven. Since, she said, the Secretary of the Faculty is now a member of the Executive Committee, and is an elected officer as the Chair of the Faculty is, she wondered whether the subcommittee had considered changing Section 2 from the duties being exercised by the Chair of the Committee of Eleven to the duties being exercised by the Secretary of the

Faculty. Senator Ewbank said they had not considered it either at great length or with seriousness, but he wondered whether such a move would engulf the Secretary of the Faculty in two kinds of responsibilities which cannot be exercised with great ease at the same time, should this circumstance occur. Further, he noted, these two elected offices are usually separated. By leaving the Chair of the Committee of Eleven as a presiding officer, that difficulty would be resolved, he felt. However, he said, if there is a sense that there should be a change, that could be introduced. Senator Peterson said he would like to support Senator Fahey's suggestion; the objection which Senator Ewbank raised is one which could be taken care of, in the same way in which Senator Sharkey was pressed into service when Secretary Ridge was away in the fall. He felt the important argument was the Secretary of the Faculty, being a member of the Executive Committee, is on-line with ongoing business of the Faculty Senate, and would represent a smoother transition, so he would like to see that brought forth as a specific recommendation. Senator Ewbank asked if there was support for rejecting this proposal. Hearing none, he said he is herewith instructed to make this change in Article I, section 2, providing for the succession of the Secretary of the Faculty in the absence or incapacitation of the Chair of the Faculty.

Article III, Meetings, Section 1: No calls for change were heard. Section 2: No calls for change were heard. Section 3: No calls for change were heard. Section 4: No calls for change were heard.

Article IV, the Faculty Senate, Section 1, Functions, a. through l. Senator Ewbank said that two proposals were germane here, and to the Constitution as well, renaming the Faculty Senate to University Senate or to Academic Senate. He suggested Senate members think this idea over, and when he went back for an overall review, he would obtain a sense on that. He called for general comments on items a. through l. Senator Goetinck: Under item a., can you find a better verb than "control"? Senator Ewbank: I'm open to suggestion. Oversee? Senator Fahey: If we approve curriculum and degrees, why not just say "approve"? Senator Ewbank: Because when we don't approve, then we are not acting. Senator Myers: I have a little confusion about item a. and recent action we took on the catalog, with certain items being for information only. This seems to say there is no such category.

Further discussion took place on the word "control." Senator Hill said she concurred with Senator Fahey's suggestion for the word "approve." Senator Ewbank felt that use of that word indicated the Senate was directed to approve each curricular matter, that that would be its function; he felt there should be an option available to either approve or disapprove. But he said he would mark that for further consideration by the subcommittee. Senator Hetrick said he didn't feel the use of the word "approve" in any way mandated approval only. After receiving additional support for use of the word "approve," Senator Ewbank said he will make that change.

Article IV, Section 2, Membership. Senator Garcia said the Committee of Eleven had asked that he bring a suggestion to the Senate concerning membership. He said the committee had been discussing this subject off and on for two years, including discussion with the Provost, and the committee had reached the following recommendation: That we have only four ex officio members of the Senate (the President, the Provost, the Chair of the Faculty, and the Secretary of the Faculty); that we have 14 members elected at large from the General Faculty, that we have 14 as a minimum representation of one per

college; and that we have 20 members apportioned to colleges; and that we have 8 student members, for a total of 60 members. The committee deliberations included the consideration that this is a mode of producing input to various deans and other officials, and this has been a long-standing discussion on campus. The committee felt that, so far as they could tell from informal discussions with the deans that they had talked to in recent times, which is more than half, they would prefer not to be here, and they would, of course, as faculty members, be eligible to run under one of the other categories and become elected members of the Senate if they so wished, that the proceedings are distributed to everyone through the Faculty Senate Minutes. The information flow would not be diminished. Some valuable administrators' time might be released for other duties and in particular it might change the nature of the discussions within the Senate and might change the faculty view of the Senate in a more prominent light. ASU has an all-faculty Senate of just the type described here, and it seemed to work well, he added, having read their Minutes and looked at the proceedings of that Senate. So, the Senate might generate more enthusiasm for the kind of things the Senate deals with by making this change, and the Committee of Eleven proposed that change. Senator Ewbank called for discussion. Senator Paplanus: This is so complex and goes so much to the heart of the nature of the Senate that I suggest that the Committee of Eleven provide to us a copy of this proposal for us to consider at the next meeting, and that now we move on to the next section.

Hearing no objection, Senator Ewbank proceeded to Section 3, Method of Voting. Hearing no comments, he moved on to Section 4, Senate Standing Committees. Hearing no comments, he then moved on to Article V, General Faculty Standing Committees, Section 1, Committee on Elections. Senator Myers asked about Section 1, a., v.; he wondered whether "The Committee on Elections shall establish the eligibility of each nominee" should be changed to "...shall verify the eligibility..." Senator Ewbank acknowledged that change will be made. Dr. Rehm said one other item has come up. He had a communication from Dean Brand hoping that the definition of College would be "a group headed by an academic dean," providing specifically for clarification in Section 1., a., iii. Senator Laird: What does that do to the Non-College group? Dr. Rehm: There would be no change in that category. Senator Chiasson: The Non-College group is sometimes treated as a college and sometimes not treated as a college. Is there a possibility that wording can be inserted to verify that they are a group? This comes up in the current election. Petitions that are signed by this group are not necessarily signed by members of the Non-College group. And yet the members that sign the petition for the Non-College group, but who are not members of that group, cannot thereafter vote for that group. And they are not represented by that group. Is there some method by which that could be taken care of? Senator Ewbank said he understood the problem and will try to devise some wording.

Senator Ewbank asked if there was any commentary on Section 2, Committee of Eleven. Hearing none, he proceeded to Section 3, Committee on Faculty Membership, and then to Section 4, Committee on Committees. Hearing no comments on these sections, he proceeded to Section 5, Committee on Conciliation. Dr. Rehm said a communication came to him as Chair of the Faculty requesting that the Committee on Conciliation consist of six full members, three to be elected every year, rather than two plus four alternates. Senator Mautner: Was the recommendation based on an unfortunate experience? Dr. Rehm: It was felt that the status of the committee would be enhanced if all members were equal, rather than two regular and four alternate. Senator

Epstein: I am a member of that committee, and the committee functions the same way whether someone is a member or an alternate, and it's very hard to remember which is whom. I would support the notion of changing it to outright membership. Senator Dickstein: Would you want to say "composed of tenured or continuing faculty?" Senator Ewbank: That is another proposal which has been received, and when we get back to talking about membership in the General Faculty including particularly continuing and continuing-eligible, that may suggest that the whole wording of both Constitution and Bylaws be checked for existence of terms which might require up-dating. Senator Dickstein: It's more than just membership in the General Faculty according to the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP). Continuing personnel have access to the Committee on Conciliation as well as CAFT, and have served on those committees before. Senator Ewbank: That is another dimension of the wording that will need to be brought into final alignment. It is now more clear that the continuing status personnel have their grievances dealt with including Conciliation and the Committee on Academic Freedom & Tenure. Senator Paplanus: Is the Committee on Conciliation busy enough to justify six members? Senator Epstein: Yes, they are very busy this year. Senator Myers suggested that there was one other item which needed to be changed. It presently says that the Chair will be the member with the longest service on that committee. Senator Ewbank: Point well taken.

Senator Ewbank then proceeded to Section 6, Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Dr. Rehm said there is one line that is incorrect: the first line says the committee shall be comprised of nine tenured faculty members, and that has not been the case in the past. They must be members of the voting faculty, he said, but not necessarily tenured faculty members. He said the current Chair is not a tenured faculty member. Senator Ewbank: Isn't it wise that the members of that committee should have tenure or continuing status? Dr. Rehm: That would be appropriate.

He then proceeded to Article VI, Amendments. Senator Paplanus, referring to the section "copies of such proposals shall be sent...", asked who would send them: the Senate, or the Committee on Elections? Senator Ewbank: It's not specified, but it should be the Committee on Elections. Their responsibilities most closely are related to balloting. If that makes sense, he said, he would add that and specify the Committee on Elections will transmit the results to the President. Senator Myers felt the transmittal aspect is more appropriately in the province of the Chair of the Faculty, although the Committee on Elections might carry out the function of conducting the election and transmitting the results to the Chair of the Faculty. Senator Ewbank agreed. Senator Peterson requested a clarification on a point brought out at the last meeting as to whether there is enough difference between the amendment procedures of the Constitution and the Bylaws. He said there seemed to be only two differences: changes to the Constitution (1) call for a special meeting and (2) require a 3/4 vote rather than 2/3. He said his question refers to the special meeting: isn't it required by Parliamentary procedure that you have to have a quorum at a special meeting, and if there is no quorum, "you're dead in the water"? Dr. Sankey said that may be the single greatest problem in Parliamentary law, and the answer is if you don't have a quorum, you don't have a meeting and cannot act. He said the fact is, organizations get into trouble when they must take action; the dilemma is that if they make the quorum small enough, and they get a quorum, then they worry about not having adequate representation. On the other hand, if they place the quorum at a more reasonable level and they don't attain that level, they can't act at all. He

said he knew of no real way out of it except to establish a reasonable quorum. Senator Ewbank said there is one codicil that Parliamentary tradition has been tolerating, and that is the presumption of a quorum: if the meeting is called and no one raises the question of whether a quorum is present or not, there is legal precedent to assume that the meeting would not have been called to order had a quorum not been present, and it becomes obligatory on somebody to prove there was not a quorum. Senator Peterson said he would like to see assurances that if there is no quorum, then action cannot be taken: he feels it should be relatively difficult to amend the Constitution. Dr. Sankey said one does assume there will be a quorum called, and the additional requirement is that supposedly the chair will determine that the quorum exists before he or she convenes the meeting.

Senator Laird said he was puzzled that throughout this document that there is hardly any mention of the President; suddenly in the last sentence he is ordered to take anything we adopt to the Regents, and if he doesn't come back and say he can't do it within 30 days, somehow it becomes law. Senator Ewbank: As far as the first portion of your observation, the President is not mentioned prominently in the Bylaws. His status is well established in the Constitution itself, and this body, correctly, has very little to say in its Bylaws about the details of his operation. The background on requesting that he transmit such material to the Regents reflects the fact that we have operated in the sort of happy assumption that we were dealing with a 1980 Constitution, which somehow never did get transmitted to the Regents, since they have not acted upon it at all. So, in legal verity, we have been operating under the 1977 Constitution, which is the last Constitution which was transmitted to the Regents for their approval. The thought, both in the Constitution and the Bylaws, that a sequence of inclination passage be followed was to obviate the possibility that we would spend a couple of meetings in the Senate talking about this, and it would somehow lie without any potential for action on the part of the Regents. Senator Paplanus: Bylaws really were meant to be housekeeping items dealing with faculty matters, and I would propose that the Bylaws take effect immediately after adoption. Clearly, the Board of Regents or the administration can come back two years later or at any time and say this is unacceptable and we have a problem. So to put a deadline on it is unrealistic, and why not simply say the Bylaws will become effective upon adoption through whatever means we have. Again, how could we take away the authority of the administration or the Board of Regents? These were meant to be housekeeping items; the Constitution is the overall group of rules under which these Bylaws are made. Senator Ewbank: If there is affirmation, we will strike the last sentence. Senator Peterson: This raises a question, and I am a little puzzled by this. As you pointed out, we have quite a few pages of details here on how the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall proceed. It is my recollection that during my service on the Committee on Academic Procedures, we looked at the problem of the consistency between local policies and the policies of the Board of Regents and we had to be very careful that we didn't call out to do something that was contrary to general Regents policy. This material was then in Chapter 8, not in the Bylaws. This kind of thing makes the Bylaws a little more than general housekeeping, and I agree with him that if the Bylaws are just housekeeping, then the Regents wouldn't necessarily be concerned, but these Bylaws are getting into some very specific things involving CAFT. Senator Ewbank: This was lifted lock, stock and barrel from current Bylaws, which doesn't necessarily speak to its acceptability. Indeed, much of this is an echo of what is in Chapter 3. I think there is something that needs to be said for inclusion in the organic rules and regulations

established by the Faculty of how its own committees ought to run, even if that's a reflection of the way the Regents statement says it must run. To say simply that the Committee on Academic Freedom shall follow the rules set down in Chapter 3 or Chapter 8, sort of hands off all control and all responsibility, is perhaps less than being overly conservative here. So if there is some change after a while in Chapter 3 or in a Regents document, we then have some basis on which to say we'd rather do it this way because it's working fine. Senator Garcia: This document was in agreement with the Board of Regents in 1977, right? So there is no real quarrel with this. Senator Ewbank: Not a real quarrel, but a significant question.

Senator McCullough: I'd like to raise the nature of the definition of the term "college." In the case of Arts & Sciences, we have four faculties. For purposes of the Constitution and Bylaws, I would propose that the term "college" should be defined as "a unit headed by an academic dean." Dr. Rehm: The number 14 in connection with proposed minimum Senate representation by College reflects inclusion of each of the four faculties of Arts & Sciences. Senator Laird: Tom has referred to 14: does that include the Non-College college? Dr. Rehm: Yes. Senator Drake: It seems to me if that number exists somewhere in the document, it should be explained explicitly why that number exists. Senator Ewbank: In the deliberations last year of the committee antecedent to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, the report and testimony at that time by faculty members of the College of Arts & Sciences was that it was their collective preference that the College of Arts & Sciences be treated as a College and that the units within not be those that were referred to when College Representatives were elected. Having been a part of that committee, that was strong in my mind as I did some rewriting here. Senator Irving: I would point out that after that discussion faculty members of the College of Arts & Sciences voted on this petition overwhelmingly, and it is their position that, and this is 76.5 percent voting in favor of the definition just outlined by Senator McCullough. That is an expressed interest of the faculty of that college that the unit headed by an academic dean be the definition for college purposes in the Constitution. Senator Ewbank: When was this vote taken, and what was the proposal? Dean Rebecca Kellogg (sitting in for Senator Brand): April of 1984. Senator Irving: This was in response to the Senate's request for a response from the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences. Senator Myers: I'd like to know how many Senators from that College received a ballot. Dean Kellogg: The ballot was sent out to all members of the voting faculty of the college. Senator Myers: I would like to know how many Senators present received a copy of that ballot? Senator Drake: Do you mean how many received it, or how many remember receiving it? (Laughter.) Senator McCullough: The ballot went out, and it said: "In all matters covered by the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona, college shall be defined as a unit headed by an academic dean." Senator Ewbank: How many ballots were returned? Senator McCullough: 128 ballots were returned. Senator Ewbank: And 76.5 percent of 128 responding voted affirmatively. Senator Ewbank asked for a show of hands of those who would be interested in supporting this proposal, and then those who would be opposed. The show of hands indicated the Senate would favor this definition of college: a unit headed by an academic dean.

Senator Ewbank asked if there is anything before Article VI that anybody has proposed that required additional discussion. Senator Garcia said the Committee of Eleven would like the Senate to consider leaving the definition of membership in the General Faculty the same as it is currently. It saw no

urgency of the need to change the definition from its current definition. Senator Ewbank: The 1980 version reads "The General Faculty of the University of Arizona includes those persons in teaching, research, or service with both full- or part-time appointments approved by the President of the University or ratified by the Board of Regents and who are in the following categories: (a) Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors and Lecturers; and (b) Individuals who, through action of the Committee on Faculty Membership have been granted membership in the General Faculty." Senator Garcia: Yes. Dr. Rehm: That version says "full- and part-time", not half-time or greater, but all appointments. Senator Ewbank: Is there discussion of this proposal? Senator Phipps: Does that exclude Continuing-Eligible because they are not named? Senator Ewbank: That would be individuals who through action of the Committee on Faculty Membership... Dr. Rehm: ...which would consist of the Librarians and Agriculture Extension people. Period. Senator Goetinck: With reference to the same point, especially (c), emeritus status, the Department of French & Italian has asked me to submit that "only full-time in-service faculty are to have voting rights." I submit this in response to Senator Garcia's proposal. Senator Ewbank: I did not complete the reading of the subcategory: Item (c) does refer to people who are in (a) and (b) who are on emeritus status, and (d) certain ex officio members such as the President of the University, the Vice Presidents, the Provost, the Deans, Associate Deans, Registrar, Associate Registrar, University Librarian, and Associate Librarians. It excludes those who are candidates for degrees at the University of Arizona. Dr. Rehm: Senator Goetinck's proposal referred to full-time appointments? Senator Goetinck: Yes. Dr. Rehm: Senator Garcia said "as it was" which would include any appointment. Senator Goetinck: I am sure there would be no bone of contention. Dr. Rehm: To include 25 percent time--1/4-time-- that is the question. Senator Hetrick: Point of information. When was it that the definition read 1/2-time or more? Dr. Rehm: The older one just says "appointments" with no indication of time at all. Senator Jones: Since the Committee on Faculty Membership has recently been reviewing all those categories, what kinds of suggestions might you have on continuing under the present definition? Dr. Rehm: The Committee on Faculty Membership has suggested that the membership of the voting faculty consist of: tenured, tenure-eligible, continuing, and continuing-eligible, half-time or greater appointments. Senator Chiasson: It seems to me that 51 percent or more counted as full-time. Dr. Rehm: For tenure purposes, it has to be 51 percent, and that's the category we are talking about. In order to be tenure-eligible, you have to be 51 percent or greater. Senator Hill: My understanding of emeritus is that it is an honorary title, and not everyone who retires becomes emeritus. Dr. Rehm: Correct. Senator Hill: It is my understanding that if a retiring faculty member is voted that very honorary title, voting rights go along with the title, and are considered one of the very nice benefits. If we want to stop having the emeritus title carry that aspect of the honors, that seems to be eliminating a nice aspect. Dr. Rehm: The number of emeritus faculty currently holding voting status is one. Senator Hill: But there is more than one emeritus? Dr. Rehm: Yes.

Senator Ewbank: Returning again to Article VI, page 4 of the Constitution, The College Faculty, which engendered some concern that individual colleges might want to have their faculty membership differ in some significant manner from the provisions for General Faculty membership, whatever they may ultimately become. In one effort to provide the flexibility that seemed to be desired, if you recall the first sentence in the proposed Article VI, "The general charge of each college is entrusted to its College Faculty,

subject to the Board of Regents and the authority vested by the Board in the various administrative officers and subdivisions of the University." It is a proposal to insert before the beginning of the next sentence: "For the purposes of campus-wide voting," membership in any college faculty (and substitute "shall be" for the word "is") determined by the same criteria specified for the General Faculty (Article II, etc.). Then to add to the beginning of the next sentence, "Councils or committees for the internal governance of any College may include whatever membership is provided by the Bylaws of that College." And add, at the end of the next sentence, "and in the Faculty Center." Senator Paplanus: I think it should be a function of the Senate or some other group to assure that indeed the Constitution and Bylaws of colleges are consonant with those of the General Faculty. Senator Ewbank: I would agree, and I guess in the general wisdom of things, the Academic Personnel Policy Committee would be the agent of the Senate which would be assigned the enviable task of review. Senator Paplanus: It should be explicitly stated that way. Senator Laird: If the Committee won't accept one, maybe it ought to come to the Senate for approval. Senator Ewbank: It is my view, consistent with Parliamentary records, that no committee acts on its own. The Committee is an agent of its parent body, and actions are taken by the body on recommendation of the Committee.

Senator Irving: Could we see these alternatives in writing? Senator Ewbank: Yes, we will submit it in writing before the next meeting. Dr. Fulginiti (substitute for Dean Kettel): Can a vote be established for a non-voting-faculty member, as a voting member of the college, if the college voting membership is so defined? Dr. Rehm: That is correct. Senator Ewbank: Campus-wide voting by the General Faculty membership obtains. For anything internal, a college can encompass however many people it wants. Dr. Fulginiti: And that presumably applies to departments as well? Senator Ewbank: Looking at the article that says College Faculty, it seemed to me inappropriate to describe what would go on in a department. I would say colleges could determine what degrees of flexibility were appropriate, possibly within departments in the college.

Dr. Rehm: What I would suggest the committee do before our next meeting is prepare from the discussion we have had written changes to the Constitution and Bylaws so that at the next meeting we can sit down and actually make the decisions.

The meeting recessed at 5:01 p.m.

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF MARCH 3, 1986:

- 86-5 Approval of Minutes of January 20 and February 3, 1986.
- 86-6 Approval of second meeting in March (March 24).
- 86-7 Approval of second meeting in April (April 21), if needed.
- 86-8A Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 10, Section I.
- 86-8B Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 10, second Section I.

MATTERS PENDING:

- Final discussion and action on proposed Constitution and Bylaws. (Copy of Constitution and Bylaws distributed with January 20 meeting call; copy of Academic Personnel Policy Committee's modifications developed as a result of Senate discussion will be distributed with March 24 meeting call.)
- Report from Undergraduate Council on curricular matters referred to it at meeting of February 3, 1986.
- Discussion on Chapter 3, University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. (Copy distributed with March 3 meeting call; discussion to begin April 7, 1986.)
- Discussion on Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads. (Copy distributed with March 3 meeting call; recommendations by Academic Personnel Policy Committee distributed on Senators' desks at March 3 meeting.)
- Discussion on Academic Personnel Policy Committee's recommendations concerning use of a textbook in a class directed by the author of the text. (Copy distributed on Senators' desks at March 3 meeting.)