

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, April 7, 1980 Kiva, Room 211 College of Education

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, April 7, 1980, in the Kiva, Room 211 of the College of Education. Sixty-eight members were present with President Schaefer presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Altschul, Antinoro, A. Armstrong, J. Armstrong, Atwater, Barrett, Briggs, Butler, Cassady, K. Clark, R. Clark, Cole, Coxon, Crowder, Cunningham, Dickinson, Dresher, Edwards, Ferrell, Fleming, Flick, Goodwin, Gourley, Green, Hartsell, Hazzard, Henderson, Hinton, Hull, Hummel, Jones, Jorgensen, Kellogg, Kennedy, Kettel, LaBan, Laird, Longman, May, Meredith, Metcalfe, Nelson, Pergrin, G. Peterson, R. Peterson, Pickens, Ramsay, Rehm, Roby, Rollins, Rosenblatt, Schaefer, Shanfield, Sigworth, Smith, Sorensen, Steelink, Sumner, Svob, Thompson, Tindall, Tomizuka, von Teuber, A. Weaver, Wilson, Windsor, Witte, and Zukoski. Dr. Robert Sankey was present as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Barefield, Brubaker, Campbell, DeArmond, Gaines, Gallagher, Garcia, Gibbs, Hasan, Kassander, Kruttsch, Mautner, Munsinger, Odishaw, Paulsen, Remers, Ridge, Rosenberg, Roubicek, Snyder, Stubblefield, Thomas, D. Weaver, and Younggren.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: The minutes of the meeting of March 3, 1980, were approved as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Schaefer said he assumed most of those present were aware that Head Football Coach Tony Mason has resigned his post that morning, effective immediately. The President said he had appointed a faculty committee to begin the search for a new coach immediately. The chairman would be Professor Lou Myers, Professor of Accounting. The members would include Dr. Lee Jones, Provost for Graduate Studies and Health Sciences, Dr. Vivian Cox, Associate Professor of Elementary Education, and Dr. Jean Weber, Professor of Management and Professor of Statistics. Dr. Richard Edwards, Vice President for Student Relations and Chairman of the Faculty Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics, and Mr. Dave Strack, Director of Athletics, would serve as ex-officio members.

The President noted that the Arizona Legislature was still in session. The Capital Outlay Bill seemed to be making satisfactory progress and it appeared the University of Arizona would receive 5.2 million dollars in capital outlay funding for 1980-81. This amount would provide funds to begin construction of the new pharmacy building as well as to begin an addition to Biological Sciences West and to take a big step toward completion of the new classroom/office building.

The President reported that personal benefits for university employees were receiving careful attention from the Legislature. The position of the House of Representatives is that university employees should receive a 4% cost-of-living increase with the state assuming the individual's 7% contribution to the state retirement system. This bill also provides 3% of the salary budget for salary adjustments based on merit. The proposal in the Senate is a 6% cost-of-living increase, with 4% of the employee's 7% contribution to the retirement program being

assumed by the state. The Senate bill also provides 3% of the salary budget is to be allocated on a merit basis. The two positions will have to be reconciled, of course, but it appears that a significant package of personal benefits will be the result, the President said.

Dr. Schaefer said that this has proved to be a difficult year for the Arizona Legislature and he felt the universities were receiving fair treatment indeed.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Sigworth announced that the University's participation in the Aetna Group Life Insurance program has been more than satisfactory in that the mortality experience has been much better than that of the national prediction tables on the basis of which premiums have been charged. Therefore premium costs have gone down while insurance payments withheld from each participating employee's paycheck have stayed the same. As a result the Aetna Company for some time has been refunding to the University approximately \$6,000 a month and this fund has now reached about \$75,000. At its last meeting the Employee Benefits Advisory Committee considered whether to increase the coverage of Aetna participants or to decrease premiums. It was concluded that the amount of reduced premium that any one individual experienced would be so slight that it would be more appropriate to provide increased coverage effective July 1. The amount of increased coverage will be based on each participating employee's age and salary. Meanwhile, the overpayment of premiums will be refunded to participants in June 1980.

Dr. Sigworth reported that a recent meeting of representatives of the Arizona Universities Faculty Council with members of the Arizona Board of Regents had been a most satisfactory occasion. Meanwhile, a proposal that the Arizona Universities Faculty Council develop a closer affiliation with the Arizona State University Faculty Association was being considered. The ASU Faculty Association is an independent organization made up of about 300 ASU faculty members who pay \$80 to \$100 dues a year. The Association maintains a paid staff with an off-campus office. The ASU Faculty Association is an effective lobbying group, Dr. Sigworth said. He said he could not help but feel guilty when he realized that for some time the faculty of the University of Arizona has coasted along on the backs of the ASU Faculty Association. Benefits that group has been instrumental in bringing about have been ones that the U of A faculty have received equally. It is apparent that the executive officer of the ASU Faculty Association knows legislators well and that legislators know her, he said. The increase in personal benefits just described by President Schaefer that apparently will be authorized by the Arizona Legislature this session will in part be the result of the effective work of the ASU Faculty Association, Dr. Sigworth said.

Dr. Sigworth said he didn't know just how the Arizona Universities Faculty Council might give support to the ASU Faculty Association but he hoped appropriate ways could be found for closer affiliation between the U of A faculty and the ASU Faculty Association. He pointed out that at ASU the institutional chapter of the American Association of University Professors and the Faculty Association are entirely separate groups. The AAUP concerns itself mainly with issues of academic freedom. The Association concerns itself with salary levels, personal benefits, and similar money matters.

Dr. Sigworth said he would appreciate receiving suggestions from members of the faculty about appropriate ways in which the U of A faculty could cooperate and assist the ASU Faculty Association.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Mr. May stated he had requested Dean Rosenblatt later in today's agenda under New Business to comment on the progress of the implementation of the new program to improve undergraduate writing at the University.

Mr. May announced that that evening, under the sponsorship of the ASUA Speakers Board with cosponsorship by Panhellenic, Mr. Frederic Storaska would lecture in the University Auditorium on rape prevention.

Mr. May reminded the senators that the Pete Seger concert, sponsored by ASUA, would be held on April 22.

He reported that the recent 1980 Spring Fling had been a success, with more than 35,000 persons passing through the entrance gates. The carnival, game booths, shows, etc., had involved a large number of student participants staffing the activities. He thought great strides had been made in reducing the noise problems of previous Spring Flings. Mr. May expressed appreciation for the involvement and support of members of the faculty in making Spring Fling a success.

Mr. May announced that the new officers of Associated Students would be inaugurated this week, including the new President of the student body, Mr. Ron St. John, the Executive Vice President, Alisa Armstrong, and the Administrative Vice President, Marc Blackman.

Mr. May said that this was his final meeting as a member of the Senate. He has been a member of this body for two years. He said he has attempted throughout this year to increase contact between students and faculty members, particularly student members of the Senate and faculty members of the Senate. He said he felt much constructive dialogue has been held. Perhaps this could be considered a pilot year, with an increased amount of two-way communication next year with still more student participation. He said his years in the Senate have been a growing experience for him. He plans to be a good alumnus of the University of Arizona. Before he retires from the scene, he said, he plans to submit a statement of recommendation to President Schaefer.

Mr. May's remarks were followed by applause by the Senate body.

President Schaefer said that Mr. May has been an excellent student body president and he has very much enjoyed working with him.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROCEDURES: Dr. Rehm informed the Senate that the "Conditions of Faculty Service" document had been formally presented to the Arizona Board of Regents on March 14. An ad hoc committee of the Regents was now reviewing the document with the three university presidents. Hopefully the document would be presented to the Regents for final action at the next meeting of the Board.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING: Dr. Steelink reported that during the recent visitation by a reaccreditation team from the North Central Association when a representative of that group met with the Committee on University Planning, the committee was told that it was rather useless for such a group to try to function without close ties with the University's central administrative planning office. Without the involvement of that office the committee would always be quite helpless. As a result, Dr. Steelink said, Dr. Gary Munsinger, Vice President for Planning and

Budgeting had been invited to meet with the committee on a regular basis and he had agreed to do so.

Dr. Steelink turned next to certain recommendations the University Planning Committee wished to present to the Senate today. He reminded the Senate that this body had requested the Planning Committee to review the arguments and proposals for the construction of a recreational sports complex. The committee had done so. The committee found that the proposed complex would accommodate students, faculty, and staff and would provide facilities for intramural and club sports, physical conditioning and recreational activities. The committee supported the concept of a sports complex, Dr. Steelink said, and now requested the endorsement of the Faculty Senate. He asked Vice President Edwards to give the Senate a brief history of the proposal.

Dr. Edwards pointed out that in 1974 a survey of the student body revealed a widespread wish for such a complex. In 1975 a student group did an excellent job of studying needs and costs. The study was updated in 1976 and again in the summer of 1978. At that time it was anticipated that the complex would cost 12 million dollars. In the summer of 1979 it was estimated that the projected cost had risen to 16 million, and by now it would probably be higher, he said. What is contemplated is a complete facility. In the main structure would be indoor handball courts and indoor squash courts, as well as adequate shower and locker facilities for both men and women. A recreational pool would be provided. Outdoors there would be both basketball and volleyball courts. Adjacent to the facilities just mentioned would be additional playing fields, tennis courts, and soccer fields. A parking area would also be included. The complex would cover perhaps five or six city blocks.

Dr. Edwards said it appeared that the University of Arizona was the only institution of its size and type that did not have such a facility for its students, faculty and staff. He pointed out that in 1977 the students voted to be assessed \$16 per semester as part of their registration fees to support developing such a complex. He did not know how it might be funded at this time. Certainly there is a widespread need for it felt on this campus, he said, and if it were provided it probably would have been outgrown by the day it opened.

The Senate then considered the following, presented by Dr. Steelink as a seconded motion as submitted by the University Planning Committee:

The University of Arizona Faculty Senate endorses the construction of a recreational sports complex at the University of Arizona for the purpose of housing intramural, club and individual recreational activities.

The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Steelink next explained that the Planning Committee had discussed long-range capital requirements of the University. He said it was evident that the current practice of annual capital appropriations from the State Legislature would not keep pace with the University's needs in the next decade. Therefore, the Planning Committee strongly recommended legislation which would give the Board of Regents authority to issue revenue bonds for the construction of permanent facilities. A bill granting this authority has been introduced in the State Legislature annually for the past 5 years and appears to have considerable support at present, he said.

Dr. Schaefer commented that it would appear that bonding may be the most viable approach to care for the capital building needs of the Arizona universities, taking into account the economic facts of life at present in this state. The approach appears to be sound, he said.

The Senate then considered the following, presented by Dr. Steelink as a seconded motion as submitted by the University Planning Committee:

The University of Arizona Faculty Senate supports legislation which would grant the Board of Regents authority to issue revenue bonds for the construction of projects at the three Arizona universities.

The motion carried with no negative votes heard.

President Schaefer thanked the Planning Committee for the time and effort given by its members to the study of a recreational sports complex.

APPROVAL OF CATALOG MATERIAL AS REPORTED IN "CURRICULUM" BULLETINS: The Senate approved catalog material furnished Senate members in "Curriculum" bulletins, Vol. 8, No. 12 (March 6, 1980) and Vol. 8, No. 13 (March 24, 1980) with these exceptions: On the recommendation of Dean Cole, the Senate did not approve proposals to revise Addiction Studies 505b and 516 in the School of Health Related Professions as presented in the March 6 issue, but rather to refer these back to Dr. Noyes for further review by the Curriculum Office. Dr. Cole questioned possible duplication between certain course work in Pharmacy or Pharmacology and these courses after they were revised.

The Senate's action included approving the new title for the present Department of Nuclear Engineering as the Department of Nuclear and Energy Engineering rather than the Department of Energy and Nuclear Engineering as announced in the "Curriculum" of March 6.

Before the March 6 "Curriculum" bulletin was approved there was considerable dialogue about the proposal for an undergraduate program of study in Energy Engineering leading to a Bachelor of Science in Energy Engineering degree, as presented in the bulletin.

Dr. Rehm said that a number of engineering faculty had asked him as their representative in the Faculty Senate to express some real concerns in regard to the proposed new program in Energy Engineering. He pointed out that these concerns were based on professional and academic standards alone.

He said the primary area of concern is that there is no clearly demonstrated demand by nationally recognized leaders in industry and government for graduates from a curriculum of the type proposed. Essentially no other universities have such a program, feeling that the traditional engineering disciplines are more than adequate to handle the engineering assignments in the energy field.

Dr. Rehm said that analysis of the courses in the proposed major indicates wide breadth but insufficient depth adequately to prepare a graduate of the program to do little more than broadly analyze the real engineering work of others. Thus the new Energy Engineering program does not meet the generally accepted meaning of engineering, that is, the ability to design real world, practical, economical systems, he said.

Professional ethics in engineering education require that each engineering curriculum lead to a degree which is marketable and in demand, Dr. Rehm continued. To offer a program which does not meet these criteria is unfair to students and not in the best interest of the University of Arizona.

Dr. Rehm said that all of the above concerns had been raised with Professor Seale, the proponent of the new program, by engineering faculty in the last three weeks. No completely satisfactory and substantiated answers had been provided to allay these concerns.

Dr. Rehm then moved "that the consideration of the Energy Engineering program as contained in the 'Curriculum' bulletin, Vol. 8, No. 12, be deferred until such time that documentary evidence can be obtained from leaders of prominent national industrial companies and governmental agencies as to the need and demand for graduates of the program as presently proposed, and such information can be studied."

There were several seconds to Dr. Rehm's motion.

Dr. Gerald Peterson said that this proposal had been thoroughly considered over a period of some months. The Curriculum Committee of the College of Engineering had been satisfied with the appropriateness of the proposal, and it also had been carefully studied by the University Undergraduate Council and approved by that body. He then requested the permission of the Senate for Dr. David Hetrick, Professor of Nuclear Engineering, to address some remarks to the body. There was no objection to Dr. Hetrick's speaking. Dr. Hetrick said it was acknowledged that in developing the proposed new program and new degree the University would be on the frontier. "We have already been there for a few years," he said. The program has been germinating since 1972. Incidentally, graduates from the existing master's program in energy systems engineering have an excellent history so far as job hunting is concerned, he said.

The proposed new program has not been developed overnight or in a vacuum, he continued. Careful consideration has been given both to academic criteria and to professional criteria. He said the Nuclear Engineering Department's faculty felt they were creating a program in response to a need of society in a changing world. He said he had with him notes on a number of conversations with representatives of various government agencies and industrial concerns all of which reflected an enthusiastic support for what was being proposed here. Energy engineering has come to be recognized as a viable professional specialty in America. There is functioning now a national Association of Energy Engineers, he said. The president of that organization, incidentally, is supportive of the proposed new program at Arizona. He said he was sure if he tried, he could obtain 100 letters testifying to the widespread demand for energy engineers. Similarly, the opposition could no doubt get an equal number of letters saying there are not ample job openings for persons with such a major. One can always document a conviction, he said.

Dr. Steelink asked Dr. Hetrick how much economics would be included in the new program. He also asked if the curriculum would include course work in biomass conversion. Dr. Hetrick said that the curriculum would include one new course in the sophomore year called the Economics of Energy. In the senior year, six in-depth technical courses are required and most of these would include economic components. The curriculum also calls for 12 semester hours of technical electives and these could also include economic course work. All engineering students, in

addition, are required to take a minimum of 9 semester hours of social science electives, and here again economics could be included. There is no specific requirement in biomass conversion, he said, but among a student's electives there would be ample room for it to be included, he said.

Dr. Steelink asked why, if Dr. Hetrick was a nuclear engineer, he was so willing to teach about alternate sources of energy.

Dr. Hetrick answered that his personal area of expertise was nuclear safety. He said the Nuclear Engineering Department, however, included physicists, chemists, chemical engineers, mechanical engineers, and a few nuclear engineers. The new program would be concerned with all sources of energy; it would teach the conservation of energy, energy alternatives, and most important, solar energy.

Dr. Tomizuka said he was bothered by such an umbrella term as "energy engineering", just as he would wonder about a "department of civilization". He wondered if the name change would involve new packaging or simply a reorganization. He wondered about the scope of the proposed new program. Would it be simply a rearrangement of present offerings, or would it be a whole new enterprise with gigantic implications? Dr. Hetrick said it indeed was not a new program on energy. It is an attempt to focus on an interdisciplinary activity, giving it an administrative home base in Nuclear Engineering, he said. The name of a department does not limit or proscribe its research activity, for example. The proposed title change would indicate the breadth that is contemplated in an effort to meet a real need. There indeed would be extensive cooperative effort with many departments from the entire campus. The program however would be conducted within the framework of the engineering curriculum.

Dr. Gerald Peterson pointed out that there was precedent for such an arrangement. When the program in industrial engineering was developed, it was recognized as a distinct curriculum and yet it needed a home identity. It was placed in the Department of Systems Engineering. A few professorial assignments were shuffled a bit, and several people given joint appointments, but no problems resulted. This would be a similar arrangement, he said.

Dr. Peterson said it should be pointed out again, as Dr. Hetrick had indicated earlier, that students receiving master of science degrees at this time with a major in energy systems engineering have in fact been very much in demand so far as employment is concerned. He explained further that the faculty of the new program would in fact come from many different departments. The other departments in the College of Engineering do not feel threatened by this proposal or fear it will infringe on their territory, he said.

Dr. LaBan asked if Dr. Rehm could elaborate on the feeling of his colleagues whose point of view he had presented. Dr. Rehm said there was no complaint about the graduate program in energy systems engineering. What is a concern, he said, is whether the new undergraduate program would truly be engineering. Engineers should be concerned with synthesis, not analysis. They should have the ability to design.

Dr. Hetrick answered that the proposed program indeed included design course work. The U of A degree might be the first bachelor's degree in energy engineering in the country but certainly there would soon be a number of others.

The question was called for and Dr. Rehm's motion to defer approval of the energy engineering program was defeated 25 to 22.

REMARKS BY DR. ROBERT A. HUFF: President Schaefer next introduced a special guest at today's meeting, Dr. Robert A. Huff, Executive Director of the Arizona Board of Regents, who the President had invited to speak to the Faculty Senate. Dr. Schaefer pointed out that Dr. Huff has served as the executive officer to the Arizona Board of Regents since January 1, 1979, and he said he had always found Dr. Huff a pleasure to work with.

Dr. Huff remarked that he had enjoyed observing the Senate in action in the preceding hour. He said sometimes when new proposals come before the Regents there is question about how carefully they have received faculty review on the campus from which they have come. He was pleased to see that there is indeed a review process at the U of A and that it is operating well in the Senate.

Dr. Huff said that state governing boards, including the Arizona Board of Regents, are under attack just now and are coming increasingly under scrutiny. However, they continue to serve a vital and important function as a buffer between legislatures and state universities. He said the attitude of government everywhere is changing since there is ever-growing pressure for government to manage more and more. There is pressure for more centralization of management power in our state and the question is whether this should lodge within the Board of Regents or within the Legislature.

The organizational and procedural structure for public university education in Arizona, he said, provides for the Board of Regents, the University administration, and the faculty. He views each of these as having delineated roles. The responsibilities of the Regents include policy making, establishing guidelines, the hiring and retiring of presidents, and overall planning. The role of the administration is to operate the university within the policies established by the Board; to hire and retire faculty; and to plan for the local campus. These responsibilities are discharged by the president and his administrative staff.

As for the faculty, their responsibilities in Dr. Huff's judgment, in addition to teaching, conducting research, and performing public service, should include: 1) Control of the curriculum. What should the body of knowledge we seek to impart at this institution be? 2) Quality control, both in teaching and in research. It must be acknowledged that a certain amount of university research simply is not noteworthy, he said. 3) Participation in the administrative process in an advisory capacity. Usually this involves committee participation. Dr. Huff said he sometimes wished this responsibility of faculties was better appreciated by Regents. Sometimes the Regents and faculties operate in isolation from one another when actually there should be no separation. That is a service the Regents' staff can provide, as a bridge between the two groups. Certainly more communication between Regents and faculty is needed.

Dr. Huff said he felt the role of the Board's central staff was a very important one. Whenever he has worked for a Board he has felt frustrated, he said, yet when he left to take another job he soon became restless, dissatisfied, and bored. He said he is happier when he is "where the hot topics are." He said he saw certain definite functions the central staff of a higher education board

should perform. He listed these as follows: 1) to identify issues for the Regents; 2) to supply information to the Regents--broad information giving both pro and con arguments; 3) to make recommendations on issues. If the Board never takes the staff's recommendations, probably a new staff is needed. On the other hand if the Board takes all of the staff's recommendations, then probably a new Board is needed. What is necessary is balance. The central staff must be fair with no feeling of attachment to any one campus of the system. The staff should not be parochial.

The Board must feel comfortable about rejecting recommendations of the central staff. In a sense the staff should be the conscience of the Board. Sometimes it is important for the central staff to ask the Regents, "Do you really want to get into that?", or "Doesn't that look like moving into the area of administration?" Central staff personnel should be educators first and politicians second, he said.

There are always live issues facing the Regents, Dr. Huff continued. A big issue at present, he said, is the study of mission and scope of higher education in Arizona that is now underway, including the mission and scope of each university. Mission and scope studies, he said, can be window dressing and frequently are, but this one may turn out to be truly significant, he said. He mentioned the great amount of careful attention that has been given the study thus far both on the separate campuses and within the Board. The role, scope, and unique characteristics of each campus should be identified and long-range implications noted. This probably will result in some mind-sets being changed, he said.

Another issue, Dr. Huff said, is sustaining reasonable autonomy from legislative control. We hear much about accountability, he said. The real issue is control. Legislators can be prone to say yes, let's appropriate funding for this but let's put a string on it coming back to us.

Dr. Huff saw as another issue the almost irrational, emotional institutional competition which sometimes extends beyond the campuses into the communities and regions of the state. There are enough battles within house that we have to worry about, he said, and a united front should be maintained. We shouldn't be tearing each other up. Efforts must be made to find procedures whereby the Arizona universities can cooperate and share and thus win widespread support from the citizenry.

Dr. Huff saw as another issue the question of a west side campus in the Phoenix area. He pointed out that Arizona State University is now the sixth largest institution in the country. It presently has enrolled 6,000 individuals in northwest Phoenix, with a full-time equivalent count of 1,500 students. Now is the time to be planning for a campus for these students who are presently taking classes in shopping centers and various other locations. If you wait until that number of students has doubled, the group will be too big properly to plan for, he said.

Another issue Dr. Huff mentioned was the delivery of off-campus courses. "This is something that must be done, it must be done properly, it must be done with enthusiasm, it must be done carefully," he said. "Quality must be maintained. The faculty must represent all of us well. Programs must be financed properly."

Another vital issue, Dr. Huff said, is funding. Actually we are in pretty good shape now in Arizona, he said. Operations are being well supported; capital outlay not so well. Inflation, of course, complicates matters seriously. Even such an increase in personal benefits as it appears likely will be approved for University employees this year will still be less than the inflation rate. As other needs go up in cost, the funding for personal services is robbed.

Nothing is static in the higher education scene, Dr. Huff said. "No one can rest on his or her laurels. We must shape our own future, all working together to make things happen before they happen to us." He urged close cooperative effort between faculty and administration within a university, between the university administration and the Regents, and yes, between the faculty and the Regents, to avoid a feeling of remoteness," he said.

Dr. Huff said he believed that if the faculty would strive, along with the administration and the Regents, to accomplish successfully some of the things he had discussed, faculty credibility would be viable. He personally would like to be a positive factor in all of the enterprise, he said.

Dr. Huff's remarks were followed by applause.

OTHER BUSINESS: Dean Rosenblatt was recognized, to respond to Flip May's earlier request for a progress report on implementation of the new undergraduate writing program. He explained that Dr. Dryden, Head of the Department of English; Dr. Davis, Head of the Freshman English program, and he had recently visited the University of Michigan at the invitation of the staff of the writing program there. They had found that the Michigan program is indeed excellent, one of the best in the nation. Attempts are now moving forward to obtain funding, perhaps grant support, to develop a superior program at the U of A. The intent is to implement fully what the Senate adopted at its meeting on January 21, 1980. The English faculty desires to help the faculty of other departments to upgrade the quality of undergraduate writing skills on this campus, not only through English classes. The writing laboratory is being planned, Dean Rosenblatt said. The full proposal is now in the draft stage, he said, but he feels that development of the new enterprise is proceeding well.

Dr. Gerald Peterson asked that when the minutes of this meeting are circulated the secretary include the names of the individuals who have been appointed to the Intercollegiate Writing Committee: (Note by the Secretary:) The following persons have been appointed members of the Writing Committee: Professor Ann Marie Tinsley-Agriculture and Home Economics; Professor Ellery Green-Architecture; Dr. Robert E. Tindall-Business and Public Administration; Dr. John W. Anthony-Earth Sciences; Dr. Kenneth Goodman-Education; Dr. Thomas Carmody-Engineering; Dr. Frank LaBan-Fine Arts; Professor Robert E. Clark-Law; Dr. William T. Lippincott-Liberal Arts; Dr. Daniel O. Levinson-Medicine; Dr. William P. Cosart-Mines; Dr. Margarita Kay-Nursing; Dr. Joseph Zapotocky-Pharmacy. The ex-officio members are: Dr. Paul Rosenblatt, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts; Dr. Edgar Dryden, Head of the Department of English; Dr. Charles Davis, Director of Freshman Composition.

President Schaefer next recognized Mr. Ramsay, who explained that he was a member of the third generation of his family to attend the University of Arizona. Since he was 4 years old he had been destined to attend this institution. He has always been proud of the University. He has been very much troubled by the recent

accusations against the athletic program, particularly the football program, in the media. Now that Coach Mason has resigned, he hoped it did not mean the demise of a fine person like Athletic Director Strack also. He wondered if further repercussions might still be forthcoming. He hoped something was going to be done to see that such a regrettable incident as the recently exposed improper procedures in the football program never happened again at this institution.

President Schaefer said he of course shared the concern of everyone who was troubled about the athletic situation. He has lived with the problem closely for 4 months. The point is, he said, the University must conduct a program that can survive any detailed surveillance or inspection. There will be a complete response made to the newspapers and the other media about all the charges that have been made, he said. Certainly some procedures must be corrected. Mr. Strack is going to need more administrative help from the University Business Affairs Department. "I certainly have no concern about Mr. Strack's integrity or ability," Dr. Schaefer said. "His leadership has been of a high quality."

Dr. Schaefer said he and Mr. Strack and many others feel a very real concern for those student athletes who came here recruited by certain coaches with the hope of participating in football. Every effort must be made to protect the best interests of the student athletes. All that has happened has been most unfortunate, the President said, with its tragic impact on many personal lives.

President Schaefer said he was confident that the new coaching staff, whoever its members might be, would develop a program that everyone could be proud of. After 4 months of scrutiny he felt no major academic irregularities had taken place. He referred to a recent study of the academic history of all student athletes within the University, particularly as to whether or not they had attended any one of some 28 colleges and universities where some questionable credit had been earned by some student athletes. The study was conducted by the Registrar's Office and it revealed there was no indication of any irregularities of this nature for student athletes attending this institution.

Dr. Schaefer said that an intercollegiate athletic program is indeed a strange and weird phenomenon, and one has some difficulty finding logic for such a program being part of a university. The fact remains that in this country it is expected by the citizens and taxpayers that a state university will conduct a strong intercollegiate athletic program. If an institution is going to be involved in such a program, he said, the same expectations are in order for it that exist for any other department, and the same high level of integrity can be demanded. If such a program cannot be guaranteed, then the institution has no business even trying to conduct that activity. The U of A has the leadership and the faculty support, Dr. Schaefer said he believed, to carry on a successful program. "We have been through difficult times, but many lessons have been learned, and I am confident the future will be much better," President Schaefer said.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 o'clock.



David L. Windsor, Secretary



David Butler, Assistant Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF APRIL 7, 1980:

1. Approval of minutes of meeting of March 3, 1980.
2. Approval of motion endorsing construction of recreational sports complex.
3. Approval of motion supporting legislation which would grant the Regents authority to issue revenue bonds for construction projects at the Arizona universities.
4. Approval of "Curriculum" bulletins Vol. 8, No. 12 (issue date of March 6, 1980) with certain exceptions, and Vol. 8, No. 13 (issue date of March 24, 1980).

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

None