

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, April 6, 1987 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:05 p.m. on Monday, April 6, 1987, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Fifty-five members were present. Presiding Officer of the Senate Thomas Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Alcorn, Aleamoni, Andreas, Aquilano, Atwater, Beigel, Bollerman, Butler, Cartee, Chase, Chisholm, Cole, Dickstein, Drake, Duncan, Epstein, Ewbank, Fahey, Fenstermacher, Fernandez, Fleming, Ganapol, Garcia, Goetinck, Hasselmo, Heires, Horak, Jones, Kizer, Laird, Larson, Matter, Mautner, McBryde, McConnell, Mishel, Muramoto, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Rehm, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Ruiz, Sacamano, Scott, Silverman, Steelink, Tollin, Tomizuka, Tuchi, Wilkening, Witte, and Woodard. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bootman, Boynton, Cardon, Chen, Culicover, Cunningham, Cusanovich, Garrett, Gourley, Hetrick, Irving, Kettel, Kinkade, Koffler, Kosinski, Logan, Marcus, McCullough, Murphy, Parsons, Peterson, Reed, Sharkey, Smith, Stein, Streitmatter, Swalin, Weiss, and Woolfenden.

ADDRESS BY REGENT DONALD SHROPSHIRE: Dr. Rehm welcomed and introduced Mr. Donald Shropshire, President-Elect of the Arizona Board of Regents. Mr. Shropshire said he was delighted to meet with this body, having read the Senate Minutes for a number of years. He said the Board of Regents is a diverse group, at times producing split votes, and while he couldn't truly speak for the Board, he would address some issues submitted to him by Dr. Rehm on behalf of the Senate as possible topics for discussion.

"The Legislative Cost Study Commission was created a year ago by an act of the Legislature. I am sure that there were a number of people both within the Legislature and without who felt this was going to be a simple matter. The reason things sometimes are simple is that some people have already made up their minds what the answers are, so therefore it shouldn't be too complex to get to that conclusion. Unfortunately, we have seen that life around universities and the judgment of higher education is a very complex matter, indeed. It has been an education, I believe, for all the members of the Cost Study Commission to go through this exercise because if any of us were being lulled to sleep thinking that life was beginning to make sense and we had a handle on everything, we're getting straightened out on that issue very fast. The Cost Study Commission is comprised of six Legislators, appointed by the Legislative leadership, and four Regents. Members of the Cost Study Commission include Representatives Joe Lane, Beth Hermon and Bob McLendon; Senators Pete Corpstein, Bill Long, and Tony Gabaldon; and Regents Donald Pitt, Tio Tachias, Donald Shropshire, and Jack Pfister, who is serving as the Commission's Chairman. The Commission's role is to review and monitor the work of the Regents' Cost Study Task Force, to identify issues, and to advise the Task Force on policy issues. It was the feeling of the Board of Regents from the very beginning that certain aspects of this study should be examined anyway through the long-range planning process. The Regents committed themselves to a more formalized, long-range planning process more than two years ago and sought

resources to put that into action. The basic work of the Commission is backed up by a technical cost study task force composed of some very bright resources within the three universities. I might say that it has not always been possible for everybody on that task force to see everything eye-to-eye. This is an extremely difficult matter, and it came as no surprise that even within the universities there would be differences of opinion as to how to properly and in a balanced way approach this charge.

"The work of this task force has gone on, and it has required thousands upon thousands of man-hours of work. It has really put a demand on University time, not only the planning of the basic reasons for our existence, but also the extra activities that always come in the summer and fall of the year with budget preparation, plus the activities of and the subject matter of the fall campaign and the change in the leadership in the Executive branch at the beginning of the year, and quite a difference in the structure and the leadership of the Legislative branch as well--this has been one really difficult job to do. On behalf of the Board of Regents, I would like to extend the Regents' real appreciation for what I consider to be extraordinary work on the part of the universities to pull this off. The approach to and issues involved in the study have been coming before the Regents' Long-Range Planning Committee, and it has been our responsibility in that committee to adjudicate differences in approaches, either by consensus or in some cases by fiat so that we could go before the Cost Study Commission with a reasonable amount of backing by the three universities and the central staff.

"The over-all goals and objectives of the study were to aid the Board of Regents and the state policy makers in making comparable or comparative budget allocations among the three universities. The study is addressing the congruence between the level of funding for each university in comparison with its size and the academic program authorities granted by the Board of Regents so that students matriculated in comparable academic programs in any Arizona university could have access to programs of equivalent high quality. Another objective was to assist each university to further develop and refine a consistent set of tools for internal planning, management and budgeting; and to develop comparable information for a set of benchmark institutions against which the policies, the available resources, and performance of Arizona universities can be compared on an ongoing basis. As I mentioned in the beginning, some people had already made up their minds what the results of these studies should be, and I am not at all sure we are convincing in even our interim reports that this is a more complex matter than that. There are still those who have their own agendas, but I believe that the Cost Study Commission is being reasonable and balanced in its reception of these matters; and while we take a grave risk whenever we bring together any additional increment of information that will be misinterpreted and those prior judgments might be used as a reason for going back and finding justification for them, that is simply a risk that has to be taken because it is not possible to do just everything as complex as this and then throw it on the floor in front of everybody--anybody could throw that as well. The members of the Commission feel that reasonable progress has been made. You take great risks when you bring out just elements of the total package that they will be misused. We try to caution the public and the members as often as we meet about this danger, but it still exists and does give us some cause for concern at times.

"What has been accomplished? We announced the state-budgeted resources available to the universities for instruction programs as the first part of a study

of total state-budgeted resources, which is near completion. Preliminary data indicate that different levels exist for operations, staff, support and faculty salaries among the three universities. These data, however, are extremely preliminary, and I urge caution on that point because of three principal reasons: (1) the conceptual issues, and the extent to which differences should be attributed to various additional considerations such as Mission and Scope and differential growth rates associated with institutional development; (2) the use of ranked faculty versus all instructional faculty in comparing funding; and (3) the appropriate adjustment for upper-division and graduate-level education is not resolved. Other resources give us concern and caution; other programs of the university budget that support the instruction program have not been studied. To take the one element that has and make conclusions on that is inappropriate. The Cost Study Commission has not yet addressed the other state-budget programs that directly or indirectly support the universities' instruction programs; these programs include academic support, student services, institutional support, organized research, and public service. The real 'sticky wicket' that we anticipate ahead of us yet involves peer comparisons: the five groups of institutions with which each Arizona university is to be compared have not yet been identified.

"How will the cost analysis be used? Our current position is that adjustments for the operations and faculty support portion of the instruction component, based upon the preliminary results from the study of instructional costs, should not be made until the universities receive funding for 1987-88 at the adjusted continuation budget level. This cut is serious, indeed, to our Arizona university system, and to use this cost study as some means to make adjustments before we get back into balance, in our view would be a mistake. Future adjustments should be based upon the completed cost study, and made only after consideration by the Arizona Board of Regents of the Mission and Scope of each institution through the long-range planning and budget approval processes. I don't believe that the current Regents anticipate that we are going to have clones out there--that everybody is going to be exactly alike, and they are all going to have the same Mission and Scope--because that's an easy, simple way to make all these comparisons that some people want, but it's not the view of most of the Regents that there should be a readjustment of Mission and Scope--that's based on the best planning and information available, and that is not yet done. The difference in Missions and Scopes will call for different support services, it seems to me, and capital. It's important for that to occur. Also, any adjustments should be made to the appropriate university's continuation budget and be incremental rather than reallocating resources from one university to another. We tried to make that clear in the last public session of the Cost Study Commission. Sometimes it is picked up and brought forth, but other times it is not. This is the current position of the Board of Regents. Regarding all future positions on how the cost analysis will be used, we would first want to see the analysis of other cost categories (academic support, student services, institutional support, organized research, and public service) completed first. The benchmark institutions must be selected, and strategic planning will include identifying friends and strategic opportunities for Arizona public higher education, the refining of Mission and Scope statements, and developing operating and capital budgets: this information should be the basis for the long-range plan of the university system, and it should be the basis for any appropriate revision to the Mission and Scope statement, and the budget should follow Mission and Scope and planning, and not follow immediately the results of the study itself.

"How has the Board of Regents interacted with the Cost Commission? We are members of that Commission, and it has been very open. We've had an opportunity on numerous occasions not only to talk with the legislative members of that Commission, but we've also talked with them separately about issues of particular interest to them and, as I mentioned earlier, many of the issues that we need to resolve among ourselves. Hopefully we try to do that through the Long-Range Planning Committee and try to eliminate the differences we may have among ourselves so that we don't create a vacuum into which others might walk in and take advantage of that situation. I do want to express my appreciation both to the central office staff and to the universities and their staff, and the Regents and the Commission members have provided guidance and direction to the Task Force, whose members worked extremely hard. I believe in taking every precaution to ensure that these complex data are not misinterpreted, over-simplified, or used inappropriately. Although I see regularly that this is done, we keep trying to work on it. It's like safety--you never reach that promised land where everything is safe and you have no need for a safety program any longer.

"Now, this committee on excellence, efficiency and competitiveness of Arizona's universities: one could raise the question if you're having such a hard time getting all the work done in the Cost Study Commission, why are you tackling this one now? Well, it was important to the Regents that, in view of the questions raised by the Governor and others in the Legislature, that we be involved and take some assertive position with respect to a study of this type. Not only did it have value with respect to our own planning process, but it also had positive value, we believe, for the universities and our ability to have and continue to have the confidence of the public. I would commend the statement which President Koffler sent to each of you regarding the study; I thought it was extremely well stated, it was in positive tones, and I won't try to repeat it because it laid out an attitude that I think exists among the presidents and the Board of Regents. While important initiatives have been taken to improve our universities in recent years, a really comprehensive review of where we are and where we should be going has not been done. This fits in to our previously announced plan for more extensive and formal long-range planning for the university system. The Governor has indicated an interest in such a study, and there have been a number of national reports about the state of higher education in general. Their recommendations for new initiatives have prompted some states to take an in-depth look at educational efficiency. These and other concerns have prompted us to take an assertive, comprehensive look at where we are and where we're going. I think the name of excellence, efficiency and competition suggests the balance of the responsibility in this committee. We felt terribly sure that this had to be a balanced one with positives as well as negatives, and it is pleasing to me to see that the Governor noted, at the time the Regents took this position, that he felt it was a balanced approach with which he could agree and could support. We are looking forward to his doing so.

"At the March 4th meeting, this committee was approved. Regent Pfister will chair the committee, which will be composed of two additional Regents, two legislators, and six individuals from the community that have an interest in Arizona higher education. I was in a group in New Orleans right after the last Regents' meeting, meeting with some other regents and trustees of colleges around the country. Maine went through such a study, although it was not under the auspices of their Regents--it was a separate, independent commission. Everybody was worried about a lot of things the universities were wanting up

there; for example, the big issue was they were trying to get six or seven million dollars extra just to close some gaps and do some special things for Maine, and everybody was all worked up about all this extra money that everybody wanted. It's my understanding that when the commission finally turned up with recommendations, what got the most attention was they said it wasn't really seven million dollars that was needed--it was fifteen. And there was so much attention devoted to the fifteen million dollars extra that was needed, that everybody forgot about all the other problems that they were worried about at the time. That turned out to be a win, win, win kind of situation for the public universities and in fact the Legislature itself. I believe that some positives can come out of this especially if:

The study must have integrity.

It must be conducted by individuals who can provide independent insights.

It must be done with a high degree of professionalism.

It must be based on the premise that it is going to be a foundation for future action because you can't change the past.

It must be done in a collaborative environment--one that is free of hostility and accusations.

The study must involve the people who have to live with the results, not that it must be controlled by those individuals, but it must involve in a constructive and participative way the people that will implement the results.

The study must identify the strengths as well as the weaknesses of each university.

Further, the results have to be credible to implement them, and factual, and likely to change long-standing practices and behavior.

Now, that's very difficult to accomplish, so the more credible and implementable the results are, the more likely it is that they will have long-lasting value. So, I am pleased to tackle this job. It's not going to be easy to find the time. We expect to involve the resources within the universities as well as outside resources to conduct the study. I believe this can be done in a way that will have positive results for the universities; it certainly fits in to our long-range planning efforts and needs. It's especially important, I think, that the Regents are asserting themselves on this matter and making every intent to see that it is a balanced study.

"The question was also asked about the Governor's concern with research and how some of us might react to that. The Board, including the Governor, supports research, which is a basic part of the missions for the University of Arizona and ASU. While there may be differences mentioned by various Board members, I believe the majority of the Board strongly supports the University's research mission. One of the areas the special commission will examine is the relationship between and the relative emphasis on teaching and research. This has been an issue of interest for some time in Arizona, so the Governor's concern is not a new one with the Regents or the universities. My personal views are that instruction and research are principally linked, particularly for a leading university with a significant graduate education mission. Here again, I think the best writing on this, which certainly states an attitude which I thoroughly endorse, is one written by Nils Hasselmo, your Provost, on teaching, research, and the spirit of inquiry dated March 23, 1987. Dr. Hasselmo, I think that is a very positive, feeling statement on the balance between teaching/research, and the commitment of the university. I was very touched by that; I think it is extremely well-stated, and it's one that I expect to refer to often during

the course of this study. I would commend the statement to you; if you have not seen it, I would urge you to get it because it deals with what is expected of a university, with balances; you and I both know that whenever we are in an area of judgment call there will always be differences as to what balances are--that will never go away. I believe that the university has distinguished itself in a very special way and can be proud that it is the 22nd in the nation in research funding. We believe that many more positives have been brought to this university by the funding which benefits research as well as the education process and which keeps the university at the front of being recognized around the country and being an attractive place for scholars to come. I would not promote a field where the balance between research and education has been seriously abused, and I would doubt thoroughly whether anybody is smart enough to figure out what that balance ought to be in the first place. It's a matter of personal feel, and there will be differences of opinion in that area. My five years on the Board of Regents have not caused me undue concern. You will recognize that two or three years ago the Regents put a very special priority on the improvement of undergraduate education. I personally do not believe that research has been done at that expense, but I do know that in any organization that I've ever been associated with, there is a time to go back and occasionally look at what your balances are. I do not think it is inappropriate to look at this now. I think what we're going to find is that we are well-balanced and my feeling is very strongly that we need to protect a reasonable balance arrived at by consensus; I believe that this special commission gives us an opportunity to describe that to the public and to reach a better public acceptance of your helpful judgment in this area. We believe that basic research is a prime mission of the university; that can be what provides the basis for the implied research and development. Our Governor has indicated to all that he has a concern for the attractiveness of Arizona business so that our economic base can be improved. He is looking greatly at the opportunity to enhance Arizona through the greater participation of business. My experience in Tucson with the Tucson Economic Development Corporation and with the Jobs Development Program of the Chamber suggests to me that when companies are talking about relocating in a state or community, they are very much concerned about what the universities are doing in that state, as well as community colleges. There is extreme interest in this. It is my understanding that the General Manager of IBM recently visited with the Governor to emphasize the importance of this to IBM--IBM was established in Tucson for the placement of a major business effort in our community. Research not only expands the frontiers of knowledge, but it's an activity that's important in teaching and public service. I congratulate you on what you've done in this area, and I believe you should not worry about the refinement of this. I believe we need to communicate better with the public and the key decision-makers about the importance of this, and I believe this study will give us that opportunity.

"There are a few general comments I'd like to make: I am very proud to be a part of the governance of higher education in our state. It not only is an honor, it's the hardest working job I've ever been asked to take on in my entire civic life. But it is worth it because of the value of our three universities. I believe that the Regents feel strongly about that. Why would anybody give 25 percent of their working hours to a \$30 a month job unless you really felt there was something there worth working for. We believe our universities are first-rate, we believe they are getting better, we believe some of these studies are going to provide us support although they may give us some pain in the process. We need support in the faculty. It is terribly

important that nothing deter us from what we must do. I think faculty involvement is important here. For us to attempt any of these studies or any of the special task forces that we have without the intimate involvement of faculty would be a terrible mistake, and I can recite about 13 groups in the last two or three years we have used faculty extensively on, but I think we can do even better. I think we have to hang solidly together for productive responses to the challenges and opportunities that are brought to us, because I believe the investment payoff for that is going to be of uncommon dimension. I expect that, as always, there will be others who will have one issue that will be bigger than some of these we are dealing with. We should not handle the one issue so greatly that we get the public confused; during this period of questioning, let's keep everybody's eye on the target. That's not to say we should ignore the one issue of concern, and I think we would expect the universities to establish the kind of system internally to see that these issues are addressed and that we stay together for the larger issues that are important.

"I would simply like to say to you that the University of Arizona has a very effective spokesman in President Koffler. Dr. Koffler is especially good with an informal session---he has brought a great deal of original thinking to the Board and to these task forces. That's an asset of real value to the University of Arizona, and I wish to acknowledge that. I think we have an activist Board. We have come out of the chute on several issues to establish priorities from minority issues with students, faculty, and staff; the issues of undergraduate education and admission standards; and I think we will continue to be an activist kind of Board. I think that, as I mentioned earlier, we will always, in these areas where judgments are placed, we will always have some airings of judgment in which there will be disagreement in the matter of balance. I would simply look forward to the opportunity, as would all Regents, of working with you and achieving a better understanding of those balances. We've got our work cut out for us. I refuse to be discouraged. I don't know of any organization in the world that has as much brain power as do we in our three universities. I've worked for other institutions besides hospitals and most organizations that I'm acquainted with would give their eye teeth to have this many resources available to them to solve problems. So my feeling is if you've got that much brain power around, let's go out and solve some of those problems: put our brain power to use for what's good for the universities and the State of Arizona. I'll stop and see if I can answer any questions, or dodge them."

Senator J. O'Brien: "We've had an evaluation system in effect for three years; I'd be interested in learning the Board's reaction to its efficacy and in seeing a resolution to the dilemma of the timing of the reward, as well as your reaction to the faculty taking on bigger classes and being more productive with the prospect of no reward." Mr. Shropshire: "I've been accustomed to that system in health care for a while. Sometimes you wonder if you're being rewarded when you're working the hardest. Let me say first of all that I believe in the performance-based system, and I believe in performance appraisal. I do not believe that any organization gets good at that overnight---it has to be developed and refined constantly. I've tried to work through a performance-based system in my hospital now for more than a dozen years. About every two years there's a revision in the system, because you never get it right. You're dealing with human judgments, and how do you narrow the opportunity down to the point where you are fair system-wide. What do you have in your system that will deal with variance if you get messed up somewhere

along the line? I think performance should be rewarded soon after the period on which you are being evaluated takes place; it's unfortunate, indeed, that the State Legislature decided two years ago to save a little money by simply changing the pay change time from July to January. I think there is too long a gap of time between the end of the fiscal year in which one's performance has been evaluated and the time when the adjustment actually appears in salary sometime next January, if you're lucky. I say 'if you're lucky' because, as you know, we still don't know whether the annualization of salaries is going to be taken care of appropriately in the budget. I do not believe that continuing on that January 1 date is in the best interest of our state employees, whether they be at the university-level or elsewhere. I frankly think that was a mistake, and it bothers me that we have not been able to get that corrected. But in spite of that, I do have a very strong feeling for performance-based salary decisions."

Senator Ganapol: "I like your optimism, but unfortunately I can't share that with you. I've been here about ten years, and during that time I've seen a steady decrease, more in recent times, in terms of the quality of our education, the ability for scholars to come here who actually want to work, and I just wonder how you can be optimistic. I think you are on a level where maybe you can be optimistic, but we're down in the trenches here, and it's a little bit hard." Mr. Shropshire: "I think sometimes failure is brought on by anticipation. I don't think an organization is assisted by getting in that frame of mind. I simply believe that the resources available to deal with the problems we have ahead are among us and available to us. When I look at what has come over my desk through huge agenda materials over the last five years, I believe that while one can point to areas of disappointment, that there are areas of success that we can be very proud of. I'm simply unwilling to believe that the people of the State of Arizona are willing to give up yet on this, provided that we act responsibly in responses to these questions. It's my personal belief that there's a kind of attitude going around in society right now that says 'let's don't believe anybody.' But I do not detect that has gone beyond the point of adjustment. A lot depends on how responsible the public sees us reacting to these questions that are occurring now. While they are irritating and distract us from other things we want to do--and cutting \$29 million out of a university budget is felt in a lot of ways; that's got to be discouraging. If you look over the history of these universities in another state that I've been over a period of time, I've seen them come up again. I used to serve on the Pima College Board. I'm surprised that thing ever got going--we had some tough times in those early days. I'm proud of that place, although it's having a few problems again. I think that social institutions will always have that. There will be up-and-down cycles, and we'll go through attitudes in moods. If you've got the right attitude, basically, you can find ways to beat that. I hope I'm not kidding myself; I can walk away in three more years, if I can live that long and manage, but I know it's harder when you're right there with it."

Senator Drake: "You noted this has been a particularly tough year because of the change in the Legislative leadership and also a change in the Governor's office. Do you feel the Governor, who has been so hostile currently in terms of budgetary matters towards the universities, is that way because of profound philosophical reasons, or whether it's basically an educational issue in understanding the role of the universities, and that he might, in fact, come around to a more positive view?" Mr. Shropshire: "Senator Drake, I think that part of it is philosophical. But I have seen the Governor already make some changes."

I prefer, at least for a while, to contain it--to share with the Governor and with members of the Legislature what we believe the real world is in higher education. The two neatest examples of this, golden opportunities, were reported on at your last Senate meeting. We had a meeting of the Finance Committee with a long statement regarding concerns in education, followed by some of the most brilliant educational responses through the three presidents and Jack Pfister: for an hour and fifteen minutes they laid the University system right out there, in a very brilliant way. I can't help but believe that made some difference to those present. Another opportunity was when the Flinn Foundation scholars met at ASU at the last Regents meeting. The Governor was great to be able to come and stay for dinner. But I don't know how any human being on earth could see those scholars stand up and talk about what they believe about their universities and the opportunities that are there, and how in some cases their attitudes about the Arizona universities changed as they got into the picture and saw what was going on--I just can't believe that anyone can sit through an opportunity like that and not be affected. I've learned that in five years on the Board of Regents it is difficult to understand. I believe that's why they have eight-year terms: it takes about half that time to understand the ballgame you're working with. We've got to continue the education process, but I think there will be times when there will be basic philosophical issues between us.

Dr. Rehm thanked Mr. Shropshire for his attendance and presentation at this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 1987: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 87-11) to approve the Minutes of March 2, 1987.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Rehm reported that President Koffler is out of town.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Hasselmo, after thanking Regent Shropshire for his comments, said that he has exercised very constructive leadership on the Board of Regents and is very much appreciated by those who work in the universities. He looked forward to his continued constructive leadership over the next few years, and perhaps another term. Referring to the cost study mentioned by Regent Shropshire, he said he had provided a very succinct summary of where we are; Dr. Hasselmo said that we at the University look forward very much to continuing to work with the Board in coming to grips with those issues, and to discussing with the Board costs in relation to Mission and Scope for the three universities. Similarly, he said, he appreciated the comments on the excellence commission, which will go into session fairly soon, and which he hoped would provide an opportunity to present the case for the universities while they also fulfill their responsibilities to be accountable to those in the state who pay for the universities.

Dr. Hasselmo reported that the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee would have its last meeting on April 9; he anticipated results would be sent soon after that. He said the Committee on Continuing Status has finished its deliberations; decisions will be going out very shortly. Dr. Hasselmo noted that in April two meetings are scheduled for the purpose of discussing the promotion and tenure and evaluation processes. Those meetings, he said, are open to everybody, and are intended for administrators, faculty, and anyone who wishes to learn more about this process. As in the past, special invitations have been extended to faculty members and professionals who are candidates for

promotion and tenure or continuing status and promotion. He requested Senators' aid in publicizing these meetings.

"Regent Shropshire referred to the situation in the Legislature very briefly, and I want to emphasize that although there have been some encouraging headlines concerning additional funding becoming available for the universities, we are still far short of the level represented by the continuation budget for the current year--that is, the budget before we cut about \$14 million from it. The Governor's revised request for the three universities is still about \$22.5 million short of the continuation base for the current year. The JLBC recommendations are about \$13.5 short of the base for the current year for the three universities taken together.

Dr. Hasselmo said he believed the Senate would receive at its May meeting a report on the implementation of the new General Education requirements. He said there will be a phasing-in period during which some rather significant, breakthrough changes will have to be implemented. "I was certainly encouraged this morning by meeting with the Deans of Arts and Sciences concerning our ability to implement the General Education requirements. We have also tried to make some improvements, for example in the Honors program, and the Honors Director has reported to me that we now have, instead of the seven course offerings for Honors students that we had some years ago, between 45 and 50 courses. This is another positive development. I received some very encouraging news recently from the Mathematics Department where they had made a comparison between performance in Mathematics 116, 117E, 119, 124, and 125 in the years 1982 through 1985, compared with the Fall of 1986. One of the measures was that in 116 improvement in the GPA was 57 percent; 117E, 30 percent; 119, 28 percent, and in 124/125, 20 percent. This is a remarkable improvement, and I want to extend to the Mathematics Department our appreciation for making this possible."

Dr. Hasselmo said he had just received and is now reviewing a report from a task force on advising; implementation of some of their recommendations is anticipated during the coming year. A commitment of \$50,000 for improvements in the advising system has been made, he said, and they are looking for ways in which to spend those funds most constructively.

Dr. Hasselmo reported that the task force for the assessment of quality of undergraduate education, chaired by Cliff Conrad, is expected to report in approximately one month, and he hopes the document they have prepared will serve as a basis for far-ranging discussions of issues in the quality of undergraduate education.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm reported that the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences has requested a transfer from Fine Arts to the Faculty of Science. It is not a major reorganization, but a request for comments from the Faculty of Fine Arts and from the general University community was broadcast; there appear to be no reasons for not proceeding with this transfer.

Dr. Rehm said that at the May meeting, the Senate will vote for representatives on the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Deadlines for nominations to be in to the Faculty Center is April 20; if Senators are nominating someone else, they should ascertain that individual's willingness to serve.

Dr. Rehm reported that in the General Faculty elections which were just completed, 20 were elected to fill 20 Senator-at-Large seats. In past years, there has always been a small number of Senators-at-Large unable to complete a term due to sabbaticals, etc.; replacements were drawn from those who were not elected in the appropriate General Faculty election. After consulting with the Committee on Elections, Dr. Rehm proposed that if such replacement individuals are required in the period 1987-89, the Senate draw on current (1985-87) Senators-at-Large who did not run for re-election, or similar individuals from previous elections if necessary, if they are willing to serve in such an interim capacity. Because these individuals had originally submitted nominating petitions and conformed, therefore, to Constitution/Bylaws requirements, he asked the Senate if there was any objection to following this procedure. There being no objections, Dr. Rehm said he will so advise the Committee on Elections.

Dr. Rehm also reported that the printing and distribution of Senate Minutes to the General Faculty will be done in a new way; printed four pages per sheet, folded in half, and stapled, this new method saved \$860 on the printing of the March minutes. The action was taken, he said, to assist in the budget cuts.

Dr. Rehm said that a list is available of official December 1986 graduates, provided by Senator Butler's office, in the Faculty Center. Interested individuals are welcome to refer to this copy as needed.

Because of the number of items on today's agenda, he said, it was not likely that the Senate could complete its work today. He proposed that discussion on Chapters 3 and 4 run to 4:45, with the remainder of agenda items scheduled in the last fifteen minutes. Should the Senate not complete action on all agenda items, he proposed the meeting be recessed, to reconvene on Monday, April 20, so that current Senators and committee members familiar with these chapters be allowed to complete action on them prior to seating of the 1987-88 Senate on May 4. There were no objections heard.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: Secretary Ridge announced results of the General Faculty Elections, Spring 1987. Chairman of the Faculty: Thomas R. Rehm. Committee of Eleven: Michael Cusanovich, Martin Fogel, Frank Rollins, Andrew Silverman, and Charles Zukoski. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure: Sigmund Eisner, Margarita Kay, and Glen Nicholson. Senators-at-Large: Betty Atwater, William Boynton, Frances Chen, Richard Cosgrove, Michael Cusanovich, Michael Drake, Bernice Epstein, Henry Ewbank, Shirley Fahey, Margaret Fleming, David Hetrick, Tom Patterson, Sam Stedman, Cornelius Steelink, Donna Swaim, Carl Tomizuka and Marlys Witte, plus the following write-in candidates: Philip Krutzsch, Robert Mautner, and James McGraw.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator McBryde said that ASUA had submitted its Undergraduate Education Report to the Regents, having reviewed the last two reports, and listed the improvements made in Undergraduate Education, in response to Governor Mecham's expressed concern that undergraduate education did not appear to be a priority with the three universities. She said they were pleased to learn that a lot had been done that they were not aware of. At the April meeting with ASUA and NAUA, she anticipated that topics of discussion would include the quality of advising, the quality of classroom facilities, and recognition of student/faculty interactions in the promotion/tenure and merit processes. Senator McBryde reported that the Student Regent Bill has to pass through the Committee of the Whole before it stands for House ratification, and

no problems were foreseen. Hopefully, she said, the Student Regent would become permanent statute at the end of this legislative session.

Senator McBryde introduced Reuben Carranza, the President-elect of ASUA for 1987-88, noting that this was her last Faculty Senate meeting.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Jones said the committee had met several times since the last Senate meeting to discuss the Chapter 3 re-hire matter, as well as issues related to Chapter 4.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator McConnell said the committee anticipates two more meetings before the end of the semester, one with Provost Hasselmo and the Chair of the Faculty, and the second to finalize the committee's annual report.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Atwater said she had placed two documents on Senators' desks today: (1) with the Committee's focus on the teaching of large classes, the Committee had prepared a table summarizing, for the past three semesters, enrollments in classes with 100 or more, indicating that total enrollment has increased from 15,000 from the Fall of 1985 to more than 22,000 in the Fall of 1986, and the number of sections involved increased from 88 to 132; the majority of large classes are taught in the College of Arts & Sciences, as well as in Business and Public Administration. She reported that several positive steps had been and are being taken to cope with this situation, including the Provost's Symposiums on Teaching. And (2) the Committee is co-sponsoring with Provost Hasselmo the second Symposium on Teaching, to be held on April 11, 3:00 p.m., Modern Languages 310; she said invitations had been sent to the 153 instructors of classes with enrollments of more than 100 during the Fall of 1985 and 1986 and the Spring of 1986, and that all instructors were warmly invited to attend. She said that a questionnaire had also been sent to large-class instructors to aid the Committee in being able to respond to concerns that such instructors have. She said that another positive response to teaching concerns is the report recently submitted to the Provost by a committee studying teaching facilities, chaired by Dr. Celestino Fernandez; this report identified several construction and renovation packages which, if funded in 1987-88, should improve the classrooms in which many of the large classes are taught. Senator Atwater said she hoped Senators would share the announcement of the Symposium on Teaching with their colleagues.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Garcia said the committee is happy to report that the Vice President for Research has approved the committee's proposal concerning Undergraduate Research Scholarships, and a committee has been appointed, chaired by Dr. Cliff Lytle of the Honors Program, for the purpose of implementing this program, which will get underway this summer or fall. He said the committee has also completed the drafting of a policy on fraud in research, and that will be presented to the Faculty Senate at its next meeting.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mishel said the only matter she had for the Senate's attention was on today's Agenda, Item 13.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Steelink said he had a question for Senator Atwater. He noticed that the number of large sections increased from one year by 50 percent, and that quality undergraduate education recommends

smaller classes: how can this dichotomy be resolved? Unidentified Senator: "Money." Senator Atwater agreed that the number of sections had increased from 88 to 133, and noted that the majority of large classes have enrollments of between 100 and 200. She said a positive aspect of this is that the university has many dedicated faculty, more than 50 percent of them tenure-track, teaching these classes; she said the committee believes that recognition and support for these faculty is needed.

Senator Woodard said that a change in the Student Government Bylaws has the newly elected ASUA President taking office earlier in the year. He asked his Senate colleagues to join him in thanking Senator Erin McBryde for her diligence and leadership during her tenure as ASUA President. The Senate responded with a thunderous round of applause.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: There being no questions or comments, it was moved and seconded, and the Senate voted unanimously to approve Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 20, section II (motion 87-12).

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON CHAPTER 3, UHAP: Senator Jones said there were several documents in the Senate meeting call pertaining to Chapter 3; in addition two items were distributed to Senators' desks today: one from the College of Medicine, and one from the Provost's office, both offering alternate wording. The major differences, he said, have to do with the issue of whether or not someone can, after four years, be eligible for another tenure-eligible position. He said he wanted to focus attention on this question to obtain the sense of the Senate, and he called for comments.

Senator Paplanus moved that the Revision to UHAP Chapter 3, section 3.12.07 Eligibility for Rehire or Other Appointments, submitted to the Faculty Senate with the April 6 meeting call, be amended as follows: that item (1) read "after completing six years..."; that item (2) be re-numbered to (3); and that item (3) be re-numbered to (4); and that a new paragraph be inserted as item (2): "A tenure-eligible faculty member may request a one-time temporary or permanent transfer to a nontenure-eligible appointment only if promotion has not been denied and only if the transfer takes place prior to the beginning of the terminal year appointment. Any such transfer must be reviewed and approved by the appropriate faculty status committees and the Provost." Senator Paplanus' motion (87-13) was seconded. Senator Paplanus said that the College of Medicine Senators who drafted this material believe, as do other individuals, that since the definitive termination of granting of tenure occurs following the sixth year, there is no point in having a four-year termination of the ability to make decisions about transfer; there seems to be no justification for changing the four years to six years, he said, and he pointed out that the current policy in effect in the College of Medicine as approved by Provost Hasselmo in the Fall of 1986 is to allow six years. If this policy is to be changed to four years, he wondered why, since practice has been that changes could not be made after the sixth or tenure year. Regarding the insertion of a new paragraph 2, he said he felt this is a University-wide proposal, although most of its application has occurred within the College of Medicine: the need to accommodate the individual who was hired into a tenure-track who is a valuable member of the University community in two of the three areas of teaching/ research/service, but whose across-the-board excellence is not such that the College P & T committees would allow this individual to receive tenure. It seemed appropriate to allow transfer after very careful scrutiny of that individual by the appropriate committees; he stressed this

was not an arbitrary decision by an administrator, and that the College of Medicine Senators are proposing a single, one-time temporary or permanent transfer into the nontenure-eligible appointment. This is a justified request, he said, in the sense that "we are not talking about a situation in which 'good old Charlie' can't quite make the grade and we'd like to keep him around because he's 'good old Charlie.' We're talking about excellent people who need to have this transfer for the reasons stated." The scrutiny will be, and has been in the past, extraordinarily careful and conscientious, he said.

Dr. Hasselmo: "Let me comment on the issue of transfer. We had a change in the Personnel system about three and a half years ago which clarified the status of clinical faculty, among other things. In that process, until the system fully adjusts to the new categories, it seemed justifiable to be able to make what were essentially corrections in the system for someone who was hired on the tenure track who may actually fit into the clinical better track better. One of the motivations for accepting this kind of transfer in the case of the Medical School was to try to correct such actions. I have occasionally received from the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee a statement to the effect that this person really seems to have been mis-classified, and this person does seem to belong in the clinical track rather than in the tenure track. I think that a basic justification for the transfer clearly lies in an adjustment to the system, and it may well be something that ought not to become a permanent part of the process of the University. It does raise the question when to start moving people from one position to a position in a different classification and if it should not be a full-fledged search for the position that is on the clinical track rather than on the tenure track. And as a compromise, we would be willing to say let's do leave the first four years on the tenure track as a period during which these adjustments can be made, and that seems to be a reasonable compromise. That is really the only justification for four years; there is nothing sacred about that particular length of time. But it seemed unreasonable to allow this situation to remain all the way up to the determining year, and then make the decision of the transfer to the clinical track. Four years was the compromise we arrived at."

Senator Dickstein said she is concerned with the idea of transfer at all because it closes the doors to other brilliant people qualified to apply for that position; further, it presents questions regarding affirmative action, since people qualified for this transfer position would never have applied for the original faculty position because they didn't fill those three requirements. She felt that people who are hired for faculty positions should be informed that balance is required of them in the six-year process. She said she understood the need to be humane in this situation, but that it opened the door for the 'old boy network' unless such individuals applied for the transfer position on the same basis as anyone else.

Senator Witte said she didn't know how other Senators in the College of Medicine feel, but she would have no objection to those positions being opened up; these individuals should have the option to apply on an equal footing with other applicants for that position. She noted that Senator Fahey nodded affirmatively; Senator Paplanus responded "the ability to transfer is so important that at least off the top of my head I'm certainly willing to say yes."

Senator Dickstein said that, in relation to Senator Witte's comments, the Provost's proposal seems to allow an individual to apply for an open position. Senator Witte: "I originally raised an objection because I felt that the time

element was punitive rather than indicating an effort to retain the very best people. When one has something very close to the best, they should be considered for other positions where they may be superior to applicants attracted by an open search." Senator Dickstein said she believed we should separate the question of time from the question of transfer because they are two separate questions.

Dr. Hasselmo noted that with the individual being considered for another position, application procedures would have to be followed.

Senator Paplanus: "I would like to point out that, while we're talking about this as a different position which should be open to all comers because it is different from that which is held by the transfer applicant, I think that everybody in this room considers himself a professional. We are not postal workers whose job is to handle so many pieces of mail a day and no more....Certainly what I expected to do on the day that I was hired in 1972 is very different than what I am actually doing today, and I think that is probably true of all of us in this room today: our jobs do change. That's part of being professionals--the job is dynamic. The research project that you signed up for five years ago is not the one you are currently working on, so that in many of these cases the individual is going to be doing something that he already is doing and has been doing for the past two or three years. This is really not, in most cases, a new position. I can't emphasize enough how important it is to maintain the professional flexibility that we all have. I can't think of a single instance in which transfer is being proposed into a position that has a description that is different from what the individual is already doing. We've got to be flexible, and these really aren't new jobs."

Senator Drake: "I can appreciate what Senator Paplanus has said, but it sounds that what is really being proposed is a parachute or a safety net. People simply, either of their own volition or because their department has recognized it for them, discover they are not going to get promotion and tenure. I think it's a very dangerous thing to lock up University resources in such a way that it effectively retains people who are not the best and the brightest."

Senator Steelink: "I have a question for Senator Paplanus: After six years of tenure-eligible service on the main campus, an individual is either up or out, as you know. We're talking only about people who have been promoted to the tenured ranks. Is that correct or not?" Senator Paplanus: "No, we are talking about people who do not have tenure, exceptional individuals who have proven themselves to be very valuable in two of the three areas. This is not intended to be a parachute. If we don't have faith in the peer review system which is and has been in operation to review these individuals, then clearly you should vote against it, because it would be an example of cronyism. But that's not the way it does or should operate."

Senator Cole said that the time period has to be at the end of five years, because at the end of six years they have either been promoted or denied tenure. Senator Paplanus agreed it should be five years.

Senator Dickstein commented that over time, people's specializations change, and they do grow into work in other areas; but such change can still be encompassed in what is expected of someone receiving tenure--they have veered off into other areas but are still fulfilling their research, service, and teaching. She said on the main campus in the past when someone has been brilliant

in two areas and totally negligent in the third, those people leave because that position required balance in the three areas. The motion being considered would divert them to another track, allowing them to continue their specializations, but denying those who, she felt, are equally as good to apply for the position suddenly created.

Senator Garcia: "I would like to understand whether the Provost's proposal fulfills the need seen in the College of Medicine; it seems to me it does, but perhaps I don't understand the issues."

Senator Paplanus: "This does not allow for a two-way transfer. At least, it doesn't explicitly allow for it. And the four years is very troublesome. I think Senator Cole's suggestion of five years is a very reasonable compromise."

Senator Drake: "The two-way transfer issue also, frankly, is a concern because it permits one to put one's tenure-clock or continuing status-clock essentially in dormancy for a period of time if it looks like one is not going to be a successful candidate. I think that runs contrary to the way this University and all other fine universities operate. It makes me very nervous to think that somebody could move over to a nontenure-eligible slot for a while and then when they think the time is right, slide back into the tenure-eligible track. I think the Provost's recommendations, perhaps changing the four years to five years, would make a lot of sense."

Senator Paplanus: "I would point out that stopping the clock for, as you put it, people who can't make it or who are afraid they can't make it, could apply to maternity leave or any of the other innumerable circumstances in which the clock could be stopped."

Senator Jones asked Dr. Hasselmo: "What circumstances presently permit the stopping of the clock?" Dr. Hasselmo: "We try not to permit that at all except for leave without pay. We are working against a backdrop of practice in the College of Medicine, which I don't know how far back it goes, where there has been some stopping out for specific reasons, for example, when somebody took on a particular type of project that effectively would prevent that person from moving ahead on the tenure-track course with the requirements for promotion and tenure. In those instances, there has been the practice of stopping the tenure clock. I'm not aware that that was done in other parts of the University. But we were concerned with that practice. I think the leave without pay is a legitimate mechanism for somebody who takes up an entirely different activity during this particular period of time, but I am very concerned about tampering with the six-year probational period."

Senator Cole, on a point of information, asked if a different policy exists in the College of Medicine than the rest of the campus, and if so, would this policy, then bring in the whole rest of the campus? Dr. Hasselmo responded "The proposed policy would be uniformly applied across the University."

The question was called.

Senator Drake asked, on a point of information, if it was possible to substitute an amended motion at this point? Dr. Sankey stated that Senator Paplanus' amendment could be amended. Senator Drake moved that the wording proposed by the Provost be substituted in its entirety. This motion (87-14) was seconded.

Senator Roemer posed a question: the third paragraph of the Provost's proposal appeared to preclude the possibility of an appointment under Chapter 4 and 5 as well; was that intended? Dr. Hasselmo responded affirmatively.

In response to a question from Senator Paplanus, Senator Drake said he would be happy to entertain a revision to 'five' years--that it was not a significant issue. Senator Ewbank, believing this to be a significant issue, proposed striking the word 'four' in the second line in paragraph 2, substituting in its place the word 'five.'" Senator Drake agreed to this change.

Senator Cole: "Point of information. In what way would this proposal apply to people who entered the University in a nontenure-eligible position, and made a decision to go to a tenure-track position?" Senator Ewbank: "This is part of Chapter 3, which does not address that particular situation. We would have to deal with that at our special meeting."

Since the 4:45 p.m. deadline had passed, Dr. Rehm called the question. Senator Jones asked how many Senators favored the Drake amendment, substituting the Provost's proposal with the years changed to five. Dr. Rehm said a clear majority was evidenced by the show of hands.

Dr. Sankey stated the Senate must now vote on Senator Drake's proposal because they had merely approved its substitution over Senator Paplanus's proposal. Dr. Rehm called for a show of hands; again, a clear majority indicated approval of motion 87-14.

At 4:52 p.m., Dr. Rehm recessed the meeting until Monday, April 20, 3:00 p.m.

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT THE MEETING OF APRIL 6, 1987:

- 87-11 Approval of Minutes of March 2, 1987.
- 87-12 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 11, No. 20, Section II.
- 87-13 Motion to amend APPC recommendation on UHAP 3.12.07.
- 87-14 Approval of motion to substitute another proposal for that moved in Motion 87-13.

MATTERS PENDING:

1. Continued discussion on Chapter 4, UHAP.
2. Selective vs. Regional Depository Status for the University of Arizona
3. Recommendations for changes to Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads.
4. Proposal for the Recognition of Student/Faculty Interaction as an Integral Component of Effective Teaching.
5. Proposals regarding Technology Transfer: Conflict of Commitment; Facilities Use; and Motion to create the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment.
6. Policy regarding use of a textbook in a class directed by the author.