

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, February 20, 1984
Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, February 20, 1984, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Thirty-six members were present with Senate Chairperson Rebecca Kellogg presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Atwater, Battan, Beigel, Butler, Chen, Cosart, Demorest, Dickstein, Dinham, Duncan, Epstein, Fahey, Farr, Flemming, Fox, Garcia, Heigl, Kellogg, Koffler, Longman, Maher, McCullough, Myers, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Parmenter, Pellman, Prosser, Reeves, Rehm, Roby, Roemer, Rollins, Stevenson, Thompson, and Witte. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Altman, Anthony, Antinoro, Antley, Berliner, Brand, Bried, Cardon, Chiasson, Cole, Dickinson, Dufficy, Eisner, Fleming, Foster, Gallagher, Gimello, Goetinck, Gourley, Hasselmo, Hegland, Hetrick, Irving, Jensen, Jones, Kettel, Kinkade, Laird, Lamb, Levitt, MacLeod, Maddock, Marcus, Mautner, Mayersohn, Munsinger, Nevins, Paplanus, G. Peterson, R. Peterson, Proctor, Schneider, Scott, Shanfield, Smith, Sorensen, Spece, Steelink, Woodard, and Zukoski.

Senator Kellogg pointed out that this was a continuation of the recessed meeting of the February 6 Senate meeting, but (because there was no quorum present) we could meet for discussion only.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS OF THE GENERAL FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA: Senator Kellogg recognized Senator Reeves as a member of the Committee on Academic Procedures and Professor Ingram as Chairperson of that committee. Senator Kellogg assumed the consent of the Senate to allow Dr. Ingram to speak. She said that she would like to preface this discussion by alerting members of the Senate to the fact that when the election for the presiding officer of the Senate is held, she would not be a candidate. She said that she has taken this position for two reasons. She has served in this position for three and one-half years and that is long enough, and the Senate should refresh itself occasionally; and secondly, there are some who believe that the presiding officer should be a fully-active faculty member and Senator Kellogg at this time has a very strong administrative appointment.

Senator Ingram said that this discussion is a little inconvenient because all we can do is discuss and they had hoped that there would not be any discussion in what the committee presented. The Committee on Academic Procedures was given the charge of updating the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws to come into line with current practice, which has changed considerably. (A copy of the proposed changes in the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona is attached to these minutes.)

She stated that they had from the beginning a very modest charge, not to think grandly about the Constitution, but instead to bring it in line with

current practice. The committee had decided that the elections for Faculty Senate officers should be held in May, so there would be no loss of start-up time in the fall. In order to do that, the Senate needs to deal with the parts of the Constitution that cover elections. Thus, she said, what she and Senator Reeves are to discuss are just those parts of the Constitution that deal with the upcoming election.

Senator Reeves stated that the Senate had before it six proposals for changes in the Faculty Constitution and one proposal for changes in the Bylaws. He said these are minimal changes that have to do with the terms of Senate offices, the election of the Presiding Officer, and with how we go about selecting the Secretary of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Senate. He said they now have some very specific stop-gap measures that allow the Senate to organize for next year to go ahead and carry on its business, and the committee presents them as minimal changes. He said that Dr. Sankey, through the Executive Committee, had given to this committee a rather substantial rewrite of the Constitution suggesting a number of changes. The committee had spent a good deal of time on these before deciding that it was very improbable that the committee could come to any sort of decision this year, so they decided to concentrate on a minimal list of constitutional changes.

In response to a question about the addendum, Senator Reeves said that perhaps there should be a change to set the last meeting of the Senate to April 30 for this year.

Senator Battan referred to the next to last line of the second page of the document reading, "..... the beginning of each new Faculty Senate". He asked if there were some place in this document that says when the new Faculty Senate begins. Senator Reeves replied that there was, and he referred to the Bylaw on the next page of the handout, stating that the terms of office began June 30. The new Faculty Senate begins the first Monday of the first month of the regular term of the fall semester.

Senator Kellogg said that the first meeting of the Senate has always been during an academic semester, but the term of the Senate actually begins July 1 under the current Bylaws.

Senator Reeves stated that the problem has been in trying to get the committees in place and moving along during the summer.

Senator Battan stated that it still was not clear that that phrase, "the beginning of each Faculty Senate" is defined. Senator Reeves said that the new officers would take over in May in concert with the first meeting of the Senate in May.

Senator Dickstein said that on the first page of the document referring to page 7 of the Constitution it talks about the terms of membership of the Faculty Senate as beginning on the first Monday in May. In our opinion that is the definition of the beginning of the Faculty Senate, she said.

Senator Myers said that since we are saying that the old terms end April 30, if the first Monday of May is one week later, do we have a week without a Senate? He said that maybe there ought to be a term of office beginning on

May 1. Senator Reeves replied that the last page of the handout indicated that that was the case. May 1 should be the starting date of the term of office of the new Senate.

Senator Myers said there seemed to be a contradiction between the first and the last pages of the proposed document as to the starting times of the new Faculty Senate. Senator Reeves suggested that the document be amended to read May 1 wherever appropriate.

Senator Myers asked, with respect to the Secretary of the Faculty, if the committee had explored the question of support for the person who serves as Secretary of the Faculty. Senator Reeves stated that they have not explored as a committee, but they have been told that there have been discussions on this matter.

Senator Dinham then spoke to this and she said that she has had discussions with Senator Kellogg, Senator Hasselmo, and Professor Burke. They have discussed ways of consolidating support for the Senate secretarial functions. Senator Myers said that if this provision is to take effect this year then there is no provision in the current election procedure to elect the secretary, and the Senate also needs to know the terms under which this office is to be conducted.

Senator Dinham replied that it is not entirely clear what the duties of the Secretary of the Faculty will be. She said we know the kinds of functions that have been performed in the past. In the reformed centralized office plan the Secretary of the Faculty might have a different kind of role. She said we might limp along without a secretary for a year trying to fill those functions in other ways. She asked if the Academic Procedures Committee had considered the problem of the Secretary of the Faculty.

Senator Reeves asked if she meant in terms of election this year, and Senator Dinham replied, "No, in terms of function." Senator Reeves stated that the committee had not.

Senator Kellogg said that we now have a secretary but only on loan until May. Senator Dinham said this is an important question which we need to discuss soon.

Senator Battan asked if the Secretary of the Faculty was the same as the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. He was told that it was. He then asked why should we change from the system we have now.

Senator Kellogg replied that the system we have now has been that the Dean of Admissions and Records also serves as the Secretary of the Faculty and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. She stated that the Vice President for Student Affairs has said this cannot continue after May. Senator Kellogg said that thus we need to make some adjustment in the Constitution and the adjustment that is being suggested is that the Secretary of the Faculty be an elected position, elected by the General Faculty as opposed to being a permanent position.

Senator Battan asked if that meant that if this proposal were adopted and the Registrar was nominated to be Secretary of the Faculty, he would have to decline.

Senator Dinham said that the question of who the Secretary of the Faculty

is, what those functions are, what the devotion of time would be, is one that apparently hasn't come up in all of this Constitutional reformation discussion; and it needs to, because it is very important. She said that she expected that we will get to this sometime very soon. We should not just elect someone who is expected to be secretary nights and Sundays, but that seems to be the current provision.

Senator Fahey said that this came up early on in Senate Executive Committee meetings. She said she does not know that the Committee on Academic Procedures was really alerted to the need to look at the Secretary of the Faculty position. She said it came on all of us fairly unexpectedly and with some degree of catastrophe. She said that since that time there have been a number of discussions with the Executive Committee and there are a lot of things tied up in this. All of the records of the Faculty Senate and all the records of faculty action are involved with this, so it is a fairly major question and one that has to be looked at carefully. She said these records must be maintained and if the Secretary of the Faculty is a faculty member not associated with an office where there are resources for record keeping, there must be a realignment of duties.

Senator Kellogg said that one of the premises coming out of recent discussions has been that there would be a full-time staff person to support the offices of the Chairman of the Faculty and the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate. She said that person is not envisioned as serving as Secretary of the Faculty or Secretary of the Faculty Senate. We are approaching this with the question of whether or not an elected member of the faculty could serve the role here and then transcribe the minutes to a staff member.

Senator Garcia asked how much secretarial time was involved. Senator Kellogg stated that the estimates vary depending on the time of year. She said we also are aware that Senator Dinham has at her disposal someone at 80% time to handle the Chairman of the Faculty matters.

Senator Epstein asked if it is feasible to think that it might be appropriate to have an elected official from this body since no one can assume that kind of responsibility in addition to other duties. Senator Kellogg stated that we are requesting that the University administration provide a full-time career staff position to handle the clerical work that is currently being done in the Dean of Admissions and Records Office.

Senator Thompson stated that this is an important issue and we should not allow ourselves to be rushed into trying to solve it all at once. He suggested that no matter what we do there will have to be a period of transition between the new officer and the existing structure. He suggested that we should plan on resolving this problem during the spring and having a special election in the fall to decide who the Faculty Secretary would be and now simply go back to Vice President Woodard and lean upon his good graces to recognize that that transition is going to be there anyway and to extend May into November. Senator Kellogg said she thought that was certainly an appropriate suggestion and she will be more than happy to take it to Vice President Woodard.

RESOLUTION FROM COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN: The following resolution from the Committee of Eleven was presented.

"In view of recent proposals and actions that break with an important academic principle, the Senate finds it appropriate to reaffirm that honorary degrees are awarded only in the name of the faculty of the University, with due approval by superior authorities, and that all decisions concerning such degrees, regardless of where nominations may originate, are subject to discussion and approval by the faculties of each successively affected unit, beginning with the department meeting in formal assembly, and to subsequent ratification by a quorum of the college, the Faculty Senate and of the University faculty prior to transmission to the Office of the President."

Senator Myers stated that in the January Senate meeting when the Senate considered honorary degrees it became clear that there were difficulties arising out of the transition from only colleges to colleges and faculty. He said that because some of the nominations had not been presented to bodies earlier there was a rush to complete the approving process, and meetings that were supposed to be held were not held but were replaced by written ballots or by other mechanisms. He said that the proposed motion reiterates what had been established previously, namely, that honorary degrees should be considered by the faculty in a meeting and not simply by ballot, and they should not go to the Senate otherwise. He said not to have that kind of support behind an honorary cheapens the degree and we do not want to go to someone receiving an honorary degree and say that only ten people voted for it. If it is an important function, then we should carry out that function in an appropriate fashion. However, he said, most of this discussion should take place at the March meeting when there is a quorum present.

Senator Battan said there have been times when honorary degrees have been approved by a small number of faculty members. Senator Myers said he remembered that also, and it seemed to him that one way of making sure that the faculty take it seriously is to take seriously our presentation of honorary degrees to the faculty.

Senator Thompson said that what we learned at the last Senate meeting was very useful and instructive to us. He said it showed that we need to make some adjustments in the way units which used to function as colleges and now function in other ways operate. He said that it does not seem to him to violate in any way the policy we adopted for honorary degrees. He further said that he believed that the resolution proposed by the Committee of Eleven actually goes beyond the present policy and in fact establishes additional policy which will damage the flexibility which now exists. It is one thing for us to say to the College of Arts and Sciences that now you are broken up into a number of units and you must learn to operate in this new fashion and another thing to say that the existing policy is not working. He said these are two different problems. He further pointed out that until last May when we adopted the policy we have now there was not at that time a policy of any kind for honorary degrees and that the policy we adopted was an attempt to address these problems; and we have only had one group of honorary degrees considered since that policy was in place. Senator Thompson said he did not like the idea of making policy in the name of reaffirming a policy before we can have any sufficient experience to find out how that policy is working. He said that when the time comes he will either vote against this motion, certainly speak against it, or insist that it be modified in such a way that it is solely a reaffirmation of existing policy and not the making of new policy in the form of a resolution.

Senator Maher said she was the only one here on the Honorary Degree Committee, and this committee had found that the procedure which had been adopted had a number of problems; so the committee is now in the process of revising the honorary degree policy. She is assuming that this will come back to the Senate for confirmation.

Senator Dinham said in light of that it struck her that Faculty Senate ratification of this motion seems nonsensical even though the original intention was good. She asked if the presiding officer could instruct the Executive Committee of the Senate to try to develop a method to establish honorary degree policies such that the concerns expressed in this motion, the original policy, and the reformulated policy are all part of one whole thought process, policy and ultimate document. Senator Witte said the concerns of the Committee of Eleven were related to actions that have already been taken, so although we are reconsidering policy we are reacting to actions and trying to prevent further actions. She said the Committee of Eleven wanted to have this motion discussed and voted on.

Senator Battan asked for a point of clarification. He asked what was the "break with academic principle". Senator Myers replied that there were several-- the policy and proposal should come from a college faculty and it became clear that it had not come from the college faculty. There had not been a meeting of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. He said that at least two faculties in the College of Arts and Sciences held ballots but not meetings. Senator Myers said that further the policy says that nominations are to be presented by the department head and the dean of the faculty of the college. He said this did not happen.

Senator Dinham said that it appeared that we were now stuck in a definition of what established academic policy is. In some individuals' interpretation a mail ballot might be fine and in other people's interpretation it might not be fine. Senator Kellogg then read the following from the Policy on Honorary Degrees: "The Dean and the Head of the department which originated the proposal then present the nominee to the college faculty for approval."

Senator Thompson said we need to be careful here when we talk about policy because there is a policy section and a procedure section in that document. He said that most of the discussion focused on difficulties in implementing that procedure under the new framework. He said it is not appropriate for us to say we have had a break with an important academic principle. We can say we are having difficulty in making a transition and the Honorary Degree Committee has recognized some of those difficulties and is trying to correct them. He personally objected very much to the first clause in the resolution.

Senator Demorest said that, however, that in no way can serve as an excuse for not consulting the faculty. He said that whatever the legislation that comes out, eventually, it must insure that it is faculty initiated and voted on by the faculty. He said if we cannot obtain a quorum necessary then this faculty does not deserve to give honorary degrees and shouldn't.

Senator Kellogg said she believed it was that kind of concern that lies at the heart of this motion and this should be referred to the Committee on Honorary Degrees and to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and all of this brought together in a more satisfactory written version of what we are trying to do. She

said it was her feeling that the Senate liked some of the terms of this resolution and did not like other aspects of it.

FORMATION OF A STAFF COUNCIL: Senator Dinham said the Senate had before it a handout. (Copy attached.) She said a Staff Council is being considered. A number of members of the university community have developed this document. She said in a discussion with the Committee of Eleven the committee realized that it might be suitable for the Senate to lend a collegial air of encouragement for the formation of a Staff Council. She said that if we had a quorum today she would have offered the following motion: The Faculty Senate supports the establishment of a University of Arizona Staff Council to be comprised of elected members.

She said it is not our business to tell those thinking about the formation of a Staff Council how to organize and conduct business, but the notion of affirming the role of employees in governance in their community seems to be a principle that we might want to reaffirm here in the Faculty Senate. She asked what kind of action the Senate could take today to affirm this principle of support. Parliamentarian Sankey said that the Senate could take no formal action. However, we could have a sense of the meeting just to imply that those members of the Senate that were here today felt a certain way.

Senator Battan stated that he gathered from newspaper accounts that there seemed to be some disagreement between the people who drew up this document and the administration on the question of whether members of the council should be elected or appointed. Senator Battan wanted to know the arguments concerning this question. Senator Dinham replied that one alternative is to divide the representation as is depicted in Appendix II on the back of the last page of the document. But, she said, we are not involved in this. That is one way to do it and then for the constituency to elect its representation to the Staff Council. She said another alternative is for the President's Office to make appointments to the Staff Council. She said this could come totally from the President's Office or could come through some sort of nominating procedure. Senator Battan said it seemed to him that establishing such a Staff Council was a good idea and that the members should be elected. He said the administration appears to be strongly opposed at this time to the election of members to this council. He said it would be desirable to hear both sides of the argument.

Senator Kellogg asked if there were anyone here who could address the question of appointment versus election.

Senator Thompson stated that he could offer an opinion. He said he believed it would be very inappropriate to appoint people to the Staff Council. He said it would defeat the entire purpose of having the council. One could argue that such an organization already exists in terms of the various supervisors of classified staff members. He said if we are going to have a council representing the interests of classified staff, it should be a council they choose. He saw no reason why there should be any fear of having these individuals elect their own representatives to a body which serves only in an advisory capacity anyway. He said he did not understand the basis for suggesting that there be appointed members rather than elected members.

Senator Parmenter said he wished to reaffirm what Senator Thompson had said. He believed it was extremely important that the Staff Council not be considered an instrument of the administration. He further said this was not only to the advantage of the staff but very much to the advantage of the administration.

Senator Witte said she would like to call for an advisory vote.

Senator Battan said he would like to interject that both Senators Parmenter's and Thompson's comments seemed to be so self-evident that it caused questions to be raised as to why the administration would oppose this. He said the Senate likes to think of itself as open-minded which implies hearing both sides of an issue, and we have not heard the other side of this issue.

The advisory vote was then taken with no opposition and several abstentions.

Senator Garcia asked if this item would appear on the March agenda. Senator Dinham said she had no wish to have it appear for formal action on the agenda. She said the notion is not to get heavily involved in the establishment of a staff council, but the notion is to lend encouragement and support and a positive note to the idea.

Parliamentarian Sankey said that what needs to be recorded is that the majority of those present, recognizing we have no quorum, expressed an opinion.

Senator Witte stated that we should state that no arguments were presented against the motion nor were there any dissenting votes heard on the advisory vote. She further said if the vote is to mean anything it has to be made formally at the March meeting.

Senator Garcia stated that he agreed with Senator Witte. He said it is in the purview of the Senate to look at those things which are in the best interest of the entire institution and if the Senate believes the establishment of a staff council with elected members will prevent some disaster in the future of the institution the Senate should so express itself formally.

Senator Thompson stated that one might raise the perennial question as to the makeup of the Senate. He stated that this is not truly a faculty senate but a university senate with faculty, administration, and student representatives. He said perhaps the time has come to include staff representatives in the university senate.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:57 p.m.



David Butler, Secretary pro tem



Herman Carrillo, Assistant Secretary pro tem

ACTION ITEMS PENDING:

1. Further discussion of proposed changes in the Constitution and Bylaws.
2. Further consideration of honorary degree motion.
3. Further discussion of formation of a Staff Council.