

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
 Monday, November 7, 1988 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, November 7, 1988, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Fifty-three members were present. Presiding Officer of the Senate Thomas R. Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Andreas, Atwater, Barrett, Boynton, Butler, Chiasson, Chen, Conway, Cosgrove, Cusanovich, Dalen, Doxtater, Drake, Epstein, Ewbank, Fagan, Fahey, Fenstermacher, Gall, Ganapol, Garcia, Goetinck, Hartse, Hasselmo, Hetrick, Irving, Jones, Koffler, Kolodny, Laird, Larson, O'Brien, Papetti, Paplanus, Parsons, Patterson, Peterson, Rehm, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Sanders, Sigelman, Silverman, Steelink, Stender, Tomizuka, Vuturo, Warner, K. Williams, Witte, and Wright. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Aquilano, Beigel, Bernhard, Bernstein, Bilsen, Blake, Blank, Bootman, Braden, Brainerd, Chase, Cole, Dean, Fleming, Hegland, Hershberger, Krutzsch, Mautner, McCullough, Ruiz, Sander, Smerdon, Smith, Stedman, Swain, Tuchi, L. Williams, and Woodard.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 19 AND OCTOBER 3, 1988: Hearing no requests for changes to the Minutes of September 19 or October 3, 1988, Dr. Rehm declared them approved as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Koffler said he was pleased to be able to attend this meeting, and apologized for his inability to attend the September and October meetings, due to his absence from campus.

"I want to comment today, by way of follow-up, on three matters which came to your attention previously. Since the Faculty Senate last met, Congress has passed the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988. This will permit construction of three telescopes on Mt. Graham. The matter is expected to go to the White House for President Reagan's signature soon. The legislation allows immediate construction on Emerald Peak of the Submillimeter Telescope, the Vatican Advanced Technology Telescope, and the Columbus Project Telescope, together with a new two-mile access road outside prime red squirrel habitat. The act also provides for four additional telescopes in future years, subject to satisfactory ongoing ecological studies of the high elevation areas of the mountain.

"The University and the Forest Service are required to immediately develop a management plan for the astrophysical and biological research area, consistent with Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines, in order to avoid potential jeopardy to the survival of the red squirrel. Special use permits for construction should immediately follow approval of the management plan. This is all most welcome news because it helps to ensure that Southern Arizona remains a world center in astronomy for another generation. We shall proceed with preliminary land and aerial surveys this fall and expect to commence construction of the access road and to prepare the site as weather permits next spring.

"On a different matter, Senators will recall that when I spoke to the General Faculty in September, I drew attention to the importance of obtaining larger salary increases for faculty members. I want to report that the three University Presidents have asked the Business Affairs Council to begin to collect necessary comparative materials as background information for the effort we shall have to make, beginning in the forthcoming legislative session. The Business Affairs Council is composed of the Vice Presidents for Administration and Finance at the three universities. It is much too early, at this point, to know what our prospects are for this year, but I wanted you to know that this matter is not standing still.

"In closing, I want to follow-up on my remarks to the General Faculty concerning affirmative action. You may remember that I expressed my personal disappointment and frustration over the slow rate at which we are adding women and minority members to our faculty and professional staff. I told you that I had made it clear to the Deans and to my Vice Presidents that I am insisting that we do better, starting right now. I want you to know that I have asked Provost Hasselmo to act on my behalf in this area and that he has my authority to turn down faculty appointments where it is clear that there has not been thorough attention to the affirmative action aspects of our searches, or where position descriptions have been written unnecessarily tightly so as to exclude otherwise well-qualified candidates."

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: No report.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm said the Senate Executive Committee had discussed rearrangement of the Senate meeting schedule. The first meeting of the second semester was scheduled for January 16, which is now the Martin Luther King holiday. The committee recommended that the schedule be adjusted so that the January meeting be held on January 23 and the February meeting be eliminated. He called for comments or objections. Senator Garcia asked why one meeting would be deleted. Dr. Rehm responded that the scheduled February 6 meeting would occur only two weeks after the January meeting. Senator Garcia said he would object to that, and Senator Witte concurred. Dr. Rehm said he would take the matter back to the Senate Executive Committee for further discussion, and report back to the Senate at the December meeting. Senator Hetrick suggested the February meeting be postponed one week.

Dr. Rehm then reported that the Yang matter has been referred to the Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. He also noted that the next breakfast for the establishment of better communications between the Vice Presidents and faculty has been scheduled for Tuesday, December 6, 7:00 a.m., Student Union 251. He said it had been hoped that at least one representative from each department/unit on campus would sign up. Reservations can be phoned in to the Faculty Center, he said. Regarding the one-week faculty paychecks, there has been activity on the part of the Human Resources Committee and the Committee of Eleven to review this matter; there will be a notice in faculty paychecks in the near future with instructions regarding this subject.

The Arizona Faculties Council will meet again the first weekend in December in Flagstaff; if Senators have items they would like discussed by that group, they should phone the Faculty Center. Dr. Rehm also reported that Senator Ewbank did transmit a request to the Board of Regents requesting a one-month extension for the University of Arizona's comments on the Tenth Draft, Conditions of Faculty Service. He added that the Great American Smoke-Out will occur on

November 17, and faculty volunteers are requested to serve on the committee in charge of that event. He noted that anyone interested could phone the Faculty Center. Dr. Rehm reported that the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel has gone to bid for printing, and it is hoped it will be distributed by the end of December. He also noted that the Bylaws of the General Faculty indicate that the census of the membership of the General Faculty will be prepared and distributed each October; that census has been sent, and comments are being received. He anticipated final copy would be available in the Faculty Center by the end of December.

An item of New Business had been placed on Senators' desks today, and Dr. Rehm asked Senators to review it prior to that point on the agenda.

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Stender said ASA had worked long hours to complete its tuition report, a lengthy document that was presented to the Board of Regents Friday at ASU. At the next Resources Committee meeting, ASA will be making its presentation. The report covers three areas: justifiability, accountability, and the cost of education formula.

Senator Stender said ASUA is working with Residence Life and the Dean of Students Office to expand the services of the Tenants Association (which helps students locate apartments or roommates) and to move their office to a larger space.

Regarding distribution of basketball tickets, he said the plan went as well as expected, but they had two outside problems: the KRO announcement and the computer going down in the ticket office. It is planned to have an improved system in place for the next time.

Lastly, he said, efforts are being made by the Student Senate to be more available to the student body: office hours are being held on the Mall to assist students in airing their concerns; and traveling Senate meetings are being tried, with meetings scheduled in residence halls or a Greek house.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Epstein asked Senator Stender if any consideration had been given to selling student tickets immediately prior to each game. She said she thought this would be more equitable, but she didn't know if students preferred to purchase season tickets. Senator Stender said that students didn't like the idea of "split season" ticket sales, and to revert to tickets sold individually for each game would mean long lines each time. Senator Epstein asked if some students weren't precluded from all games because they couldn't afford the cost of a season ticket. Senator Stender said he would suppose some would be.

Senator Steelink said he had a question on the case of Dr. Yang. "You said you transmitted the files to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. In your letter of instruction, you were very detailed and specific and focused. If I remember, the intent of the Senate's vote was to review and hear the case without any pre-instructions." Dr. Rehm said that was true, and what he wrote about to the Chairman of CAFT was the three items the Senate discussed, two of which had been fully examined, and the third which the committee was to examine carefully. Senator Witte: "We did specifically state that insofar as was necessary to go into some of the other items, that was up to the committee to

do it, and that they should not be constrained at the beginning." Senator Roemer said her notes about the Senate meeting showed the referral to CAFT was directed to the academic freedom issue and all matters related to it. Dr. Rehm said that is correct; the report made by Senator Silverman and Dr. Sacken indicated there were three items, two of which had been thoroughly examined previously and need not be looked into again, and that was his reading of the situation. Senator Silverman said that, for the record, he and Dr. Sacken have communicated with Dr. Sheehan in response to Dr. Rehm's letter to CAFT, regarding their understanding of the matter. Dr. Rehm noted that a copy of the Senate Minutes was also sent to the CAFT Chair.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Ewbank reported that, as noted by Dr. Rehm, the letter was sent to the Regents requesting the extension of the deadline for comments on the Tenth Draft, Conditions of Faculty Service. He said that, although the committee has not yet received a reply to its September 23 letter seeking verification of the intention of those revisions, a subcommittee has been appointed to review the Tenth Draft. Any suggestions Senators or their colleagues may have may be sent to J. D. Garcia, Physics, or Charles Hedtke, Oriental Studies, or to Senator Ewbank, who will forward them.

Placed on Senators' desks today was a proposed resolution for adoption, scheduled under New Business. He said the resolution is identical to those which will be presented for action at the Senate meetings of ASU and NAU on November 21. The collective hope and intention, he said, is that through a unified statement the Board of Regents and the Legislature will be moved to support the position taken by President Koffler at the General Faculty meeting in September. Senator Ewbank said it is hoped to focus some effort on improvement of the salary picture for faculty at the state's universities.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: In Senator Pootman's absence, Senator Paplanus reported that the committee has met with Provost Hasselmo to discuss the current draft of the University's Mission and Scope statement. The committee is in the process of developing a formal response.

He said the committee's ranked objectives are: (1) In collaboration with the University to further refine and delineate the process and framework of long-term and strategic planning at the University of Arizona, based on accepted models. (2) The process by which program change requests, otherwise known as Decision Packages, are evaluated will be reviewed for possible recommendation to improve the evaluation process. (3) Ways to assure the process successfully interfaces with the strategic planning process will be explored. (4) The committee plans to explore mechanisms to improve faculty participation in the strategic planning process at all levels of the University.

INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Peterson said his report is an item on the agenda.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Professor Johnson said the committee has met four times this semester; members believe the best way for the committee to serve students is to try to improve the interaction between the faculty and the students. Four areas are being pursued: (1) The criteria for hiring, given the teaching and hiring patterns. (2) How teaching is

weighted in the promotion/tenure guidelines. (3) The committee plans to ask department heads whether they are allowing faculty to negotiate how their merit pay is considered in teaching, research, and public service. (4) They also will ask faculty whether they plan to have such a negotiation. The committee is preparing a pamphlet which will provide some tips to faculty and students on how interaction between the two can be carried out.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Dr. Hasselmo said he had one comment related to Senator Fwbank's report: the Board's Academic Affairs Council met with the Legal Affairs Council late last week to discuss review of Conditions of Faculty Service. The Board legal staff has promised a statement that will indicate the rationale for the wording changes in Chapter 6. He said as soon as those clarifications are received, they will be shared with the appropriate Senate committee.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 88/89-19) to approve the notices in Section I. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 88/89-20) to approve new courses and course deletions in Section IV.

APPROVAL OF 1989-90, 1990-91 ACADEMIC YEAR CALENDAR: Senator Butler said that discussion of the calendar at the September Senate meeting centered on the observance of the Martin Luther King holiday, which has now been set by the Regents for the third Monday in January. The concern voiced by the Senate was that the holiday occurred too early in the semester; with classes starting the previous Thursday, perhaps students might not return until the following Tuesday. The Calendar Committee met again, he said, and drafted the revised calendar sent with the Senate meeting call. Members of the Calendar Committee present today to respond to possible questions are Dr. Don Aripoli, Chair, and Senator Peterson.

Senator Butler said he would like to point out that, for the spring semesters, the committee recommended classes begin on a Wednesday rather than a Thursday. Members believed the one additional class day would encourage students to return on schedule, and discourage excessive absences. This calendar, he said, still provides students with the free day prior to final exams as well as the six-day final exam period. Senator Butler also pointed out that the Senate-adopted guidelines specify that in any given semester, there must be no less than 44 and no more than 46 M-W-F teaching days, and no less than 29 nor more than 31 T-Th teaching days. The calendar before the Senate today complies with those guidelines: the fall semesters have 44 M-W-F days and 30 T-Th teaching days, and the spring semesters have 45 M-W-F days and 30 T-Th teaching days.

Senator Butler then called for approval of the seconded motion (88/89-10) tabled at the September meeting, approving this revised version of the 1989-91 Academic Calendar.

Senator Peterson said that in the course of reviewing this matter, he came to the conclusion that it would be best to not delay observance of this holiday until another year, and to observe it on the same day as the rest of the country. He said he had proposed consideration of a perfectly satisfactory academic calendar which would delay the start of classes until after the Martin Luther King holiday and still retain the required number of teaching days; however, discussion with the Calendar Committee indicated there was concern about registration, student services, and items of that sort, in that if

classes didn't begin until Tuesday, many students who need to come early because of financial aid and housing might not arrive until the day classes started, producing much confusion. He believed the proposed calendar would require many personnel to return to campus five days earlier than is necessary, but all things considered, believed the proposed calendar should be approved. Senator Peterson added that he felt it would be important to gather attendance statistics during the next three years, possibly adding a rider requesting that the Registrar make every effort to obtain statistics in terms of student attendance on these days.

The question was called, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval of the revised 1989-91 calendar.

ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE INTERCOLLEGIATE WRITING COMMITTEE: Dr. Rehm said that Dr. Michael Sacken, Chair of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee, was present to answer any questions Senators might have on the committee's Annual Report. There being no questions, Dr. Rehm said the report was accepted as written, and would be appended to the Minutes distributed to the General Faculty.

Before Dr. Rehm moved on to the next agenda item, Senator Fahey said she would like an estimate as to whether the numbers have improved over the years. Dr. Sacken said the number appears to be relatively stable over the last three or four years. Senator Fahey asked whether the committee had looked at the overview of this process to determine whether what we are doing is right and we are doing the best we can, or whether something else should be done. Dr. Sacken said that writing emphasis is controlled by departments, and improvements are contingent upon the departmental programs.

Senator Peterson had a question on the chart on page 3, Fall 1986, U of A students--39%, 23% unsatisfactory: 39% and 23% of what? Dr. Sacken explained that 39% of the number of tests given were given to U of A students, and 23% of the U of A students received an unsatisfactory grade. Senator Peterson said that in answer to Senator Fahey's question, are we doing any good, the Senate hoped this examination would prod students to take freshman composition a little more seriously and perhaps do better; according to these figures, the trend for U of A students is slightly worse, and that seems a bit discouraging. Dr. Sacken said last year's figures didn't have International Students sorted out from U of A figures.

Senator Witte said Senator Fahey raised an important question: is the importance of evaluation measurement or physical improvement? She said if it isn't improvement, is it worth it? Senator Wright noted that the total of students tested is listed, but he wondered whether that figure is broken down by major. Dr. Sacken said it was possible to pull those numbers by college, but he didn't think it had been entered by program and major. Senator Tomizuka wondered whether it is possible that departments could receive notice as to how many of their students had taken and passed the exam. Dr. Sacken said he agreed that information would be valuable, and he will check to see if that could be accomplished. Senator Steelink asked if all students must take this particular exam, or if some can take it in their own departments. Dr. Sacken said all students must take this exam in order to graduate, and it is given only by the University Composition Board.

DISCUSSION ON RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE EVALUATION AND REWARD OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Senator Peterson noted that all Senators had received a copy of

the full report, Evaluation and Reward of Teaching Effectiveness, prepared by Senator Atwater, former Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee. He said he wanted to highlight a few important items.

The study was undertaken last year essentially to determine whether faculty perceptions of teaching evaluation and reward had changed since 1981, when a Committee of Eleven study was completed; what is now being done in departments, as department heads perceive it, and in colleges, as deans perceive it, in the general area of teaching evaluation and reward. A great deal of data was collected, he said. One of the interesting points resulted from a question to department heads; one would assume that evaluation for merit ought to be reflected in some way in the promotion and tenure evaluations, and yet it seems that in the departments, in the opinion of the department heads, that is not the case: teaching is rewarded less than research in 70 percent of departments (see p. 7 of the report). Senator Peterson said a significant factor is that faculty perception of how well teaching is rewarded at the University does not appear to have changed at all from 1979. On page 11, in response to the question 'how well do you believe excellence in teaching is rewarded?', at the department level the figures indicate teaching is better rewarded than at the college/university level. Senator Peterson also referred to the figure in the upper right on page 14, showing the difference between faculty perceptions on rewards for teaching and department heads' actual weighting of teaching reward.

Based on this data, Senator Peterson said the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee developed six recommendations, and it was to come to the Senate as a seconded motion for approval of these recommendations. However, he said, he felt that it is a bit premature to vote on for the reason that at the same time the survey was being conducted, a committee had been appointed by the Provost to study basically the same kinds of problems. The report by that committee, generally known as the Dinham Committee, addresses many of the same topics and makes some very forceful and striking recommendations about things that need to be done to put some teeth into the concept that teaching is viewed as valuable. He said it had been the hope of the committee that by the time its report reached the Senate, recommendations from the Deans' Council would be available, the Dinham report having been sent to that group for consideration. He said the Provost indicated just before the start of this meeting that it has been delayed due to Regents business, but the Provost feels there will be recommendations available by the end of this month. Senator Peterson then moved (motion 88/89-21) to have action on the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee's recommendations postponed until the recommendations from the Deans' Council regarding the Dinham Report are available. That motion was seconded.

Senator Jones asked if the recommendations from the Dinham Committee could be included with the next materials distributed to the Faculty Senate. Dr. Hasselmo said that the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee report the Senate received was presented to and discussed in the Deans' Council late last spring, with representatives of the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee present. A discussion also occurred at that point of the report from the Teaching Evaluation Committee, the so-called Dinham Committee. Early this fall, he said, another discussion was held regarding the Dinham Report, specifically called regarding implementation of recommendations. At this time a committee of deans is preparing recommendations on behalf of the Deans' Council. He said he expected that by the end of this month, recommendations will be available from the Deans' Council. Dr. Hasselmo said his assessment is

that policies are by and large in place, and it is very much a matter of implementation of existing policies rather than a lot of additional policy formation, "although there are, perhaps, some policy refinements that we might want to consider." Implementation is very important, he said, and obviously in that context, deans play a very important role. It is through the deans and the department heads that we are going to reach departments and be able to see to it that full implementation takes place.

Senator Jones asked if the Senate has seen the Dinham Report. Senator Peterson said the Senate as a body has not, but the committee has reviewed it. He said he assumed the committee will report to the Senate on both the Dinham Report and the recommendations from the Deans Council. He thought distributing the Dinham Report to the Senate would be an extensive business because it is about 50 pages long. Senator Jones asked if there is an executive summary or synopsis. Senator Peterson thought not. Senator Garcia said there is a copy of the Dinham Report available in the Faculty Center. Senator Jones asked if a copy of the Dinham Report recommendations could be sent to Senators. Senator Peterson said he would leave that decision to the Provost. Dr. Hasselmo said he would be glad to distribute the report to the Senate. Dr. Rehm: All fifty pages of it? Dr. Hasselmo: If you want it. Senator Witte said that since so much effort went into it, and so much expense, she felt it would be appropriate to request Dr. Dinham to prepare a one- or two-page executive summary that may be distributed to the Senate. Dr. Hasselmo said he could certainly distribute the recommendation pages, but he said there is some philosophical discussion in the report that would be of interest. He said he would be glad to distribute either, whichever is preferred. Dr. Rehm asked whether the Senate preferred the full report or the summary, and a show of hands indicated the summary was preferred. Senator Witte asked if the philosophy could be summarized, followed by the recommendations.

Dr. Rehm suggested that when this topic comes up for discussion again, Dr. Sarah Dinham be invited to participate in the deliberations. No objections were voiced.

Senator Paplanus asked Dr. Hasselmo if his offer of supplying copy by phoning his office still stands. Dr. Hasselmo responded affirmatively.

Dr. Rehm then called for the vote on postponing discussion on this subject until the Deans' Council recommendations are available. A voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

NEW BUSINESS: FACULTY SALARIES: The Academic Personnel Policy Committee had drafted a resolution concerning faculty salary increments, and copies had been placed on Senators' desks. Senator Ewbank said the resolution came as a seconded motion (88/89-22) from the committee, and if approved by the Senate would be forwarded through the Arizona Faculties Council to the Board of Regents at their December meeting. He said the same resolution will be placed before the Senates at ASU and NAU on November 21:

"In all future adjustments to faculty salaries, all faculty who are evaluated at Level II (i.e., 'responsibilities of the position fulfilled') or higher (i.e., 'responsibilities of the position exceeded') should receive at least the cost-of-living raise given to all state employees during that same period; additional funds should be made available for merit funding."

Senator Cusanovich asked for clarification: would this mean that there would be no merit money, using this year as an example? Senator Ewbank responded that, given the appropriation, the proposal was not advanced through the Legislature that there be a cost-of-living increase across the board. It is not accurate to conclude that, given what was available this year, that there would have been necessarily no merit: there might have been a smaller across-the-board sum plus some merit, but that places a somewhat negative connotation on it that he didn't feel comfortable with.

Senator Peterson asked for clarification on the policy this year: did the Legislature hand out appropriations specifying that all or some percentage was to be cost-of-living, or was this left to the various State agencies to make their own decisions? Senator Ewbank said it was his understanding that the funding for salaries was granted by the Legislature for 3.5 percent of the total salary picture, and he called for corrections if he was in error; then the Regents sought to distribute that 3.5 percent sum in variable amounts of merit for faculty, whereas the staffs of the universities, as well as the rest of the state agencies, were granted 3.5 percent for everyone who met the criteria of fulfilling the responsibilities of each position. Senator Peterson said he didn't see how these funds should have been made available for merit in view of the Legislature's stand.

President Koffler said that Senator Cusanovich's question gets at the heart of the matter: The Legislature will do different things in different years. There is no standard. They may specify across-the-board or not. "When I started here, we were bound to do the same thing, which is basically in a sense what this resolution ultimately says. We worked very hard to get that changed so that the Regents would have the authority to distribute the money differently." Senator Witte said that, as President Koffler mentioned, this is a recent event compared to having only cost-of-living, and if we are to justify, we have to remember that merit is important. She said she believed the people handing out the merit really have to provide us with some evidence that it has indeed been handed out as merit, and secondly there has been an improvement on campus because of this new way of funding. Senator Witte said she is totally unconvinced of that and therefore would vote in favor of this resolution because she believed things were at least fairer then, and they haven't improved it to be better since.

Senator Patterson: I wondered if the other state agencies have any other funds that are available for raises. Merit is one of the few ways we have to receive raises. President Koffler said other state agencies are not subject to supervision by the Board.

Senator Ewbank said if we return to what President Koffler said at the beginning of his remarks, that the Legislature does various things at various times, the fact that it was an across-the-board mandate this last year does not necessarily mean that that is always to be expected. In addition, the University itself has made changes over the years. This proposal, he said, would make further changes.

Senator Cusanovich said there are a lot of faculty he is personally familiar with that have supported and worked very hard to obtain merit for faculty. He believed they would want to see all merit and no cost-of-living. He believed that if this type of action is to be taken, a referendum should be taken to the General Faculty so that everyone is heard, because he did not know if the

Senate is truly representative of that group. Senator Paplanus asked what the President believed would be the effect of the Senate's passing this resolution. President Koffler said, "It depends on what I do with it. I have worked hard to get a merit system established."

Senator Laird said he could probably support this as advisory, but he wanted to point out that if this proposal is put into law, it makes the discrepancy between low and high salaries get progressively worse: as long as you give everyone the same percent, the big salary gets bigger faster. He said he favored lump sums, so that excellent, low-salaried employees can be rewarded without regard to their salary level.

Senator Wright said the notion that Senator Cusanovich put forth many people would agree with in principle: the idea of a good job being rewarded with merit increases. The difficulty, he said, is when your staff receive a 3-1/2 percent increase, and because of the merit pool, you receive a 1.1 percent increase; you could say "at least I earned mine" he said. He thought it would be preferable to give meaningful merit increases to faculty, and cost-of-living increases to classified staff. Senator Patterson said he believed a referendum would indicate that, for younger and lower-salaried faculty, merit would be extremely important, and that the cost-of-living increases are so small it wouldn't be worthwhile giving up merit. Senator Chiasson asked if there isn't another component to the 3-1/2 percent figure: market. Dr. Rehm said market is one of the three items the adjustment is based on, the other two being cost-of-living and merit. He said the formula, which determines how much is available in each category, varies every year. Senator Garcia said he would like to go on record as enthusiastically supporting Senator Cusanovich's call for a referendum on this issue, and he would like to see it implemented. Senator Drake said he is sympathetic to the notion that people should get cost-of-living increases if they have adequate or superior performances, but that he would not suppose the Legislature would give universities more money than other state agencies. Given that, the message the Senate will be sending to the Board of Regents and the Legislature, in approving this resolution, is: at a time when we are trying to improve the quality of teaching and research programs, we are not interested in supporting and rewarding meritorious people. He believed it would be a mistake to vote in favor of the resolution. Senator Goetinck said he thought the percentages which Senator Peterson submitted with the faculty survey already indicate the reply because of the high degree of skepticism among the faculty. On the other hand, he said, perhaps there should be a ceiling on awards. Senator Patterson said one of the problems of a general referendum is that only a portion receive merit, and others might be opposed to it.

After further discussion, Senator Paplanus moved this be tabled until the referendum could be completed. That motion (88/89-23) was seconded. Questions arose concerning whether sufficient time would be available to complete such a referendum by the December meeting. A show of hands indicated the motion to table was approved. Dr. Rehm said he and Senator Cusanovich would meet to formulate the appropriate wording for such a referendum. Senator Fenstermacher said if there is a referendum, he would urge the pros and cons be carefully laid out. He said he had found it quite difficult to be presented with this resolution today and have to vote on it with little time for discussion about its implications, and with no warning. Dr. Rehm said that is essentially why it is being tabled. Senator Peterson said he shared Senator Fenstermacher's feeling, and, furthermore, that it is essentially impossible to write a poll

that is not biased in one direction or another.

NEW BUSINESS: OTHER: Senator Goetinck said that last semester Senator Steelink brought up the matter of the lack of chalk in the classroom; this semester there are no more wastepaper baskets--they have been replaced by cardboard boxes, he said. And in one classroom he has a garbage can the size of a volkswagon.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS APPROVED AT MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 1988:

- 88/89-19 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 11, Section I.
- 88/89-20 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 11, Section IV.
- 88/89-10 Approval of 1989-91 Academic Calendar.
- 88/89-21 Postponement of further discussion on Evaluation and Reward of Teaching Effectiveness until recommendations from the Dinham Report are available from the Deans Council.
- 88/89-22 Motion to approve APPC resolution concerning faculty salaries.
- 88/89-23 Above motion tabled until referendum of General Faculty can be carried out and results reported back to Faculty Senate.

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THESE MINUTES:

- Evaluation and Reward of Teaching Effectiveness: A Report by the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
- 1987-88 Annual Report on Writing Across the Curriculum Programs: Intercollegiate Writing Committee.
- Promotion and Tenure Outcomes at the University of Arizona, 1984-85 through 1988-89.