

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, January 16, 1984 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, January 16, 1984, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Sixty-two members were present with Senate Chairperson Rebecca Kellogg presiding.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Antinoro, Antley, Atwater, Battan, Berliner, Brand, Butler, Chen, Chiasson, Cole, Cosart, Dickinson, Dickstein, Dinham, Dufficy, Eisner, Epstein, Fahey, Fleming, Flemming, Foster, Fox, Garcia, Goetinck, Gourley, Hasselmo, Hegland, Heigl, Hetrick, Irving, Jensen, Kellogg, Kettel, Koffler, Laird, Lamb, Longman, MacLeod, Maher, Mautner, McCullough, Myers, Nevins, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Parmenter, Pellman, G. Peterson, Proctor, Prosser, Reeves, Roemer, Rollins, Schneider, Shanfield, Sorensen, Spece, Steelink, Stevenson, Thompson, Witte, and Woodard. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Altman, Anthony, Beigel, Bried, Cardon, Demorest, Farr, Frank, Gallagher, Gimello, Jones, Kinkade, Levitt, Maddock, Marcus, Mayersohn, Moffatt, Munsinger, J. O'Brien, R. Peterson, Rehm, Roby, Scott, Smith, and Zukoski.

ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES: The Senate accepted the minutes of the November 21, 1983 meeting and the December 5, 1983 meeting as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: Dr. Koffler said that since it had been some time since we had met he had several comments. The first deals with the President's Advisory Council. He had decided to terminate that body. The Council has been in existence since the 1920s and for many years was the principal advisory and consultative body of the University. It considered a wide range of matters from course proposals to new programs to academic calendars. In the past 10 to 15 years as the University has grown there has been a marked erosion of the Council's responsibility. Its various functions have been assumed by the Faculty Senate, the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council. For some years now the Advisory Council has considered matters already considered by other bodies and has duplicated actions taken elsewhere. Further, most members of the Advisory Council are members of other groups which consider the same matters.

Dr. Koffler stated that he had appointed a new committee on the Conditions of Professional Service, which would be chaired by Vice Provost Wilkening. The committee would contain two members of the Senate Committee on Academic Procedures, Dr. Ingram and Senator Dickstein. Last month the Board of Regents adopted a new policy statement which concerns conditions of employment for academic professionals and service professionals at all three universities. At the same time, the Regents decided that managerial professionals would be subject to Conditions of Administrative Service. The committee must consider in detail what arrangements must be made on this campus to apply the new policies which are to take effect July 1, 1984.

Dr. Koffler next stated he wished to refer to the Governor's budget recommendations for 1984-85. He said he understood that Dr. Paplanus would present

a more detailed statement later on and did not wish to duplicate his remarks. However, he wished to make one point relevant to the Senate discussion of library funds. The executive recommendation does incorporate the University's proposal that the library acquisition budget be increased by 26 per cent to make up for earlier losses.

Dr. Koffler said that last weekend the Board of Regents met in Tempe and three items of their agenda were of particular interest. First, the University was authorized to implement a graduate minor in Gerontology. The new minor will become an important focal point for our activities in this area. Second, the University was authorized to re-finance or to acquire through lease-purchase arrangement a total of \$5,000,000 in computing equipment over the next three years. We will make substantial purchases still this year. This has been delayed somewhat waiting for the final report of the Task Force on Information Services. This becomes even more important when taken in conjunction with the recently announced gift of \$2,000,000 from National Cash Register Corporation to the Department of Management Information Systems. This will create an impact on our outreach activities as well as our teaching and research efforts. Dr. Koffler stated he also informed the Regents of the recent agreement with the Digital Equipment Corporation which represented a total of a \$650,000 donation which will be used for equipment throughout the University. He stated we are definitely making headway in our data processing areas.

The Regents also authorized the University to enter into discussion with the Pima County Board of Supervisors with a view to possible acquisition of Kino Community Hospital. However, he stated it must be made clear that any recommendation which is forthcoming must not involve new State funds. These discussions are just beginning.

Dr. Koffler stated he wanted to make a final comment on two matters relating to retirement. It has been suggested that changes be made in the State Retirement System so that employees' retirement contributions not be liable to taxation. The Board of Regents staff and the administration of the three universities are working on this matter. Some aspects, of course, are controlled by IRS regulations and the issues are not going to be easily resolved.

A more immediate matter involves Senate Bill 1025, which would initially reduce both employee and State retirement contributions from 7 per cent to 6.2 per cent, effective July 1984, and would establish different retirement rates to each year to 1988. This would not affect benefits of those under the State Retirement plan but would seriously reduce retirement benefits for those under optional plans, such as TIAA-CREF. This weekend the three presidents of the three universities agreed upon a statement which is to be sent to key members of the Legislature, urging that State and employee contributions to the retirement program remain at 7 per cent.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Dinham said she wished to express appreciation to Professor Myers for his assuming the role of Chairman of the Faculty in her absence during October, November and December. She appreciated his fine sense of discretion.

She asked the deans to either at a department heads' meeting or college faculty meeting make special mention of the fact that the Faculty Senate college representative elections are forthcoming. Faculty should be alerted to that fact.

Senator Dinham also asked the deans to indicate to their faculties that they now have a choice. They have two commencements to choose between rather than

one to avoid. We need to be sure that the attention of the faculty is drawn to the more personalized aspect of commencement that took place in December by the faculty accompanying the students in the academic procession.

She commented that the Senate is aware of Dean Windsor's retirement and there have been discussions between the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Chairman of the Faculty about combining the secretarial activities into one office.

Dr. Dinham said she had a comment pertaining to President Koffler's remarks about the Advisory Council. There were two aspects that concerned her. Her understanding was that the Advisory Council has a constitutionally prescribed role dealing with probation and disqualification. She wants to be sure that these educational and teaching-related activities do not get lost in the shuffle. Further, with the substitution of the Deans' Council for the Advisory Council, some who were members of the Advisory Council are no longer in a consultative role with the assembled deans and President. Among those is the Chairman of the Faculty. So there is at present no forum other than this one of deans and the President in which the Chairman of the Faculty has a discussing relationship. It is, of course, true that the faculty as a general group through the Senate and Senate committees have access to administrators who advise the President. But her concern is about the lack of contact between the Chairman of the Faculty and the assembled group of deans, vice presidents and the President. Dr. Dinham then asked Senator Myers if he had any comments which he wished to make.

Senator Myers stated that evidently many faculty members read the minutes of the Senate meeting word-for-word because an erroneous statement he had made had been called to his attention. In the Senate minutes of December 5, Senator Myers had stated that federal employees do not contribute to their retirement accounts. The fact is, federal employees do contribute to their retirement accounts. Thus, he was in error in that statement and wished to correct it. He said he believed he was correct that military employees do not contribute to their retirement accounts.

Senator Myers stated that he was now speaking as a member of the Benefits Committee and wished to comment on the retirement contribution rate which Dr. Koffler had referred to earlier. He had written to several legislators concerning this problem. He suspected that if the retirement contribution rate for those under the optional programs was maintained at 7 per cent and for those under the State plan reduced to 6.2 per cent, this would present additional problems.

The current funding rate of the retirement program is about 90 per cent. This is enormously higher than practically any other retirement program. Some years ago it was at about 67 per cent. This is considered fairly high. This means that there is money available for vastly increased benefits under the State program, and we should press for increased benefits. Among them would be to make permanent those retirement provisions that were temporarily available this past year, namely using the highest three-year salary rate, instead of the highest five-year, and to make all past service count at 2 per cent rather than $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Further, we should press for providing improved retirement benefits for older employees who have already retired under a much lower rate, and perhaps we should request that future benefit rates be increased to 2.25 per cent. He suggested that the Senate by means of a resolution may wish to express displeasure at the attempt to change the standing practice that the State is required to

contribute at the rate of 7 per cent. The State is attempting to settle State budget problems at the expense of the participants in the State Retirement System.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Senator Proctor said he wished to extend personal and heartfelt thanks to those faculty who made Winter Commencement so memorable. He felt it was a memorable occasion and was an example of what could be accomplished when we made our minds up to do something.

He stated that this evening the Associated Students at the University of Arizona is sponsoring a town hall for off-campus students to address parking problems, landlord-tenant relationships, etc. ASUA is also arranging meetings with the faculties of the Mathematics and English Departments, as well as with the Dean of Students Office to work out some problems that students experience in introductory courses in those areas and also work out fee payments for those students who have to take placement examinations.

Senator Proctor referred to a document from the Committee on University Planning concerning the relative State appropriation to higher education in Arizona. He stated that the Arizona Students Association and the Associated Students of the University of Arizona will pursue this information very actively this year. He also stated that ASUA will stay involved in the production and filming of the "Revenge of the Nerds" in order to minimize any negative effects that may reflect on the University of Arizona.

Senator Proctor said that Senate Bill 1061 which proposes raising the out-of-state tuition to 100 per cent of the cost of education, and in-state tuition to 25 per cent of the cost of education over the next three years will be contested by both ASUA and ASA because they believe that this is a usurpation of the Regents' authority to set tuition.

There are two Student Regent bills being introduced in the State Legislature this year. Representative Cooper is sponsoring House Bill 2053 which calls for a Student Regent without a vote for the next three years with a sunset clause. In the Senate through Senator Lindeman's Committee on Education a bill is being introduced which is basically the same but would carry a vote for the Student Regent. Senator Proctor said it was hopeful that the vote provision could be added to the House Bill in Conference Committee.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE SENATE: Senator Kellogg said that the College of Nursing has selected a replacement for Senator DeWalt. They had elected Professor Longman. She asked the Senate by consent to confirm that college's choice. Senator Longman was then welcomed to the Faculty Senate.

Senator Kellogg stated that the University has added a new vice president; therefore she wished to welcome Vice President Beigel to the Senate. However, he was unable to attend today.

Senator Kellogg also stated that she will include with the minutes of this meeting lists of the members of all Senate committees (Copies attached). This would be quite helpful to faculty and the Senate to be able to contact individuals about particular Senate matters.

She referred to Item 4a of the agenda, calling for a report from the Committee on Academic Procedures. Senator Thompson has decided that he would no longer be chairman of that committee, but he would continue to serve on the committee. The committee has chosen Professor Helen Ingram as chair. She is

not a Senator; therefore the Senate needs to make provision for receiving the report from the committee. Two options present themselves. The report could be given by a member of that committee who is also a member of the Senate, or the Senate could give consent to the chairman to address the Senate. Since Senator Kellogg's discussions with the Executive Committee are not final concerning a standing procedure for this situation, she asked that Professor Ingram be allowed to present the report of the Committee on Academic Procedures. The Senate granted that request.

REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROCEDURES: Professor Ingram stated that the committee has been working on revisions of the Constitution and Bylaws. This was not meant to be an ambitious enterprise, but was to simply bring the Constitution in line with present practices. However, they discovered that upon bringing the Constitution up to present practice, they ended up with some contradictions and differences in level of detail between what was in the Bylaws and what was in the Constitution; so the committee would like to take another month or so to provide a better document for the Senate to consider. So, the committee would like to report on the Constitution and Bylaws in March. However, because elections need to be held in a timely fashion, that part of the Constitution that deals with election of the Presiding Officer of the Senate and standing committees will be considered in February.

Professor Ingram further stated that the committee anticipated involvement in other issues. Among them are the Conditions of Professional Service and an expected role in dealing with the women's faculty salary equity adjustment issues.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING: Senator Paplanus said that the Planning Committee has been asked to address the relative decrease in Legislative appropriation for higher education over the past few years. The graph distributed to the Senate (attached to these minutes) illustrates the problem. Over the past six years higher education has had an increase in appropriations of approximately 56.9 per cent. This is relatively low compared with other appropriations in the State. It is fairly clear that this is a long-term problem which will probably become more severe as more and more demands are made on the limited amount of State revenue. As problems of crime, deterioration of highways, and other matters have risen, there has been a redistribution of legislative priorities. It seems clear that there is a need to attempt to reverse this trend. There has been a fair amount of discussion concerning the best strategy for doing this. Since the University cannot lobby, one effective way for dealing with the problem is for individuals as individuals to work with the State legislators who represent them in order to make them better informed about the contribution of the University to the welfare of the State. The approach should be positive emphasizing why higher education deserves more support. The faculty should make it clear that they are acting as individuals rather than as representatives of the University.

Senator Paplanus further said that the Faculty Senate on January 17, 1983, endorsed the taking of legal and administrative action required to qualify contributions to the Arizona State Retirement System plan and optional retirement plans for federal income tax deferment. The Senate requested the President of the University as a matter of urgency to discuss the matter with the Arizona Universities Presidents Council with the aim of having the three State universities and the Board of Regents assert their full influence in support of this move. The Planning Committee had been asked to report the status of this request and the committee can report at this time that the

matter is actively being pursued by the Arizona Board of Regents Legislative Committee.

Finally, the Planning Committee was given the opportunity to review the Executive budget for 1984-85. The recommended budget for the U of A main campus is \$322,000,000 vs. \$303,000,000 for 83-84. Nine decision packages have been recommended more or less in the order in which the University presented them. The Executive budget recommends that there be a 1.5 million dollar adjustment in our budget based on the one faculty member for each 22 full-time equivalent student ratio. This is a function of our declining enrollment.

Finally, the matter of salary adjustments has been discussed. The numbers at this time are not quite clear. However, a recommendation of a 5.7 per cent salary adjustment has been made. This is not to be an across-the-board adjustment, but a matter of individual adjustments ranging from 2.5 to 7.5 per cent.

Senator Garcia said he had a question concerning the decision packages. Did the Planning Committee advise concerning the priorities assigned to these decision packages? Senator Paplanus replied that the Planning Committee was given the opportunity to review the decision packages prior to their being forwarded. We made a number of recommendations which were taken into account in the final ranking of the decision packages. Senator Garcia asked if that meant that the final order was the order which the Planning Committee had recommended. Senator Paplanus replied that it did not mean that because their input was not the compelling factor in the ordering of the priorities of the decision packages. However, the Planning Committee's input did make a difference in the order of the packages.

REPORT ON THE LIBRARY: Senator Kellogg indicated that Senator Laird would be available to answer any questions. She referred to the letter which had been distributed to members of the Senate from Dr. Koffler regarding the library. Senator Kellogg asked if there were any questions. Senator MacLeod stated that he wished to talk on behalf of an organization known as the Faculty Library Action Committee, a group of about 300 faculty concerned over the library situation. He said he wished to express a feeling of encouragement that Dr. Koffler has asked the State for increased funds for library acquisition and also expressed dismay that the library has not reached its earlier position held in 1981-82 as far as acquisitions are concerned. Senator MacLeod stated that the library is the main place of work and research for many faculty members and expressed regret that this workplace seems to have been deteriorating over the past two years and hoped that the situation would be rectified fairly soon. He asked if Senator Laird wished to respond to that.

Senator Laird said he, too, had the same concerns. There are some ways in which the University of Arizona Library is still in fair shape compared on a national basis. One of these is the proportion we spend on acquisitions compared to that spent on other things. On the national scene, the median is 31 per cent. For 81-82 the University's percentage was 43 per cent, and in 83-84 the projections were still above 40 per cent.

Senator Eisner asked if Senator Laird's figures were based on the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) figures. Senator Laird replied that they were based partially on those figures.

Senator Eisner asked where we stood now in relation to earlier rankings. He stated that we were 17th in the nation last year. Senator Laird replied that

he did not have the complete figures. Senator Eisner asked when the figures would be available and Senator Laird responded that they should be out within the next month. Senator Eisner then asked if we could have these figures at the next meeting of the Senate.

Senator MacLeod directed the Senate's attention to the table on the back of President Koffler's letter pointing out that the acquisitions total had decreased from \$3,485,702 in 1981-82 to \$3,232,000 in 1983-84, this at a time when book and journal inflation far exceeds inflation that we normally experience. Therefore the cut in acquisitions is considerable over the past 2 years.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Senator Atwater reported that the charge of their committee was to determine the number and distribution of seats allocated to elected college representatives of the Faculty Senate. The Constitution provides that there shall be two elected members of the Senate for each ex-officio member. Since there are 26 ex-officio members of the Faculty Senate, there must be 52 elected representatives. Twenty of the 52 are "at-large" members and were elected in 1983. Of the remaining 32 members, one must be elected from each of the colleges (12 including the non-college group). The remaining 20 members will be elected in proportion to the number of faculty members of each college.

Senator Atwater then asked the Senate to refer to the table which had been distributed earlier to Senate members (copy attached to these minutes). The number of voting faculty had been provided to the committee by the Office of Planning and Budgeting. Column 3 is the percentage that each college faculty makes of the total of the entire voting faculty. The committee recommends that the number and distribution of college representatives elected in 1984 be as listed in Column 7 on the accompanying table.

Senator Atwater pointed out that there was a problem concerning the College of Arts and Sciences. There are four faculties involved and at present eight members of the Faculty Senate would be elected from that college if we followed the rules of the Constitution, with no subdivision of those 658 members into their various college faculties.

Senator Dinham then moved that the recommendations represented in Column 7 including the addition of one for the non-college group be adopted for the 1984-86 terms of office, and secondly that the Arts and Sciences distribution be arranged proportionately according to the sizes of the four faculties so that each Arts and Sciences faculty is treated distinctly. This motion was seconded and Senator Dinham asked if she could now make some explanation. She said that one way of handling the four faculties and eight seats would be to give each faculty two seats. However, the sizes of the faculties are sufficiently different that some sort of proportional mechanism would seem to be better. A proportional mechanism would clearly give Sciences three of the eight seats; Fine Arts, one; Humanities, one; and Social and Behavioral Sciences, two. Her recommendation would be then for this coming two-year period that we make the allocation of seven of the eight in the way that our dialogue has just now represented, and that the eighth seat in Arts and Sciences be designated as an "at-large" Arts and Sciences seat.

Senator Chiasson asked if we could see what the fractions are before we donate that extra seat to non-college faculty. Senator Chiasson said he was questioning whether or not Arts and Sciences would not gain an additional

seat in the reapportionment of those into the three colleges because the fraction could be over .5 in more than one faculty. Senator Dinham replied that her recollection from the mathematics indicated that the answer was no. Senator Atwater replied that these were estimated figures because the precise number of voting faculty within each faculty had not been accurately determined. At this point, Senator Shanfield asked if this could be separated into two motions. Senator Kellogg asked if the maker of the motion and the seconder of the motion had any objections to breaking this up into two motions. There were no objections.

Senator Myers then stated that if we are going to use the rational designating how many seats go to each of the four faculties we should logically give each one of the four faculties one seat, then apportion the remaining. Senator Dinham said that she believed that Senator Myers' remarks referred to the second motion. Senator Kellogg said that Senator Myers was referring to Column 4 of the table and proposing that instead of giving one seat for Arts and Sciences there should be four seats representing the four faculties.

Senator Berliner asked if we were making recommendations regarding the allocation of seats to a particular college, would we be in violation of the Constitution and have to change it? The Constitution speaks of colleges and makes no mention of faculties.

Senator Kellogg replied that the Constitution, Section III, F., 10 indicates that the Senate does have general responsibility over the elections. She pointed out that the Constitution also refers to a formula for allocation and specifically refers to colleges. Thus, the Constitution may have to be changed if the kind of change Senator Myers has proposed is adopted. Senator Berliner replied that the Constitution is clear, and all we can do is make recommendations.

Parliamentarian Sankey stated that Senator Berliner is technically correct. The Senate does not have the authority to dictate to a college how to elect the senators from that college.

Senator Garcia said the issue was still open as to whether the College of Arts and Sciences should have one representative or four. Senator Kellogg stated that the distinction is in the word "college". She stated that at this point she would like to hear from Senator Hasselmo and get his opinion on this matter.

Senator Hasselmo stated that this was indeed an unusual situation and he suggested that the matter be referred to the four deans to see if they could resolve it.

At this point, a Senator called for the question. The motion to close debate was passed. The Senate then considered Senator Dinham's first motion. It, too, carried.

Senator Kellogg then stated that as Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate she wished to request that the four deans of Arts and Sciences consider the matter of the four faculties and then requested that they, the four deans, including the coordinating dean, bring the discussion to the Senate in February.

Senator Dinham said she had some major concerns. One was that those faculty members who want to stand for election for next year have sufficient time to do so, therefore this matter must be resolved early in February. Her

second concern was that the four faculties represented each find a way to be adequately represented.

Senator Myers stated that there is no provision for the deans to make a decision about this. This is in the hands of the Senate and in the hands of the General Faculty. The Senators representing a given college are elected by members of that college, but the election is not conducted by the college. So it is inappropriate and out-of-order for a decision to be made by the deans of the college about the apportionment. Senator Kellogg stated that she was asking that they bring their review to the Senate and was not asking for them to make a decision. Senator Myers said that this was still out-of-order. He believed that the only thing we could do was simply to elect eight senators-at-large from the College of Arts and Sciences.

At this point, Senator Chiasson asked for a point of information. He asked if Senator Dinham had withdrawn her motion regarding apportionment. Senator Kellogg stated that she had not and the matter was still before the Senate.

Senator Paplanus asked if it would be more appropriate for the four deans involved to meet with the current senators from the College of Arts and Sciences to discuss the problem and decide what would be an appropriate course of action. Senator Kellogg replied that it would not be appropriate.

Senator G. Peterson stated that the Constitution simply says that a minimum of one faculty member shall be elected from each college. It does not place any restriction on how each college chooses to elect its faculty members. They could elect them by telling the dean to appoint them. The Senate has no authority to tell the college how to elect its representatives. Therefore, he believed it would be appropriate for the Parliamentarian to rule this whole thing out-of-order and let the College of Arts and Sciences elect their representatives in whatever manner they deem fit.

Senator Kellogg said we needed to get on with the business of the Senate since there was a faculty meeting immediately following to consider honorary degrees. She stated that the second motion that was before the Senate was that the College of Arts and Sciences seats be arrived at in proportion to the number of faculty members within each faculty.

Senator Garcia said if we defeat this motion and then there is no motion before the Senate, then the College of Arts and Sciences will find a way to solve the problem. Senator Antinoro said he must pose a technical problem. The files required to send out voting information to the various faculties cannot be modified in time, so if the Senate were to decide to send the information out via the different faculties, technically it could not be done. So, in effect, the election could only be done on an "at-large" basis. Senator Witte moved that we table Senator Dinham's motion and explore the various constitutional aspects raised for next year's election. The motion to table was carried.

REQUEST FOR TEMPORARY CHANGES IN HONORARY DEGREE PROCEDURE: Senator Thompson referred to Dr. Koffler's letter which had been distributed to the Senate explaining the rationale for proposed changes for honorary degrees for the Centennial Year only.

This proposal was generated because of the extraordinary circumstances due to the increased number of honorary degrees to be awarded during the

Centennial year. Senator Thompson referred to page 1 of the Schedule (page 3 of the handout) and indicated that there should be some changes made on that Schedule. It was never the intention of the Centennial Committee or the group that drew up this document to substitute the wisdom of the Centennial Committee for the colleges' in the nomination for degrees, only to provide a mechanism whereby that group would have an opportunity to participate in the process. Therefore, on the first full paragraph of page 1 of the Schedule, on the 6th line down, the committee wished to substitute after the words, "nominated by the Centennial Committee", delete the phrase, "rather than by" and insert the phrase, "with close cooperation with", so the last part of the sentence would read, "nominated by the Centennial Committee with close cooperation with the colleges". To further clarify this Senator Thompson stated that in the Schedule on the bottom left of the page, under January 17, the words, "for all six Centennial events, especially", should be inserted between 1985 and Founders' Day, so that the terminology should now read as follows, "President calls for nominations for 1985 for all six Centennial events, especially Founders' Day, Spring Commencement, etc." And the last item for April 15 should read as follows, "President requests college opinions for all six Centennial events."

Senator Dinham stated that the major question had been concern about the traditional role of the faculty in the awarding of honorary degrees. She asked Senator Thompson to explain what was meant by the term, "close cooperation".

Professor Thompson said he would like to think of it in terms of the Inaugural event at which time they hoped to have some very distinguished people here to speak to the faculty and the community. Some discussions have already been held with the deans concerning speakers, performers, and other individuals. They have tried to identify individuals who would not only serve the purposes of the Centennial, but would also be acceptable individuals in terms of candidates for honorary degrees. So by close cooperation Senator Thompson stated he means it in the fullest sense of the word and we would not want to move ahead on a speaker or performer who was not acceptable as a candidate for an honorary degree from this institution. Senator Dinham asked if we could insure then that cooperation would include approval, ratification, or nomination by a given college or combination of colleges for all degrees. Senator Thompson replied that he believed that the procedure that is already in place, indicating that the President would request college opinions for all six Centennial events provides that these proposals adopted last year provides at that time for these nominations which have received administrative screening would then go back to the colleges for faculty approval. That is already built into the procedure that we adopted last year and that is what is meant by the referral back to the colleges. The committee did not feel that it was necessary to spell out everyone of those steps because those are already in place. Senator Cole stated that the policy has already been approved by the Senate and the committee was simply operating under the existing policy.

Senator Myers stated that the document we adopted last May and this document make no reference to faculty, just colleges, could that be clarified? Senator Thompson replied that colleges only exist because there are faculties; therefore, the two are closely intertwined. Senator Myers referred to the College of Arts and Sciences which has four faculties. He asked who would act? Would the faculty act or would the college act?

Senator Thompson replied that the tradition at this University has been that faculties make the decisions. The policy adopted last May only codifies that language. This discussion seemed to be relative to the earlier one regarding reapportionment. It is up to the College of Arts and Sciences how it wishes to

approve its recommendations for honorary degrees.

Senator Cole stated that this schedule is the basic difference from a policy that has been established. We are operating under the policy that has been established by the Senate. The fact that it says college opinions and not college faculty is, I think at this point, immaterial. I believe the document states that we will operate under the existing policy with the changes in schedule. We are not considering changing the policy; however, the committee is concerned about the policy and will make recommendations concerning the policy at some future time. A motion to adopt the temporary change in schedule was approved by the Senate. The change in schedule was then approved by the Senate. (A copy of the schedule as approved by the Seante is attached to these minutes.)

NOTE: At this point the Senate went into Executive Session.

APPROVAL OF HONORARY DEGREES: The Senate approved one recommendation from the Faculty of Fine Arts, one recommendation from the Faculty of Humanities, one recommendation from the Faculty of Sciences, and one recommendation from the College of Medicine that certain honorary degrees be conferred by the University of Arizona at the May 1984 Commencement. These proposals next will be acted upon by the General Faculty of the University of Arizona and then by the Arizona Board of Regents. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:43 o'clock.



David Butler, Secretary pro tem



Herman D. Carrillo, Assistant Secretary pro tem

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF JANUARY 16, 1984

1. Ratification of election of Alice Longman as Nursing representative, replacing Evelyn DeWalt.
2. Approval of motion that the number and distribution of college representatives elected in 1984 be as recommended by the ad hoc Committee to Reapportion Membership by College as represented in Col. 7 of the committee's table, including the addition of one college representative for the non-college group.
3. Approval of motion to adopt a temporary change in the Honorary Degree Policy schedule for honorary degrees to be conferred during the Centennial year.
4. Approval of certain honorary degrees to be conferred at May 1974 Commencement.