

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, February 4, 1985 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, February 4, 1985, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Fifty-eight members were present. President Dinham presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Aquilano, Atwater, Bootman, Brand, Cavitt, Chen, Cole, Demorest, Dickinson, Dinham, Duncan, Emery, Ewbank, Fahey, Farr, Fox, Garcia, Goetinck, Gourley, Hasselmo, Hetrick, Hill, Irving, Kettel, Koffler, Laird, Lytle, McCullough, Mishel, Myers, Nach, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Obst, Paplanus, Peterson, Phipps, Prosser, Rehm, Ridge, Robinson, Roby, Roemer, Rollins, Rund, Sacken, Salzman, Scott, Shanfield, Sharkey, Silver, Smith, Sorensen, Stevenson, Wert, Witte, and Zukoski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Altman, Antinoro, Beigel, Butler, Cardon, Cunningham, Dickstein, Ebeltoft, Epstein, Flemming, Gimello, Hegland, D. Jones, L. Jones, Kellogg, Kelly, Kinkade, Kuehl, MacLeod, Marcus, Parmenter, Steelink, Swalin, Tuchi, Woodard, and Zube.

CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY REPORT: Chairman Dinham noted that there was a revised schedule for election dates, because last year the Senate changed the date that newly elected faculty would take office--May 1 rather than September 1. She also announced that Faculty Elections for 1985-86 were underway with nominating petitions.

Chairman Dinham announced that Senate meetings would begin at 3:15 for this semester, because of room scheduling problems.

She said that the Senate's Reorganization Procedures called for a report to the Senate from each Reorganization Committee, and Senators received in their meeting packet such a report from the Engineering/Mines Reorganization Committee. She called on Senator Aleamoni, chairman of that committee, for the dates set for hearings; Senator Aleamoni said that the hearings, scheduled to permit other academic units affected by the reorganization to have input into the proposed reorganization, are scheduled as follows: February 7, 3:30-5, Student Union 251; February 11 and 12, 3:30-5, Student Union 355.

Chairman Dinham said that among the items Senators found on their desks today was a letter to the Senate from the "Mega" Committee. She urged that any suggestions for change be communicated to any of the "Mega" Committee members listed on the report, so that whatever the Committee proposes at the March meeting will reflect all points of view. The committees will be formed during March and April in order to begin activity by May 1.

Chairman Dinham next referred to a letter from a Department Head at ASU which was distributed to Senators (attached to Minutes) and which was relevant to the agenda item on Selection and Review of Department Heads. That letter recently came to the attention of the Committee of Eleven, and they wished to

share it with the Senate.

Lastly, she reported there will be another another split of one department into two, which some people might have thought of as a reorganization. The Department of Radiology has split its Radiation Oncology section off into another department. After consultation with the four Senators from the College of Medicine about whether that constitutes a reorganization, she decided that it didn't, for two reasons:

1. It is a clean split between two sections, and
2. Sections in Departments in Medicine are often very separate operations, so this is a fairly easy split budgetarily.

The topic has already received a great deal of discussion in the College of Medicine faculty including a vote in a faculty meeting, she said.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 21, 1985: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (motion 85-6) to accept the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 1985 as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT: I wanted to report on our Hearing last Friday in the House regarding our budget. This proceeded basically from the recommendations of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. These recommendations, fortunately, are considerably better than the Governor's.

To summarize some salient features as far as the Main Campus is concerned:

- There was an increase requested of \$23 million in expenditure authority. (Expenditure authority includes the General Fund appropriation plus tuition income, so it represents the basis of our expenditure funds.) The JLBC recommendation was \$12.6 million, certainly not so much as the Regents recommended, but a recommendation that we can use as a good basis to start from in our negotiations. Now, a good portion of that is annualization of the salary increases which were paid in January.
- In terms of decision packages, the Board requested \$11.8 million and the JLBC staff recommended \$4.7 million, again, considerably less than we asked for but, nevertheless, quite a good beginning.
- I think Provost Hasselmo mentioned that, regrettably, there is a faculty reduction item of 24 positions because of a decrease in enrollments, which corresponds to \$800,000. We argued, I think quite persuasively, that this cut should not be made, but what happens remains to be seen. Basically, many of us believe that this 22:1 formula, which created growth during the past, to some extent is really not valid. The difficulty is that on the way up we took advantage of it, and on the way down we want to get rid of it, and that is not a very persuasive way of dealing with it. We do not anticipate enrollment drops to continue much longer. Very likely there will be an increase in total numbers, if not next year then the year after. I think it is wasteful to dismantle things and start them all over again. Universities do not function very well in this regard.

- In the College of Medicine the expenditure authority requested was \$3.4 million over this year, and the JLBC recommended \$1.8 million. They recommended only one specific decision package of a modest \$30,000. Altogether the my own impression is that it's a very good beginning for us to negotiate for larger amounts, during the rest of the legislative session.
- I am really quite optimistic. Now this does not include salary increases as you know. The Board requested an 11.9% increase. All the recommendations, so far, are 9.3%, again, not too far from where we recommended. We will certainly keep on arguing for higher salaries since this is my number one priority.
- I know that the Senate and the faculty in general, including myself, are very much interested in the possibility that tax-deferred status might be given to University employees' retirement contribution. I think you will be pleased to know that the Board of Regents is supporting legislation, during the present session, to make this a reality. It seems that we have a fighting chance of accomplishing it this this year.
- I think you have read of a variety of administrative changes to have taken effect February 1. I'd like to review them. They were brought about partly because of the arrival of Dr. Ben Tuchi, the Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, but also, at the same time, to some extent brought about by Vice President Peterson's departure. I have appointed George Cunningham as Vice President for Administrative Services. In that role he will report to Ben Tuchi. In his legislative activities, he will report to me directly, as he does now. But there are to be three Associate Vice Presidents who will take over a great deal of the daily operation: Sarah Blake, Associate Vice President for Finance; Bill Varney, who will have broadened responsibilities as Associate Vice President for Administration; and John Monnier who will become Associate Vice President for Information Services. We will try to consolidate all computer and tele-communications activities under one individual, very much as the Task Force on Information Services originally recommended. I think, basically, this is largely a reshuffling of individuals because, in essence, it eliminates one position. But it is my belief that this will result in a considerably more effective situation for all of us.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST: Provost Hasselmo emphasized the Faculty and Community Centennial series, a series of lectures intended to feature the important contributions made by the faculty at the University of Arizona (attached to Minutes).

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: Senator Stevenson commented on the University's Mission and Scope Statement. Recently, he said, the Committee of Eleven and the Senate Planning Committee took a look at the Mission and Scope Statement and, "at least as I understood it," have some very deep reservations about the content. "I would hope that in the reworking of the document in the next few weeks and months that it would take into consideration an increased emphasis on undergraduate education. It has a heavy research emphasis which I think is good if it's carried out to the proper degree which

would be that in order to have an excellent undergraduate education, research is necessary but that there is a distinction between a research institute and a research university. A research university implies the conveyance of education to undergraduates, graduates, and a quality education at that. So I look forward to the reworking of the document and hope that it stresses at least the intent that I think the University is trying to get at."

He also said that at this month's Board of Regents meeting, the three student government associations will be providing comment on some aspects of undergraduate education that students are concerned with. He passed out a flyer called "The Student Is..." (attached to Minutes).

Updating on the proposed mandatory Mathematics Proficiency Exam, he said there have been a few meetings, and concern centers around the fee that may accompany the test for entering freshmen.

He requested that student input be included in the review of deans.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROCEDURES: Senator Farr deferred until the Committee's recommendation under Agenda Item #10.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY PLANNING: Senator Peterson said at their last meeting the Planning Committee reviewed the Mission and Scope Statement with Provost Hasselmo. There was general concern in the committee that the present draft version does not reflect the fundamental mission of the University in teaching in an appropriate manner. In fact, he said, the very first statement in the present draft states, "The fundamental driving force of the University is research," and "I consider that a very unfortunate statement." The basic schedule on this document is that following some further revision it is to go to the Regents staff on March 2 and through the various review levels, and will then come back to campus late in April for further review and will finally go to the Regents about June 1.

The next item that the committee will be concerned with is the 10-year plan for University construction, which was drawn up at the first of this year.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS: Senator Dickinson deferred his report until the Committee's recommendation was discussed in agenda item 7.

REPORT FROM THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON SALARY ADJUSTMENTS: No report.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Witte said she felt probably most faculty did consider the split of Radiology to be a reorganization, but it was one that was handled openly.

Senator Fahey asked a question of Senator Peterson regarding his referral to the Mission and Scope Statement. She said she is on the Tri-University Committee on Minority Student Recruitment and one concern is that there is nothing in that statement which referred to any commitment on the part of the University system.

CONSIDERATION OF COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS'S RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING A NEW ASUA TEACHER/COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE: Senator Dickinson submitted for background and discussion an informational questionnaire, developed by the committee and primarily by student members, to obtain information about how classes are evaluated on campus. He said the committee met last Monday and discussed the questionnaire, and found some additional areas for revision. He asked the Senate to take a close look at it and let the committee know what suggestions they might have for changes or improvements. Senator Shanfield asked what the purpose of the questionnaire would be. Senator Dickinson responded that the purpose was to distribute it to the student body in general, to try to provide more information about classes, how evaluations are done. Senator Garcia asked if this would be prepared in the form of a booklet including a summary of student evaluations for the course and instructor. Senator Dickinson said he thought the idea was just as a separate publication, an information publication about the courses--not an evaluation of the courses.

RATIFICATION OF ARIZONA UNIVERSITIES FACULTY COUNCIL (AUFC) PLANNED INCORPORATION: Chairman Dinham said that the Arizona Universities Faculty Council consists of three representatives from each of the three faculties: the Chairman of the Faculty, and two other people defined within the faculty. She then called upon Senator Roemer, who stated that the AUFC had been in existence for about 10 years, and perhaps its biggest value is the opportunity to exchange information on various issues of concern to faculty within the three University campuses in this state. The concurrent resolution asking recognition of the AUFC as the coordinating organization for the faculties of the three Universities is being presented to the Faculty Senates on the three University campuses. Senator Roemer so moved, and the motion (85-7) was seconded. The vote was called and the motion was approved unanimously.

REPORT FROM SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE: Dr. Stevenson said he would not read the report (attached to Minutes) aloud, but would answer questions. Senator Zukoski asked if the IAC had anything to do with making parking decisions concerning athletic events. Dr. Stevenson did not recall if that matter had come up or not. Senator Zukoski said he would like to have an answer, next year at this time perhaps.

Secretary Ridge asked about statistics on the commitment to recreational facilities for the students; expressing a belief that there has been nothing but a general decline, and a report every year about a commitment to an increase. Dr. Stevenson: "I don't know of any statistics. I've been on this committee two years, and I probably won't be around to see it myself, but I believe by 1990 there will be a full-time facility similar to the one at the University of Colorado. Secretary Ridge: What specifically has been done as far as recreational facilities? Dr. Stevenson: Nothing yet, but the baseball field is to become general student use, a recreational facility. That's a major commitment. Secretary Ridge: Is there any time frame? Dr. Stevenson: There was a time frame that has been put back by lack of revenue. Secretary Ridge noted that every student pays for this in registration fees. Dr. Stevenson suggested that when Dr. Dempsey is before the Senate, he be questioned on the subject.

In response to further questions, Senator Stevenson added that ASUA and Dr. Woodard are currently undertaking plans for both short-term and long-term recreation. By short term, he meant such projects as more weights in Bear

Down, and lighting the tennis courts. Senator Hasselmo said that Dr. Dempsey does come annually to the Senate to make a report, and he also arranged a special session early in the fall to which he invited the Senate and all the Deans, and it was very poorly attended. It was a very well orchestrated session, he added. Senator Shanfield said he felt that the Senate had given Professor Stevenson a hard time; perhaps some consideration should be given to Dr. Dempsey coming before the Senate, but he felt Dr. Stevenson was not directly responsible.

DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PROCEDURE'S RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE PROVOST REGARDING CHAPTER 3 (FORMERLY VIII): After discussing the confused history of the Faculty Manual, Senator Farr said the Committee on Academic Procedures wants to offer a couple of amendments. The first deals with the appeals procedure, what happens when an individual has gone all the way through the process and received a decision on an application for promotion or tenure, and is not happy with that decision. The proposed language: "Just as decisions on promotion, tenure, and retention and non-retention of non-tenured faculty members are made by the University President, all appeal procedures must begin with the University President. However, unless appeal procedures are initiated within one month after receiving an adverse tenure or promotion decision, there is no prospect of reconsideration." Senator Myers felt this limit was "rather different from past practice...When do you start talking one month?" Senator Hasselmo: "This the date of the letter issued by the President reported to the faculty member the promotion and tenure decision." Senator Myers: "Past experiences are that sometimes those do not come out until late June. Faculty members are in some cases not on campus at that time period. Much of the machinery for helping is not available at that time period. Even if a faculty member were to make an appeal through Conciliation or the CAFT concerning key matters, one month I think is simply not a reasonable amount of time and does not recognize a variety of possibilities that may occur." Senator Hill: "I have a couple of recommendations on this point. One of them is that one month is not good. What happens if the month falls on Sunday, and I recommend you specify some number of working days. The second thing is that initiating appeal procedures is a little too vague and I think you probably want to say something like "A letter indicating the intention of the faculty member to appeal the decision must be received in the Office of the President within 'x' number of working days." Senator Farr: "That suggestion certainly seems to be within the spirit of the discussion on Academic Procedures." Senator Farr offered one possible resolution: "We could say 30 working days or October 1 or some day in the fall. Specifically these decisions are made in the spring, but once you have a date in the fall, whichever one comes later." Chairman Dinham asked him if he was considering incorporating Senator Hill's suggestion, that it be a letter received in the President's Office expressing intent to appeal Dr. Hasselmo by October 1? Senator Farr: Yes. Senator Hasselmo said that from the point of view of the Administration that would not pose any problems, just as long as the appeal can be taken care of well in advance of the end of the seventh and critical year. Senator Myers said he felt there were several questions being addressed by this: (1) the date of the time period itself, and October 1 seems like a useful time period; and (2) we also seem to be spelling out something more or different than already exists in Chapter 8 in appeal procedures. It seems to me we need to look at the rest of Chapter 8 and see how this fits in in order to be able to judge it properly. Senator Myers moved to table the action until we have further considerations and see it in context, but Chairman Dinham said the Senate now had two motions on the floor for amendments, and neither had a

second. The motion to table was then seconded and defeated.

The October 1 amendment (85-8) was seconded and then approved unanimously.

The second motion, pertaining to the way in which an appeal procedure is initiated, by receipt of a letter in the President's Office, was discussed. Senator Sacken said that he had the distinct feeling that if we accept this amendment today that we will be back having to make changes to this set of procedures. "I initially voted against Senator Myers, but it now seems like a much better idea, rather than continuing to draft." Senator Garcia: It may be that the Committee on Academic Procedures at this point in time will withdraw the main motion, and bring it back to us in March. Senator Farr said he would bow to the wisdom of Senator Garcia and take it back to the Committee.

Turning to section 8.12, Senator Farr said this one refers to the procedures to be followed at the end of the second and fourth years, when an Assistant Professor typically is either retained for another two years or not retained. The feeling of the Committee was that at the present time in many instances was exactly that--a decision without any guidance of the Assistant Professor involved. The new language: "Reappointment in rank at two and four years may be made without college or university review but assistant professors must be formally evaluated by the department head and departmental standing committee on faculty status. This evaluation shall be expressed in writing, identifying any problem areas which may preclude the granting of tenure, and given to the non-tenured faculty member." Dean Kettel: I have a little problem with the potential quantitative aspect of it. Supposing that an area occurs that wasn't listed as a problem area at the time of the letter, two years later. What is the status of this new problem that wasn't listed? The language says you are supposed to identify your problem areas which may preclude promotion and tenure, but a year and a half down the road I find a new problem area that would preclude promotion and tenure, and I apply that." Senator Farr: "My interpretation is there would be nothing to preclude that." Chairman Dinham reported that the question was called, and she took the prerogative of changing "this evaluation" to "these evaluations" because it seemed to be what most people thought reasonable. The motion (85-9) to accept the Committee on Academic Procedure's revision of section 8.12 of the Faculty Manual was then approved with one dissenting vote, as follows:

8.12, Faculty Manual. An assistant professor may be recommended for promotion, for non-retention, or for other change in status at any time during the first through sixth year of service in this rank. Before the end of a faculty member's second year at the University of Arizona in the rank of assistant professor, the faculty member shall be informed by the department head that he or she is being recommended for: (a) reappointment for a third and fourth year as assistant professor (this does not necessarily preclude consideration for promotion effective the fourth year); (b) promotion for the third year; or (c) non-retention at the expiration of the third year of service in rank. Further, before the end of the fourth year in the rank of assistant professor at the University of Arizona, a faculty member will be informed, in writing, by the department head, that he or she is being recommended for: (a) reappointment for a fifth and sixth year as assistant professor (this does not necessarily preclude consideration for promotion effective the sixth year); (b) promotion for the fifth year; or (c) non-retention at the expiration of the fifth year of service in rank. **Re-appointment in rank at two and four**

years may be made without college or university review but assistant professors must be formally evaluated by the department head and departmental standing committee on faculty status. These evaluations shall be expressed in writing, identifying any problem areas which may preclude the granting of tenure, and given to the non-tenured faculty member.

DISCUSSION OF ASUA SENATE RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL EXAM SCHEDULE CHANGE: Senator Stevenson said the measure, to alleviate any concerns Faculty Senators might have, keeps the same number of final exams per day, the same number of days of final exams. All it does is readjust the times within each day to allow one hour between each exam. Presently, a student can have as many as three exams in rapid succession, within a 7-hour period. This would reshuffle exams so there would be an hour between each final exam. The last exam currently is given from 7-9 p.m., and this revised schedule would have the last exam from 8-10 p.m. The measure had been given the endorsement of the Registrar, he said, and also has been approved by the Undergraduate Council. He then moved adoption of the resolution, and the motion was seconded. The motion (85-10) was approved unanimously.

DISCUSSION ON SELECTION AND REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT HEADS PRESENTED BY A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN: Senators Demorest and Roemer took the floor, representing the Subcommittee of the Committee of Eleven. Senator Demorest: "If you will recall, the motion was tabled at the December meeting to allow some of the senators to look at it more closely and for us to discuss it with those senators. Those discussions have taken place, and we bring the seconded motion to you again. There are no changes in the motion as you saw it last time." Senator Peterson: "Did the committee consider making the language in B, under Appointment, a bit stronger and more specific?" Senator Demorest: "Clearly, what you are saying, if I understand correctly, you are proposing that the faculty retain the prerogative of appointing the Department Head. Is that not what you are saying? Because what we are proposing is that the faculty make the recommendation from a committee made up of three members of the faculty elected by the Department, two members appointed by the Dean. Now that recommendation goes to the Dean, and we considered it was the Dean's prerogative to agree with the faculty's recommendation or to deny the faculty recommendation."

Senator Peterson: "I don't see that this language spells out the fact that the committee would necessarily recommend a specific individual." Senator Demorest: "We do that because some colleges have a practice of offering two or three names--the practice varies from college to college."

Senator Kettel: "Is this the second half of this proposal? Is the first half the previous action approved by the Senate?" Senator Demorest: "The general review has been created by the Senate in the Fahey report recommendation of March 1974. It is in no way a change from the original." Senator Roemer: "We are making this recommendation because many departments have not followed through on the need to follow from the Fahey recommendation to develop departmental procedures, and what we are offering here is essentially a synthesis of our findings from the response to a questionnaire of what seemed to us a representative and workable and desirable procedure."

Senator Irving: Can you explain to me how this recommendation will

operate and impact on the search eventually? Is it a mandated procedure? Are they recommended guidelines, or is it one process that every department and every dean will have to follow in detail?" Senator Roemer: "Are you talking about the search procedures, or the review procedures?" Senator Irving: "The search procedures." Senator Roemer: "We are recommending them as general guidelines which could be filled out with additional details by departments. Now partly in response to your question, partly in response to Senator Peterson's question, on the form of the recommendation, we recognize that the control of these appointments is in the hands of the administration: that is required by the Regents. The Committee, as I see it, is essentially the negotiating committee to carry out certain duties representing the interests of the departmental faculty on one hand, and the aim to find the best qualified candidates, and candidates that are acceptable both to the departmental faculty and to the administration. The real control of the appointment is in the hands of the dean and the higher administration. The committee will fail in its duties of the search procedure if it did not find well qualified candidates that were satisfactory on both the point of view of the administration and the department. There has been a question about the three elected members of the faculty. We feel that the control of the administration is already so strong, if the Dean reviews the various guidelines for the qualifications that will be part of the search, the dossiers of the candidates, participates in the interviews and has the power to overrule the recommendation of the committee if he feels that that's desirable. But we feel that to have these three elected members from the department is essentially the minimum to well represent the department's interests."

Senator Irving: In some instances, in searches currently underway, this process would not work. In other instances, it would work to the disadvantage of a department. In other instances it would lead to stalemate and no appointment for a number of years if election were to be mandated--election in the process of selecting a committee were to be mandated--and even in some instances, if the election of the chair of the committee were to be mandated. On one end of the continuum would be a department where there are currently six vacancies, in a department of eight members. It's impossible to develop an elective process unless you include temporary, one-year appointments, or one-semester appointments, as part of the faculty that would elect the committee. In other instances it would be to stalemate, and I can describe a number of circumstances where it would lead to stalemate. As a matter of fact, you have outlined some of those, but it's not specified what occurs if, for example, the Dean disagrees with the selection committee. Is that a stalemate, and you go back to zero and elect a new committee and start the process all over again? I'm concerned that there's a difference between guidelines that could be thought of, and a single, mandated procedure that would have to affect every department."

Senator Brand: There are certain departments within Social and Behavioral Science that over the years have worked out very carefully articulated and faculty-generated guidelines specially for internal candidates, and in some cases they differ from external candidates. And I believe that if these are mandated you will in fact be removing some of the departmental autonomy and prerogatives just contrary to what you hope to accomplish. So I would suggest that this be set up as a model or a set of recommendations to be seriously considered by any unit, but not interfere with well-working processes within departments now. There are certain committees that are elected within certain departments to recommend a slate to the Dean of three internal candidates

without question about whether these candidates are willing to serve, through negotiation between the Dean and the candidates; for an external review, it's an entirely different matter. Departments operate entirely differently; sometimes as a committee of the whole. There are well-worked out departmental procedures that are operative now, and this proposal would interfere with them. I think that is really interjecting the Senate mandates into departmental autonomy. Chairman Dinham: Then you are suggesting that these be adopted as guidelines rather than as mandates? Senator Brand: Absolutely. Senator Demorest: I would like to point out to you that the Senate, as far as I know, enjoys a great amount of influence, but I was never aware that those things we recommend here represent mandates. Very clearly what we are recommending here has to be agreed upon by the administration. Because of the time, Senator Cole moved that the matter be tabled, rather than another meeting in two weeks. The motion (85-11) was seconded and approved on a voice vote.

The Senate then went into Executive Session at 5:11 p.m.

---

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT MEETING OF FEBRUARY 4, 1985:

- 85-6 Approval of minutes of January 21, 1985.
- 85-7 Ratification of Arizona Universities Faculty Council incorporation.
- 85-8 Approval of "October 1" amendment to Committee on Academic Procedures' recommendation for change in Chapter 8.
- 85-9 Approval of Committee on Academic Procedures' recommendation for change in Chapter 8 (8.12).
- 85-10 Approval of change in Final Exam Scheduling.
- 85-11 Tabling of discussion on Selection and Review of Department Heads.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

- 85-12 Honorary Degree Nomination, College of Architecture, honorary Doctor of Fine Arts, waiver of nominating statement.
- 85-13 Honorary Degree Nomination, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, honorary Doctor of Humanities, waiver of nominating statement.
- 85-14 Honorary Degree Nomination, College of Engineering, honorary Doctor of Science, waiver of nominating statement.
- 85-15 Honorary Degree Nomination, College of Medicine, honorary Doctor of Science, waiver of nominating statement.

- 85-16 Honorary Degree Nomination, College of Law, honorary Doctor of Laws, waiver of nominating statement.
- 85-17 Honorary Degree Nomination, College of Law, honorary Doctor of Laws, waiver of nominating statement.
- 85-18 Honorary Degree Nomination, College of Law, honorary Doctor of Laws, waiver of nominating statement.
- 85-19 Approval of awarding all honorary degrees as listed above.

PENDING:

Ad Hoc Student Life Committee will report to Senate during the spring semester whether appointment of a standing committee is necessary.

Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Adjustments will report to Faculty Senate when they have the results of the questionnaire.

Executive Session minutes of February 4 to be considered at next scheduled Executive Session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MINUTES. It was moved, seconded, and approved that the minutes of the Executive Sessions of September 10 and October 1 be approved as submitted.

HONORARY DEGREE NOMINATIONS: Chairman Dinham said there would be seven honorary degree nominations, and to facilitate the nominating process, she would adopt a procedure suggested to her a few minutes ago, i.e., dispensing with the reading of nominating statements: with each candidate, she will ask whether there is a motion to waive the description of the candidate's accomplishments; if that motion passes, then the candidate's name will be put forward for a vote without the description; if it fails, then the description will be heard.

The first honorary degree candidate was presented by the College of Architecture, for the honorary Doctor of Fine Arts Degree. It was moved, (85-12) seconded, and approved that the reading of the qualification statement be dispensed with.

The second honorary degree candidate was presented by the Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, for the honorary Doctor of Humanities. Chairman Dinham said she would entertain a motion to waive the nominating statement. It was so moved (85-13), seconded and approved unanimously.

The third candidate was presented by the faculty of the College of Engineering, for the honorary degree Doctor of Science. It was moved (85-14), seconded, and approved unanimously to waive the reading of the nominating statement.

The fourth candidate was presented by the faculty of the College of Medicine for the honorary degree Doctor of Science. It was moved and seconded to waive the reading of the nominating statement for this candidate. After some discussion the motion (85-15) was approved.

The fifth candidate was nominated for the honorary degree Doctor of Laws, from the College of Law. It was moved (85-16), seconded, and approved to waive the reading of the nominating statement.

The sixth candidate was recommended for the honorary degree, Doctor of Laws, from the College of Law. It was moved (85-17), seconded, and approved to waive the reading of the nominating credentials.

The seventh candidate was recommended for the honorary degree, Doctor of Laws, from the College of Law. It was moved (85-18), seconded, and approved to waive the reading of the nominating statement.

Chairman Dinham said she would now entertain a motion that the Faculty Senate recommend to the General Faculty that the seven honorary degree candidates, and the degrees stated, be awarded honorary degrees in 1985. It was so moved (85-19) and seconded. Senator Garcia said he would like Senator Cole's committee looking at Honorary Degree procedures note that this is essentially a total farce. Worthy as these candidates might be, what we are doing now is not a worthy procedure, and I would like Senator Cole's committee to take that into account and bring back a procedure which is not a sham. Chairman Dinham said that at a General Faculty meeting, one of the matters that

can come up would be a matter pertaining to the announced meeting, and if Senator Garcia wished to discuss it at that meeting, he could do so. The vote was called, and the motion was approved, with three nay votes heard.

The meeting adjourned at 5:22 p.m.