

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, May 5, 1986 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:00 p.m. on Monday, May 5, 1986, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Sixty-two members were present. Presiding Officer of the Senate Thomas Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Alcorn, Aleamoni, Andreas, Atwater, Beigel, Bootman, Boynton, Butler, Cardon, Chase, Chen, Cole, Cusanovich, Dickstein, Drake, Duncan, Epstein, Ewbank, Fahey, Fenstermacher, Fernandez, Finkler, Fleming, Ganapol, Garcia, Giffin, Goetinck, Hasselmo, Hetrick, Horak, Irving, Jones, Laird, Matter, Mautner, McBryde, McConnell, Mishel, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Peterson, Reed, Rehm, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Sampanes, Sharkey, Silverberg, Silverman, Sorensen, Steelink, Streitmatter, Swalin, Tollin, Tomizuka, Torres, Wert, Wilkening, Witte, and Woodard. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Aquilano, Brand, Cunningham, Emery, Garrett, Gourley, Kettel, Kinkade, Koffler, Larson, Marcus, Martin, McCullough, Muramoto, Obst, Sacamano, Scott, Smith, Tuchi, and Weiss.

WELCOME OF NEW FACULTY SENATORS: Dr. Rehm welcomed ten newly-elected College Representatives: Clement Chase, Barry Ganapol, Dennis Larson, Charles Martin, Robert McConnell, Pamela Reed, William Scott, Andrew Silverman, Janice Streitmatter, and Gordon Tollin. He also welcomed Erin McBryde, newly-elected President of ASUA, and the newly appointed student representatives for 1986-87: Doug Bollerman, Dan Heires, Richard Kosinski, Carolyn Murphy, and Jay Stein.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF APRIL 7, 1986: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted to approve the Minutes of April 7. Dr. Rehm noted that minutes of the meeting of April 21, which was not an official meeting because it lacked a quorum, were included for Senators' information only.

ELECTION OF PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Rehm turned the Chair over to Secretary Ridge, who called for nominations. Senator Fahey nominated Dr. Rehm; that nomination was seconded. It was then moved, seconded and unanimously approved (motion 86-22) by voice vote that nominations be closed, and that Dr. Rehm be re-elected Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, 1986-87.

Dr. Rehm said nominations would be accepted from the floor for any of the following elections provided Senators could assure him the person nominated would be willing to serve.

ELECTION OF FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Dr. Rehm resumed the Chair, and asked Senate members to mark the ballots that had been placed on their desks: two members must be elected to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, for one-year terms (5/86-4/87) because, once again, the Chairman of the Faculty and the Presiding Officer are one and the same. Senators Shirley Fahey and Samuel Paplanus were elected.

ELECTION OF UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD NOMINEES: Senators voted for five nominees whose names will be submitted to President Koffler for appointments (two, plus two alternates) to the University Hearing Board for the term 8/86-7/87. Biographical information had been previously supplied, and ballots had been placed on Senators' desks. Those selected were: Larry E. Beutler, Billie Jo Inman, Alice L. Noyes, Kenneth J. Ryan, and Aldine S. Von Isser.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION: Senators then voted for one member and two alternates (terms: 5/86-4/88) for the Committee on Conciliation. Written ballots were provided, and biographical information had been distributed previously. Those elected were: James C. McBrearty (member), Rudolf A. Jimenez (alternate) and L. D. Clark (alternate). Dr. Rehm noted that alternates exist under the present Constitution/Bylaws, but if the new Constitution/Bylaws is approved, all will have equal membership.

ELECTION OF SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS COMMITTEE: On written ballots provided, the Senate then voted on its representative to the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee for a three-year term (5/86-4/89). Biographical information had been distributed previously. Elected was Mary Hendrix.

ELECTION OF 2 ARTS & SCIENCES SENATORS: Dr. Rehm reminded Senators that at the previous meeting he had indicated he would call a meeting of all elected Arts & Sciences Senators to determine the best way to fill two vacant seats. At that meeting, held on May 2, nominations were submitted of faculty who were either willing or might be willing to serve. He said that all faculty on the ballot in front of each Senator were willing to serve. The two elected to serve two-year terms (5/86-4/88) are: Joaquin Ruiz, Geosciences, and David H. Chisholm, German.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Hasselmo said he had only two announcements. First, the promotion and tenure and continuing status decisions had been made and communicated to the various individuals involved. He said that those who wish to appeal the decisions can do so to the President, who will then undertake an independent review of the decisions that were made. He said that a report on these decisions will be prepared for the Academic Personnel Policy Committee. Secondly, he said, Decision Packages would be due May 9. In addition to the Decision Packages being prepared by Departments and Colleges, he said, they are also considering a couple of University-wide packages including the possibility of some additional funding for Undergraduate Education, perhaps focusing on General Education. Some of those packages will incorporate components coming forward from departments. He said he had sent the instruction letter to the Budget Policy Committee, and review meetings are being scheduled with that committee so that, at the beginning of the process, guidelines can be developed for the review process. He said the committee's input will also be requested at a later stage when the actual draft of the Decision Packages is available as a group.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm said the Annual Reports from all Senate standing committees will be included with the Minutes of this meeting. Standing committees for the coming year are nearly in place. He said that the following Senators had agreed to chair those committees: Douglas Jones, Academic Personnel Policy Committee; no chair has yet been designated

for the Budget Policy Committee; Senator Betty Atwater, the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee; Senator J. D. Garcia, the Research Policy Committee; and Senator Merle Mishel, the Student Affairs Policy Committee.

Dr. Rehm announced that Senator Michael Cusanovich had been elected to chair the Committee of Eleven for 1986-87.

He reported that next fall the Faculty Senate may see Technology Transfer appear on its agenda. It has been appearing regularly in the Minutes this semester, and since this is an item undergoing active examination on campus, the Senate should be aware of developments. Presentations will be made to obtain Senate input.

Discussion on Chapters 3 and 4, which were distributed to the Senate, will be postponed until the fall semester. He said those chapters had undergone review by a number of committees, and they will be used on an interim basis for any matters that the faculty or the administration needs to deal with until Senate ratification in the fall.

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Erin McBryde, newly-elected President of ASUA, said she was very pleased to join the Faculty Senate. Her first report will be presented at the September meeting.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Paplanus said he felt compelled to be brief. He said the committee has worked on the Constitution and Bylaws this year, and he joins with Dr. Rehm in hoping it would be approved this afternoon. Other items on the agenda for this afternoon are the Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads and the policy on Textbooks in a Class Directed by the Author. Part of the committee's charge, he said, is to receive the annual report on Affirmative Action. He said he just received it, and neither he nor the committee has had an opportunity to study it. He would distribute it with the Minutes of this meeting, however.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Ruth Dickstein, who had chaired the committee's last meeting, reported that Vice President Cunningham met with the committee to report on what everyone anticipated would be the final report on State Legislative action as it affected the University of Arizona. Unfortunately, she said, the Legislative session had not ended on schedule, and Vice President Cunningham had shared with the committee the recommendations from the Joint Legislative Budget Committee which is likely to be what is eventually ratified. They recommended that the first eleven Decision Packages be either fully or partly funded. She said this may be the first time the Legislature will have accepted the Decision Packages in the priority order presented. She said the Legislature has already passed one bill which the Governor has signed which provides funding for remodeling and refurbishing of facilities at the three state Universities. In anticipation of this funding, the administration has requested deans and administrators to submit prioritized remodeling/refurbishing requests. After July 1, when the funding is available, a list will be drawn up and arrangements made for work to begin. She said the committee has requested to see this list so that it may provide some input before final decisions are made. Senator Dickstein said Vice President Cunningham also shared with the committee material that had been

prepared and used in the fall to educate State Legislators. She said it was the feeling that the University of Arizona fared as well as it did because of the educational process that occurred; she has copies of statistics related to present and previous requests in higher education in Arizona if anyone is interested. Total anticipated this year is \$7.2 million in Decision Packages.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Tomizuka said that the committee's annual report will be attached to the minutes of this meeting, and will focus on the committee's activities in connection with the training of graduate teaching assistants, the state of the University Film Library, the co-sponsorship of the Teaching Improvement Awards program, and the co-sponsorship of the Provost's Symposium on Classroom Teaching; the committee recommends that the latter area of study continue into next year. He said the committee appreciated the support of the faculty and of the Provost for the success of these projects.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Garcia said the committee had made detailed comments to the Vice President for Research on the Technology Transfer policy document that was distributed to all Senators as well as a number of other people. He said a copy of those comments will be distributed with the minutes of this meeting. While this kind of development is welcome, he said, the committee felt that careful safeguards should be built in to a policy in order to maintain the academic goals of the institution.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mishel said the committee had recently met with Dean Andreas, who shared with them some of her experiences with the student/faculty interaction program. She said that at the end of its first year of existence, the committee is functioning well and will continue to address student/faculty interaction as its main focus next year.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Garcia asked about the difference between the list of standing committee chairs placed on Senators' desks today, which indicated Senator Ewbank would chair the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, and the list read by Dr. Rehm which indicated Senator Jones would chair that committee. Dr. Rehm responded that Senator Jones would be the Chair; that change occurred about an hour ago.

Senator Goetinck asked Senator Tomizuka about the training of teaching assistants. In the document that teaching assistants received, he said, language was used which gave it a chauvinistic air generally. He wondered whether this document had come from the committee. Senator Tomizuka responded that it had not. Senator Goetinck said he wanted to make the point that there are TAs from Nigeria and Kenya who are known to speak English better than some coming from the United Kingdom. He wondered why the system had to be set up so rigidly. The confrontational aspect of the memo, he said, placed the entire blame on the teaching assistants and not on the departments, where it belongs. He said his second question is why should American English be spoken? Referring to Mississippi and Texas accents, he said that most countries of these foreign TAs do not want their people returning with an American accent: they prefer British pronunciation. Without wanting to be nasty, he said, the document is addressed to "International TAs"; he said there is no such thing as an "international TA." Senator Goetinck said there are foreign TAs, there is international trade. He said he brought this up because training of TAs was mentioned, and in his opinion there are several problems which must be resolved. Senator Tomizuka said he agreed with most of what Senator Goetinck

said, but he is stepping down as Chair and he would refer the matter to Senator Atwater. Senator Garcia asked if the Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee was consulted prior to the distribution of the TA training document. Senator Tomizuka said it was not. Senator Fleming said she was chair of the committee two or three years ago, and it was that committee's input originally which may have initiated this document, although that committee could not take responsibility for the specific language.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: Dr. Rehm called attention to Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 11, page 5: Change Molecular and Cellular Biology 181, by adding to the last sentence "and recombinant DNA technology with illustration from plants, animals and humans." He called for discussion. There being none, it was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 86-23) that Vol. 11, No. 11 be approved as modified. Dr. Rehm said that Vol. 11, No. 12 was distributed for information only.

APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES TO BE COMPLETED MAY 17, 1986: Dr. Rehm asked Senators to note that the names listed as degree candidates are not assured these degrees: degrees are contingent upon successful completion of all requirements. A vote for approval was binding only for those circumstances. It was then moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 86-24) to approve the list of degree candidates.

APPROVAL OF CHAIRS OF FACULTY SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES FOR 1986-87: Dr. Rehm called for approval of the list of Chairs for Senate Standing Committees for 1986-87 as amended: Douglas Jones, Academic Personnel Policy Committee; Budget Policy Committee chairmanship would be acted upon in the next two weeks and would be presented to the Senate in September; Betty Atwater, Instruction & Curriculum Policy Committee; J. D. Garcia, Research Policy Committee; and Merle Mishel, Student Affairs Policy Committee. It was then moved, seconded, and unanimously approved (motion 86-25) to ratify the appointments.

APPROVAL TO CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS: Because Senator Paplanus had to leave the meeting at 4:10 p.m., Dr. Rehm asked for approval to change the order of business by inserting Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads ahead of Constitution and Bylaws. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 86-26) to so approve.

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF GUIDELINES FOR FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS OF DEANS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS: Senator Paplanus said that the Senate had previously received the Guidelines document, dated February 20, 1986, which had originated in the Provost's office. He said the Provost had discussed the document at length with the Academic Personnel Policy Committee and with others, and the committee was now presenting it to the Senate for adoption, with amendments recommended by the committee. He said this is coming before the Senate as a seconded motion from the APPC.

Senator Steelink said there is a typographical error: on the committee's Amendments page, "The policy described in these guidelines is a policy" rather than "in" a policy. Senator Paplanus accepted that change.

Senator Paplanus said he would like each of the committee's three amendments to be considered and voted on separately. The first one, he said, is a paragraph to be added as a third paragraph under the section designated "General": "The policy described in these guidelines is a Policy of the

University of Arizona and may not be modified by colleges or departments." He said the committee felt that for this policy to have any meaning whatsoever, it must be University-wide. He then placed the amendment before the Senate as a seconded motion (motion 86-27) from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee. The motion was then unanimously approved.

Senator Paplanus said the second amendment is a subsection to be inserted between the two paragraphs of the section "Initiation of Reviews" as follows:

Extraordinary Reviews

Under unusual circumstances the faculty of a college or department may wish to initiate a review of a dean or department head prior to the next scheduled periodic review. In such a situation the following will apply:

1. If a petition calling for an extraordinary review of a dean or department head be signed by 1/3 or more of the faculty and academic professionals of the college or department be presented to the Provost or dean the Provost or dean shall initiate such a review in conformity with the described procedures.
2. The extraordinary review will not replace the next periodic review unless that periodic review would have occurred within 18 months. No more than one extraordinary review may occur within a single five-year cycle. An extraordinary review may not occur sooner than two years following a periodic review.

Senator Paplanus said this was presented as a seconded motion (86-28). Senator Hasselmo said he understood the motivation behind this particular amendment, that there can be certain circumstances where it is desirable to have a review of a department head out-of-cycle. However, he said, based on experience, sometimes those circumstances are such that they ought to really dictate the decision rather than a vote that simply fixes a particular proportion of the membership of that particular unit. He said there should be a provision where such a review can be requested, but he didn't believe there should be a mandatory rule with a particular fixed membership of the department. He would recommend it be modified to read something like: "Under unusual circumstances, the faculty of a college or department may wish to request a review of a dean or department head by the next scheduled periodic review. Such a request should then be forwarded to the initiating administrator." Senator Witte: "I think we have come back tremendously from the intent of this whole review process. This was an effort to make the department head accountable. It has, as I've pointed out on numerous occasions, been turned around to serve a different purpose. I think the amendment proposed by Senator Hasselmo turns it back again, and the faculty cannot initiate the review. I actually think that the term 'extraordinary' is acceptable only because the other is ordinary. But I think it does tend to constrict and restrain the faculty members who do feel a review is indicated. I also object to two years having to pass, but I think this further amendment so weakens the guidelines and subverts the original intention of five-year reviews of deans and department heads that I object strongly to it."

Senator Paplanus said that he could not speak on behalf of the committee regarding Senator Hasselmo's amendment, but he would suggest it simply be voted upon to save hours and hours of debate. Dr. Rehm said he understood Senator

Hasselmo to say that he is not opposed to extraordinary reviews. Senator Hasselmo said that he thinks it is a good provision, although he is opposed to its being automatic on the basis of one-third of the membership. He said he keeps coming back to his fundamental argument: it certainly is in the interest of initiating administrators to make sure that the administrators reporting to him or her do fulfill their responsibilities, and if there is trouble in a particular unit, it would be a very foolish administrator who would not take steps towards review into that particular situation. He thought we should remain open to those circumstances where even a vote of that magnitude might force a review which would not be an appropriate mechanism. Senator Garcia said that we have, under the current policy, a rule which says department heads can be reviewed on petitions received by the Dean containing signatures of half of the members of the unit. He said we had been successfully living under that rule for some time, and he wondered if one-third is too small a number; but if an administrator had so many people, especially in a large unit, unhappy with what he was doing, he would be unlikely to be successful as an administrator. Senator Garcia believed the committee's amendment, for the health of the institution, provided a safety valve which opened up immediately if pressure built too high. He said the committee's wording seemed quite appropriate and very much in line with current policy and with what has been tested successfully over the last 12 years.

Senator Witte said she felt the rules are intended to deal both with enlightened administrators, such as Provost Hasselmo, and with unenlightened administrators. She said her experience indicated that prior to the implementation of current policy, many departments requested a review and were not allowed to conduct a review. Rules should cover such possibilities.

Senator Ewbank said that some specification of mandatory minimum proportions would protect a reviewing administrator from a small number of unhappy individuals requesting an extraordinary review. Senator Drake wondered if an intermediate position would be acceptable. He said he could sympathize with the problem of not getting the reviews initiated, but on the other hand one-third is too small a fraction. Since we have been successfully existing with a policy that called for half of the faculty, perhaps this amendment should reflect our existing procedures, because it should be automatic if essentially 50 percent requested a review. Senator Witte said she would support that intermediary position. Senator Hasselmo said it was really the mandatory nature of the review that was his concern. He said he hated to invoke higher authority, but he has received indications that there were some severe reservations about this particular aspect of the policy; a preferable policy would leave this section available to be invoked, but would not make it mandatory. Dr. Witte spoke in favor of retaining this section, because a lack would pervert the original intent. Senator Hasselmo said he would like to move for amendment to the motion now on the floor, to the effect that the language of the Extraordinary Review read approximately: "Under unusual circumstances, the faculty of a college or department may wish to request a review of a dean or department head prior to the next scheduled periodic review. Such a request should then be forwarded to the initiating administrator, who shall give serious consideration to such a request." That motion (86-29) was seconded, but a voice vote indicated the motion was defeated. Senator Peterson then moved to change one-third to half. That motion (86-30) was seconded and approved unanimously. A vote was then called for amended motion 86-28, and it was approved.

Senator Paplanus then turned to the third amendment, which would call for replacement of the final paragraph of the proposed new policy with the following: "Within 30 days after termination of the review of a dean or department head, the initiating administrator shall make available in the Dean's office a copy of the final report. This report shall be available for 30 days to be read by the faculty and professionals of the reviewee's college or department. The report may not be removed from the Dean's office, nor may it be copied in whole or in part. Violators of this rule shall be subject to disciplinary action." He stated that this amendment came as a seconded motion (86-31) from the APPC. Senator Garcia said he believed this to be an excellent compromise to the various opinions expressed in the Senate over the past few months, providing for faculty access to the outcome as well as safeguards. He said he would support this amendment. Senator Witte said she wondered whether the length of time the report would be available could be extended a bit; she suggested 90 days, rather than 30. She also asked what constituted "disciplinary action." Senator Witte then suggested that the amendment be changed to read "This report shall be available for 90 days..." Senator Paplanus said the committee will consider that change.

Senator Drake asked if this report would be simply an executive summary, rather than a full report. Senator Paplanus responded that the report would not contain confidential material, but it would not be a summary. Senator Drake suggested the amendment be changed to reflect, specifically, that confidential supporting material not be included. Senator Paplanus said the committee will accept that change.

Senator J. O'Brien asked if it wasn't possible, with the implementation of this amendment, that what became public might become inaccurate. Senator Paplanus responded that that is a price one has to consider, but if the review is to be a useful and effective process, it will be detailed, frank, and productive. What the Senate is considering right now is the only compromise the committee could agree on, he said. Dr. Rehm noted that on page 6 the committee report is fully described.

Senator Geotinck asked if it could be explained what was meant by disciplinary action. Senator Paplanus said he would prefer that the amendment be accepted or rejected on its merits now, and if one wanted to come up with proposals for disciplinary action in the fall, that would be preferable to trying to do it now. Senator Witte said that perhaps we should indicate that the phrase "subject to disciplinary action" could be discussed or agreed upon at some time in the future. Senator Paplanus said the committee would accept that.

Senator Drake asked if the Senate could insist administrators take disciplinary action against somebody who violates the rule by copying down a paragraph? Would a University lawyer agree that one should be "subject to disciplinary action"? He felt that if there are no teeth in it, then it is not important enough to include. After further discussion, Senator Paplanus said that the committee felt this was important enough that it represents a trade-off: if the faculty are allowed to see this report, then they should be willing to abide by the rules. "It is a matter of responsibility, it's not a matter of someone shaking a finger at you," he said. "Much of the objection to the whole process has been the dissemination of the report. It's very important for the faculty to see the report and I think the faculty should be willing to abide by the rules under which it is allowed to see it." Senator

Witte suggested that perhaps Senators Hetrick or Ridge, or others who have dealt with the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, might come up with an analogous situation where information is divulged from hearings. Senator Hetrick said that as a former Chairman of the Committee on Academic Privilege and Tenure, as the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure was named at that time, a number of cases were called where there was much dispute on availability of hearing reports. Much of that was resolved, he said, to the extent that reports are now more available than they were under the old rules. But he said he failed to see why any precedent established there would have any bearing on the report of a review committee. Senator Tomizuka said there is a legal issue involved in the confidentiality of the review itself. Can this document be subpoenaed? The response was that anything can be subpoenaed. Senator Ewbank said that it struck him that perhaps the mode of enforcement or the agency for enforcement might more properly be the University Hearing Board under the Code of Conduct as a matter of professional responsibility, rather than CAFT, and he would suggest this change to the amendment.

After some further discussion, Dr. Rehm called for a show of hands for those in favor of retaining "30 days" in its second reference, and for those in favor of changing to "90 days". Retention of 30 days was preferred, with the addition of "working", to then read "30 working days." Senator Irving asked for clarification on the objections to making the reviews completely open and available. Senator Paplanus said that a review which is known at the beginning is going to be open and available will not be an administrative review, nor perhaps should it. The purpose of these reviews, he said, is to be thorough, to identify all the problems, and to include them in the report. He said that would be very unlikely to occur if members of the committee know the review report would be a public document: there would be an attempt to soften it, or there would be two reports, and this represents the best compromise.

Dr. Rehm called for a vote on the amendment (motion 86-31) as modified. The voice vote indicated strong approval.

Senator Paplanus then presented to the Senate the amended Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Departments, coming as a seconded motion from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (motion 86-32). Senator Hasselmo said he had some minor language changes he would like to propose, in the nature of clarification rather than change in intent: At the top of page 4, he said it was indicated to him there was no mention of how the "set of objectives" referred to would be established. He suggested this sentence be amended to say "and all objectives established through the unit's planning effort and in the annual review of administrators." Senator Paplanus said he did not understand which planning process was referred to. Senator Hasselmo responded that it is the process through which a department or college establishes its own goals and objectives through whatever method; and since the University is working toward a more systematic planning effort, there will be a plan for goals and objectives. He said it seemed that the evaluation of an administrator often took into consideration the close objectives. Senators Paplanus said this introduced an element of having individual colleges and departments modify the nature of the review. Senator Witte said she perceived it in a similar way; she hoped the guidelines would not be so prescriptive that we define the plan and processes so tightly that some of the faculty might disagree with the long-range planning document, and they would like to see different or additional development of objectives. She said that the most successful people on Wall Street don't plan five and ten years away. Senator Peterson said he would

agree that what Senator Hasselmo is suggesting is reasonable; the present wording is so vague as to be meaningless, and he thought it might be simpler to strike the last sentence of the paragraph. Senator Hasselmo said that one of the points that had been made in his discussions with administrators is that they would like a clarification of the basis on which they will be evaluated. He said his amendment here is an effort to identify the policy objectives that are established on the basis of which they would be evaluated. Senator Garcia said he had a little problem with the proposed amendment because the faculty does not have access to the objectives which are listed in the evaluation of administrators document, and does not know what is contained in that document. He felt these could be potentially foreign substances. Senator Hasselmo responded that the initiating administrator could simply write down the objectives and tell the review committee that these are the objectives on which this administrator should be evaluated. He said this would provide some kind of safeguard that those objectives come from negotiations somewhere. Senator Ewbank said that, between the mandate that the objectives be established in the unit's planning process and the absence of any specificity at all, he would suggest that the objectives include goals from the unit's planning process, without necessarily excluding everything else; this would accomplish both goals. He then moved the adoption of Senator Hasselmo's suggestion, amended as follows: "The review shall be based on a description of the position and its responsibilities and all objectives established including the unit's planning effort and the annual review of administrators." That motion (86-33) was seconded. Senator Witte said she would have no objection to this material being included, but she was concerned that in the reviews of administrators, the administrators have been careful that they be judged by stated objectives, when many of the complaints heard from the faculty are that they are not being judged by stated objectives. Dr. Rehm called for a voice vote, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Senator Silverman referred to the bottom of page 2, under "Review Committee," and moved that (1) be amended to read "Where a dean is to be reviewed, the faculty and professional members of the college shall elect four members of the tenured faculty or continuing professionals to serve on the review committee." and that the second sentence be deleted. Senator Hasselmo said that this is an issue that has been reviewed carefully, and he urged the Senate to retain the present language because it is very important to have that additional input for balance. Hearing no second, Dr. Rehm called for further amendments. Senator Silverman protested that there had been a second, and appealed the decision of the Chair. Dr. Rehm called for a voice vote on the appeal request, and it was approved. Dr. Rehm said that this issue has been discussed at length in the past, and in the interest of moving on, he called for a prompt vote on this motion (86-34). A voice vote indicated the amending motion was defeated.

Senator Hasselmo said he had one additional suggestion for change on page 6, "Action by Initiating Administrator," first paragraph, last sentence, "Copies of the report shall be submitted to the President." The President requested that this be amended to read, "Copies of the report and the initiating administrator's evaluation and comments shall be submitted to the President." That motion (86-35) was seconded. There being no discussion, the vote was called and the motion was unanimously approved.

There being no further requests for change, Dr. Rehm called for action on the amended document, Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department

Heads. Motion 86-32 was then unanimously approved (copy of amended document attached to these Minutes).

DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF REVISED CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS: Dr. Rehm said he would institute a discussion time limit of two or three minutes, and he requested that Senators Ewbank and Roemer come to the podium to lead the discussion. Senator McConnell reported that he had not received a copy of the Constitution/Bylaws in his meeting call. Senator Ewbank provided him with a copy.

Dr. Rehm reminded those present that at its last meeting on April 21, the Senate, not having a quorum, sat as a Committee of the Whole. Recommended changes to the Constitution and Bylaws voted upon at that meeting, and reported to Senators in the minutes of that meeting, would require a vote at this meeting.

Senator Garcia said the Committee of Eleven had instructed him to bring to the attention of the Senate an information sheet which had been placed on Senators' desks concerning a Committee of Eleven proposal for the recomposition of the Senate. He said this had been discussed at the April 21 meeting; while a full survey of all PAC-10 universities had not been done, information on ASU's and NAU's Faculty Senates had been obtained. He said that he had looked at more than half of the Faculty Senate membership structures at all PAC-10 institutions, and they were very similar to those of our sister institutions, i.e., they did not contain 1/3 administrators. He said he would like to propose that the constitution of the Faculty Senate be changed, adopting the wording which the Committee of Eleven brought before the Senate earlier, because he felt it would be in the best interests of this campus to do so, enlivening the debate and increasing communication on vital issues in particular by more open discussion. He urged the change, and moved that the Bylaws, page 16 of the draft document, be changed according to pages 3 and 4 of the Alternatives document. The motion (86-36) was seconded. Senator Drake asked for a point of information: should the Committee of Eleven proposal read 20 under At-Large rather than 14? Senator Garcia responded that it should. Senator Laird said that at the April 21 meeting, he had spoken in favor of the reorganization of the Senate as proposed by the Committee of Eleven, but he now wants to acknowledge publicly that he does not favor the proposal. He believed it would not lead to an increase, but rather a decrease, in communications between administrators and faculty, and that the Senate would be poorer for not having those administrators included in the membership. Senator Steelink said he would speak for and support the motion, but for none of the reasons mentioned in previous meetings: the motion reflects the name of this body, "Faculty Senate." He said the Senate has no real power or jurisdiction over University operations: it is a forum, and it is good. He said the restructured Senate would neither increase nor decrease its effectiveness or effective role with or without administrators. He said he didn't believe Faculty Senators would be more forthright or more circumspect in the absence of administrators. Senator Steelink said he would not bite his tongue because Dean Sorensen kicks him in the shins, as she has. (Much laughter!) He said he would continue to tell awful jokes even though Provost Hasselmo winces when he tells them. He said the faculty are trained to spout off, and they do it very well, with or without the administrators. Right now, he said, we are a University Senate with many constituencies other than faculty; we don't speak for the faculty, and we are not identified with the faculty, either from the inside or the outside. He believed the Senate needs that identity, and if it

wants to continue with its present mode, the Senate should call itself something other than a Faculty Senate. "If we want a faculty forum that can be identified as such, let's go for it." Dr. Rehm said he would accept one more question, because the time limit was approaching. Senator Hetrick said he would like to ask Senator Steelink if, by the same reasoning, we might have no students in this body. Senator Steelink responded that yes, we ought not have students in the Faculty Senate.

Senator Goetinck asked if Senator Hetrick had suggested at the April 21 meeting that Deans elect representatives. Senator Hetrick responded that he had offered that compromise.

Dr. Rehm called for a vote on motion 86-36, changing the composition of the Faculty Senate to include four Ex-Officio members (President, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chairman and Secretary of the Faculty), twenty At-Large Faculty Senators, twenty-eight College Representatives (14 for each College/Faculty and 14 proportionately allocated), and eight students. A voice vote was inconclusive, and he called for a show of hands. The motion was defeated (24-19).

Senator Garcia said that, since that motion failed, he would submit an alternative; he then distributed copies of an alternative proposal. Senator Garcia said that the alternative maintains the same number of Senators as the just-defeated proposal (60), but increases Ex-Officio members to 10, with six of them to be elected, perhaps by Dean's Council, so that there would be adequate administrative representation in the Senate; the number of College Representatives was reduced from 28 to 22. He moved for approval of the Committee of Eleven's proposal (motion 86-37), and the motion was seconded.

Senator Fahey said she would like to amend this proposal in footnote 2: she said she would accept the four members referenced in footnote 1 (President, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Chairman and Secretary of the Faculty) but would substitute "plus all the academic Deans" for the "plus six administrators, to be elected by the Dean's Council." She felt that academic deans are the administrators who have the most common interest with the Senate. Although her first preference would still be to maintain the Senate as it is composed now, if there would be a substitute, she would prefer this method. This motion (86-38) was seconded. Senator Witte asked how many academic deans there are. Dr. Rehm provided that information: 14. Senator Fahey said this would eliminate the Vice Presidents as well as some others from Senate membership. Senator Drake said that it seemed to him that these intermediate proposals between the current situation and the original Committee of Eleven proposal are really beginning to split hairs; he believed the main reason for changing the present system would be an attempt to attract the best and the brightest of the faculty to run for the Faculty Senate. A recomposition of the Senate would send a clear message to the faculty, he said, that something might have changed; in the absence of that motion passing, it seemed to him there would be very little benefit in excluding a few people, and we should recognize that and stay the way we are.

Senator Ewbank said he perceived a rather distinctly different interpretation than Senator Drake: the Committee of Eleven motion provides for administrators who are elected from a constituency of administrators and faculty members elected from a faculty constituency. One beneficial potential, he felt, would be that elected administrators might have a heightened

responsibility to participate in Faculty Senate activity in order to report back to their constituency.

Senator Goetinck commented that including all the academic deans would raise the Ex-Officio total to 18; with elected faculty totaling 44, the ratio of the two groups would be worse than it currently is.

Dr. Rehm called for a vote on motion 86-38, increasing the number of "6" in Senator Garcia's motion to "14." A voice vote indicated that motion was defeated overwhelmingly.

Regarding student membership in the Committee of Eleven proposal, Senator Garcia said that student representation increases proportionately under this proposal: the current ratio is 9:85; approval of the proposal would result in a ratio of 8:60.

Dr. Rehm called for the vote on motion 86-37. A voice vote indicated the motion was overwhelmingly defeated.

Senator Peterson said that in the Alternatives document of March 24, on page 2, in the reference to Constitution Article VI, College, he assumed it was a typographical error, and it should read Article VII; and secondly, he wondered whether this alternative had been adopted. Senator Ewbank confirmed that it was, indeed, Article VII; he said that revision (a) was adopted with the modification that the word "shall" be stricken and the word "may" be inserted in its place.

Senator Duncan said that at the April 21 meeting, the Committee of the Whole voted to approve extending student members of the Committee of Eleven full voting membership. He said he would now move that action be approved by the Senate. Senator Duncan's motion (86-39) was seconded and unanimously approved.

Senator Garcia moved that the Senate accept all motions approved by the Committee of the Whole at the meeting of April 21 related to the Constitution and Bylaws. That motion (86-40) was seconded. Senator Ewbank said that he could not recall what action had been taken on Senator Irving's motion on behalf of a replacement for the Preamble. He was informed that it had been defeated. Senator Ewbank said it might be reassuring to know that he had researched Preambles of previous Constitutions and learned that the Preamble presently proposed is the identical one which was approved by the Board of Regents in 1974. Dr. Rehm then called for the vote on motion 86-40, and it was approved unanimously.

Dr. Rehm then called for a motion to approve the Constitution and Bylaws as amended, and it was so moved (motion 86-41) and seconded. There being no further discussion, the vote was taken, and the amended Constitution and Bylaws was approved with one dissenting vote. Dr. Rehm reminded the Senate that the Constitution and Bylaws now must go through appropriate procedures to obtain General Faculty approval, with a meeting to be called in the fall, followed by a written ballot.

POSTPONEMENT OF TEXTBOOK DISCUSSION; ADJOURNMENT: Dr. Rehm turned to the next item on the agenda, discussion on policy regarding the use of a textbook in a class directed by the author. Senator Steelink suggested that in honor of the

occasion of approving a new Constitution and Bylaws after 12 years, he moved for adjournment. That motion was seconded and unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT THE MEETING OF MAY 5, 1986:

- 86-22 Election of Presiding Officer for 1986-87: Thomas R. Rehm.
- 86-23 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 11, No. 11, as modified.
- 86-24 Approval of degree list for graduation on May 17, 1986.
- 86-25 Ratification of Faculty Senate standing committee chairs for 1986-87.
- 86-26 Approval to change agenda's order of business.
- 86-27 Approval of APPC amendment #1 to Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads.
- 86-28 Approval of APPC amendment #2 to Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads, as amended.
- 86-29 Defeat of motion to amend 86-28.
- 86-30 Approval of motion to amend motion 86-28.
- 86-31 Approval of APPC amendment #3 to Guideliens for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads.
- 86-32 Approval of Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads, as amended.
- 86-33 Approval of motion to amend motion 86-32.
- 86-34 Denial of motion to amend motion 86-32.
- 86-35 Approval of motion to amend motion 86-32.
- 86-36 Defeat of motion to provide for recomposition of the Faculty Senate.
- 86-37 Defeat of motion to provide for an alternative recomposition of the Faculty Senate.
- 86-38 Defeat of motion to amend motion 86-37.
- 86-39 Approval to extend voting membership to student members of the Committee of Eleven in the Constitution/Bylaws.
- 86-40 Approval of all motions passed by the Committee of the Whole on April 21 related to the Constitution/Bylaws.
- 86-41 Approval of the Constitution and Bylaws, as amended.

MATTERS PENDING, TO BE CARRIED OVER INTO FALL 1986:

1. Policy regarding use of a textbook in a class directed by the author: Academic Personnel Policy Committee.
2. Discussion on Chapter 3, University Handbook for Appointed Personnel: Academic Personnel Policy Committee.
3. Discussion on Chapter 4, University Handbook for Appointed Personnel: Academic Personnel Policy Committee.