

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, September 13, 1993 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, September 13, 1993, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Fifty-one members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Malcolm J. Zwolinski presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Anderson, Atwater, Barrett, Brichler, Buras, Coons, DaDeppo, Desai, Dickinson, Dvorak, Enos, Ewbank, Fernandez, Garcia, Gruener, Hammond, Hildebrand, Hill, Huete, Impey, Inman, Joens, Jones, Larson, Lei, Lewis, McElroy, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Parsons, Pitt, Reynolds, Roemer, Ruiz, Shoemaker, Silverman, Sjong, Songer, Sullivan, Sypherd, Troy, Warburton, E. Williams, J. Williams, Witte, Wright, Young, Zukoski, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Badger, Dahlgran, Fajardo, Linn, Manke and Pacheco.

2. OPEN SESSION: James M. Toevs, Coordinator of the Tucson AIDS Project, reported that the four Tucson and Pima County AIDS organizations (Tucson AIDS Project, Shanti Foundation, PACT for Life, and El Proyecto) were coordinating a major fund-raising AidsWalk scheduled for Saturday, October 2. The goal is \$250,000 and 2,500 walkers, and the organizers' goal is to create an event which anyone in the community would feel comfortable participating in, in the fight against AIDS. He said a number of outstanding corporate sponsors have contributed \$5,000 in cash or in-kind services, such as KVOA, the Tucson Citizen and the Tucson Weekly. Mr. Toevs said the University community will have several teams entered, and if individuals had not yet been contacted, he would urge them to walk as individuals or form additional teams. Coach Lute Olson is the Honorary Chair, prizes will be awarded, and t-shirts are available for purchase.

Senator Silverman commended Senator Roemer and others who are assisting with the Faculty Newsletter. He said the newsletter is a "great addition to the Senate and the faculty", and is an excellent way to communicate with faculty about what is happening on campus; he hopes it can be continued.

3. WELCOME TO SAC OBSERVER: Dr. Zwolinski welcomed the newly appointed observer from the Staff Advisory Council, Armando Vargas, who will be attending Senate meetings on a regular basis.

4. REPORTS

- 4A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Zwolinski reported that Dr. Pacheco, who was out of town today, had provided a written report, placed on Senators' desks:

"I regret that I am unable to attend our first meeting of 1993-94 and must rely on this memorandum to wish the Senate a productive year. I also want to draw attention to some matters that may have escaped the attention of members who were out of town this summer.

"Since the Senate last met, Dr. Allan Beigel decided to return to his faculty position in Medicine. Given the University's financial situation, rather than

replace him, I chose to terminate the position of Vice President for Institutional Planning and to distribute its responsibilities among other officers. Dr. Beigel's planning duties will be handled in the Provost's Office, and his responsibilities as Senior Associate to the Council of Presidents will fall to Mr. Greg Fahey of my staff.

"In addition, the duties of Vice President Celestino Fernandez have altered and his title has changed. As Vice President for Academic Outreach and International Affairs, he retains most of his existing duties but has take over responsibility for the Extended University, the Sierra Vista Off-Campus Center, KUAT Communications and the Office of Cultural Affairs. In addition, he will take the lead in planning for the new four-year college proposed for Pima County and for our joint sequential degree program with Pima Community College. His former responsibilities for the College of Arts and Sciences and for Undergraduate Education are being transferred to Dr. Edgar McCullough, who will serve as Interim Vice Provost.

"Work continued during the summer with efforts to help the University to adapt to the new social and economic realities. The group working on a Strategic Long Range Plan produced drafts of a Mission Statement and the associated Institutional Objectives. These are being circulated for discussion on campus and, this semester, colleges and faculties are being asked to develop compatible mission statements and objectives. Another group has been assessing our experience with PAIP (Program for the Assessment of Institutional Priorities) in order to determine the most beneficial future arrangements and how best to involve the results in our ongoing planning activities. In addition, changes were made in the CORE (Continuous Organizational Renewal) Program. The CORE Council has been restructured and, in future, will focus on identifying key projects, arranging for teams to address them, and allocating priorities and support. Overall oversight for CORE now rests with the President's Cabinet which has appointed teams to address critical processes that need improvement. In addition, the Cabinet has helped to design the President's Quality Leadership Series, a training course for upper- and middle-level managers that will be offered this Fall and again in the Spring.

"If our University is to make progress in the new environment for higher education, we have no option but to change. My own assessment of these recent administrative rearrangements, and of our progress with strategic planning and CORE, is that the momentum we developed last academic year has continued over the summer. Now it remains to move ahead to the critical and difficult programmatic decisions that are unavoidable if we are to establish a better balance between our programs and our resources.

"One of the happiest outcomes of the summer's work has been a vastly improved experience for our new undergraduates. Last Spring, Provost Sypherd promised every freshman a full load of courses that contributed to their major and general education programs. The work of our academic departments, the Student Affairs staff and the Provost's Office throughout the summer has turned this promise into a reality. I want to congratulate everyone who contributed to this marked improvement in the overall undergraduate experience.

"In closing, let me mention that there will be a General Faculty Meeting in the Arizona Ballroom of the Student Union Building at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, October 5, 1993. At that time I shall present the President's annual 'State of the University' message."

- 4B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Provost Sypherd welcomed everyone back. "It is always a pleasure to stand in front of a classroom and see smiling, happy faces.

"I would like to call your attention to an article written by Chair of the Faculty Garcia and published in the August 30 issue of Lo Que Pasa, in which he recounted what I think I would paraphrase as improved relations between the Faculty Senate and the administration, and his hope that we would continue down this pathway. I would like to underscore his wishes, and say that I wish for the same. I think that several movements in the right direction have been taken. First of all, the President has asked the Chair of the Faculty to become a member of the President's Cabinet. I think that's a very important step. At the same time, we are going to be moving in the direction of an Undergraduate and a Graduate Council that are Faculty Senate committees. We have agreed in an informal sense on a three-year migration from the current appointed Councils to those that are completely elected; this is another important move. I would also like to tell you that it is my intention to recommend to the University community in a formal way that the University Promotion and Tenure Committee also be an elected committee. I would like to work with the Senate Executive Committee to develop the method by which we would elect a University Promotion and Tenure Committee and the criteria that we would use in establishing candidates for such a committee.

"I would like to call on Senate members each to be responsible personally for moving in the direction of greater cooperation and collaboration and movement towards true joint governance. I think you all would have to agree with me that it takes each of us feeling like we are members of a team, and that must necessarily mean that we don't sit back in the bushes shooting at each other. And I say this in a very serious sense, because there seems to be a growth business in seeing how many administrators can be lined up in the sights of one gun at one time. I've enjoyed doing that myself, over the years, and I understand the thrill that comes with it, but I would urge you to consider that we are embarked on a new pathway here, and it is going to take the cooperation and collaboration of everyone to see that we really do accomplish a system of joint governance at this University. What I'm asking for, then, is that each of us--administrators and faculty--avoid the 'we and they' mentality, because at the end of the day we're all part of this University, and we all have to make it work.

"I was asked specifically to address the issue of the reorganization of Arts and Sciences. A report was placed on your desks today (copy appended to these minutes) from the Committee of Eleven addressing the Thompson Committee Report. The Thompson Committee was established by Vice President Fernandez and charged by the President to look at the current structure of Arts and Sciences and make recommendations about possible reorganization. That report is still on my desk. It is still under active consideration. I must say that I am particularly fond of several related recommendations from that report, but I have done nothing to move either in the direction of requesting the Faculty Senate to address it specifically and make recommendations, or to ask the administration to do that. I have, however, as all of you know, asked Professor Ed McCullough to become the Interim Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences and Undergraduate Education, and I did so when Professor McCullough indicated to me his desire to leave the Deanship, a desire he expressed to me about six months ago. I told him I was still learning the job, and that I'd appreciate it if he wouldn't mention that again for the next several months. Well, he mentioned it several more times. As all of you know, Professor McCullough has had a lot of experience with Arts

and Sciences undergraduate education, has thought deeply and for a long time about the issues that surround the student who has not yet selected a major, and the interdisciplinary studies student. I think he is going to bring to that office, on an interim basis, a lot of experience and a lot of feeling about the way that job should be done. So currently Interim Vice Provost/Dean McCullough is doing two jobs. The Thompson Committee Report includes quite a bit of rhetoric about general education and a few other things that the committee wasn't exactly charged to do, but which I appreciated some input on.

"General education, under the PAIP review process, took its hits. I think the hits are directed more to the administration than to the faculty, but I believe that as a faculty we're going to have to address the issues of general education and where we have really failed to fulfill the thrust that was given to this activity nearly a decade ago. In a letter that will be coming from me to the faculty within the next week, I'm going to ask the faculty to look again at general education: what the expectation was when the University launched this new enterprise, and whether or not we have achieved that.

"The Arizona Faculties Council some months ago asked the Regents to consider a different compensation plan for faculty, specifically the one based on the California Step/Merit System. The Regents asked each Provost to constitute a committee on their respective campuses that would take this plan under advisement. Having had twenty-two years of experience with that system, I elected myself to teach the other two Provosts about how a system like that works, and also appointed a committee on our campus which would consider such a proposal and make its recommendations. That committee has met once, during which time I outlined what I knew about the way Step/Merit System operated, and we are collecting data from other universities around the country, particularly those universities we would like to emulate, to take a look at their compensation systems, particularly as they focus on merit or performance. I do not have anything to report to you because the committee has not really engaged in debate nor reached any conclusion. I believe the Regents have requested a report from the three universities by the first of the year. I think we can move that along rather quickly, and I would propose that as we get fairly close to a conclusion, that we hold a series of open faculty forums, during which the committee could state its proposal and be involved in dialogue with the faculty. I think feelings are running high about a system that is performance-based with real rewards, not every four or five years, but those that come along on a regular, anticipated basis.

"Strategic planning, as you know, has been changed somewhat at the University since Dr. Beigel's return to the faculty, the most joyous of professions, and strategic planning activities have come to the Provost's Office through some hasty reorganization and volunteer efforts from faculty members. We are moving ahead now with activities that go beyond the PAIP assessment. PAIP, as we all envisioned it, provided a platform of information from which we should be able to develop long-range strategic plans. The word on the street for the last couple of months has been that departments, colleges, and programs should have strategic plans in to the planning office by November 12. On Friday of last week, I notified the Deans that I was waiving that November 12 deadline as a result of a lot of information coming from a lot of you, particularly individuals who served on PAIP Assessment Teams, as well as department heads and deans. That time seemed to present a particularly onerous burden on the departments and the department heads. We have abandoned that particular goal, primarily in order to give us some time to provide some guidelines by which we might all plan."

Provost Sypherd noted that he had a letter, his fourth to the faculty in the eight months and sixteen days that he had been at the University. It was still in draft form and would not be released publicly until it was available to the faculty, but he wanted to share some portions with the Faculty Senate. He then read and commented on paragraphs that addressed the consequences of limitations on incremental State support associated with capped enrollment, the expectation of the people of Arizona for contributions by the University toward improving the quality of life as well as in providing quality educational opportunities for their sons and daughters, issues related to general education, and problems related to the increasingly fragmented curriculum.

- 4C. REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia said he also wished to welcome everyone back, and perhaps to echo some of the Provost's words. "You may recall that I transmitted to all Senators a copy of a memorandum that elected faculty officers had sent to the President last year, in light of the passage of S.B. 1106. It encompassed three pages and seven specific recommendations. With the Provost's remarks today, and with what he assures me is something that will occur this month, namely the placement of the Presiding Officer of the Senate on the Council of Deans, essentially all of the recommendations that we made to the President in that memorandum have now come to pass. In fact, more than that, because this summer faculty governance officers received a pile of requests for people to serve on committees not included in our memorandum. With this, I believe, comes the responsibility for each of us to think of our Senate duties in a different way, and to convey that sense to the rest of the faculty. The seriousness with which faculty governance is now being viewed must be respected with a sense of responsibility to our duty. It is no longer something to leave for last, but something that has become important to the institution to do first. That's going to take some getting used to."

"The PAIP process was an assessment process, our first comprehensive attempt at assessment of our institution. Because it was the first, I am sure there are things we might have done differently in a more perfect world. The five-page summary submissions by the units and the evaluations by the assessment teams for academic and non-academic units are located at the Faculty Center, 1400 East Mabel, and you are welcome to come look at them. The full reports, containing all of the departments' submissions and the documentation of the supplementary material for every unit on this campus are located in the Office of Institutional Research. The reports are available to every Senator."

Senator Garcia reported that the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC) had elected new officers: Joe Lingerfelt, President of the Faculty at NAU, President; and Carol Valentine, Secretary of the Senate at ASU, Secretary/Treasurer. However, Dr. Lingerfelt had suffered a heart attack and undergone substantial surgery, rendering him unable, therefore, to fulfill his duties. AFC then named Bill Arnold, President of the Senate at ASU, to replace Lingerfelt as the 1993-94 President.

Senator Garcia stated that the Legislature, as its final act of the year, passed a bill which created an oversight committee for health insurance benefits for all state employees. The five-member committee includes a representative of the faculty, selected by the Board of Regents. He said faculty governance officers from each campus were asked to submit nominations, and Professor Frank Williams of the School of Health Administration and Policy of the College of Business at Arizona State University was selected. At the same time, the Regents created a committee to advise Frank Williams, comprised of the Chairs of the Faculty on each campus, the head of the Benefits Committee on each campus, and the head of

the Staff Advisory Council on each campus. Thus, Senator Garcia will serve as a conduit to that state advisory committee for health insurance issues which faculty wish to have conveyed to that body.

Senator Garcia reported that, since the May 3 Senate meeting, the administration had transmitted to faculty governance a number of requests for review and comment, including the structure of institutional data acquisition and management, academic program review revisions, the review of Promotion and Tenure processes on our campus, and the Tri-University Task Force on Undergraduate Curricular Admissions Requirements report, the latter item being on the Senate's agenda today. He said all had been transmitted to appropriate Senate committees.

Senator Garcia noted that the form of 1993-94 contract renewals had changed, but contained no less information except for the Conditions of Faculty Service portion, which is available at the Faculty Center in the Board of Regents Policy Manual. Renewals must still be signed and returned. He added that the Faculty Center now subscribes to the Chronicle of Higher Education, which is thus available for perusal at that location.

Senator Garcia said that he expects to receive soon a copy of the University's mission statement and strategic objectives in their current form. "As soon as I receive them, I will transmit them to all of you, and we will meet to make formal input concerning those documents, which are in near-final draft form.

- 4D. REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Zwolinski also welcomed everyone back to the start of a new academic year. "This year is going to be a difficult and challenging one. As Senators, you will be involved, as the Provost indicated, in much of the activity taking place on campus. Working together--students, staff, professional staff, faculty and administrators--we can resolve the problems before us and make this a better institution.

Dr. Zwolinski called attention to the new Senate nameplates; replacement had been necessitated by a nearly exhausted supply of colored stock material, and resulted in consistency and improved lettering. He said he hoped Senators liked them. He added that the podium remained as before, with the exception of the change in Presiding Officer, and included Emily Krauz, Administrative Associate, who handles the daily operations of the Faculty Center; the Secretary of the Faculty, Senator Elizabeth Roemer, who has very capably prepared the Senate Minutes and also serves as Editor of the Faculty Newsletter; and Dr. Robert Sankey, who has served as the Senate's Parliamentarian for countless years, "a task which probably borders on the nearly impossible."

Dr. Zwolinski said informal Faculty Senate orientation meetings would be scheduled soon for newly elected Senators, and would include some of the major items contained in the Senate Handbook, such as the composition of the Senate standing committees. Comments will be sought on shared governance. He reminded Senators that the Senate Executive Committee meets approximately two weeks after a Senate meeting, although due to the Labor Day holiday the next meeting would occur a week from today, and the October agenda would be finalized then. He added that the Faculty Center office or any member of the Senate Executive Committee would be happy to assist Senators in entering items onto the committee's draft agenda. Included with today's agenda material was a membership listing of the Senate and General Faculty standing committees for 1993-94.

Dr. Zwolinski, referring to a column he had written for the Faculty Newsletter,

said he had a concern with the relatively small number of faculty who are actively involved in governance activities. "As we take on more participatory responsibilities with central administration, we need to have more faculty serving in various roles. I urge all of you to speak with faculty in your departments and colleges and encourage them to participate in these activities. We are also very interested in you as individual Senators, to learn if you want to be more involved in any of the ad hoc or standing committees that the Senate now has or will be establishing. Please let either Faculty Chair Garcia or me know of your interest."

Dr. Zwolinski said that the Compensation Committee, referred to by Provost Sypherd, and established to design a faculty compensation plan, is chaired by the Provost and includes the following Faculty Senators: Anne Atwater, J.D. Garcia, Stanley Reynolds, and himself.

"The final point that I would like to share with you this afternoon is that the University is developing a mission statement and strategic objectives which will be utilized in the assessment of units in conjunction with the PAIP reports. This will result in some unit reorganizations. Reorganizations not involving the release of tenured faculty will be conducted in accordance with a procedure approved by the Faculty Senate in 1992, and revised in the Spring of 1993. Reorganizations involving the release of tenured faculty will be conducted in accordance with the process mandated by the Arizona Board of Regents, Chapter VI in the Policy Manual. It is anticipated that the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the University's Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee will review all requests for such reorganizations before they are forwarded to the President. The President must then ask the Faculty Senate to designate a committee to review and evaluate the proposed reorganization plan. This review would include a public forum to allow all members of the university community to offer their views on the impact of the plan, if approved. Each reorganization proposal will be reviewed by a separate and independent Senate committee. Faculty Chair Garcia will present a procedure for selecting these Senate reorganization review committees for Senate ratification at today's meeting under agenda item #15. Since there is a possibility that several Senate review committees may be functioning at the same time, the Senate Executive Committee has established a special Select Committee on Reorganization. This Select Committee, essentially an oversight committee, will be responsible for examining the collective impact of all reorganization proposals on the University community. Furthermore, this committee will make certain that procedures for such proposals are followed properly by all parties and will provide timely advice to the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive Committee on all matters pertaining to proposed reorganizations. This Select Committee will be chaired by Dr. Dipankar Chakravarti. The other members are Dr. Donald Thomson, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology; Senator Billie Jo Inman, Department of English; Senator Andy Silverman, College of Law; Senator Ed Williams, Political Science; and Senator Derek Lewis, President of ASUA."

- 4E. REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Roemer introduced her collaborator in production of the Faculty Newsletter, Chestalene Pintozzi, who is serving a second year as a valued member of the team. She reported that the May Senate Minutes had been distributed to unit heads in June, and thus had been available for some time available to members of the faculty who are not members of the Senate. Members of the Senate continue to receive the full minutes; only summaries appear in the Faculty Newsletter. Dr. Roemer said that if anybody still has trouble getting access to full minutes, she would like to know. Copies

are placed in Special Collections, Central Reference, and in the Reserve Book room in the Main Library, as well as in the Music Library, the Law Library, and in the library of the Center for Creative Photography.

"With respect to attendance at Senate meetings, if you find you cannot attend a Senate meeting, you can, of course, send a substitute. The substitute is requested to check in with me so that I can make a special nameplate. Please note, however, that substitutes do not vote."

- 4F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Lewis said that it was good to be back. He noted that the colors of the new nameplates were appropriate: at the beginning of the 20th century, the school colors were silver and green.

He introduced new student members of the Faculty Senate present today: Jon Shoemaker, the Chair of the Undergraduate Senate; Justin Williams, a member of the Engineering Student Council; Vicki Sjong, a member of the Panhellenic Association; Susan Brichler, the Chair of the Campus Policies Review Committee and a member of the President's Cabinet in ASUA; and Wendy Anderson, a member of the Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC).

Senator Lewis said that, since the Senate last met, he was happy to report that the Undergraduate Senate and GPSC have worked together on a number of initiatives, one being the Student Showcase, scheduled for November. This event will showcase a variety of research projects and other types of undertakings to the campus community at large. He said the new bicameral system of student governance is working out quite well, with only a few glitches.

During the summer, the progress of the Arts and Sciences reorganization was monitored. At the state and national levels, Associated Students has begun initiatives on a number of issues, and is very supportive of the faculty compensation issue; it will consider some State financial aid programs and the National Service Act, with its ramifications for Pell Grant entitlements.

Senator Lewis said one of his highest priorities this year will be academic program changes and their impact on students. He said among the reasons he chose to come to this University in 1990 as a freshman was he believed it to be the best institution in the state, and that it had a large diversity of programs from which he could select. "But over the years, I've found that the maxim of being all things to all people is perhaps not the best path to follow, and I am certainly very supportive of taking a look, rolling up our sleeves, and engaging the student body in a discourse that will lead to some very tough decisions about what kind of academic programs we should be offered, which ones we shouldn't, and perhaps even areas where we need to consolidate. That would be something that I will be infusing into the process over the coming months. This year will be a tough year for decisions, but certainly it will be necessary to make choices. You have my commitment as the President of the student body to ensure that our voices will be heard. You can always call me to find out what the temperature is in the student body from day to day, and I encourage you to do that. The most important thing that I would like to communicate to you all is that this year has to be a year of a new sense of community on campus. If we are going to make tough choices, it can only be done in a forum in which we feel comfortable to deal with constructive criticism. The student body is ready to do that, and we look forward to engaging in discussions concerning academic program changes."

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Silverman said he was pleased to have received the list of Senate and General Faculty standing committee rosters, and wondered whether Provost Sypherd could provide such lists for campus-wide committees which he creates. Perhaps he could induce other Vice Presidents to do the same, and perhaps new committee names, charges, and roster of members could be reported in Lo Que Pasa and/or the Faculty Newsletter. He added that faculty governance should also follow that policy. The result would be a better informed campus community.

Senator Songer remarked that he was surprised to learn of the November 12 deadline referred to in Provost Sypherd's report concerning reorganization, because news of departmental responses in the form of strategic planning documents had not filtered down to him. He said he believes faculty are confused by the reorganization's potential for elimination of units, and tend to see such action in terms of the wielding of the ax. He thought that a constructive approach to help counteract such views would be to provide the faculty with more information about the "why's" behind particular reorganizations, perhaps channeling that information through the Faculty Senate or by announcements from the administration. Senator Songer added that perhaps a college-wide approach to reorganization, getting faculty to do different things, rather than just get rid of faculty, might produce gratifying results and save a lot of grief.

Senator Buras also commented on the Provost's report. He said he was optimistic because there appear to be positive efforts underway to change the culture of the campus. The matter of making public as much as possible everything that's happening will result in everybody feeling more a part of the picture, and as Senator Lewis indicated, hard decisions are never comfortable. "But if we feel that we share the making of those hard decisions, we minimize the pain."

Senator J. O'Brien asked Provost Sypherd if the Compensation Committee will draft its report based on a state-wide or site mandate. Dr. Sypherd responded that his assumption is that the three universities will adopt very similar programs, with perhaps some negotiation when the Provosts get together to submit their final report to the Regents. He thought it possible that each university might also be asked to report independently to the Regents. Senator J. O'Brien asked if we might end up with another Arthur Young study. Dr. Sypherd said he did not think so.

Senator Hammond, commenting on items in the Provost's report related to pruning our programs back and consolidating areas of faculty teaching and research, as well as the citizens' right to a quality education, wondered about how to reconcile instructional activities with the decrease in State funding. Dr. Sypherd said that the University's budget is close to \$700 million; the amount brought in from contracts and grants is just over \$200 million, and the State provides approximately \$200 million; "students pay a fair chunk, and as a result of separating tuition from the State budget, there is room for anxiety that the part the students pay will get ever larger. One might expect that the student demand will also become more finely honed and better articulated." He added that "There is a tremendous sense of ownership when Legislators and citizens pass through our many buildings, with our 1,500 faculty and 10,000 employees. I think there is a very big sense that they own this place...not an unreasonable position."

Senator Williams said he would also like to comment on the reorganization issue, with the anticipated carving away of the more esoteric programs while at the same time creating new knowledge. "Creating new knowledge is very frequently

an exercise in pursuing these very esoteric paths, and we ought to be sure that diversity at the University is not only social, racial and ethnic, but also intellectual. While there is room for some pruning and some discipline, there is also the need for ongoing experimentation."

Senator Inman commented that one point of interest to her was stated by Provost Sypherd: the University has 1,500 faculty and 10,000 employees. "Perhaps we need to look not so much at our academic programs when we're cutting, but at other areas--the faculty is really quite outnumbered here."

Senator Impey said he had just come from the research symposium, where the topic of the research enterprise under stress was discussed. He wondered whether the goals outlined by the Provost could be achieved without enormous pain simply by realigning some of our activities. One example, he said, is undergraduate research as a part of their normal curriculum. We have this enormous and highly successful intercollegial enterprise, with researchers bringing in lots of funds, as well as small but very successful efforts in biochemistry, chemistry, and the Honors Center. We could expand those efforts and achieve a number of goals." He said faculty supervising undergraduate research include students in the discussion of scholarship and the creation of knowledge, and provide one-on-one contact, something that other students complain about missing in this large institution.

Senator Witte said she would disagree with the concept of narrowing the University's focus. "Even with less money, we have to broaden our focus because we must prepare for the next century of uncertainty. The idea of broadening, as opposed to narrowing, in the face of a diminishing budget is a challenge."

Dr. Sypherd, by way of clarification, said he was talking particularly of the splintering and fragmentation of the curriculum. "As an exercise, you might each take the catalog, go through the number of graduate listings, and see how many departments have more graduate courses than graduate students. That's the kind of focus I am talking about."

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MAY 3, 1993: The minutes of May 3, 1993 were approved as distributed.
7. APPROVAL OF CURRICULUM BULLETIN: Dr. Zwolinski reported that the Senate Executive Committee has discussed the approval of curricular items at each Senate meeting, and considered that it might be possible for the Senate to act on curricular matters more effectively and efficiently by scheduling them for one or two meetings during the year. He said this question will be assigned to a Senate standing committee for consideration and to solicit faculty input. He said he would keep the Senate informed. Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 5, Section I, was then moved (motion 1993/94-10), seconded and approved on a voice vote.

Approval of Curriculum Bulletin Vol. 15, No. 5, Section III was moved (motion 1993/94-11) and seconded. Senator Myers stated that he counted 66 new courses and two deletions in Section III; he wondered if anyone had a sense for the cost of the new courses. Senator Garcia said that at a previous Senate meeting he had called for a review by the Senate Budget Committee of the financial consequences of the casual approval of new courses and programs, and he hoped that the 1993-94 committee would undertake such a review. Senator Neuman said that, as a new Senator, he was having difficulty deciding on what basis he should vote

yes or no on Section III; in particular, he was interested in the intellectual content of the new courses, and how they would intermesh with the existing curriculum. He wondered whether a review committee could convey comments to Senators prior to a vote being taken. He said he appreciated Provost Sypherd's attitude with respect to the need to consolidate, and did not view that as an attempt to narrow the curriculum, but rather to focus it.

Senator Garcia, by way of explanation, said that it is the job of the Undergraduate or the Graduate Council to thoroughly review the proposals that appear in the Curriculum Bulletin, although the overall financial impact is not considered by either Council. He added that the intellectual impact on the University's curriculum is not necessarily considered, either, and that is probably the job of the Senate. Unless the Senate wishes to take on a lot of research, it probably should accept that new courses have been properly structured and are in compliance with University rules.

Senator Songer said that in the College of Agriculture, the College Curriculum Committee does consider the financial implications of new courses, and what changes are being made to accommodate them, before the course proposals are sent forward.

At Dr. Zwolinski's request, Dr. Sankey provided background on new course proposals. "The Curriculum Bulletin is produced by the Curriculum Office, of which I am the Director. All matters of policy or procedure go through the Undergraduate or Graduate Council. Courses do not. In the early 1950s, there was a University-wide Curriculum Committee. When the Curriculum Office was set up, the approval and cataloging functions were delegated to it. Faculty approval of courses was left with departments and colleges. When new course proposals or changes in courses have been signed by the department head and the dean of the college that offers that course, the Curriculum Office assumes that the policies of that department and college have indeed been followed. "The Curriculum Office does not make an effort to second-guess the procedures of a college or a department, but it does carefully ascertain that course proposals have been signed by those two persons at those two levels. If not, they go back."

Senator Desai commented that at his previous university, he was required to appear before a college-level committee when he proposed a new course, to defend the proposal; new course proposals were sent to all departments who might have an interest. He said that in comparison, the procedures used on this campus for introducing new courses appear to be ad hoc and not scientific, which may account for some of the duplication of courses. He wondered whether this might not be an appropriate time to develop some stricter guidelines for the introduction of new courses.

Dr. Sankey thanked Senator Desai for mentioning that issue, because he forgot to mention one function of both the Curriculum Office and the Curriculum Bulletin. Several hundred new course proposals are sent annually, along with a standard form, to other departments that might have an interest, either because they might want their students to be aware of such new offerings or because they may feel there is a conflict with courses offered by their department. The second vehicle used for that purpose is the Curriculum Bulletin itself, which is sent to about 600 persons in addition to members of the Senate. He said the Bulletin can be sent to any department interested in receiving it. The present mailing list includes department heads, advisors, heads of curriculum committees and others. He said there are occasionally responses on the part of a depart-

ment, and when that occurs and a course is withdrawn from the Bulletin, the information is announced in Senate meetings. Sometimes responses are received prior to printing. In either event, the Curriculum Office asks the departments involved to get together to work out the difficulties. Dr. Sankey said he was providing this information by way of explanation of current practices, and was not in any way defending the procedures set up for the Curriculum Office over the course of a number of years.

Senator Lewis asked Dr. Sankey, "Where in all of this does someone sit down and say, here is a course that someone wants to add--let's see where else in the University something like this is already offered. Is that process included?" Dr. Sankey said his office examines both the title of the course and the description to determine with what other departments there may be overlap. If overlap is evident, his office sends to the head of the other department(s) a copy of the proposal with a note indicating that they or their students may be interested or concerned about the proposed course. He said the only other opportunity for review of duplication occurs through the distribution of the Curriculum Bulletin and through review by colleges prior to the course proposal being transmitted to the Curriculum Office. Most duplication would occur within the college. Senator Lewis said there might be a need to encourage flexibility, perhaps at the departmental level. He said he has observed in his discipline (science) a number of courses that are very similar.

Senator Inman reported that one of the issues that she thought the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC) might undertake this year was a review of how new courses are proposed and approved throughout the University: how courses enter the catalog, and how descriptions are revised. She said officials responsible for curriculum approval campus-wide would be involved in this review, and that suggestions for revision might develop from that review. Senator Inman said she was not sure whether her committee might be "jumping the gun," but if Dr. Zwolinski was going to appoint a committee, ICPC might be the appropriate committee to undertake this assignment.

Senator Silverman said he was glad to hear that the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee is planning a review of the curricular situation. He said he would particularly be interested to learn if department and college curriculum committees exist campus-wide, in view of the fact that there appears to be no oversight to ensure faculty approval. Senator Silverman said he hoped ICPC would look at a second issue: the possibility of requesting reports from the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, summarizing their discussions on matters which then come to the Senate.

Senator Pitt said she agreed with Senator Silverman's comments related to control over the curriculum at the department and college levels. She said that in Fine Arts tight control does exist, with faculty curriculum committees and a college curriculum committee. But concerning previous comments related to cost, she said she believes that even when costs are associated with a new course proposal, there is no implication that funds will be found for that course. It was her opinion that funding would be a matter totally within the discretion of the department concerned, and should not be discussed beyond the departmental level.

Senator Myers questioned the status of courses which were being taught in the Summer or Fall of 1993 but not yet submitted to the Senate for approval. Dr. Sankey responded that such courses were submitted on permanent course forms with the appropriate approvals. When the Curriculum Office cannot get the proposals

to the Senate prior to the requested effective date, they convert to temporary, experimental courses; as such, they can be taught twice without Senate approval. The permanent course proposal, then, is submitted to the Senate at its next meeting, without changing the requested effective date. The only alternative, given that the Senate does not meet during the summer, would be to shut off acceptance of any course proposals after approximately the first of April for fall semester offerings. Dr. Sankey added that if the Senate wished to do that, the Curriculum Office would comply.

Dr. Sypherd said "I can't pass up the opportunity to press the point home here on the cost of offering courses. As I understand it, the reason general education has not been a sterling success is that 'the administration has not supported it.' If departments and colleges wish to continue to expand their course offerings, drawing faculty farther and farther away from those courses that have 50, 100, 150 students in them, in favor of those that have 5, 10 and 15, there is a tremendous cost. The administration feels as if it has already paid. This ever-expanding universe of course offerings has to be reined in because we are in a period of limited resources."

Dr. Sankey noted that course offerings total approximately 10,000, with undergraduate programs in the neighborhood of about 380, including all options within the 135 degree programs that Provost Sypherd mentioned.

Dr. Zwolinski said that discussion should be drawn to a close unless someone had a pressing point that they would like to bring up at this time.

Senator Jones commented that, concerning costs, the implication for new courses goes beyond the department, because instructors expect the library to provide appropriate books and material to support them. "In many cases, courses are offered for which the library does not have adequate resources or is experiencing cutbacks."

Senator Songer asked what should be done if errors that are not typographical are found in the Curriculum Bulletin, especially in a section not designated for Senate approval. Dr. Sankey said the Curriculum Office should be contacted, so they can make appropriate connections.

Dr. Zwolinski called for action on motion 1993/94-11. A voice vote indicated approval, with some opposition and two abstentions.

8. FACULTY SENATOR SURVEY: Dr. Zwolinski asked Senators to complete the survey form included with their meeting call, which asked for a list of five key issues other than compensation that Senators believe are facing the University this year. Drs. Roemer and Sankey collected the forms. The Senate will be asked to prioritize the results in a merged list.
9. APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY DEGREE LISTS, SUMMER 1993 COMMENCEMENT: Dr. Zwolinski said that in anticipation of questions which might arise on degree lists, the Senate Executive Committee discussed the issue of Senate approval. This topic will be transmitted to a Senate standing committee, and the committee's recommendations will be brought to the Senate for future action.

Approval was then moved (motion 1993/94-12) and seconded. Senator Gruener: "I'd like to suggest that, just as concerned the new course list, this is an inappropriate action for the Senate. We are being asked to approve things that

others have already approved, and we're asked to do it in a way that does not involve any new research or different criteria. This reminds me of another item that was reported to us previously by Provost Sypherd: that there were 43 actions and signatures necessary to acquire a telephone in this institution. The fact that the administration has reduced that process to three signatures should be an example of what we should do....We should talk about the policies, and what it takes to graduate, but to pass on each and every student or course ...is simply inappropriate for this body." Senator Neuman said he strongly supported Senator Gruener's comment.

After calling for a voice vote, by which the motion was approved without opposition, Dr. Zwolinski stated that Senators would be kept informed of efforts to find better ways of dealing with these issues.

10. CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR FACULTY BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Dr. Zwolinski called for nominations for two Senate representatives to the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee for one-year terms. He said the election would occur at the October 4 Senate meeting. Nominations must be submitted to the Faculty Center by Friday, September 17. He noted that two members of this faculty committee are also members of the University Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, providing a direct link back to the Faculty Senate. He asked Senators to give these nominations serious thought.
11. RATIFICATION OF TWO NEW FACULTY SENATORS: Dr. Zwolinski announced that two members of the Senate, Virginia Horak, College of Education, and Terence Valenzuela, College of Medicine, had recently resigned their seats. In accordance with the Bylaws of the General Faculty, Article VI, Section 1, when Senate vacancies occur, and there were unelected candidates for the seat in question, the Presiding Officer will ask the unelected candidates who received the highest number of votes in the last election to fill any vacancies. Dr. Zwolinski reported that an examination of election results from the last election indicated that Lawrence Aleamoni, College of Education, and Walter Williams, College of Medicine, met these criteria, and both had agreed to serve to the end of the vacated terms (4/94). He said that before these two faculty members could officially take their Senate seats, their selection had to be ratified by the Senate.

Senator Garcia moved to suspend the rules so that ratification could occur immediately. That motion (1993/94-13) was seconded, and a voice vote indicated approval without opposition. Senator Garcia then moved that Lawrence Aleamoni and Walter Williams be ratified as the Senators from their respective colleges to serve through April 1994 (motion 1993/94-14). That motion was seconded, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

Dr. Zwolinski presented Senator Williams with his nameplate, and indicated Senator Aleamoni would join the Senate at the October meeting.

12. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON DRAFT REPORT OF THE TRI-UNIVERSITY TASK FORCE ON UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULAR ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS: Dr. John D. McCullen, member of and Senate representative to the Task Force, reminded Senators that formation of the Task Force had been reported to the Senate in February through the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, and the Senate had considered many of the relevant issues. The Task Force met during the last year, and completed its deliberations in June. Its report was submitted to the Senate with the call for this meeting. The report had been submitted to the Council of Presidents;

while they approved it in principle, they wanted to be sure that the respective faculties had an opportunity for input. He said that was the purpose of this agenda item: to provide Senators an opportunity to review the report and respond to the Council of Presidents.

The general charge to the Task Force, on page 2 of their report, was to consider additions to the admissions requirements, to review the impact on students' academic performance since the admissions requirements were last changed in 1987, and to look at the new competency-based standards being put in place by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. "Our feeling generally was that the 1987 changes, which increased the number of units required for high school students to enter the university from 0 to 11, were in some sense not an advance at all because 11 units of college preparatory courses was clearly not enough. It was not a realistic demand on the students, and the mandate of 11 units sent a false message to the high schools of the state. That false message has been responsible in part for some of the problems we have had since, the fact that approximately 40 percent of our entering students are not prepared in English and mathematics to undertake University-level work. We felt that students and school districts from those parts of the State which did not have the benefit of a large representation of college graduates to counsel students about preparation for university work were penalized. Minorities and small high schools suffered disproportionately. Many of the students who come to the University do have a good preparation. They go well beyond the 11 units. But they do so because they have been counseled by others--their parents or their high school counselors or the general climate of the environment in which they find themselves. They realize that 11 units is insufficient.

"The unanimous attitude of the Task Force was to increase the number of units to the level of academic preparation necessary to achieve success. The next issue was simply where those units should go. We gathered information from many sources including what every young high school student should know, to what courses have been shown by as much research as is available to predict academic success in many areas, not just the local areas. There is very little information, but what is available clearly shows that math, science and foreign language are good predictors of success in college and University level work.

"The Task Force realized that implementation of these recommendations could not be done either in a vacuum or immediately. A three-pronged effort is distributed among the 11 recommendations before you.

"One recommendation is that this new college preparatory curriculum be in place by 1997 in order to give the high schools four years lead time. The second is, we will establish and support a committee on quality academic preparation which would be a cross-cultural committee to include people from the universities, the junior colleges, and the Department of Education, to try to work out a strategy and techniques to make sure that the 1997 high school graduating class across the state is ready to enter the University. Thirdly, the Task Force was charged with reviewing the standards that the Department of Education has already begun to implement. The opinion of the Task Force was unanimous, these are going to be wonderful things, and if they really catch hold in the State by 2010, it will no longer be necessary to impose unit requirements because the students, in fulfilling the competency requirements, will have necessarily completed the units."

It was then moved and seconded (motion 1993/94-15) that the recommendations of the Tri-University Task Force on Undergraduate Curricular Admissions Require-

ments be adopted.

Senator Lewis asked about completion of deficiencies before students were allowed to enroll as regular students: in the discussions which led to creation of these recommendations, and which included high schools, junior colleges and members of the community, was there discussion on the kind of articulation program that could be put in place, to provide for students with deficiencies? And secondly, did the Task Force find a relationship between the rate of deficiency and students' socio-economic backgrounds?

Dr. McCullen, responding to the second question, said that "the database is very sparse....There is anecdotal evidence that practically every admissions officer, and this Task Force had admissions officers from each university in the state, strongly supports the point that schools with poorer socio-economic circumstances correlate with students with deficiencies. Such information provides admissions officers with another lever to improve the situation. If the present policy is upgraded, so that students are required to improve their skills, then I think that problem will disappear. But there are no data that I can quote you to support any of this."

Senator Garcia recalled that the Senate considered many of these issues when Senator Young presented a preliminary version of the Task Force report in the Senate last April. "I think this is a very positive report, and I encourage the Senate to adopt these recommendations; furthermore, I would recommend to the Regents that they become the policies of the State. The issues concerning socio-economically disadvantaged schools and minorities need special attention, but they are issues that the institutions need to pay attention to in any case. Students who come from schools with lower socio-economic status are our customers, and we must serve those customers."

Dr. McCullen, returning to Senator Lewis' first question, said the articulation question certainly came up, but it was well outside the charge of the Task Force. But the Task Force did want to speak to the issue, and consequently urged the creation of the committee on quality academic preparation.

Senator Pitt said she found the following sentence, from page 4, troubling: "The most distressing finding is that students who are admitted with multiple deficiencies (especially if these deficiencies are in mathematics and science) have 'little or no chance of persisting to graduation.'" She said the faculty in Fine Arts have not found this to be true for students enrolled in the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree program. "We are not looking for people with strong backgrounds in math and science. What degree is being referred to here as 'persisting to graduation?'" Dr. McCullen said he believes this would be true University-wide, although it may well be that in Fine Arts it is not as pronounced as it is elsewhere. Senator Pitt said introduction of these new requirements would have a strong impact on the Fine Arts BFA program, because many of those students don't focus on math, science and foreign languages in high school. Rather, they focus on the arts. She believed this policy would, in effect, eliminate those students with outstanding talent in the Fine Arts, or place them under additional stress in their attempt to be accepted to an Arizona university. Senator Pitt asked if any provision would be made for these students. Dr. McCullen responded that it was not the Task Force's intent to waive any requirements. He added that this report is only a recommendation, but it is established fact that students who enter with both math and science deficiencies have less than a 10 percent chance of graduating. Senator Pitt said

she would like to go on record that that is definitely not the experience in the Art Department, and that this will cause a tremendous amount of duress for incoming exceptionally talented art students.

Senator Troy noted that the Task Force's recommendation #2 would place this university above the national average in mathematics, requiring 4 years, while the national average is only 3; at the same time, there is no increase in the social sciences, leaving that category at 2, which is 1 below the national average. He wondered whether this was an oversight. Dr. McCullen said that this was not an oversight; reasons why the Task Force made this recommendation include (1) "The best data we have is that students who fail to take mathematics courses in their senior year struggle; (2) The Task Force believed that the purpose for entrance requirements is to ensure adequate academic experience. One of the biggest problems with 11 units vs. 15 or 16 units is that students do not have enough academic experience to enter into virtually any University program. (3) The recommendations emphasize those areas that seemed to be the best predictors of academic success." He added that available data did not indicate that another year of social science would be a better predictor of success than another year of math.

Senator E. Williams commented that the social science requirement had caught his attention, too, because the two years of social science would be the only area where the Arizona universities preparatory requirements do not equal or exceed those of common national college entrance or Arizona high school graduation requirements. Dr. McCullen said that, in fact, students would complete three years of social sciences because the State requires completion of two courses not considered to be college entrance courses: Arizona and the U. S. Constitution and Free Enterprise. He stated that of the required 16 hours, 1 is unspecified, and students will be able to select one unit from the arts, foreign languages, social sciences, English, speech or mathematics.

Senator Witte said she was concerned about shutting doors. Senator Silverman agreed, and said "We want to have not only ethnic diversity but diversity of academic interests." He said a second concern related to the physical education requirement of many school districts, bringing the required units to 17 or 18. "We are saying that in four years you can take two courses beyond these requirements if you want to attend an Arizona university. These requirements may really restrict high school students and what they are able to take while they are in high school, especially if Free Enterprise is required. Maybe we're saying they have no freedom of choice if they're going to come to an Arizona university, and that concerns me."

Dr. McCullen said he appreciated that point of view. "I must say, however, that I think that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves to demand entrance requirements that we know are fraudulent. We know that a student coming in here with 11 units of academic preparation in high school has a much less than 50-50 chance of graduating from this university."

Senator Neuman said he supported the spirit of the recommendations, yet wondered whether the Task Force could perhaps consider the possibility of having a number of optional tracks for incoming students. He said he realized it would not be easy to institute, but he has seen it in operation in other countries, where high school students can choose among several different tracks, for example mathematics/science or fine arts. The University could then gear its admissions requirements for particular colleges and schools according to those tracks.

Senator Neuman then asked about recommendation #8, that by Fall 1997 students be admitted with a maximum of two deficiencies, and, no later than Fall 2002, the Board would re-examine this deficiency policy and determine whether to adopt a policy that no student be permitted to matriculate as a degree-seeking student at a state university until all deficiencies are removed. He asked why this should not occur in 1997. Dr. McCullen responded that the Task Force found it necessary to make many compromises. He noted that he was reporting for the Task Force, not himself.

Senator Songer, commenting on recommendation #6, regarding the standardized placement tests, said he was concerned that the Math Department administers placement tests now, but admits that 45 percent of students flunk the courses in which they are placed. He added that he believes it is important that if these recommendations are adopted, we should improve the accuracy of the placement tests to avoid frustrating the students. If the high school courses will not enable students to pass the placement tests, then something else should be done.

Senator Garcia said he believes the proposed oversight committee has the flexibility to negotiate difficult issues. He noted that four campuses and many other individuals worked together to bring these recommendations to all four campuses. He said he thought particular needs, including Senator Pitt's concerns, could be dealt with through the oversight committee. Each institution may propose revisions to the oversight committee, including the development of tracks.

Senator Fernandez: "The Senate last spring did support stiffer admissions standards. Enrollment is going to be capped at 35,000. Decisions are going to be made. Not every student that applies here will be admitted. I think it is important for the Senate to play a role in making those decisions, rather than leaving them up to an admissions officer. The plan that is proposed here will be phased in. Some of us, actually, would recommend that we speed up the implementation for a number of reasons, including the fact that we had more entering students this fall than we anticipated.

"Regarding minority students, an issue that some Senators have raised, the empirical evidence is this: In the fall of 1987, this University raised its admission standards. Prior to doing that, there were a number of discussions about the negative impact such action would have on the enrollment of minority students. Since then, the facts are that the proportionate number of minority students has increased yearly at this University. Raising the admissions standards in a timely way, and letting the high schools know that changes are going to be made at the universities, will result in the proper preparation of the students by our high schools. The University has to continue aggressive recruitment, and it must enhance its retention efforts. Speaking for myself, I am not proud of what we do in terms of retention of minority students. Recruitment efforts have been successful, but when 40 percent of these students are gone at the end of the first year, there is a problem. We are not giving the right messages to the high schools about the preparation that is needed in order for students to succeed. I think we should be admitting students to this University that have a reasonable chance of succeeding, and succeeding means graduating.

"One final point. As you know, the Board of Regents has a plan for meeting the enrollment demand that they project into the year 2010. The plan includes the

building out of ASU-West; the development of an ASU-East--already possibly identified as Williams Air Force Base; the expansion of the NAU-Yuma Off-Campus Center and the UA-Sierra Vista Off-Campus Center; and the development of a new four-year university in Pima County. We have a difficult decision to make, but I support the proposal wholeheartedly, and I hope we move in that direction."

Senator Wright said he wanted to support Senator Fernandez' perspective on this issue. "If we ask less of our children in the form of requirements that we place on them, that surely will be what we receive. If we ask more of them, and phase those requirements in, the University's leadership will help the high schools to provide programs for our students which will help them meet our demands--that is the only thing we can do. If we say we want to be in the top ten universities in the United States, but only require 11 units for admission, and then fail 40 percent of our students, these things don't combine in my mind. I support the philosophy that has been put forward here."

Senator Young said that by raising entrance requirements, bridging course resources will be freed for diversion to other programs in general education.

Senator Hildebrand said he strongly supported the recommendations and the comments of Senator Fernandez, and wanted to add a slightly different spin. In the last week, he said, the national press widely reported the results of a rather impressive survey that indicated 50 percent of the adults in this country are functionally illiterate and innumerate. Speaking as a former musician, he felt he could argue that even artists should be able to read, write and calculate at the level of their grocery bills. "The message that we communicate on elevating requirements will have an important impact not only on our own admission policies, but on the education offered in the public schools of the State, so that even those who don't come to the University may have a better education, with increased literacy and math skills."

Senator Buras commented that this is an important document, an important step forward, but he believes we have to continue. He said he agreed with Senator Pitt that we must encourage extraordinary individuals who have shown outstanding talent, whatever it is, but they must be full persons with knowledge and understanding of reading, writing, arithmetic, science, and social sciences. In this way, we will create good citizens.

Senator DaDeppo wondered why the mathematics entrance requirements couldn't remain the same except to require that the last course be taken in the senior year, eliminating the problem of disuse causing hardship. Dr. McCullen stated that he believes the proposed requirement for four years of mathematics will eventually fall back to three when the state competency standards are in force and the definition of high school algebra will be uniform. "The reason we went to four units is that this simply is not the case today. The level of second year algebra varies from pre-calculus to the second semester of first-year algebra."

Senator Myers commented that the Math Department does not specify math requirements for any curriculum or major other than mathematics; yet nearly all University students have a mathematics requirement stipulated by their faculty, college or department. If mathematics requirements for incoming students are minimized, those students will be denied access to many courses in various departments. And when students enter without a math course in their senior year, they are simply not prepared. Unfortunately, he said, the same students who do not take

the fourth year math course in high school are the ones who did not do well in the third-year course. So they are penalized for having a year in which they did not take a course--lack of reinforcement--and secondly, they did not do well in the first place.

The question was called, and a voice vote indicated approval, with some negative votes heard.

13. DISCUSSION ON THE FINAL REPORT OF THE RESEARCH PARK SUBCOMMITTEE: Senator Witte distributed a copy of the Wildcat article of September 10 on this topic. She noted that the article presented several different perspectives and quoted a number of Senators' views. She said the Subcommittee on Research Parks had completed its report, concerning the possibility that a research park will be created at the IBM plant, and a copy had been provided to Senators with today's meeting call. She called attention to page 3 of the report, "which states that the main weakness of the proposal, although there are many favorable aspects, is that there is not a well thought out management plan and an appropriate opportunity for faculty input in this important venture, which will involve not only money--and if it is not cost-neutral, substantial amounts of money--but also problems in terms of the mission of the University and the activities of faculty." She introduced Dr. Harris Bernstein, member of the Research Park Subcommittee, and invited questions.

Senator Myers requested a one-page list summarizing the committee's recommendations, for the Senate's October 4 meeting. Senator Witte agreed that would be provided.

Senator Silverman requested an estimate of the anticipated costs, beyond what it would cost to retire the bonds, as he had heard about plans to rent part of the facility. Senator Witte responded that such information was not provided to the subcommittee, which is recommending establishment of an oversight committee. Dr. Bernstein reported that the approximate cost of the IBM facility is \$100 million; the mortgage arrangement, with a 20-year lease, would be of the order of \$10 million a year.

Senator Silverman asked how this would be paid. Senator Witte said that had not been made clear yet. She indicated that other matters for discussion included indirect cost expenditures and potential conflicts of interest. Senator Witte said the Research Policy Committee had been reviewing drafts of a Conflict of Interest policy since last year, and she anticipated a final draft would come to the Senate later this year.

Senator Young said that before acting on the report, he thought it would be a good idea to consider the impact it could have on the relationship between research and teaching at the University--whether it will further polarize the difference between research and teaching faculty. He was concerned as well about the site's distance from campus. He wondered whether a research park could offer benefits to the faculty who teach on campus, and whether faculty would be expected to split their time between technology transfer and time on campus.

Senator Reynolds commented that he served on the Subcommittee on Research Parks, and one of the difficulties with the report is that the subcommittee actually had no proposal to react to in developing its report. He said he believed the subcommittee could have made more specific recommendations had the negotiating details been made available to them. He added that he believes there are some

potentially large benefits if the negotiations are successful, and that the University has been trying to structure this in such a way that there will be no significant financial impact on the University, i.e., covering costs through lease arrangements and other revenues that would be earned as part of owning the property. While he did not want to minimize other concerns, he said he wanted to suggest there may be some large benefits, too.

Senator Witte reported that one of the subcommittee members had placed comments on her desk which expressed the opinion that the University should not agree to purchase the IBM site until the management issue and operations costs had been determined. She added that "I think the concern is that the negotiations are proceeding without these considerations being involved."

Senator Buras said that, in addition to the focus on issues of economics, i.e., that this project should be cost-neutral, consideration should be given to the academic issues. Senator W. Williams said he would like to respond to Senator Buras' comments. He said he spent ten years working in Cal Tech's research park, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. A research park functions as an industrial arm of a university. The administrative portion is run by the university, and the research sections are usually subsidized by research grants, including the salaries of engineers and scientific staff, the positions tied specifically to grant funds. He added that when a research park is successful, it adds a lot to a university in providing opportunities for graduate students to senior postdocs.

Senator Dvorak, also a member of the subcommittee, said that as the subcommittee was assembling the portions of its report, it was like "batting in the dark." The subcommittee was unable to obtain much information. At the time, it was unaware that Hughes was making a firm commitment. He noted that more information is available now, and on page 11, the buildings that will be rented by Hughes are 20, 21 and 30, while 60 and 71 will be used by the university, instead of 21 and 23.

Senator Witte said she hoped Senators would think about these issues, and come to the October 4 meeting ready for discussion and action.

14. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON CHANGES TO THE GRADE APPEAL POLICY: Dr. Zwolinski called for discussion and action on the seconded motion (1993/94-16) from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC) regarding revisions in the Grade Appeal Policy. Also on the agenda for discussion was a seconded motion (1993/94-17) for an amendment to the Grade Appeal Policy from the Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC). Discussion was led by Senator Billie Jo Inman, Chair of ICPC and Dr. David Williams, Chair of SAPC.

Senator Inman noted that last spring Dr. Susan Steele, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences, submitted for consideration a revision that she called a clarification of the Grade Appeal Policy. That revision was referred to ICPC. Senator Kenneth Young, Chair of the 1992-93 committee, discussed the matter with the committee, conferred with Dr. Steele, and prepared the presentation mailed to Senators with today's agenda materials. She said the text he used for current policy was in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP), but a somewhat different text appears in the current (and preceding) catalog. It appeared to her that the differences are simply stylistic. "There is nothing revolutionary about this, the power equation does not change, and the responsibilities of the students, the instructors, the department heads, the committees, the deans are the same as they have been. The intent of the changes is to speed

up the process a bit, to set deadlines more precisely so that the process will normally be completed within one semester. Also, to insist that everything be put in writing: statements of instructors and students and all, and that copies be sent to all concerned parties."

The question was called, and the seconded motion from ICPC (1993/94-16) was then approved unanimously on a voice vote.

Dr. Zwolinski said that the Student Affairs Policy Committee submitted as a seconded motion (1993/94-17) changes to the Grade Appeal Policy related to the membership of the committee to be established by the Dean. There was no discussion, and a voice vote indicated approval, although some dissent was heard.

Dr. Zwolinski said he had been asked when the changes in policy would take effect, since nothing was stipulated in the motions.

Senator Inman said she had talked with Dean Steele about implementation, and the dean had indicated that she would like to see the policy changes become effective in the Spring Semester of 1994, with Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Ed McCullough handling notification of students. Senator Inman added that material contained in the catalog has always represented a kind of contract with students, and she was unsure where we stood in regard to the catalog.

Dr. Sankey said that, because the Curriculum Office will be asked this question, Senate action on this point is needed. It appeared to him that these changes could be initiated as early as Spring if appropriate notice was sent throughout the campus. He said it would be very helpful to have the backing of the Senate.

Senator Young asked why the versions in the catalog and the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel were different. Senator Inman said she had conferred with Dr. Sankey on that question, and he indicated that when the Grade Appeal Policy first entered the catalog in 1991, the wording had been obtained from the Student Handbook. Specific responsibility for the change was unclear. She added that with the changes approved today, one text exists that will be authoritative, and we can forget the past.

Senator Ewbank then moved that the Senate be on record as supporting implementation of the revised Grade Appeal Policy beginning with the second semester of 1993-94. That motion (1993/94-18) was seconded and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

15. 1992-93 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN: Dr. Zwolinski noted that the 1992-93 Annual Report of the Committee of Eleven had been received and asked that the Secretary make an appropriate record.
16. RATIFICATION OF THE PROCEDURES FOR SELECTING REORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMITTEES: Senator Garcia reported that the Board of Regents requires the Faculty Senate to select a committee consisting of faculty and students which will review each proposed reorganization that involves the release of tenured faculty. The Senate Executive Committee was recommending the procedures contained in the document submitted to Senators with today's agenda materials for selection of such committees. Due to the late hour, he suggested that if there are questions on the proposal, action be delayed until the October meeting.

Senator Atwater said she had some questions on the wording which referred to

eight members, with a chair to be selected from those faculty holding elected positions. She wondered whether that meant elected to this committee. Senator Garcia said that referred to elected Faculty Senators, members of the Committee of Eleven, or similar positions. Senator Atwater requested that portion be clarified. Senator Desai also suggested some changes, and Senator Larson then moved (motion 1993/94-19) that discussion on this proposal be tabled until the next meeting. That motion was seconded and approved unanimously on a voice vote.

17. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

18. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1993

- 1993/94-10 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 5, Section I.
1993/94-11 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 5, Section III.
1993/94-12 Approval of Degree Lists for Summer 1993 Commencement.
1993/94-13 Approval to suspend the rules.
1993/94-14 Ratification of Senate College Representatives Lawrence Aleamoni, Education; and Walter Williams, Medicine.
1993/94-15 Approval of the recommendations of the Tri-University Task Force on Undergraduate Curricular Admissions Requirements.
1993/94-16 Approval of changes to the Grade Appeal Policy.
1993/94-17 Approval of additional changes to the Grade Appeal Policy.
1993/94-18 Approval to implement above changes to the Grade Appeal Policy effective with the second semester 1993-94.
1993/94-19 Approval of motion to table until October 4 consideration of Procedures for Selecting Reorganization Review Committees.