

1990/91-97

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, April 1, 1991 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, April 1, 1991, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-six members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Vivian L. Cox presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Aquilano, Avery, Badger, Bickel, Braden, Burkhart, Butler, Chen, Cox, Elliott, Enos, Ewbank, Ganapol, Garcia, Goetinck, Hildebrand, Jones, Kermes, Knight, D. Larson, LaSalle, Lei, Masone, Mautner, Mitchell, O'Brien, Pao Tao, Redeker, Roemer, Salomon, Sander, Schneider, Shisslak, Silverman, Spera, Steinke, Sugnet, Sullivan, Thomson, Tomizuka, Tomoff, Vezino, Witte, Zukoski, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Adamec, Atwater, Bizik, Bootman, Cole, Cork, Cusanovich, Dalen, Dvorak, Escalante, Fenstermacher, Fernandez, Ganguly, Hershberger, Hetrick, Joens, Johnson, Koffler, Kolodny, Krager, L. Larson, McCullough, Parsons, Phipps, Ratner, Rollins, Sigelman, Smerdon, Smith, Songer, Valdez, Valenzuela, VanMetre, Woodard and Zeigler.

OPEN SESSION: Senator James P. O'Brien (School of Music) said that in view of the fact that this is apparently the first General Faculty election to include endorsements of candidates, it would be beneficial for less well-known and unendorsed candidates to have the opportunity of participating in an open forum to assist them in becoming better known. Senator Marlys Witte (Department of Surgery) agreed with that suggestion, especially for the Faculty Chair position.

Assistant Professor Bruce Walsh (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology) said this was the first Senate meeting he had attended, and his concern was with the March Senate Minutes and the political tone he perceived. He said he was a member of CUE (Coalition for University Excellence) and coordinates the largest undergraduate class in Biology on campus as well as conducting a substantial amount of research, so he had strong feelings on both teaching and research. He said the position of his colleagues was not getting across, and he was disturbed by what he saw as attacks on CUE, "an organization which seeks to generate input in a very constructive way." He added that his views reflected the opinions of a number of people not in attendance today, and those views are not being presented.

Senator Witte commented that she had co-authored a letter recently circulated to faculty describing the qualifications of candidates not endorsed by CUE in their endorsement letters.

Senator Salomon commented that in this situation, everybody is not going to love everybody else, memos will fly, and that is politics, but faculty genuinely concerned with campus excellence should not be upset. He added that "sterility is over with."

There being no further comments, and it having been determined a quorum was present, Dr. Cox opened the Senate Meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Approval of Minutes of March 4, 1991: Approval of the Minutes of March 4 was moved and seconded (motion 90/91-40). Acting Secretary Butler reported that a memo had been received from Dr. Eugene Levy concerning the reporting of his remarks in the Open Session of March 4, and unless there was objection, he would append those written comments to today's Minutes. There being no objection, the Minutes were then approved on a voice vote.

REPORT FROM THE ACTING PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: Vice Provost Holly Smith reported Acting President Cole was unable to attend today's meeting, and she had been asked to read his report: "As many of you know, a proposed budget plan for 1991-92 was discussed last week with the Deans Council and with the Ad Hoc Budget Priorities Advisory Task Force. In a few days time I shall review the proposal with the Senate's Budget and Strategic Planning Policy Committee. I am asking for the comments and advice of all these groups so that we can be prepared to design the final plan when we know what the Legislature approves for next year.

"In the meantime I want to outline for the Senate the basic problems that the plan must confront and the basic principles that the Administration has adopted in developing the proposal. For simplicity's sake I am going to confine my remarks to the Main Campus budget. The same themes are true, in general, for the College of Medicine.

"This preliminary plan is based on the assumption that the Legislature is likely to approve the recommendations of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC). At first glance this may not appear to create much of a problem for us since the JLBC has suggested an expenditure authority for the Main Campus only \$2 million less than this year, that is before the mid-year recision, and only \$460,00 less for the College of Medicine. The problem consists of what we find behind these overall values.

"First, as I noted, there is the reduced expenditure authority. Next, the JLBC has assumed what we believe to be unrealistic local collection estimates, that is, the budget is funded in part by revenues that we do not expect to collect. Furthermore, the JLBC proposes sizeable increases for some of our activities but funds them by reducing the amounts for other programs. Finally, the required vacancy factor, the amount of personnel money that we are awarded in theory but are expected to return at year's end, has been substantially increased. Overall, then, whereas at first glance the JLBC proposal suggests only a \$2 million cut, we calculate that it really amounts to a \$7.8 million problem.

"Beyond all this there is the challenge of the Governor's proposal. As you may have read in the newspapers, Governor Symington has proposed additional cuts in agency budgets below the proposals made by the JLBC. In the case of the Main Campus this could amount to about \$6 million. Obviously we have to be prepared for some such cut until we know what our final budget is going to be. In any case, if past years are our guide, if we don't lose this money up front we are likely to lose it in a mid-year budget recision.

"Next, we need to meet certain internal needs by reallocating funding between programs. In particular we need to move away from our past arrangements by which extensive operations have depended on temporary funding allocated on a year-by-year basis. As the Senate will remember from our discussions about budget reallocations last Fall, this has included allocations of about \$8.5 million in temporary funds each year to cover our teaching needs alone. Certainly this arrangement has allowed maximum flexibility in meeting needs that change from year to year, but it has also created instability and uncertainty in college

budgets. We estimate that we need to shift about \$14.1 million to build some appropriate permanency into unit budgets, including \$5 million to meet teaching needs.

"Finally, it is prudent to recognize that, since we do not know what emergencies the year might bring, we need to provide a realistic contingency fund. In the absence of such a fund, our only alternative would be to pull back funds from the operating units in mid-year, with all the resultant turmoil that we know so well from recent years.

"All this, then constitutes the general background against which we have developed a budget proposal. Clearly we needed to have a clear idea of what we wanted to achieve. So let me indicate the basic principles that guided us as we went along, principles derived in part from the recommendations of our Budget Priorities Advisory Task Force this past winter and partly from the recommendations from Mr. William Fischer, a consultant who reported to the Regents on measures to manage our financial problems in changing times:

"First, we recognized the need to use realistic estimates of expenditures and resources, including due allowances for the state economic picture and an expected temporary drop in enrollment.

"Second, we need to protect our instructional programs, the libraries and minority student recruitment and retention to the maximum extent practicable.

"Third, we need a realistic contingency fund in light of possible emergencies, possible state budget reductions and, perhaps, a mid-year state budget decision.

"Fourth, we need to live up to President Koffler's undertaking to the Board of Regents that the University would continue to implement the recommendations of Mr. William Fischer. In particular, this means reducing our reliance on temporary funding by making increased permanent allocations to college budgets to meet teaching needs.

"Finally, we need to decentralize the authority and responsibility for managing next year's budget changes to the deans, directors and department heads as far as is practicable. This can allow us to make the best use of limited resources by allowing the people in the operating units to manage the details of reallocation rather than attempting to do it centrally.

"Now, clearly, everyone involved in developing next year's budget--the campus administration, the deans, the Ad Hoc Budget Priorities Advisory Task Force and the Senate's Budget and Strategic Planning Policy Committee--all have to operate at this time in a state of uncertainty. No one knows what the Legislature will approve. None of us know whether the Governor will proceed with his idea of deeper cuts. We have no way of knowing what our enrollment--and hence our student revenues--will be until next September and, in part, and indeed, until the Spring semester. As a result, even more than in normal years, we must view this budget as an evolving thing. I look forward to receiving the advice of all the groups we are consulting and I shall keep the Senate informed as matters proceed.

"One thing is absolutely certain. Next year will be a very difficult time for all of us. We are sharing in the tough times that are afflicting higher educa-

tion nationwide--public and private institutions alike. The University of Minnesota is closing down a whole campus. Stanford is reducing its work force by several hundred employees. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst is about to close down fourteen programs. Here, at the University of Arizona, our task is to design a budget that will protect our key programs so far as is practicable and maintain the essential quality of the institution for the long term future. Thank you."

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Cox reported that the Ad Hoc Library Committee had made rapid progress and would be able to report to the Senate at the May meeting.

She also reported the May 6 Faculty Senate meeting will be held in the Stadium Club; details will be provided with agenda material. She said that in response to the offer Dr. Dempsey made at the last meeting concerning the Stadium Club, she will appoint a committee to review his proposal for use of that space as a Faculty Club. She invited those who might be interested to contact her.

Dr. Cox called for nominations for 1991-92 Presiding Officer of the Senate and Senate Executive Committee; deadline for submission will be noon on April 22. Nominations may be telephoned, faxed or hand delivered to the Faculty Center.

Dr. Cox requested remaining reports be kept as brief as possible because of the lengthy agenda.

ACTING CHAIR OF THE FACULTY REPORT: Senator Burkhart said he would like to formally thank the Board of Regents for including the faculty governance sessions and the teaching/research sessions in the Presidential search interview process. He reported that the University Teaching Center had videotaped each candidate's faculty governance remarks, and would make them available to those interested.

He said he was happy to report that return of ballots in the General Faculty primaries had been much higher than normal, and would he thanked the Committee on Elections for their handling of that and the runoff election. He said the increased participation represents a great success and makes us all winners.

Senator Burkhart said his main promise as Secretary of the Faculty was to implement shorter Minutes, and in view of the length of the March Minutes, he suggested the Senate "might later want to propose a motion to continue as we are or to try a shorter version of the Minutes."

Senator Burkhart reported that he had been asked at the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC) meeting last week to consider a financial contribution contribution to AFC if the Faculty Center has a surplus at the end of the fiscal year. He noted that Professor Dale Hoskins, 1990-91 President of the Arizona Faculties Council, would be reporting to the Senate later on in the agenda. He said one of the more important issues discussed at that meeting was a stronger presence at the Arizona Board of Regents, and they invited faculty comment in support or opposition to the Regents bill.

The turnout for the two open faculty forums was excellent, he reported, and another one will be scheduled. He cited the high degree of collegiality which developed, and added that the number of people involved should send a clear signal to the Regents that faculty are becoming increasingly involved.

Senator Burkhart noted that faculty governance is generally functioning rather

well, and that he had called together the chairs of the committees on Elections, Conciliation, Academic Freedom and Tenure, and Faculty Membership recently for a lunch to talk about our collective work. He said he was very happy to have their advice and counsel.

Senator Burkhart said he had reported two meetings ago that the deans were seeking suggestions for composition of a few major committees, one reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences, the second one the status of the weight of teaching and research on the campus, two important faculty service committees. He said he drafted a memo on how this could be handled, and circulated it to every faculty governance leader he could think of. Responses were submitted, and the redrafted document was now ready to send to Dr. Cole, for use as a guiding document. He said if anyone was interested in seeing that document before it was distributed, he would be happy to send them a copy.

REPORT FROM THE ACTING SECRETARY OF THE SENATE: Mr. Butler said he had been asked to make one announcement concerning University participation in the Tucson Community Food Bank. "The month of April is Tucson Community Food Bank, and we as a major factor in this community need to give our attention to this. I'm not asking the Senate to do anything corporately, but you and your departments individually to participate and say a good word. There are very few administrative expenses: any donations that go to the Food Bank, cash or food, go 100 percent to help the needy in the Tucson community. I urge you to keep that in mind as we go through this month."

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Avery reported that some members of student leadership had traveled to Washington, D.C. during spring break to lobby for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, which comes before Congress every five years; it includes all federal financial aid programs. He said it was a very successful trip, and student leadership succeeded in convincing the U.S. Senate to agree to hold a field hearing April 25 in Arizona.

Senator Avery urged Senate consideration of the ASUA teaching proposal on the agenda today, and he reported that the ASUA elections will be held this week. At the May Senate meeting seven new Senators, including a new ASUA President, will be in place. This would probably be his last Senate meeting as ASUA President.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Garcia asked Dr. Holly Smith about faculty input in the budget restructuring process as he had not heard reference to any committee at the departmental level. Dr. Smith responded that faculty will have input through the Senate's Budget and Strategic Planning Policy Committee and through the Ad Hoc Budget Priorities Advisory Task Force. In addition, she said, each dean has submitted a budget cut plan, and deans were asked to involve faculty in the process. Senator Garcia said that did not occur in some units, and there are units on campus which have no clue as to what the budget cutting plan might be for their colleges. Dr. Smith responded that there was not a requirement that the plan be circulated to all faculty, rather that there be faculty participation, and it was left to each dean to determine the type of participation. Senator Garcia asked if the plans included the form of faculty participation. Dr. Smith said they were included in many discussions.

Senator Salomon said he believed that the fact that some units did not involve faculty in an advisory capacity is a faculty issue and should be addressed through faculty governance, which should ensure such an event does not occur, and which could have done something about it.

Senator Silverman said he believes it is important for the administrator to at least make the point to the deans that the budget will not be accepted without sufficient indication of faculty input. But he said he agreed with Senator Salomon in that it the faculty's responsibility to monitor the process. He said he would like to ask Dr. Smith about the article that appeared in the news media about the termination of twenty University employees. He asked how the individuals were selected, and whether classified staff as well as academic professionals were terminated. Dr. Smith said she was out of town, so didn't see the article, but there were several cases in which the budget plans brought forward by the Deans, none of which have been finally approved, in a sense, did recommend that there be certain program changes and terminations. She said that in some cases those terminations were authorized because the unit thought it would be necessary. And in the cases of academic personnel, notices had to go out by April 1, so they were authorized. In response to a further question from Senator Silverman, she added that in the cases where there were those kinds of recommendations, there was evidence of faculty participation.

Senator Witte said she would like to poll those present, with the exception of deans and department heads, with the following question: how many come from colleges where the faculty was consulted regarding budgetary decisions? [The following verbal responses were heard: Law, Education, Library, BPA, Agriculture.] Senator Burkhardt noted that in the College of Arts and Sciences a memo was sent to individual faculty but departments in some cases were not affected by or did not act upon it. He asked Senator Garcia what he would suggest for those faculty in departments where they have been met with silence or ignored. Senator Garcia said he would recommend that every college have an ongoing budget policy committee, not called just for a special event, but ongoing, and that policy issues related to the budget would automatically be transmitted to the committee for review. He noted that the Committee of Eleven issued a position paper which called for exactly such a committee within departments and colleges, modeled after a process that is successful at institutions which we aspire to be like. Senator Chen added that, in the College of Medicine, the Health Sciences Library Director was asked to provide input. Senator Salomon said in the College of Education the Faculty Association Committee, an elected body, proposed that the committee be elected to serve with the Dean in preparing the new budget. That was been voted on by the whole faculty, and the Dean accepted it. Senator Salomon added that the faculty clearly indicated a critical desire to participate in the process. Senator Witte noted that the College of Medicine has an elected finance medical committee which meets monthly to discuss hospital finances, and she believed such a governance structure would be ideal for the university at large.

Senator Garcia asked Senator Burkhardt if he could provide details on the increase in faculty votes in the most recent election. Senator Burkhardt said he did not have the written report with him. Senator Garcia said he didn't have the written report either, but it was his understanding that 900 votes were cast last year, and 927 this year, which appeared to be less than a 3 percent increase. Senator Burkhardt said he stood corrected.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Ewbank reported that in addition to the document on today's agenda, the committee is approaching completion of a review of the status of multi-year lecturers.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Roemer reported that the committee has three representatives on the Task Force, one of whom, Lynn Nadel, has been asked to serve as Chair; the Task Force has been asked

to continue until 30 June. She said the committee has been briefed on the general plan concerning balancing the budget, and it was clear that notices of termination had to be handled in a particular time frame in order to comply with the law. She said it is the committee's understanding that the budget situation is still in transition, subject to action of the Legislature. Senator Roemer said the committee is appreciative of the improved information flow; it has received a report of space analysis, the response to the Fischer report, and a copy of the Affirmative Action Plan for 1990-91.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mitchell called attention to the committee's March report, appended to the last page of the Senate Minutes. He called attention to the Provost's Symposium on Teaching which would occur on April 16 at 3:30 in the Kiva Auditorium. A group of faculty identified as excellent teachers will speak briefly on effective teaching and the characteristics of outstanding teachers. He said the committee invited all Senators to attend and asked them to spread the word to their colleagues.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Larson noted that the Intellectual Property Policy was scheduled for discussion on today's agenda. He said that since the Senate's last meeting, the committee had participated with administrators in a dialogue to determine desired improvements in FRS services.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Enos reported on three committee projects: Senate ratification of degree candidates, mall noise and the undergraduate advising survey. She said today's agenda was too crowded for the first of those items, and it is now scheduled for the May agenda. Regarding mall noise, in January a 3-D memo from the Associate Dean of Students was distributed reiterating mall policies, including the policy on amplified sound: when classes are in session, amplified sound is allowed only between 12 and 1 p.m., Monday through Friday, and between 5 and 7 Monday through Thursday. Sponsoring organizations must monitor sound levels, and representatives must be present during the event to ensure adherence to the policy. Because the Dean of Students has been working extensively on this problem, the committee will report to the Senate in May the progress made by the Dean of Students' Office. Regarding the committee's third project, the advising survey response totaled 522. She expressed the committee's thanks to Dr. Lynne Tronsdal and her assistant, Christine Kitko, who put together the aggregates, a major statistical task that could not have been accomplished without their assistance. She further reported that the statisticians at CCIT have been equally helpful, and it is anticipated the final report will be ready for submission to the Senate at its May meeting.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Jones asked Senator Ewbank to provide more detail on the Academic Personnel Policy Committee review of lecturers. Senator Ewbank responded that the Provost's Office had requested a status review of multi-year lecturers; year-to-year and "grandfathered" lecturers were not part of this study. Senator Jones then asked Dr. Holly Smith if she knew why other lecturers were excluded from this review. Dr. Smith responded that the question was originally raised by the Board of Regents. The administration was asked to look into the status of multi-year lecturers, and when she sent the request to Senator Ewbank she sent copies to deans, as well, to prepare them for the likelihood that the committee would be asking them for information, and she believed she had indicated one of the possible issues might be for colleges to use the multi-year track more often.

Senator Aleamoni asked Senator Mitchell if the Instruction and Curriculum Policy

Committee had had an opportunity to react to the concerns he had raised in the letter he asked Dr. Cox to read at the March Senate meeting. Senator Mitchell said the committee had not yet had an opportunity to address those topics, but was currently engaged in assisting the University Teaching Center in disseminating information about the new AZTEQ questionnaire, which was being implemented sooner than originally projected.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 17, Section I was moved (motion 90/91-41) moved, seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote. Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 17, Addendum, was moved (motion 90/91-42) was approved on a voice vote.

ARIZONA FACULTIES COUNCIL PRESIDENT DALE HOSKINS (NAU): Dr. Cox introduced Professor Dale Hoskins of Northern Arizona University, President of the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC). Professor Hoskins said he wanted to explain briefly what the AFC does and some of the issues on its agenda. In 1987 the group was reactivated, having been active in the early 80s. The primary issue then was faculty input to the Regents, especially a Faculty Regent. He said the Council was not terribly successful with that issue at that time, but there were some significant achievements. The first was the faculty breakfasts, which helped to formalize some contact with faculty: every year each university has a chance to invite thirty or forty faculty members to meet with Regents to freely share views. Secondly, representation on the Programs Committee has been attained: the Chair of each Faculty Senate is seated at Programs Committee meetings. Thirdly, there is now involvement in various subcommittees appointed by the Regents, probably the best example of this being the Tri-University Committee which initiates the re-write of Conditions of Faculty Service. As a result, he said, AFC has been involved in two other committees, one involving the teaching/research balance. In addition, the Council of Presidents were charged to meet with the Chairs of the three Senates; the next meeting will be held on April 11.

Professor Hoskins said four major items have been accomplished in the last four years: (1) Recognition of the importance of faculty input into decision-making; (2) Recognition of the role of the Senates and other faculty committees on the campus; (3) Direct contact of faculty representatives with Regents and Regents staff. (4) Commitment of the Regents staff to ensure faculty involvement. Last fall, he said, he requested faculty representation be included on that committee. He said he has not yet received a response but he believes there is cause for optimism that this will be adopted. So far this year, faculty have not been left off of any subcommittees, and he believes that is significant.

Professor Hoskins said there are currently four or five issues of concern to AFC: (1) the Faculty Regent bill, which if approved would require some thought: faculty will not want to give up their career to serve one year as a Faculty Regent, and that is what it is going to take. Representation there would represent a major accomplishment, but even without it he believed the Regents will continue to be receptive to faculty input. (2) Bylaw problems are facing the AFC due to a challenge to a group of representatives to the AFC. He said his position on this is long-term commitment is needed for contact with the Regents for recognition. He added that "we must make sacrifices if we want that to work. Therefore, one of the issues I think we face is how committed are we to working with the Regents in the way that is most effective for us?"

Professor Hoskins expressed his appreciation to the Faculty Center's Emily Krauz for the assistance she has lent to AFC.

Senator Burkhart asked, "If we are not on the Dean's Council and the President's Council why should we jump over that to Faculty Regent?" Professor Hoskins said that, logically, we ought to start from the ground and move up, but it would appear that the Regents are working with University administrators with these goals in mind, and he has seen tremendous strides on the NAU and ASU campuses concerning faculty involvement. He said that he believed that as a new executive branch is designed on this campus, more faculty involvement will result.

ACTION ON ASUA RESOLUTION FOR RECOGNIZING EXCELLENT TEACHING: Senator Avery noted that discussion on the topic of ASUA's resolution and proposal for recognition of excellent teaching had been sidetracked at previous Senate meetings, and today he hoped to focus on the actual resolution, which he perceived to be clear and not as controversial.

Senator Vezino said there are two different issues involved: (1) the resolution and (2) what form is used to meet the criteria. He said ASUA is not proposing which evaluation form should be used, because they do not have the expertise. ASUA hoped to obtain Senate input on whether this institution should use a standard form campus-wide.

Senator Witte proposed moving to the question immediately, followed by discussion on the form. Senator Tomizuka asked what stood in the way of implementation. Senator Avery said the main hurdle is there has been much opposition from faculty members on releasing scores and, secondly, there has been much discussion on exactly how we are going to evaluate, 100-level against other 100-level courses, for example, or department against department. Senator O'Brien asked if the instructor would still release the scores? Senator Avery responded that the ASUA proposal calls for release of scores if the instructor consents or if the department as a whole votes to release them. He added that the resolution merely represents the concept.

Senator Garcia said he favored the proposal and the resolution, but he suggested ASUA return with specific data on implementation. He moved for approval of the resolution. Senator LaSalle said he supported the concept, but questions he had received from others indicated it is not clear whether the uniform campus-wide student evaluation system would leave room for different forms within different colleges. Senator Avery asked if anyone had drafted an amendment which might cover this. Senator Ewbank offered the motion that the Senate endorse in principle the resolution adopted by the ASUA Senate and urge affirmative action on that motion with the full hope that details will get pursued and ultimately brought to fruition. That motion (90/91-43) was seconded.

Senator Avery asked if, in conjunction with this motion, the Senate might act to set up procedures for committee review of implementation. Senator Ewbank said it was his intent that the principle can be adopted without absolute endorsement of each of the "whereas" clauses, so the Senate, as he saw it, would not be committed to support each of the affirmative declarations of each of these clauses. Senator O'Brien asked if the Senate was being asked to vote on the concept even if Senators did not support all the statements. Senator Ewbank affirmed that was correct.

Dr. Cox said it would seem the proper course of action would be to refer this to the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee for their review, and ask them to return to the Senate with their recommendations. Senator Zukoski said he would like to have that included in the motion. Senator Witte called the question, and a voice vote indicated approval of the motion without dissent.

Senator Garcia asked if the motion just passed included the referral to the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, and Dr. Cox responded affirmatively.

ACTION ON GUIDELINES FOR PERIODIC REVIEW OF DEANS, DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS OF ACADEMIC UNITS: Senator Ewbank said the Senate had completed through the middle of page 3 in previous discussions of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee's (APPC) proposed revisions to Guidelines for Periodic Review of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units. Before continuing, he asked Senators to turn to the top of the second page. APPC had received and approved a request for a further amendment in the second paragraph, insertion of a new sentence, so that the revised paragraph would read: "Upon recommendation of the Committee on Conciliation, the Provost will poll each member of the General Faculty of the unit by means of a ballot asking whether or not the dean, director, or department head should be the subject of an extraordinary review. In no instance will the Committee on Conciliation recommend a ballot requesting the extraordinary review of the same administrator MORE THAN ONCE within any twelve-month period...." Senator Ewbank said the basis for this request was the experience of an administrator who had been the subject of a request for extraordinary review more than once during the twelve-month period and discovered that the hassle and turmoil kept anything from going on within that academic unit. The request seemed reasonable. There being no questions or comments, he turned to page 3, and reviewed the remaining recommended changes. Senator Ewbank said he would respond to questions, and APPC urged the Senate to adopt this proposal.

Approval of revisions to Guidelines for Periodic Reviews of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units was then moved (motion 90/91-44) and seconded. Senator Zukoski asked whether the document would be implemented on July 1, 1991, or whether there would be a four- or five-year delay. Senator Ewbank said this was intended to amend section 5.09 in the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, and precedent does exist for Mr. George Evanoff, of the Provost's Office, to issue a memorandum to General Faculty citing these changes. The question was called and the motion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

UA RETIREES ASSOCIATION: LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMS: Dr. Herbert Abrams said the UA Retirees Association (UARA) wanted to acquaint the Faculty Senate with some of the bills coming before the State Legislature at this time that will affect faculty now or in the future, as well as provide some background on UARA's history. He said the Association would like to be able to call on the Senate when warranted. He introduced UARA's President, Jency Houser, and David W. Smith, Legislative Action Committee, and then stated "It is only two years ago that for the first time in history, this Association more than any other factor got the Legislature to vote health insurance benefits for the first time as a benefit of retirement at the University of Arizona. We were very backward up until that point, as three-quarters of the state retirement systems in the country were already providing health benefits.

"UARA has been concerned with three main issues: (1) improving the benefits--dependents are not yet covered, only the retiree. (2) obtaining an annual cost-of-living adjustment (COLA)--again, most of the state retirement systems in the country do provide that, but here in Arizona we are forced to go to the Legislature every year and lobby to get COLA. (3) protecting the integrity of the retirement system. As you may know, virtually every year there are attempts made within the Legislature to raid the state's retirement funds for purposes unrelated to retirement benefits...It's very important for those of you on the active faculty and those of us who have retired to keep a watch on this, and be in touch with our representatives in Phoenix to protect and improve the retirement system.

"We've given you a list of the current bills. Three concern active employees: 1405, 1406 and 1462. Others concern retirees. Many of these will be amended before the Legislature recesses, and we think it is important for you to keep a watch on them. Vivian Cox, your Presiding Officer, attended the last meeting of the UARA Council, and she is going to act as liaison between the Senate and UARA and may bring back to you issues which require political action."

David Smith commented on Senate Bill 1405. "There are about 300 faculty and staff at the UA who are still on the old system. In 1984 your contribution was reduced to an actuarially determined rate; I think this year it is 3.62 percent. What this bill does is restore your benefits so that if at your date of retirement you computed the difference between say, 3.62 and 7 percent, the University of Arizona would contribute their share, and then the funds you have earned each year which receive excess earnings would be taken out of the system fund. They estimate this would increase your benefits about 5 percent a year, which is a substantial amount. You might be interested to know that the youngest person still in the system is a University of Arizona employee. This individual is 42 years of age. So if you think in terms of twenty-three years, and that person works until 65, that is a tremendous amount of money. One other point. Let's say you retire this June and want to make that transfer, if you have some tax-sheltered annuity funds, you can transfer what is required from the TSA over to the retirement system at no tax cost to you. It simply increases your benefits. For those planning to retire in the next two years, 1406 increases your benefit by 3 percent. You may recall in 1989 there was a Supreme Court ruling that states could not provide the benefit to you tax-free unless they also provided it for federal employees and military personnel. 1406 provides you with equity, whether you are in the plan or the system. Senate bill 1462 will permit you to retire at '80 points', a combination of your age and your number of years of service." Dr. Cox thanked the members of UARA for explaining these issues to the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

David Butler, Acting Secretary of the Senate

MOTIONS APPROVED AT APRIL 1, 1991 MEETING:

- 90/91-40 Approval of Minutes of March 4, 1991
- 90/91-41 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 17, Section I
- 90/91-42 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 17, Addendum
- 90/91-43 Approval of ASUA resolution concerning a uniform, campus-wide instructional evaluation system and referral of the proposal to the Faculty Senate's Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
- 90/91-44 Approval of revisions to Guidelines for Periodic Review of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units

ATTACHMENTS TO THESE MINUTES

- Statement of Dr. Eugene Levy, made at the March 4 Senate meeting
- Revised policy: Guidelines for Periodic Review of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units
- ASUA Resolution concerning a uniform, campus-wide instructional evaluation system