

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
September 9, 1996

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Jeffrey L. Warburton at 3:15 p.m. in Room 140 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Abrams, Aleamoni, Atwater, Barrett, Chen, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, D. Davis, T. Davis, Desai, Dvorak, Dyl, Emrick, Erickson, Feltham, Garcia, Gerber, Glittenberg, Gore, Hurt, Jacobs, Joens, Larson, Lei, Levy, Mare, Medine, Meyer, Mitchell, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Poss, Reeves, Schiffer, Schooley, Schwarz, Sharkey, Silverman, Sugiyama, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Wilson, and Zwolinski. Observers Jull (APOC), Rochlin (Alumni Association), and Vos (SAC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Anderson, Forbes, Garrard, Gruener, McCaslin, Pitt, Sliger, and Witte.

2. OPEN SESSION

There were no comments for the open session.

3. TRIBUTE TO EMILY KRAUZ

Senator Warburton first thanked the Krauz family for attending the tribute. He then called for a moment of silence in memory of Emily Krauz, the long-time executive manager of the Faculty Center who died in May. Dr. Terence Burke spoke about his long acquaintance with Ms. Krauz, noting that he had first met her in the early 1970s at the University of Massachusetts - Amherst. He remembered her as a superb secretary with absolute efficiency and attention to detail; he concluded by commenting that the university community had lost a charming person and dedicated servant. Dr. Sarah Dinham recalled that she had first hired Ms. Krauz at the UA (in 1984), and together they had established the Faculty Center. She described Ms. Krauz as highly regarded, with a variety of contacts around campus. She recalled that Ms. Krauz had the highest standards, as well as an air of peace, confidence, and balance. Chair of the Faculty John Schwarz commented that Ms. Krauz interacted with nearly all those involved in faculty governance at the UA; she was the thread that connected the past with the present, and all of the present elements with each other. He announced the establishment of the Emily Krauz Staff Scholarship Fund to assist classified staff employees with education-related expenses. He concluded by saying that he would miss Emily's humanity, gentleness, calmness, and dignity.

4. REPORTS

4A. President Manuel Pacheco

President Pacheco expressed his condolences regarding Ms. Krauz's death and encouraged donations to the scholarship fund. He then welcomed everyone back for the new academic year and noted that the Senate faces an agenda of significant items in the coming months. He expressed the hope that the University could continue to navigate successfully the troubled waters that higher education is facing.

He discussed the 1997-98 UA budget request in some detail, noting that last month the UA had indicated to the Arizona Board of Regents that the main campus proposal would be \$304 million, including a 2.9 percent increase plus almost \$3.7 million in decision packages. The proposed budget request for the Sierra Vista Campus was slated to be almost \$1.5 million (representing an increase of 5 percent), and the proposed request for the Arizona International Campus, \$2.9 million, would also be an increase of 5 percent. In addition, the UA put forward requests under the heading of "critical issues" for a share of a possible additional pool of \$40 million for the three universities. However, the Regents had reservations about the proposals and asked the University to rework them, cutting the overall size of the request, particularly in critical issues, and making better provision for AIC and Sierra Vista. The UA is currently working on the required adjustments.

President Pacheco emphasized that he is not backing away from his earlier stance that main campus funding would not be diverted to AIC. He reminded everyone that, as yet, no dollars have been diverted from anyone or anywhere, and the discussion relates to requests for possible new dollars that may or may not come to the UA. He added that it would be the ABOR budget proposal, not the UA's, that goes forward to the Governor.

He also noted that ABOR would pursue salary increases as a separate matter; it is currently considering moving faculty salaries at the three universities to the 50th percentile among peers over a three- or four-year period, and advancing staff pay to the mid-point in their respective markets over the same period. Since these changes would require an increase of \$50 million in appropriations, a multi-year approach makes sense. Subsequently moving to the 75th percentile is also being considered; this would require \$71 million rather than \$50 million.

President Pacheco mentioned that, since the Board had expressed concern about the construction proposed in the UA's five-year, rolling Capital Improvement Plan, the University would present its case in more detail at the next ABOR meeting. He noted that the top priority for FY98 would be the new Integrated Instructional Facility, which is fundamental in our progress to improve the freshman year experience. In 1998-99, the first priority will be the first phase of rebuilding the Student Union.

4B. Provost Paul Sypherd

Provost Sypherd began by reviewing the land-grant origins of The University of Arizona in the late 1800s. He remarked that Arizonans can be proud of what has been accomplished in 100 years, noting that the UA ranks among the best of the nation's public universities in both education and research. It thus represents a fantastic bargain for the state's taxpayers, since the expenditure per student in its public universities is in the lowest 20 percent of public universities nationwide. Other encouraging statistics: Among American public universities, the UA ranks 18th in enrollments, 24th in number of doctoral degrees awarded, 25th in the library rating, 11th for capture and expenditure of research funding, and 16th in quality of graduate programs, taken as a whole. All of this has been achieved despite the fact that the UA today has 300 fewer faculty than in 1990.

Nevertheless, he added, all is not well with the academy. Many political leaders and citizens question our dedication, work ethic, and traditions. In response to these challenges, the UA has embarked on an ambitious agenda for change, a vast transformation that encompasses many aspects of university life, including enrollment and financial aid procedures, business practices, student advising, and access to health care. We are also upgrading classrooms, continuing to keep the computing infrastructure a high priority, and working to increase our use of the latest technologies. For our most valuable resource, our people, we have developed, and the Faculty Senate has approved, a merit-based compensation system that awaits approval and funding by the Regents. Other important initiatives are the development of the core curriculum in general education and the construction of a classroom building to enhance the freshman experience.

Provost Sypherd urged that we focus particularly on the following goals in the next year:

- Continue to pursue excellence, including emphasizing our research mission, focusing on quality in everything we do, providing opportunities for the faculty to become more effective teachers, and continuing to provide the knowledge infrastructure for economic growth in Arizona and the nation.
- Devote ourselves to building community, by recognizing that our community extends beyond the boundaries of the University, renewing our commitment to increasing partnership between administration and faculty, and individually finding ways to reach out and participate.
- Remain accountable, by recognizing the legitimate public interest in receiving full value for funds invested in education, continuing to limit or eliminate low-demand classes and programs across the University, completing the proposal for a meaningful post-tenure review process, and continuing to streamline administrative and business processes.

Provost Sypherd suggested that it should be the collective vision in each UA department and college to become one of the leading public universities in America. He then read a quote from the late Ernest Boyer's 1990 report to the Carnegie Foundation about the necessity of higher education to continually adapt to the changing social context. Dr. Sypherd concluded by expressing his belief that we have reached a point in our institutional life to redefine ourselves, first by evaluating our strengths and weaknesses, and then looking forward to a new century.

4C. Faculty Chair John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz characterized this a time for hope and for taking stock. He noted that three major issues for the Faculty Senate to consider this year are post-tenure review, shared governance, and the core curriculum. He added that the latest version of the post-tenure review document would be the major topic of discussion at the October 7 Faculty Senate meeting. A special Senate meeting will be convened on October 14 if there is not sufficient time to complete discussion and debate on the document at the October 7 meeting; he asked Senators to keep this date in mind. He added that the UA's recommendation on the post-tenure review document is due to the Arizona Board of Regents by November 1. Accordingly, the Academic Personnel Policy Committee is working on revising the proposal now. He asked Senators to review draft 10.4 of the document, which was recently mailed to all Senators and distributed 3-D on campus, and to send input to Dr. Larry Schooley, Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, or to the Faculty Center, no later than September 20.

4D. Secretary Gerber

Secretary Gerber reported that her major responsibility as secretary is to record and distribute Senate meeting minutes. She stated that a summary of meeting proceedings would be provided in the minutes, while a verbatim record of meetings would be kept on file at the Faculty Center in the form of audiotapes. She added that soon the Faculty Center Home Page would be fully functional, and that rosters, minutes, and other information related to the Faculty Senate and its committees would be available on it. When the Home Page is ready to be made public, the address will be announced at the Senate meeting. She concluded by welcoming input from Senators.

4E. Presiding Officer Jeff Warburton

Senator Warburton began by introducing new Faculty Center staff members Donna Leavell and Pam Bridgmon; he noted that the center's student employee, Karla Breceda, is now the "senior" employee there, with three years of experience at the center. He then thanked Senator Atwater for her leadership in setting up the Home Page for the Faculty Center.

Senator Warburton announced that an orientation for new Senators, and any interested returning Senators, would be held at the Faculty Center on Monday, September 23, from 3:00 to 4:30 p.m.; he noted that alternate arrangements would be made for anyone unable to attend at that time due to the religious holiday.

He called the Senate's attention to the meeting schedules included in the Senate packet and stated that anyone is welcome to attend the Senate Executive Committee meetings. He then introduced new Senators Jody Glittenberg (College of Nursing) and Thomas Davis (College of Medicine); he also noted that Polin Lei would be substituting for Senator Huete until he returns from his extended sabbatical later this fall.

He reported that the Faculty Senate Handbook had been updated and distributed to all current Senators. He concluded by announcing that today's agenda item #8, approval of the academic calendar for 2000-01, had been removed from the agenda because Interim Registrar Judy Mobasserri was unable to attend the meeting. It will be placed on the agenda for the October 7 meeting.

4F. ASUA President Rhonda Wilson

Senator Wilson described ASUA efforts to increase the number of students voting in the national elections this fall, including programs such as debate watch and an early polling site at Mabel and Campbell. She noted that on the state level, ASUA plans to work for more financial aid for students. She also reported that the day-time escort service has been taken over by Parking & Transportation, and that the night-time escorts are available for faculty and staff, as well as students.

Senator Wilson noted that ASUA is looking at cost-effective ways of publishing teacher evaluations. She added that ASUA goals include keeping the University accountable, making sure that University priorities reflect the unselfish needs of students, taking a more active role in plans for the Student Union renovation, and participating in the discussion of post-tenure review. She then introduced the new student Senators present: Patrick Williams, a junior in communication; Valerie Meyer, a sophomore majoring in political science, and Alex Sugiyama, a graduate student in economics and chair of the Graduate and Professional Student Council. It was noted that Senators Mitzi Forbes and Lauren Sliger were unable to attend, and that one graduate student Senator remains to be named.

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Szilagyi referred to the portion of the May 6, 1996, Faculty Senate minutes containing Senator Medine's comments about the *Arizona Alumnus* interview with Regents Basha and Munger (pp. 1 and 2). He asked President Pacheco what he thought of Mr. Munger's frontal assault on academic freedom, and what he planned to do to educate the Arizona Board of Regents about what a university is. President Pacheco responded that he did not have an opinion about what President Munger meant by his questions. He stated that he did not believe that Mr. Munger has an adverse or negative opinion about academic freedom, but he certainly has opinions about how programs operate in the university setting, and those opinions may or may not concur with the opinions of many of us. With respect to the education of the Board, he added, there is no question that Regents work very hard to understand the objectives, policies, and traditions of faculty, but many times they simply disagree with them. Those disagreements can be healthy, as long as we can keep the dialogue open.

Senator Silverman thanked President Pacheco and others for their support of Affirmative Action, and he asked President Pacheco to comment on where the Regents are on that issue now. President Pacheco responded that the majority of Regents is supportive of Affirmative Action programs as they currently exist. While the Board has expressed some hesitancy about Affirmative Action in general, it has also stated strongly that until there is an alternative we should keep the current Affirmative Action programs in place. He said he interprets that as Board endorsement of what we are doing, but at the same time the Board is continuing to look for ways to improve issues such as equal access to education.

Student Advisory Council President Lewis Tenney introduced Tobi Sue Stonechek, current chair of the Staff Advisory Council Staff Endowment Fund, and Mary Stein, executive vice president of the Staff Advisory Council and past chair of the Staff Endowment Fund. On behalf of the classified staff of the University, Mr. Tenney thanked the Faculty Senate for the tribute to Ms. Krauz and for establishing the Emily Krauz Staff Scholarship Fund. Due to a prior commitment, they then had to excuse themselves from the meeting.

Senator Schiffer asked President Pacheco to clarify the status of the Arizona International Campus curriculum plan. Senator Schiffer noted that on May 6, 1996, the Faculty Senate had voted merely to receive the AIC curriculum, but in subsequent press coverage, it was reported that the Arizona Board of Regents had approved the curriculum on May 31; he wondered aloud whether the Faculty Senate had been "leap-frogged" in the process. President Pacheco responded that the Regents had decided to move forward with regard to the AIC curriculum, and that it was within ABOR's purview to do so.

Senator Joens asked Provost Sypherd how departments were targeted for budget cuts and what formula was used to acquire funds. Provost Sypherd reviewed the budget situation for this year: We were anticipating a \$7.5 million shortfall between appropriations and the cost of doing business. About half of the shortfall was made up with increases in fees and out-of-state tuition; the other half was apportioned throughout the University, after a vigorous discussion within the University, the administration, and finally the University Strategic Planning and Budgeting Committee (SPBAC). The bulk of the budget reduction was taken in administrative units, with the largest single cut taken in Business Affairs. Each college was asked to withhold spending until enrollment figures were known. We are still waiting for the enrollment information from the 21st day of the semester; it appears that the situation is not the worst-case scenario, but certainly not the best, either. At this point, it is not possible to predict whether the freeze will have to be maintained.

Senator Clarke asked Provost Sypherd about plans for the new instructional building. Provost Sypherd commented that the only site presently being considered is on the mall, with subterranean construction. Forums have been and are continuing to be held around campus to receive input about the plans. The President has said that we are to go forward with the building, and that, Dr. Sypherd noted, is what we intend to do.

6. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 29, 1996, AND MAY 6, 1996

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meetings on April 29, 1996, and May 6, 1996, were approved as distributed.

7. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

7A. Academic Personnel Policy Committee

Senator Schooley, APPC chair, listed the committee membership: Senator Aleamoni, Elizabeth Ervin, Secretary Gerber, Senator Poss, Senator Silverman, and Senator Troy; a student representative is yet to be named. Senator Schooley noted that the APPC has a full agenda for this year: One item, emeritus status, has been carried over from last year and is on today's agenda. The most urgent item this year is the document related to continuing review of tenured faculty, which has been distributed widely on campus and is currently being revised during weekly APPC meetings based on input received. Other issues the committee will consider are a university-level statement of guidelines for promotion and tenure and the principles of shared governance.

7B. Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee

Dr. Ann Weekes, chair of the ICPC, named committee members: Dr. Jennifer Croissant, Senator Dahlgran, Senator Emrick, Dr. Judy Mitchell, Senator Robert Mitchell, and Senator Pitt; a student member remains to be appointed. Dr. Weekes listed three important matters for ICPC to consider this year: the core curriculum, the Arizona International Campus, and the upper-division writing proficiency requirement. With regard to the core curriculum, ICPC is hoping to bring it to some sort of resolution and have the Senate vote on it as soon as possible. For the Arizona International Campus, the ICPC wants to bring a list of procedures and dates for adoption of new AIC courses, with the hope of having AIC follow the same procedures as the main campus. The committee will also examine the findings of the task force dealing with the upper-division writing proficiency requirement, with the goal of bringing a recommendation to the Senate before the end of the year. The ICPC also will handle more routine matters, such as the proposal to establish a B.A. degree in Engineering.

7C. Research Policy Committee

Dr. Ara Arabyan, RPC chair, identified members: Senator Coons, Dr. Sue DeNise, Senator Gruener, Senator McCaslin, Senator Neuman, and Dr. Gordon Tollin, with a student representative still to be named. Dr. Arabyan reported that there are two items on the RPC agenda this year: the data ownership and retention policy, which the Senate tabled last year and referred back to the RPC for further review; and the institutional consulting policy, proposed by Vice President Cusanovich, a draft of which the RPC will review and modify.

7D. Student Affairs Policy Committee

Senator Warburton indicated that Dr. Jocelyn Reiter, chair of SAPC, would have no report today. SAPC members in addition to Dr. Reiter are: Dr. Donald DaDeppo, Senator Dvorak, and Dr. Mikelle Smith Omari. Three additional faculty members and one student will need to be named to complete the committee roster.

7E. Committee of Eleven

Senator Aleamoni, chair of the Committee of Eleven, first listed committee members: Dr. Roger Caldwell, Ms. Anita Bhappu, Senator Feltham, Senator Garcia, Senator Glittenberg, Senator Jacobs, Senator Myers, Chair Schwarz, Senator Silverman, Senator Szilagyi, Senator Williams, and Senator Witte. Senator Aleamoni noted that the Committee of Eleven had asked him to speak briefly about Emily Krauz, in order to mention that she was as much a faculty member as many of us, fighting for faculty issues and faculty rights. Senator Aleamoni then reported that the Committee of Eleven at its May 10 retreat had identified seven issues to concentrate on this year; the committee has begun to work on three of those items during its first two meetings: the meaning of a student-centered research university; concerns about meet and confer agreements; and special ways of recognizing and rewarding faculty. He also noted that the committee is in the process of finishing the tabulation of the questionnaires regarding the President and the Provost, after which a report will be brought to the Senate. The issue of indirect costs, including the rationale for collecting and using it, has also been discussed in the committee.

7F. Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee

Committee member Doug Jones indicated that he had been asked to report in the committee chair's place. Other Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee members are: Senator Glittenberg (chair), Dr. Carmen Garcia-Downing, Dr. Judith Parrish, and Dr. Gary Rhoades. Additional members, including one student representative, are needed in order to complete the committee.

Mr. Jones began by clarifying the difference between the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee and the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (SPBAC). The first committee is a faculty group, with most members being elected by the General Faculty. The second group is a university-wide committee that includes the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee, but also has members appointed by the President.

Mr. Jones reported that the faculty committee had been working over the summer to develop recommendations to forward to the Provost regarding budget reallocations. Although since 1992 the general policy for state-funded vacant lines has been that the lines and their accompanying funding have remained in their respective colleges, there has been no official university-wide policy regarding practices of shared decision-making or accountability in the budget reallocation process. The faculty committee saw a need to strike a balance between the needs of the colleges and university-wide needs and priorities in managing reallocations and is therefore in the process of forwarding the following recommendations to the Provost:

- (1) Beginning October 1, 1996, all currently filled state-funded appointed lines that become vacant, including the funding allocated to those lines, shall revert to the office of the appropriate senior vice president, with the exception of those lines associated with negative tenure or continuing-eligible decisions, which shall remain in the college or unit.

- (2) Beginning with the next budget cycle on July 1, 1997, all currently unfilled state-funded lines shall revert to the appropriate senior vice president, but the funds associated with those lines shall remain in their respective colleges or units.
- (3) At least twice a year, the Provost and the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs shall confer with the university-wide Strategic Planning and Budget Committee regarding decisions on reallocations. At least once a year deans should confer with their college councils regarding reallocations that they are working out with the Provost.
- (4) Each dean or vice president shall formulate a multi-year plan for the use of vacant positions subject to reallocation and enter into discussions with the appropriate senior vice president regarding the allocation of positions. This should be completed by July 1 each year for regular faculty lines and on an ongoing basis for fiscal-year administrative or professional appointments. It is assumed that each vacancy and management analysis of unit needs for that position will be reviewed with the appropriate unit vice president.
- (5) The Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee recommends that an inventory of instructional demands relative to resources across colleges be carried out in the form of this allocation process.

Mr. Jones concluded by noting that the above-described process is not intended to impede the normal case-by-case decisions on retention made by the Provost nor to foreclose targets of opportunity outside of recruitment plans.

8. APPROVAL OF ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 2000-01

This item was removed from the agenda at the request of the interim registrar and will be placed on the agenda for the October 7, 1996, Senate meeting.

9. UPDATE ON CORE CURRICULUM ISSUES

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Michael Gottfredson began by commenting that it is essential for us to be in continuous discussion about the general education program, because it is about 25 percent of a student's course work. Nevertheless, it is important to bring the core curriculum activities to some sort of conclusion; in order to implement the plan for students next fall, some decision will need to be made by November of this year. Vice Provost Gottfredson urged the Senate to take time to study the proposal that was recently distributed, as it differs substantially from the one circulated two years ago. The current proposal seeks to establish a single university-wide general education system, and it asks the university community to adopt a structure, filling the content with a combination of existing general education courses and new core courses being developed. He emphasized that the proposal still needs considerable input and development. The Undergraduate Council is now deliberating, in order to develop an official version of the general education proposal; that version will then be circulated for comment, deliberation, and approval.

Dr. Gottfredson then reviewed some basics of the core curriculum proposal, including the proposed requirements for Foundations, Tier 1, and Tier 2. He noted that it will be the responsibility of the University General Education Committee, a faculty committee, to develop and monitor a general education system for the University, and to articulate the existing general education program courses into the Tier 1 and Tier 2 structure in an evolutionary fashion. The current proposal represents a compromise between the original core curriculum idea and the existing general education programs. It has been developed in response to concerns expressed by faculty, students, and others about the original proposal, including that the core curriculum idea was too strongly common (i.e., common framework and syllabus) and too interdisciplinary, that there was no provision for non-western study, that the proposal ignored foreign-language study, that it should flow from the faculty rather than from the administration, and that there were insufficient resources directed to general education. Dr. Gottfredson added that the proposal denies implicitly that students in specialized programs do not need general education. He then outlined general areas of agreement about the current proposal, including the need to have full faculty participation in general education, in both the structuring of the system and its delivery, and

the partitioning of the curriculum into three general areas. He added that questions remain about other areas of the proposal, including the treatment of non-western materials and the unit load of Tier 2. He again asked for input from faculty, noting that comments can be directed to him or to the Undergraduate Council.

Dr. Gottfredson introduced Dr. Janet Sturman, chair of the University-Wide General Education Committee. Dr. Sturman listed the current members of the committee: Senator Atwater, Ms. Laura Casper, Dr. Don Harper, Dr. Wanda Howell, Dr. Paul Ivey, Dr. Sally Jackson, Dr. Chris Lamoureux, Dr. James LaSalle, Ms. Kimberly Loui, Dr. Jonathan Lunine, Dr. Mark Luprecht, Dr. David Lynch, Dr. Pat MacCorquodale, Dr. Keith McElroy, Ms. Susan Moody, Dr. Cary Nederman, Mr. David Padgett (PCC), Dr. Dennis Ray, Dr. Susan Steele, Ms. Lynne Tronsdal, Dr. Bruce Walsh, and Dr. Amy Williamsen. She commented that to date the committee has largely been evaluating courses; its new task is to evaluate pilot courses for the core curriculum and to provide guidelines for the proposal, especially for Tier 2. She noted that the committee will meet in the next month to decide how to proceed, and she welcomed input.

Senator Warburton announced that there would be some time available for discussion. Senator Myers asked how members of the committee were selected, and he wondered why they were not selected through the Faculty Senate if the committee is a faculty group. Dr. Gottfredson explained the formation and composition of the committee, noting that some members were elected in colleges and some were appointed.

Senator Neuman commented that incoming students may have a very broad range of skills, and he asked what provision would be made for advanced placement. He expressed the fear that the lowest common denominator would prevail and that students would be forced into the same curriculum. This situation could lengthen graduation time and turn away students who are better prepared. Dr. Gottfredson responded that there would be provision for students to place out of certain courses.

Senator D. Davis asked who would make the decision on the balance between disciplinary subject matter courses and general education subjects. Dr. Gottfredson responded that under the current proposal there would be a single program administered by the University General Education Committee.

10. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON UNIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLAN

Senator Glittenberg noted that Senators had received a copy of the University Strategic Plan in their meeting packets. She made four points regarding the plan:

- (1) This is a dynamic process; this particular plan is an annual plan.
- (2) This plan, called draft 23, will go forward to the Regents tomorrow. It has been reviewed by many groups on campus, and review by the Faculty Senate is the last step before it goes forward.
- (3) Last Friday afternoon the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee made very minor editing changes on pages 4 through 10 which are not contained in the draft Senators have.
- (4) This year the Regents moved the deadline date for submission of the plan forward by two months. For next year's plan, the committee will get a much earlier start writing it, beginning next month. Please review the current plan and send any comments to the Faculty Center, so that the input can be incorporated into next year's plan.

Senator Glittenberg then asked for questions or a motion to receive the plan. Dean Levy asked how the list of specific examples of research cited in the second paragraph of page 1 was decided upon; he noted that it suggested an exclusion and/or a prioritization. Senator Glittenberg said that the list was not intended to be exclusive. She commented that it is too late to strike that wording for this year, but that comments such as Dean Levy's should be taken into consideration when preparing next year's plan. Chair Schwarz added that the earlier deadline created a problem with obtaining wide input, and that there would be more opportunity for input with next year's plan.

Senator Garcia said he would like to see a more orderly process for bringing forward examples which then set University priorities. Mr. Jones noted that the specific examples cited on page 2 came from the environmental

scan and other sources, rather than just from the people who were in the room at the time the document was written.

Senator Silverman commented that it concerned him that all the Faculty Senate can do today is to receive the document, which is an important one, because of the lack of involvement this year.

Chair Schwarz said the committee sincerely does want Senate input and involvement, and that will be possible to a greater degree for next year's plan.

Senator Neuman commented that the plan should address key issues and problems that the University will face in the future, such as the tension between the conflicting forces of broad accessibility, high quality of programs, and low cost.

Provost Sypherd reiterated that the plan is a living, active document, and he noted that the University Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (SPBAC), which also reviewed the plan, is composed of more than half faculty members.

Senator Aleamoni expressed a concern about the way the Senate's action (i.e., to receive the document) would be interpreted at the next level.

Senator Glittenberg again asked Senators to provide input in writing for next year's plan, and she noted that this is the best that can be done this year.

President Pacheco noted that there is a real difference between accepting a document and approving it. Accepting or receiving a document leaves the door open for further action, and the Board of Regents recognizes this.

Senator Abrams moved and Senator Atwater seconded a motion that the Faculty Senate receive the University Strategic Plan. [Motion 1996/97-1] The motion passed by a voice vote; a few nays were heard.

11. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A PROPOSAL CONCERNING EMERITUS STATUS

Senator Schooley noted that this item had been brought to the Senate last spring by the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, but the Senate referred it back to APPC for resolution of two primary points:

- (1) To clarify that the statement in paragraph 1 of the emeritus status policy refers only to faculty as defined in the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* (in Chapter 3, which deals with faculty policies); there is no comparable item in UHAP's Chapter 4, which contains policies for continuing academic professionals.
- (2) To delete the final paragraph dealing with voting rights of emeritus faculty, since that would require a change in the Constitution and Bylaws.

Senator Schooley reported that the changes had been made and were reflected in the version of the policy distributed in Senate packets.

Senator Garcia commented that the Constitution and Bylaws state that emeritus faculty are classified as General Faculty with University voting rights. He asked if that would continue, and Senator Schooley responded in the affirmative.

It was moved and seconded that the emeritus status proposal be adopted. [Motion 1996/97-2]

Senator Desai stated that the main reason the emeritus status proposal was suggested was the issue of voting rights. He said he was disappointed and surprised that the new version of the proposal contained no mention of

voting rights and therefore, in his opinion, served no purpose. Senator Schooley pointed out that emeritus voting rights must simply be addressed separately as a change to the Constitution and Bylaws.

Senator Schiffer suggested a change in wording in the fourth paragraph to avoid establishing more bureaucracy where none is needed. He said the section as amended should simply read, "Each department should negotiate specific agreements for each individual case, for a specific period of time, and document these agreements in writing." [Motion 1996/97-3] Senator Schooley said he had no problem with the suggested change.

Senator Hurt asked why APPC did not investigate the concept of allowing departments to vote on emeritus status, as is the practice at some other universities.

Senator Aleamoni clarified that the emeritus status proposal would replace the current section 3.22 of UHAP, which does not address the issue of voting rights.

Senator Sypherd commented that we need to ascertain whether we are talking about an entitlement, a right, or a privilege of retirees. He added that if the University is to be served, there should be a flow of requests from the department to the President, stating that it needs a certain person as emeritus because of some programmatic issue.

Senator Neuman stated that he did not think emeritus status should be granted automatically, but rather should be an indication of status and prestige. It should be granted by the department, just as any other faculty status is. This is especially true when discussing voting rights. He said he could not support the motion in its current form.

It was moved and seconded to table the motion until the next Senate meeting.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Appendix*

1. 1996/97 Faculty Senate and Executive Committee Meeting Schedule
2. 1996/97 Faculty Senate Roster
3. Proposed Academic Calendar for 2000-2001.
4. Draft 23 of the University of Arizona Strategic Plan, with cover memo and suggested revisions.
5. Proposed Emeritus Status document
6. Memo announcing establishment of Emily Krauz Staff Scholarship Fund

*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.

Motions of the Meeting of September 9, 1996

- 1996/97-1 A motion to receive the University Strategic Plan (Draft 23). Motion carried.
- 1996/97-2 A motion to adopt the Emeritus Status Proposal as written (document dated 4/15/96). Motion amended (see below).
- 1996/97-3 A substitute motion to change the wording of 1996/97-2 by changing the fourth paragraph to read: "Each department should negotiate specific agreements for each individual case, for a specific period of time, and document these agreements in writing." Motion tabled.