

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
February 3, 1997**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Jeffrey L. Warburton at 3:05 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Barrett, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Desai, Dyl, Emrick, Erickson, Feltham, Garcia, Gerber, Glittenberg, Gruener, Jacobs, Joens, Larson, Levy, McCaslin, Medine, Mitchell, Myers, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Poss, Reeves, Schiffer, Schwarz, Sharkey, Silverman, Sliger, Sugiyama, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troy, Warburton, Weinand, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Anderson, Brown, Charney, Chen, T. Davis, Dvorak, Forbes, Gore, Huete, Hurt, Maré, Meyer, Neuman, Schooley, Williams, Wilson, and Witte.

2. OPEN SESSION

There were no comments for the open session.

3. REPORTS

3A. President Manuel Pacheco

No report.

3B. Provost Paul Sypherd

Provost Sypherd began by highlighting an important ramification of the University's real mission: the responsibility shared by all of us to ensure that the University is the best that it can be. He recalled the summaries of UA accomplishments he had distributed at the January 27th Senate meeting, and he noted that more of this type of news would be forthcoming on a regular basis—indications that the we at the UA are, indeed, becoming the best that we can be. In this process, he noted, we need to focus on building a community within the University. This is an area in which we have made substantial progress during the past five years, as evidenced by increased faculty representation in key governance processes, such as the Undergraduate Council, the University-Wide General Education Committee, and the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC). He added that the Continuous Organizational Renewal Project (CORE), although soundly criticized by many, had been an important instrument in managing the University through difficult financial times, and it had provided an opportunity for faculty, students, appointed personnel, and staff to work together as a community. This need to work together will remain as the University continues to deal with fiscal stringency and the concomitant challenges of streamlining, eliminating non-value-added activities, and modernizing our infrastructure. Dr. Sypherd then mentioned a new weekly campus lecture series entitled "Building Academic Community," scheduled for every Wednesday for the remainder of this semester. The first lecture, by Professor N. Scott Momaday, was very well attended by a good cross-section of the campus community. Dr. Sypherd credited Professor George Davis with conceiving of and organizing the series, and he encouraged Senators to attend the lectures and take other campus community members with them. Provost Sypherd concluded by commenting on the shared governance document to be discussed at today's meeting: Although it is not perfect, the intention of those who drafted it was to produce an instrument to be a guide for the campus to engage constructively in the government of our community.

3C. Chair of the Faculty John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz provided an update on the presidential search: Although the search committee is not yet finalized, there should be at least four faculty members on it, rather than the two faculty representatives mentioned previously. Approximately 30 faculty members were recommended for nomination; the elected members of the Senate Executive Committee have reviewed

those names and are preparing a list of names to forward to the Board of Regents. An announcement of the composition of the search committee should be forthcoming in the next week.

3D. Secretary of the Faculty Rose Gerber

No report.

3E. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Jeffrey Warburton

No report.

3F. ASUA President Rhonda Wilson

No report, since ASUA President Wilson was unable to attend.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Regarding the presidential search committee, Senator Feltham asked Chair Schwarz if a slate of nominees for the committee or a number of nominees for every position on the committee would be sent. Dr. Schwarz responded that the Board had asked for a slate of people, and that is what the Senate Executive Committee would send.

Senator Szilagyi commented that, although the Board has the constitutional right to select a president, he did not understand why it is important for the Board to decide who the faculty representatives on the presidential search committee will be. Since the Board is not bound by search committee recommendations, he added, it seems that the faculty ought to be able to choose the faculty representatives on the committee.

5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON REVISED (DRAFT #6) SHARED GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT (Attachment)

Senator Warburton announced that Senator Poss, a member of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, would be leading the discussion, since the chair of the APPC, Senator Schooley, had gone home ill earlier in the day. Senator Warburton also asked Senators to submit any suggested amendments to the draft in writing, either to the Faculty Center or to Senator Poss, so that they can be considered by the APPC and brought back to the Senate for further discussion.

Senator Poss began by noting that the current document reflects changes made by the APPC at its last meeting. He then shared a brief history of the document: It has been in existence for some time, having been revised several times based on faculty input. One difference from earlier versions is at the beginning of the document; the quotations from the Constitution of the General Faculty and Arizona Revised Statutes that previously appeared at the beginning have been moved to a footnote on page 4. Senator Poss noted that this document represents a memorandum of understanding between the faculty and the administration—an essential pledge. Most of the problematic areas of the document related to specificity and the ramifications of the language contained therein; Senator Poss commented that some implementation details and other specifics will need to be addressed over time through the normal faculty governance process. He added that many changes were made simply to provide consistency with other documents; in instances where policies outlined elsewhere (e.g., the General Faculty's Constitution, UHAP, or the ABOR Policy Manual) are in conflict with the shared governance document, those other documents will supersede the shared governance document. Thus, some provisions of the document would require changes in the Constitution in order to be carried out as planned. For example, in order to provide fully for the faculty representation mandated throughout the document, the Constitution and Bylaws would need to be revised so that the General Faculty's Committee on Committees members are elected rather than appointed. Senator Poss concluded his introductory remarks by requesting Senators' comments within ten days.

With regard to section A of the draft, Senator Szilagyi expressed the opinion that the original language of the last sentence should be retained—that is, that extraordinary reviews may take place upon the written petition of one-fifth of the constituent faculty, rather than one-third. Under circumstances of tyranny, he said, it would be virtually impossible to obtain signatures from one-third of the faculty.

There was some discussion regarding section B of the document, which addresses budget and strategic planning. Senator Silverman, a member of the APPC, noted that the committee intended for faculty representatives to the

University-Wide Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) to be elected in some manner, but the details remain to be finalized.

Senator Sharkey applauded the fact that shared governance is now being openly and frankly discussed on campus, and she credited Chair Schwarz, Provost Sypherd, and President Pacheco for initiating this dialogue. She then asked about wording changes in section B, noting that “projected” had been inserted before “budget” in several places. She inquired whether there is a difference between projected budget and actual budget, and at what point SPBAC becomes involved in the budgetary process. Senator Sypherd explained that the projected budget can differ substantially from actual expenditures, depending upon whether there are mid-year budget recisions and/or emergencies; he added that, although the process varies somewhat from year to year, generally SPBAC has a great deal of input during budget projections. Senator Silverman clarified that some of the wording changes in section B were intended to allow for broader faculty input. Chair Schwarz added that SPBAC has developed a series of budgetary guidelines, and part of its role is to ascertain that those guidelines have been followed in the formulation of the budget.

Discussion of section C of the document centered around the definition of an academic administrative position and the deletion of the provision for the appropriate faculty body to have final approval of all faculty and academic administrative appointments. Senator Sypherd pointed out that allowing a faculty body final approval of the aforementioned appointments would be an infringement on the authority of the President and the Board of Regents. Senator Schiffer stated that section C lacks information regarding which committees will evaluate candidates for a position and make a selection, recognizing that the Board of Regents has final authority in all appointments. Senator Garcia clarified that an academic administrator is one who holds an academic rank; for example, if the head of CCIT were a professor of computer science, he or she would hold an academic administrative appointment. Senator Silverman commented that certain non-academic administrators, such as the Senior Vice President for Business Affairs, have great influence over the academic mission of the University, and the faculty would therefore like an opportunity to have input into the selection process for those appointments. Senator Myers noted that faculty should also be involved in the creation of new academic administrative positions. With regard to the added sentence, “This statement is not intended to prohibit target-of-opportunity appointments,” Senator Myers expressed the opinion that more information should be included about the justification for target-of-opportunity appointments and the review process involved in those cases. Senator Sharkey made the general comment that section C seems vague and unclear; there was some sentiment that the APPC should revisit this section for the purpose of providing clarification.

Section D: Senator Sharkey commented that she disagreed with the deletion of “by secret ballot,” noting that many junior faculty are apparently fearful of expressing opinions without the protection of guaranteed anonymity. She added that the results of the surveys regarding the President’s and Provost’s performances were skewed because of the low level of participation among newer faculty members. Senator Poss pointed out that this revision in section D has the effect of allowing for secret ballots, but no longer mandating them. Senator Jacobs suggested that a secret ballot is the essence of the election process; therefore, a secret ballot should be automatic, and an individual should not have to expose himself or herself by calling for one. Senator Feltham agreed with Senator Sharkey that some faculty experience genuine fear for their jobs. Senator Medine commented that he is generally against secret ballots; faculty should be willing to stand up and be counted, and to take care of junior faculty members as necessary. Senator Sharkey said that she would forward a memo to the APPC containing her comments and suggestions about this and other sections of the document.

Section E: Senator Schiffer asked whether the sentence, “Academic and curricular policies rest primarily with the faculty,” was intended to mean that those policies do not relate to shared governance and therefore would not be within the purview of this document. Senator Poss responded in the negative; he reiterated that the document is a memorandum of understanding between faculty and administration regarding shared governance. He added that “primarily” does not mean “exclusively.” Senator Schiffer commented that succeeding sentences in section E seem to suggest the possibility that the administration can appoint a committee to deal with academic or curricular matters under certain circumstances. Chair Schwarz noted that under the precepts of shared governance at least half of the members of committees dealing with academic or curricular matters would have to be faculty members selected as outlined in section D—that is, either elected directly by their faculty peers or selected by a Committee on Committees that has been elected directly by the faculty. Provost Sypherd commented that he would resist an attempt to require an election for every committee. He noted that there are frequently occasions when he needs to gather a small group of faculty with expertise in a given area to receive their input and guidance on a particular issue; sometimes this can be accomplished in just one meeting. He urged the Senate not to tie the administration’s hands by requiring that every committee be elected, because the effect would be that administrative decisions would be made even more slowly than they are now. Senator Poss pointed out that there is a difference between an administrator appointing a committee for the purpose of study, deliberation, and making recommendations, and an administrator appointing a committee for the

purpose of formulating and then effecting policy. In the later instance, the spirit of shared governance would require that faculty be involved, he said. Senator Levy noted that a distinction needs to be made between architectural or policy matters and matters that relate to routine management. Most faculty members are not interested in being involved in day-to-day management details, he said. Senator Medine noted that the language of the second sentence in section E is well crafted; it refers to broad but precise areas, such as the creation and elimination of programs and units, and decisions related to those areas should not be made in haste, but should follow the tenets of shared governance. He recommended that the sentence be retained as is it currently written. Senator Garcia noted that section E authorizes only the administration to initiate action with respect to changing curriculum or programs; it does not authorize the faculty to do so. A change in the wording to enable faculty to initiate such action should be considered, he said. Chair Schwarz noted that the document is very clear about the fact that faculty should not be involved in management decisions. Because it is sometimes difficult to define what a management decision is as opposed to a policy decision, there may be occasions when there is a difference of opinion; in those cases, a review committee could consider the issue and decide. Senator Sharkey questioned whether the sentence, "Shared governance on the above-mentioned policies needs also to occur within the colleges, mindful of the circumstances of each college," was deleted in this area merely because something similar appears also at the end of the document. She expressed the opinion that it would be better to repeat thoughts than to create confusion and ambiguity within a particular section.

Section F: Senator Poss explained that this section is intended to acknowledge that there are times when the President needs to take unilateral action and that there will be a process for faculty review of such actions. Senator Myers commented that the use of the word "faculty" is not clear, since the section refers to both faculty and to the Faculty Senate. Senator Schwarz pointed out that the section as it is currently written could imply that the faculty must make a determination on every occasion that the President takes a unilateral action, and that was not the intent of the APPC; the section is intended to mean that the faculty will decide when something is important or significant enough to raise as an issue.

Section G: Senator Poss noted that this section describes the governance review committee that would be formed to address concerns regarding implementation of the procedures outlined in the shared governance document. Senator Erickson expressed the concern that the membership of the committee would be too restrictive, since as the section is currently written, the faculty representatives would be Faculty Senators. She asked if two of the committee positions could be filled by members of the General Faculty; Senator Poss said the APPC could consider that prospect.

Section H: Senator Poss pointed out that this section simply describes appropriate involvement of students, staff and professional personnel in the shared governance process.

Section I: This section discusses consistency of the shared governance document with other documents, such as the General Faculty's Constitution and Bylaws, UHAP, the ABOR Policy Manual, and Arizona Revised Statutes. It notes that other documents take precedence over this document, but it allows the possibility that other documents may be revised to conform with the principles set forth in the shared governance document.

Section J: Senator Myers asked why the last sentence of the second paragraph in this section—"The Faculty Senate will also consider issues related to representation in the Senate"—had been added. He said that if the sentence is simply acknowledging that the Senate has that prerogative, it is unnecessary; if, on the other hand, it is dictating such an action, it is inappropriate in a faculty governance document. Senator Poss and Senator Troy said this sentence was added in response to concerns the APPC received regarding the composition of the Senate, and they agreed that the shared governance document is perhaps not the appropriate place for such a comment. Senator Medine commented that, although the academic units at the University are a federation of sorts, there is a great deal of variety in procedures from unit to unit and college to college. Senator Poss noted that the APPC had intended to acknowledge that variety in the first sentence of section J, which states that, "Shared governance... also needs to occur with the colleges and units, as appropriate to the circumstances of each college and unit..."

Senator Warburton reminded Senators to submit comments to the APPC so that they can be considered in further revisions of the shared governance document.

6. DISCUSSION OF PROMOTION AND TENURE GUIDELINES DRAFT DOCUMENT (Attachment)

Senator Warburton explained that, in the absence of Senator Schooley, Senator Aleamoni would lead the discussion of the promotion and tenure guidelines document.

Senator Aleamoni began by noting that the APPC had taken the current draft as provided to them by its promotion and tenure subcommittee and distributed it to the Faculty Senate for input prior to making additional modifications to the document. He added that the cover memos from Senator Schooley and the promotion and tenure subcommittee outline the history of the document. It draws heavily on three recent University documents dealing with faculty evaluation, promotion and tenure. Earlier drafts of the document were distributed to the General Faculty in mid-April 1996; that same month both a General Faculty meeting and a special session of the Faculty Senate were held to discuss the draft. Comments from these meetings and from individual faculty members have been incorporated into the current draft (#9). Senator Aleamoni then called for comments and discussion.

Senator Myers asked where in the document the responsibility of serving on a doctoral committee without being the adviser would fall. Senator Garcia suggested that the deletion of the word "supervisory" in the item, "Serving on master's or doctoral supervisory committees," (Table I, Assignment Activities, Instruction, Advising, #3) would change the meaning of the item to include all responsibilities related to doctoral committees, rather than just supervisory.

Senator Myers recommended that some mention of collegiality be included in the document. Frequently assistant professors feel that they must work independently in order to obtain promotions; by the time they are promoted to full professors their independent work habits are well established and they find it difficult to work cooperatively with colleagues. Senator Aleamoni acknowledged that this is currently an issue of concern at universities around the country; the only question is where to list collegiality in the document—as a separate category or under an existing category.

Senator Szilagyi expressed the opinion that the amount of grant funding that a faculty member receives is more a measure of salesmanship than of research activity, and to be promoted to full professor based on salesmanship is wrong. It is especially wrong, he added, if a faculty member's unit is allowed to determine the weight ranges for each performance dimension, because in certain units, grant funding is all that is considered.

Senator Pitt commented that, with regard to sources of evaluation input, a faculty member's two- and four-year reviews should become part of his or her official record and not just used in-house, so that they can be used to indicate how a faculty member is developing.

Senator Mitchell reported that he had shared the promotion and tenure guidelines document with the library promotion and continuing status committee. That committee liked the document and asked whether a parallel document for continuing status personnel is being developed. Senator Aleamoni indicated that the APPC had not discussed that issue yet, but it should be considered.

With regard to the document's mention of the use of modern technologies, Senator Schiffer cautioned against the possibility of faddism. Even chalk, blackboard, and eraser are legitimate technologies, he said. He also commented that the table at the end of the document may be a red herring, because it would be impossible to list all activities and lines of evidence that might be considered for a faculty member's evaluation. Senator Garcia responded that, on the other hand, some common thread must exist from unit to unit; otherwise, professorships could mean different things in different areas of the institution. To follow up on Senator Szilagyi's comment regarding grant funding, Senator Garcia noted that grants are a proper measure for evaluation—not the only measure, but certainly a significant measure.

Senator Aleamoni stated that it is the APPC's intent that some details related to this document, such as weighting of performance dimensions, be determined at the unit level. Thus, a unit could decide to use substitutes, alternate but equivalent ways of measuring performance.

Senator Clarke noted that weighting the factors listed in the table is the crux of the matter. Disagreements abound over the relative worth of publications (e.g., how many journal articles equal a book; is a book published in cloth and paper worth more than one published only in paper) and methods of calculating or increasing citation counts. Senator Aleamoni agreed that these are issues, but it is nevertheless preferable that standards be defined at the unit level and modified as necessary.

Senator Weinand commented that, speaking as a representative of the College of Medicine, the most important part of the document is the first paragraph of section III, which recognizes that an institution needs both general standards and also unit-specific standards for promotion and tenure; the standards developed in units must, of course, support the institutional goals in the areas of teaching, research, and service.

Senator Schiffer asked if the outcome of implementing promotion and tenure guidelines would be the establishment of unit-specific bureaucratic documents that will dictate even more complex procedures for promotion and tenure reviews. Senator Aleamoni responded that the implementation of the promotion and tenure guidelines document should require no more committee work than faculty currently have. Once the unit guidelines are established and in place, the complexity and the amount of work should be reduced, and the long-term result should be more reliability and validity of the evaluations.

Senator Warburton asked Senators to submit comments to the Faculty Center or the APPC so that they can be incorporated into the next draft of the document.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Rose M. Gerber, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Guidelines for Shared Governance, Draft 6 (dated 1/23/97)
2. University Guidelines, Criteria, and Evaluation Procedures for Promotion and Tenure, Draft 9 (dated 8/20/96), along with cover memos dated 12/2/96 and 8/23/96

*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 February 3, 1997

None