

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, November 2, 1992 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, November 2, 1992, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-two members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Vivian L. Cox presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Atwater, Badger, Barrett, Cox, Cusanovich, Dickinson, Elliott, Enos, Ewbank, Garcia, Hildebrand, Hill, Horak, Impey, Inman, Jones, Larson, Lewis, MacDonell, Mautner, McElroy, Najor, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Reiter, Reynolds, Roemer, Sergeant, Siciliano, Silverman, Spera, Sullivan, Tomizuka, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Witte, Wright, Young, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Coons, Dvorak, Fajardo, Hammond, Joens, Kaczynski, Konur, Law, Mitchell, Songer, and Valenzuela.

2. TOWN HALL ON SHARED GOVERNANCE: Dr. Cox reported that this "Town Hall" agenda item had been added because the Faculty Senate Executive Committee believes it is important to provide Senators with an opportunity to address some of the critical topics which impact and affect the University community. She invited Senators to participate in today's topic: exploration of the concept of shared governance as provided in Senate Bill 1106.

Senator Silverman said he believed this would be an appropriate time, in view of the difficult decisions facing the institution, to start "changing the culture" and acknowledge the fact that "we--administration, faculty, staff, and students--are all in this together, and we will rise and fall together." He suggested that the administration, including department heads and deans, should recognize that faculty, staff and students should no longer be "out of the loop," but be an integral part of the decision-making process, participating in formation of important ad hoc committees and appointment of members. He added that the Chair of the Faculty should be a member of the President's Cabinet, and a faculty representative should sit on the Deans' Council, as is the case with other universities, including Arizona State University, in order to achieve shared governance.

Senator Garcia: "I think it's especially important to do as Senator Silverman indicates in budgetarily difficult times. I think we are headed for a decade of difficulty, not just one year. And, because of that, we have to create a sense of shared vision. The only way that anybody's going to believe in the vision is to have a say in creating that vision. We talk about teamwork. Teamwork doesn't mean that somebody gives the orders and somebody else pulls on the oars. That's a kind of teamwork, but it is not the kind that will work in academe. I think the atmosphere is getting worse here, not better, and I think we should work toward change."

Senator Inman asked which Senate committee would be the proper one to formulate recommendations for Senate consideration that could then be forwarded to President Pacheco. Dr. Cox responded that no appropriate committee may exist. If the Senate wanted to press the matter in this way, she thought a special group should be asked to undertake the assignment.

President Pacheco noted that, following Senator Garcia's statement, the Senate

appeared to be taking a unilateral approach to implementation of SB1106, contrary to the previous proposal, submitted by a representative group of the Senate. "I believe we should sit down with a group representing both the central administration and the Faculty Senate to work this problem through. I find that to be a much more acceptable and productive approach."

Senator Witte suggested that this topic relates clearly to academic personnel policy, and would seem appropriate for assignment to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, which could be charged with drafting a proposal, consulting with the administration as appropriate, and submitting the result to the Senate for consideration.

Senator Inman said she believed that after a proposal had been drafted, it would be appropriate for a group of Senators to sit down with administrators and discuss it, but that some sense of the Senate should be determined prior to such a meeting.

Senator McElroy commented that faculty in his department have been involved over the past two years in searches for a new head and for a Fine Arts dean; the most common reaction received from candidates for those positions was a disbelief that departmental chairs and deans were not elected by the faculty. They expressed discomfort at the possibility of entering a situation in which they could be perceived as representing interests other than those of the people they were to serve. Senator McElroy thought that there would be a better chance of enticing good candidates to come if the selection process was changed.

Senator Lewis asked who had pressed for SB1106, as he did not recall Senate discussions on this topic last year. Senator Garcia responded that the Faculty Senate had been provided with at least five opportunities to comment in 1991-92 and 1990-91, and that he, as Chairman of the Faculty, and previously, as Chair of the Committee of Eleven, had testified on behalf of the bill. In each case, he had reported to the Senate, and while no vote was taken, ample opportunity for comment had been provided. He added that the faculties at both ASU and NAU had formally voted to endorse SB1106. Senator Lewis said that he believed the Senate should work with central administrators collaboratively to determine implementation, and he supported President Pacheco's remarks. Senator Garcia agreed that this issue cannot be settled unilaterally and does require collaboration, and noted that some members of the Senate had clearly expressed their view that policy documents that affect faculty affairs should originate with a committee of the faculty.

Senator Witte noted that the Legislature must have felt that something was seriously wrong for them to have passed SB1106 and for the Governor to have signed it into Arizona law.

Senator Silverman stated that shared governance at the departmental and college levels should not get lost in the discussion. A few years ago, the Committee of Eleven conducted some research on that topic and learned that (1) few colleges and departments had bylaws, and (2) many colleges, and possibly some departments, never conducted faculty meetings. He said it appeared that some deans in the larger colleges appeared to be making decisions without much faculty input. He then asked President Pacheco if the question of the meaning of SB1106 is now before the Council of Presidents.

President Pacheco responded that a discussion had taken place in the Council of Presidents, and he would be reporting on that in his remarks.

Senator Garcia commented that, at the beginning of this decade, in 1990, the University underwent NCA accreditation review, which included a Self-Study Committee that examined the institution's internal organization, and it found that faculty governance was lacking. The external committee reviewed that report, conducted its own interviews and hearings on campus and concluded that the self-study was correct: faculty governance was severely lacking on this campus. Senator Garcia added that, a year later, a Vice President from Northwestern University came to examine the institution's financial structure. Although he was not asked to review the issue of faculty governance, in the process of assessing our financial structure and budgetary problems, decided that part of the "mess we were in" was caused by a lack of proper faculty governance and accountability to the faculty. "Whether or not we have trouble here is not in doubt. We have been examined internally and externally, and there is no question. We do not do well in the area of faculty governance."

Senator Wright, noting that the leadership of the state had not always acted in the best interests of the University of Arizona, said he believed the principal problem with faculty governance derives from the fact that faculty do not participate in its governance within its existing structures. "If we could get everyone out to vote in all elections, ... then bills such as this one would not be needed. The root of the problem is simply that most of the faculty at the University, with all the pressures directed at them from every avenue, don't look at faculty governance as a principal issue of their daily lives. And yet it is, increasingly so. I would maintain that we need to get the faculty out to vote, find some people who really want to lead them, and rate issues like this one as only confusing the system."

Dr. Cox asked the Senate whether it wished to continue into time allocated for the Open Session, the entire time for the Town Hall having elapsed. Many responses requested a continuance of the present discussion.

Senator Hildebrand said that he wished to speak on behalf of his faculty colleagues concerning the concept of a Faculty Town Hall. He persuaded only one colleague to accompany him, and that individual appeared to be the only non-Senator here for the Town Hall discussion. He said he believed it would be fraudulent to call this anything more than a Senate discussion, and it should be so labeled. He said he was unaware of any public announcement other than that today in Lo Que Pasa, and added that if such sessions are to be called Faculty Town Meetings, and if the Senate seriously wants to welcome faculty participation, then it should be publicized at least a month in advance.

Senator Williams commented about a cause and effect regarding faculty participation in governance. A feeling of alienation develops when faculty feel that their participation was not truly effective.

Dr. Cox said all comments were appreciated. "We certainly are aware of the importance of trying to make announcements in a timely fashion so that not only members of the Senate but others can participate, and we certainly will take that into consideration and do the best we can to facilitate that."

3. OPEN SESSION: Senator Impey reported that a recent memo from the Dean of the Graduate College announced a change in the way graduate fellowships are awarded. As a member of his unit's graduate admissions committee, he wished to bring the matter to the Senate's attention. Previously, he said, graduate fellowships were awarded on a competitive basis, but would now be based on a unit's graduate

enrollment. For example, a department with graduate enrollment of from 1 to 60 would receive a maximum of one fellowship. Senator Impey said this change, approved by the Graduate Council, appears to run counter to the issues of merit and excellence. In addition, graduate fellowships are split more or less 50-50 in terms of unrestricted and minority, and it appeared that the change would also run counter to the concept of affirmative action.

4. REPORTS

- 4.A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Pacheco said he wanted to comment on three matters that the Senate will consider today or has considered in past weeks: Senate Bill 1106; the recently circulated draft document dealing with sanctions against faculty members; and preparations for assessing programs.

"I have listened with interest to the discussion today on SB1106. Let me take this opportunity first to say the obvious, namely that we need to make progress in this area with minimal delay. More importantly, I want to add a couple of new points and perhaps a caution. As Senators will well know from my remarks when I became President, I have a deep personal belief in collaborative decision-making. More importantly, however, my subsequent behavior in such areas as budget shaping have confirmed that point. The general intent of the new legislation is clear enough, and I believe universally acceptable. Shared governance represents a shared value for all of us.

"The problem with this legislation is that the language that is used is quite uncertain. Some might argue that the language is ambiguous and I suspect that all of us could agree that it's vague. As a result, there is a high probability that well-disposed individuals will read quite different meanings into its phrases. What, for example, is meant by the phrase 'matters related to faculty personnel?' Is this merely a long-winded way of saying faculty personnel matters, that is promotion and tenure and so forth? If not, what does it mean? Again, the law speaks of faculty members being involved in university governance 'through their elected faculty representatives.' What precisely does this mean? A literal meaning suggests that the total burden of contributing to governance is to fall solely on the small numbers of elected Senators, which would be quite impractical. Even if we read the law as permitting the Senate to designate other faculty members to share the burden, we need to proceed carefully if we are going to avoid a true bureaucratic nightmare. More fundamentally, however, what is meant by the phrase 'shared governance' and on its relationship to existing laws dealing with the power and responsibilities of the Arizona Board of Regents and the University Presidents. It does not, for example, stipulate in clear language the necessary distinction between advice and decisions. The Board of Regents and the Presidents cannot reasonably be expected to accept responsibility for managing universities if they do not have the ability to make fundamental decisions.

"These examples suggest that reasonable people could well arrive at a very different interpretation of this new law. To me, this suggests that we need to proceed carefully, perhaps by first agreeing on some operational definitions. To further complicate matters, this is not solely a University of Arizona problem. It involves all three universities and the Arizona Board of Regents. I think we need to move carefully in concert if we are to avoid endless and unproductive arguments. We need to agree on definitions with which all three faculties, all three institutions, and the Regents can live, but still maintaining the autonomy of all three institutions to be governed as they see fit. An alternative, of course, and some people have suggested this, is to obtain an

interpretation or interpretations from the Attorney General. This might well produce outcomes that none of us would enjoy. Certainly it would remove the matter from our--faculty and administration--control.

"As I understand matters, the Arizona Faculties Council has conferred on this law, as has the Council of Presidents. I now look forward to discussing the situation with the Senate leadership so that we can determine the most effective way to proceed. We need to make Senate Bill 1106 a benefit rather than a terminological quagmire. One other comment that I would make on this, just so that we are not left with a misimpression, the Bill that was ultimately passed was not the same one that was originally introduced. As all of you may be aware, it was changed in the last part of the Legislative session. Nonetheless, when it went to the Governor's Office, the Governor sent a letter to each of the three university presidents asking why he should not veto this bill. All three of us responded in writing that we felt that this is a bill that should be passed. I don't want you to be left with the impression that somehow the Governor's Office or that all of State Government thought that there was something terribly wrong that needed to be corrected.

"Now I want to turn briefly to the draft document on sanctions that was circulated for comment in recent weeks, and which the Senate discussed at a previous meeting. Let me say that there is a consensus. The Senate discussion was valuable and I think it's going to benefit the outcome, and I know that there are going to be additional discussions. Last year, in the course of handling one particular personnel problem, it became apparent that we had a significant void in our personnel policies at both the Regental and the University levels. We have no policy covering circumstances in which misconduct by a faculty member falls short of the level that would warrant suspension or dismissal. The administrators involved in the Senate's own Academic Personnel Policy Committee all recognize this deficiency in their communication to me, and that's why I appointed this ad hoc committee to recommend possible sanctions that could be applied in situations in which termination or suspension would not be justified. At that same time, I advised the Chairman of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee that a draft would be forthcoming for review and comment. Unfortunately, it seems that some of our colleagues have interpreted an effort to fill an obvious gap in the personnel policies as a fiendish plot to oppress faculty members and to remove their rights. The fact is that common sense should tell us that we are likely to need penalties somewhere between an oral reprimand and termination or suspension. The only way I know of to develop such a scale of penalties, and to agree on how best to apply them, and what provisions are necessary is to produce a draft document and then progressively hammer it into an improved form.

"I have absolutely no problem with working with a modified version of what was submitted to you. That was a draft document. I think it is a responsibility of the President of this University to find the time to take initiatives of this nature. Sometimes that initiative will start someplace else. I don't think that any one place in the University has the only responsibility for these initiatives. To me this is shared governance at work, and I appreciate the Senate's contribution at its previous meeting. I want to make it clear, however, that there never was, nor is there now, any intention of imposing some new code without consultation and an opportunity to work together on the matter. This brings me to the final point.

"Concerning the program assessment and establishing a process for the future, I want to express my thanks to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for

arranging a special meeting of the Senate to review the preliminary reports of the several task forces involved. For me, at least, the Senate's discussion developed several substantive points that I understand are receiving the attention of the task forces. Among these I include the need to improve arrangements for establishing the various groups that will be needed, the necessity to recognize and support the arduous tasks that will be accepted by faculty members involved in forthcoming efforts, and the value of designating core criteria to be used in assessing academic programs in the departments. I fully anticipate that these and other points will be reflected in the final reports and recommendations that come from the task forces.

"In an ideal world, I suppose, we would have taken much more time to develop arrangements for assessing programs and for establishing of priorities. Unfortunately, the pressures of our financial situation just simply do not allow us that luxury. Even so, I want to stress that many of our colleagues were directly involved in the effort to this point, and that many more will be involved in the second phase of the work. I am told that this level of collaborative participation is on a far wider scale than the University has been accustomed to in the past, and I find that to be an appealing fact.

"My remarks this afternoon have addressed three apparently disparate topics: Senate Bill 1106, improved personnel policies, and the preliminaries to institutional planning. In fact, of course, all three are related in that they deal with different aspects of shared governance. If you ask me to summarize the meaning of my remarks today overall, I would say that they amount to this: while some of you may disagree with the extent of this statement, I would say that we have had shared governance in the past. Perhaps some disagree in this with the extent of it. We are developing better shared governance at the present and once we clarify its meaning, Senate Bill 1106 will give us even better shared governance in the future. Thank you."

4B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: No report.

4C. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia, on behalf of the members of the General Faculty, extended his thanks to those Senators and others who shared the sanctions proposals with their colleagues, and who had taken the time to telephone or submit written comments to him. He reported he had shared them all with the Academic Personnel Policy Committee.

He reported that the reorganization of Chemical Engineering in the College of Engineering and Mines, involving the transfer of environmental engineering faculty from Civil Engineering to Chemical and Environmental Engineering, was occurring in accordance with the procedures instituted by the Senate last spring. He noted that President Pacheco had agreed to use one of his appointments for the individual elected by the Civil Engineering faculty to represent them. The committee had been constituted and had elected himself as Chair, and Senator Robert Dvorak as Vice-Chair. The committee is proceeding with its meeting schedule, and will report and terminate by December 14th.

Senator Garcia reminded Senators of the selection process underway for Affirmative Action Officer, with open forums scheduled next week. He urged Senators to take the time to attend, and to transmit their comments to the Chair of that Search Committee, Dr. Ted Tong.

In conclusion, Senator Garcia reported the Board of Regents will be meeting on our campus November 19 and 20, and the Senate's three representatives to the

Arizona Faculties Council (Drs. Cox, Ewbank and Garcia) would be in attendance. Issues for the attention of the Board could be addressed to any one of the three. He said he also wanted to formally thank ASU's and ASU-West's Faculty Senate President and President-Elect Dr. Dickinson McGaw and Dr. Jane Carey for sharing with this body on October 26 the status of faculty governance on their respective campuses. He said he hoped the meetings which Dr. Pacheco referred to will occur in the immediate future so "we can get on with improving faculty governance on this campus." Senator Garcia added that the Continuous Organizational Renewal (CORE) program is planning an information and discussion session the morning of December 3, to which Faculty Senators will be invited. He asked Senators to clear and mark their calendars for that event.

- 4D. REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE: Secretary Roemer reported that the first issue of the Faculty Newsletter had evoked few reactions to the more restricted distribution of minutes, initiated for financial reasons: two letters of protest, one letter of support, and conversations which indicated mild support. Consequently, she concluded that few are desolated by not receiving individual copies of the minutes. Combined costs are running at about two-thirds of those associated with the previous broad distribution of the minutes alone. Secretary Roemer said she also wished to comment on the form of reporting of the two additional lengthy Senate sessions. Resources would not permit complete transcription of the extra sessions, but "notes" would be provided.
- 4E. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Siciliano reported that ASUA had succeeded in registering around 5,200 new voters this fall, and Arizona Students Association (ASA) had registered more than 12,000 state-wide, the largest ever registration for ASA. ASUA's drive included forums and efforts to get out the vote, and it will assist with transportation to the polling booths. The effort concentrated on high school and college students, and he said MTV targeted our campus for election-day filming due to those efforts. He urged Senators to join ranks with ASUA and encourage students to vote.

Senator Siciliano said he also wished to comment on tuition, which will be set in April. ASA drafted four basic conditions that need to be met in order for that organization to endorse a tuition increase: (1) each institution will be able to control the tuition revenue generated by its students; (2) no campus-wide mandatory fees or similar hidden tuition increases will be imposed on students; (3) there will be a substantial infusion of funding for unmet financial need--the funding requested by students after available funds have been awarded, because the figure has been growing over the last three years; (4) no decrease in state appropriations will take place. He said ASUA realizes the latter item is not under the control of the universities directly, but it is not the intention of students to increase their share only to see it applied elsewhere within the state. Basically, students want to get what they pay for through any tuition increase.

Senator Siciliano reported ASUA is implementing a "Wednesday Program," which will consist of invitations to spend time at ASUA and address the Student Senate. He also commented on a wager he might make with the President of the student body at ASU concerning the outcome of the annual football game between UA and ASU.

- 4F. REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Cox reported that the Committee on Elections is anticipating that newly elected Senators, resulting from three special elections being held in Agriculture, Engineering and Science, will be able to join the Senate at its December 7 meeting. She noted that meeting will be held in DuVal Auditorium. Dr. Cox also reported that orientation

for new Faculty Senators has been scheduled for next week, and she encouraged those who could not attend to let her know so she could schedule a second orientation if necessary.

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Witte told Secretary Roemer that she had concern regarding the distribution of minutes because she believes them to be a vital communication link with members of the General Faculty. "I do not believe they should be discontinued, particularly in times of budget crises... with jobs and departments in jeopardy." She reported she had received feedback from clinical faculty who, although not highly involved in campus matters, were dismayed at their discontinuance; they stated that, while they do not read everything in the minutes, they always look through them. She said they commented that the newsletter did not provide the information they needed. She said she wondered why 150 administrators, rather than faculty, received copies of this faculty communication. She proposed instead that those 150 copies be sent to faculty in those units if financial reduction is necessary. Senator Witte said she would ask the Senate at some time in the future to reinstate the minutes, and to provide Senators with financial details. She asked if the \$5,000 figure referenced previously included the newsletter.

Secretary Roemer responded that the minutes had not been discontinued--only the general distribution. "The 150 copies that go to unit leaders include the specific request that they be made available to faculty, and the faculty in the units be informed where and under what circumstances. I can testify that in my own units there have been notices sent around, and the minutes are available to read in a place that is convenient. The one disadvantage is you can't take them home and read them after dinner." She noted that she was working toward additional deposits in the library, and a \$12 annual subscription can be arranged with the FastCopy Center for personal copies. Secretary Roemer said the cost of distribution to the General Faculty had been running somewhere between \$500 and \$700 a month, and funds are not available to provide individual copies of the full minutes. "The plan was that minutes would be made available in some way so that everybody has access. I know there are some people who do read them thoroughly, but many copies end up in the wastebasket. The newsletter costs about \$200 a month for copies to all of the General Faculty, and its purpose is to pick up highlights of the minutes so individuals can learn if there is a need to read the detailed minutes, as well as to provide more current information so there is opportunity to participate in questions of governance before Senate action occurs. If there is an alternate plan, or we're not succeeding, we would like to have suggestions and consider what can be done toward a more satisfactory solution."

Senator Lewis, referring to a recent Wildcat article that indicated Math 116 might be phased out, asked President Pacheco about the effects of such a move on admission standards and on students who need that course, and the anticipated timetable. President Pacheco responded that at times the claims of the Wildcat are exaggerated; he asked Interim Provost Cusanovich to respond. Dr. Cusanovich stated that a review of the issue and all related factors is occurring now, for possible implementation in the spring, but no decisions had yet been made concerning remedial courses, which do not count towards degree programs. One of the main issues, he said, is whether the University should be teaching high school math and English. If proposals result from the review, he said, they will be brought forward. In response to a question from Senator Ewbank, Dr. Cusanovich said he had asked Vice President Fernandez to look into this matter to determine if sufficient funds could be saved to apply toward degree-counting courses. "If our sense is that there are sufficient economic and educational

advantages, they we'll bring a recommendation forward through appropriate channels, but it is a complex issue. In my role as Provost, I need to examine these kinds of issues from time to time and make recommendations." Senator Lewis requested further clarification on (1) appropriate channels; and (2), even though the coursework could be deemed in line with current high school courses, how could a cut be justified in view of the need of approximately 40 percent of incoming freshmen, transfer, and re-entry students? He added that it is evident that we still need to provide that service. Dr. Cusanovich: "I would bring it to Chairman of the Faculty Garcia, and to the Instructional Committee of the Undergraduate Council; there are a number of places it would go." Senator Garcia asked if a proposal had been developed yet, and if faculty are involved at this stage. Dr. Cusanovich responded that no proposal has been made, and no faculty were currently involved.

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Hearing no objections, the Notes of September 21 and the Minutes of October 5, 1992, were approved as distributed.
7. ADDRESS BY DEAN OF LIBRARIES CARLA J. STOFFLE CONCERNING THE CRISIS IN SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION: Dean Stoffle said that she wished this, her first official meeting with the Senate, were an occasion to share the many exciting changes occurring in the Library which will improve services and access for faculty and students. However, today she needed to make the Senate aware of a threat to scholarly communication facing all of higher education, and had placed informative packets on Senators' desks.

Dean Stoffle reported that escalation in the price of scholarly materials has created a problem that will require the cooperation and combined efforts of faculty, students, administration and library staff, along with similar efforts from peer institutions across the country, and that both short-term and long-term action will be required for the outcome to be successful.

Dean Stoffle highlighted, with the aid of an overhead projector, data related to increases in prices of library materials: periodical and book price increases compared with increases in the consumer price index for familiar items from 1984-91, indicating the increases clearly exceed all categories except medical costs. In 1992, periodical costs increased 10 percent, and books 12.5 percent; general inflation was 3 percent, and the gap continues to grow. Projections for 1993 indicate that periodicals may increase by as much as 16 to 19 percent, and books by another 12.5 percent.

Causes for the library materials price increases are varied and complex, she said, and include the following factors: the weakness of the dollar against foreign currency; increases in the number of pages in journal issues; and--the real culprit--exploitation of the scholarly communication process by commercial for-profit publishers of a large portion of the scholarly journals in science, technology and medicine. These publishers are now moving into the social sciences and humanities, and they are making large profits by selling back to universities information created, reviewed, and edited by faculty. A recent issue of the Wall Street Journal carried an article covering the recent merger of Elsevier with another trade publisher. The 40+ percent profit margin on many of Elsevier's scientific titles was cited as the reason why it made such a desirable partner. Last year Elsevier purchased Pergamon, another European publisher, combining two of the largest for-profit publishers in the world, which resulted in mid-year price increases of up to 30 percent for some of the Pergamon journals. Typical cumulative price increases from European for-profit publishers, from 1989 to 1992, were 101 percent, and the 1993 rate is projected

to bring the cumulative rate to 179 percent for some publications, and to over 1,000 percent for others.

Dean Stoffle compared the growth of the Library's funding to state, university, and personal income growth, and to peer libraries, starting from 1981-82, the time of the Library's highest ranking against its peers. It appears to be falling behind, despite the protection from cuts it has received in the last few years. To bring it to a level with its peers, the Library would need a materials budget of \$7.7 million versus its present \$5.1.

Despite the difficult budgetary factors, the Library has maintained a high collecting level because, compared with its peers, it has spent a greater portion (41 percent, as opposed to an average 33 percent) of its total library budget on materials. To maximize its buying power, Library staff employed creativity, tenacity, and multiple strategies. Dean Stoffle said the staff have pushed vendors for higher discounts and lower service charges, reduced approval plans, canceled some standing orders, and moved to direct faculty selection in some areas to maximize purchasing power. Reference materials have been reviewed and canceled. Dollars have been moved from preservation, bindery and conservation. Expenditures on market research have been virtually eliminated. On-line access has been substituted for expensive, little used print items. Duplicate purchasing has been nearly eliminated. Rare Book and Center for Creative Photography materials funds have been reduced. From 1986 to 1989, serials were reduced \$280,000, and since then the purchase of new serials titles has been held in check. Outside funds have been sought. Resource sharing agreements have been signed with other institutions, and subsidized inter-library loans and reprint purchases will soon be made available to faculty to make up for buying power loss. Dollars have been moved from book purchases to support serial subscriptions in the last two years. She said she believes staff have reached the end of their ability to "make do."

Dean Stoffle reported that, using conservative estimates, the Library would need \$1.17 million dollars to cover serials inflation from 1991 to 1994-95. Data received after allocation of the 1992-93 budget indicates that the estimates for serials may be 3-5 percent too low. The impact of library materials inflation is hampering the Library's ability to supply the research and undergraduate education readings of faculty and students because fewer titles are being purchased each year, 6 percent fewer last year. The chief collection development officers of the top 40 percent of the Association for Research Libraries reported cutting an average of \$130,000 in serials titles in 1991-92. One-third of this group were planning serials reductions averaging \$300,000 this year. ASU cut \$180,000 last year and is planning to trim over \$600,000 this year. In addition to reducing serials titles, many institutions are targeting for special reductions materials of publishers who have specially high pricing fees. Research-sharing agreements are being signed to facilitate moving materials from one institution to another.

Dean Stoffle stated that the Library is proposing that \$700,000 in serials expenditures be eliminated from the 1994 budget to control increasing costs and to avoid losing more book dollars to pay for serials. "If we accomplish our reductions appropriately, in 1994-95 we will have avoided \$200,000 of additional cost, bringing our savings to \$900,000." In addition to targeting \$700,000, the Library also proposes to allocate reductions in a manner reflecting where the pricing increases occurred. The Library will add services to increase the ability of the community to identify and gain access to materials the Library does not own, and it is prepared to work with ASU to ensure they maintain titles

we will reduce, and vice versa. In addition, the Library will initiate a series of faculty seminars to help faculty understand the negative consequences for scholarly communication, and to identify activities faculty can undertake to help bring the problem under control. Staff will be available to meet with departments to discuss how best to handle a departmental review of serials, and she will be glad to meet with groups that have questions or alternative suggestions. She extended thanks to Sara Heitshu, Steve Bosch, Karen Tallman and Doug Jones for their assistance in compiling the report presented to the Senate today.

Senator Impey asked if serials duplication exists between the Library and departmental libraries, and if so, if departmental/college collections could be cross-referenced with University Library materials so that students could access them. Secondly, he asked if there was any prospect of the Library and its counterparts at other Research I universities getting together to send a strong statement of strategic goals to the publishers involved, indicating a common strategy for dealing with the exorbitant prices. Dean Stoffle responded that she had no idea how many departmental libraries exist and what they contain, but that if departments want to work with the Library and are willing to provide access to their materials, Library staff will be happy to assist. She added that there is a strong possibility that many of the journals in departmental libraries are faculty personal copies, and publishers have instituted a procedure of asking faculty to sign agreements that, when they get the lower personal subscription rate, approximately a tenth the library rate, they will not share their copy with the Library or anyone else. While major universities are looking to develop borrowing agreements, publishers have sued individual faculty who have published articles that suggest costs are unreasonable. She reported that publishers are actively examining copyright issues to determine if inter-library loans are in violation, and that is why it will be important to initiate the series of faculty seminars in the spring, to begin action.

Senator Witte asked if universities, nationally or internationally, had considered the idea of using university presses, which could conceivably produce the journals for a third of the publisher's price. She said it would seem to be the most powerful tool available. Dean Stoffle stated that she is exploring that possibility, but universities would have to invest in some start-up funds and faculty would have to pressure their scholarly societies to move their journals. She added that part of the problem is that scholarly societies are being subsidized by the commercial publishers.

Senator Tomizuka commented that he had a soft spot for Elsevier that in 1638 had published the books of Galileo banned by the Inquisition. He then noted that his alma mater, through its Foundation, has been conducting an aggressive fund-raising campaign to save their library. For example, an additional premium is assessed on athletic season tickets. He wondered whether any thought had been given to such a possibility on this campus. Dean Stoffle said she proposed that the PAC-10 institute a surcharge on ticket prices for all athletic events, the proceeds to go to the libraries. She said they turned her down: they had other things to pay for and were broke anyhow. Dean Stoffle provided details on current fund-raising plans, and the generous assistance the Library has received from the Parents Association and Friends of the Library. She added that more ideas are needed. "If you know where there's money, I'll go try to get it."

Senator Garcia asked if the Library's standing is falling behind that of its peers. Dean Stoffle responded that the Library is automating now, approximately five years after everybody else, at a cost of close to \$3 million over a three-year period. That would show as a library expenditure, but she was not sure that

would counterbalance against no raises, even cuts in some portions of the budget. In 1981-82, we were ranked 17th, and today we're ranked 23rd. Over the last year the ranking has remained flat. But if this library wanted to be in the same place relative to its peers that it was in 1981-82, it would need a \$2.6 million increase in its materials budget alone.

Senator Elliott asked how the \$700,000 figure was determined. Dean Stoffle responded that close scrutiny indicated that if the \$700,000 is cut now, in the manner proposed, it would be the equivalent of cutting \$900,000 two years from now. Senator Elliott asked if this would be a permanent or temporary cut. Dean Stoffle responded that it would be permanent, although deleted serials could always be restored if funds became available.

Senator Impey asked Dean Stoffle to speculate on the entrepreneurial efforts occurring in Science, and on the possible effects of electronic publishers. Dean Stoffle stated that, in the short term, it would increase the problem because of its nature as a supplement rather than a replacement. There will be more information to manage, rather than less. Some of the material in electronic form duplicates versions in print, and the Library will work with faculty on matters of choice, concentrating on maximizing access and reducing costs.

8. ACTION ON RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR./CIVIL RIGHTS HOLIDAY:
Senator Garcia moved for approval of the following proposal:

WHEREAS, it is fitting and proper that the citizens of the State of Arizona recognize and honor the advancement of civil rights and the part played in this important and great struggle by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; and

WHEREAS, the federal government, all other state governments, the City of Tucson and the University of Arizona have already recognized the third Monday of January as an official holiday;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY recommended by the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona that the citizens of the State of Arizona vote for Proposition 300, establishing the third Monday of January as a legal holiday to be known as MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR./CIVIL RIGHTS DAY.

Motion 1992/93-25 was then seconded.

Senator Mautner said he would like to speak neither for nor against the resolution, believing that all members of the Senate would vote for it, but wondered whether this sort of item required Faculty Senate consideration.

Senator Siciliano said he believed the state's lack of a holiday sends certain signals to others, and he wanted to comment on why this issue might be appropriate for the Senate to consider. He said ASUA had an opportunity to host a national student association meeting, but they chose not to come to Arizona because of its potentially hostile atmosphere; \$30,000 in potential income was lost, and ASUA had to pay travel expenses for its representatives to attend the meeting. In addition, he has friends from New York who applied to this campus, but then withdrew their applications because of the question concerning acknowledgment of civil rights. He said he believes the matters is very much related to code of conduct and academic integrity, and how individuals on campus treat one another, and he believed the Senate should act on the resolution.

A voice vote indicated approval.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULUM BULLETIN: Dr. Cox reported that in Section I, item (E) had been removed. Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 14, No. 11, Section I, as amended, was moved (motion 1992/93-26A), seconded, and unanimously supported on a voice vote. Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 14, No. 11, Section II was moved (1992/93-26B), seconded, and unanimously supported on a voice vote.

Senator Garcia, on a point of information, said that at the October meeting, an item related to the rules for selecting the grade review committee had been removed from the Curriculum Bulletin. He wondered if it would be correct to conclude that the proposed revision of the composition of grade review committees is not finalized, and the previous policy is still in place. Dr. Cox said that would be her understanding. Senator Young noted that this point raises the question of improperly constituted grade appeal committees, and the decisions those committees made. Dr. Cox said that issue should be addressed, and she will look into it to determine what action might be appropriate.

10. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON REVISIONS TO GUIDELINES FOR PERIODIC REVIEWS OF DEANS, DIRECTORS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS OF ACADEMIC UNITS: Dr. Dipankar Chakravarti, Chair of the Academic Personnel Committee (APPC), noting that late last spring revisions to Guidelines for Periodic Reviews of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units were scheduled for discussion, but postponed until this semester. Hence, APPC has taken the opportunity to review the document again. The copy provided to Senators for discussion is, therefore, a recently revised version, and he reviewed the changes, including a new insert, "Summary Report." He said the recommendation for revisions came to the Senate as a seconded motion from APPC (motion 1992/93-27).

Dr. Cusanovich asked about the section, Action by Initiating Administrator: "The initiating administrator may consider additional information bearing on the performance and effectiveness of the Dean, Director or Department Head. However, such information must be shared with the Committee and the Committee's input sought prior to developing the initiating administrator's evaluation." He said there is no question on the first sentence, but it was not clear what was meant by the second sentence. Dr. Chakravarti said that the intent was to ensure that additional information that the initiating administrator generated would be made available to the committee; the committee would then discuss it, and their input on the additional information would be used by the administrator in developing the final recommendation.

A voice vote indicated approval without dissent.

11. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE SANCTIONS PROPOSALS: Dr. Dipankar Chakravarti, Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC), noted first that the material being presented had been prepared and distributed prior to the remarks of the President to the Senate on this topic earlier in the meeting. He then thanked his colleagues on the committee for their forbearance in the face of additional meeting time and the many hours it took to finalize their report. He also thanked the many faculty who contributed their comments under enormous time pressure. He then read APPC's report, addressed to the Chair of the Faculty, concerning the Sanctions proposals:

"At your request, the APPC has reviewed the draft documents concerning 'Sanctions for Misconduct or Unacceptable Performance' for faculty, professionals and

administrators. The committee examined the information in these documents and in President Pacheco's forwarding letter to you. It also considered the assessments provided by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) and the Committee on Conciliation that you had requested. Finally, the APPC also noted the sentiments expressed in the numerous telephone calls and correspondence that it received from various groups and individuals in the University community."

"Based on this review, the APPC unanimously and unequivocally finds that the above 'Sanctions proposals' are unacceptable for either permanent adoption or interim implementation as policy governing appointed personnel at the University of Arizona.

"This appraisal rests on the following essential elements:

1. There is no compelling evidence in either the draft documents or in the accompanying transmittal letter from President Pacheco that establishes the need for and the rationale underlying the sanctions proposal. The President's view that the document responds to an AAUP admonition appears untenable and is clearly rejected by campus AAUP representatives, according to Attachment A.
2. There is no compelling evidence that the proposals are based on a thorough review of the strengths and weaknesses of existing procedure and policy that may apply in cases of misconduct and unacceptable performance. The APPC is not convinced that the University administration's prior inability to respond 'in an appropriate manner' to alleged misconduct or unacceptable performance by university personnel stemmed from shortcomings in existing procedures and policies. The assessments provided by CAFT, in Attachment B, and the Committee on Conciliation, attachment C, reflect very similar views.
3. There is significant evidence that the process used to develop the sanctions proposal was at variance with the norms of faculty participation in university governance. The committee does not find that the proposals reflect a shared understanding between the administration and the faculty of the need for such procedures and policies. It does not find that the proposals were initiated by or emerged from the deliberations of broad-based faculty organizations such as the Senate or its standing committees. It does not see evidence of ongoing faculty input or that the input was either carefully considered or represented in the final proposals. Rather, the evidence suggests that these issues were in contention from outset and remain so this day. Attachment D provides some supporting material in that regard.
4. The APPC is perplexed by the inopportune timing of the proposal relative to the general air of uncertainty surrounding the University's ability to fulfill its academic mission given its budgetary situation. The committee does not understand the urgency of formulating and implementing such proposals in a time frame that does not permit the development of a shared understanding or a thorough review of the issues surrounding the institution of such measures.
5. Beyond these fundamental concerns regarding the premises and the process used to develop these documents, the committee also objects to the substantive content of the proposal. For instance, the document focuses entirely on the actions to follow the labelling of behavior or performance as 'misconduct' or 'unacceptable performance.' However, there is no discussion of the scope of such labels nor any provision for a thorough and balanced review of the

history and events that surround the alleged misconduct or unacceptable performance. Rather, the emphasis appears to be on dispensing summary administrative actions with minimal opportunity for using traditional procedures that emphasize peer review and conciliation efforts to resolve disputes.

6. As the documents' fundamental premises are unacceptable, the APPC refrains from making a detailed critique of specific procedures. However, several committees and concerned individuals have conducted such analyses and communicated their views to the committee. These are attached to this memorandum, in Attachment E, for the record. The APPC will make its analysis available in the context of an appropriately-conducted reevaluation.

"In summary, the APPC finds that the draft documents concerning 'Sanctions for Misconduct or Unacceptable Performance' for faculty, professionals and administrators are themselves unacceptable. It recommends that the University administration work with the Faculty Senate if it is deemed necessary to reconsider the issues surrounding the imposition of disciplinary measures on faculty, professionals or administrators. Such activity must occur within the framework of the recently passed laws concerning faculty governance encoded in SB1106.

"In closing, the APPC also notes that similar serious reservations exist with respect to the larger planning process that has recently been instituted at the University of Arizona and that administrative failure to seek and generate broad-based consensus and support for such activity increases the probability of generating ill-conceived plans that are doomed to failure in implementation."

Senator Witte then moved (motion 1992/93-28) for approval of the report of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee. That motion was seconded, and approved with no dissent heard on a voice vote.

President Pacheco asked that it be made a matter of record that, while the local AAUP may have found that there was no need for interim sanctions, such was not a finding of the national AAUP.

Senator Garcia, speaking as Chairman of the Faculty, said he would like to commend the members of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee for the monumental effort in bringing this report forward. He said their considerable effort was sincerely appreciated.

12. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON ADOPTION OF PLUS/MINUS GRADING FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS: Senator Kenneth Young, Chair, Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (I&CPC) said the recommendation presented to the Senate today for adoption of Plus/Minus Grading for Graduate Students, came as a seconded motion (1992/93-29) from the committee. He said the committee recommends that any grades implemented in this regard should be across the board, covering all students in the Graduate College. According to Registrar Dexter Schubert, the cost to convert the entire university to the plus/minus system would be about \$60,500. Senator Young said the committee's major reason for endorsing the proposal was the fact that graduate students are expected to maintain a B average. If a graduate student earns a C in the last or next-to-last semester, it is sometimes difficult to balance it with an A. The plus/minus system could alleviate that problem. Senator Young said he wondered if the problems faced in graduate grading represented sufficient grounds to extend the plus/minus system to the entire university. He understood the Undergraduate Council had reviewed plus/minus grading, and turned it down, in part because they did not feel there is any pressing need in the undergraduate

colleges and they also cited some evidence that this procedure would suppress student GPAs. He said he does not believe that is a significant problem.

Senator Tomizuka said this proposal was also submitted in the mid-70s by the College of Law, and was turned down by the General Faculty, he believed, by one vote. He added that if individual faculty don't wish to use it, they wouldn't have to, but most of the Ivy League schools have been using it for years. This would bring our campus up to date. He said the major objection in the 1970s was the cost: \$30,000. As to grade inflation, there are better ways to cope. At the University of Utah the average grade given to the class is recorded and it is points in excess of class average that count toward honors standing.

Senator MacDonell said that in many ways he agreed with the proposal, but he was concerned that a student could earn all A's in graduate school, yet still have less than a 4.0 grade point average. He suggested that the A+ count as a plus .33, which could be applied to an A-, but the final GPA could not exceed 4.0.

Senator Dickinson stated that many people had talked with him about the proposal, and all had viewed it very favorably. The difference between a B- and a B+ is very substantial, he believes.

Senator Hill thought that the Undergraduate Council's views were not being given sufficient attention. They had the matter under review for most of last year, and the final opposition vote was unanimous. He said formal faculty discussion campus-wide had not occurred, and he would strongly urge rejection of the proposal because he believes the system thus imposed would be much more difficult to administer.

Senator Sullivan noted that it has taken the College of Law two years to get the proposal placed on the Senate agenda. He said there are strong reasons within the College of Law for support of this proposal, and he understood that the Graduate College also has supported the issue. Concerning the \$60,000 cost, he said when he first approached former Registrar Butler, the cost was figured at \$53,700, with an indication that with advancement of technology and computers, that this cost would decrease. He said this proposal is very important for the integrity of the grading system. The College of Law has a very specific grading scale that causes compression, with very little distinction between the grades, so that for both academic and market reasons, in the employment context, he strongly urged adoption for graduate students and the College of Law. Concerning cost factors, it was his and Registrar Butler's opinion that the marginal cost to other units as they join on to the system or reject would be virtually zero, once the computers are reprogrammed to accommodate plus/minus grading.

In response to a question from Senator Witte, Senator Young stated that this proposal would not have to be implemented in the College of Medicine.

Senator Williams said he would fully support adoption of this resolution for the Graduate College and the College of Law, but given the action taken by the Undergraduate Council, he would not favor its application to undergraduates.

Dr. Cusanovich stated that the Graduate Council is strongly in support of this, and they had considered it over a long period of time.

Senator Young called on Registrar Dexter Schubert for comment, and asked him if there would be an extra cost if this proposal applied only to graduate students and those in the College of Law, and not to undergraduates.

Registrar Schubert said he did not have any figures on that possibility. The cost estimates were projected in connection with changing the entire system. He added, however, that the \$60,000 represented the 1991 \$54,000 estimate with an addition for inflation and 10 percent for the unknown.

Senator Badger asked if faculty will have discretion to use the revised grading system or not. Senator Young said use was not being mandated. Senator Inman said she did not think that was realistic: students receiving minus and plus grades in one class would want them in other classes. She added that faculty will be expected to use it. She said she favored the proposal, but does not believe it will be a matter for choice. Senator Young said he would simply assume that individuals would not have to use plus/minus grading, just as they do not have to award all A's. He added that Senator Sullivan's comments brought to his attention that the College of Law is not part of the Graduate College and, therefore, the proposal needs to be amended, as follows:

That the University of Arizona adopt plus/minus grading for graduate students. The Graduate College and the College of Law will remain on the 4.0 system, but students' grade point averages shall be computed by adding 0.33 to the underlying mark for a plus, and subtracting 0.33 from the underlying mark for a minus. There shall be no grades of A+, E+, or E-.

A voice vote on motion 1992/93-29 indicated approval, with a couple of dissenting votes heard.

Senator Dickinson asked when this would go into effect. Senator Young responded that implementation is projected for the Spring of 1994. Senator Badger recommended that I&CPC publish an announcement in Lo Que Pasa so faculty will be made aware of its planned implementation.

13. DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF GRADE REPLACEMENT POLICY FOR THE COLLEGE OF LAW: Senator Young, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (I&CPC), said the committee was submitting, as a seconded motion (1992/93-30) the following proposal concerning grade replacement for the College of Law, but which he must amend to have the second sentence read: "Under this system, College of Law students will be able to repeat up to 10 units or 3 courses, whichever is greater, in which a student receives a grade of D or E." He added that Law students will not be able to replace C or B grades, as is the case with the grade replacement policy in effect for undergraduate students. The revised proposal is as follows:

That the University of Arizona extend the present grade replacement policy for undergraduate students to include the College of Law. Under this system, College of Law students will be able to repeat up to 10 units or 3 courses, whichever is greater, in which a student received a grade of D or E. The grade received in the repeat of the course shall replace the grade received on the first attempt, and only the grade received in the repeat of the course shall be used in calculating the student's cumulative grade point average.

Senator Garcia noted that this kind of policy is common in undergraduate universities everywhere but wondered whether it was found often in professional schools. Senator Sullivan responded that he had not seen that kind of data on law schools, although much data was obtained on undergraduate programs at other universities when grade replacement practices had been reviewed for this

institution's implementation of the grade replacement policy. He said his impression is that it is probably not prevalent in a majority of law schools, but when College of Law faculty reviewed its grading system two years ago, it was viewed as an important and fair change that should be made.

Senator Wright commented that when this proposal was introduced for undergraduates several years ago, he voted against it because it sends the wrong message about the academic excellence we want to promote on this campus. In addition, as a researcher, it distresses him to throw away information, and he believes the first grade earned should remain on the transcript, even though the course was retaken. Senator Sullivan responded that the first grade would remain on the transcript, as is the case now for undergraduates; replacement affects only computation of gradepoint. Concerning standards, he said that perhaps this philosophy applies only to the College of Law, but it was the view of Law faculty that for those students who receive a E or an E, they want to positively encourage the retaking of the course because of its fundamental nature and the need for the student to earn proficiency and a more acceptable grade in it.

Senator Sergeant noted that the proposal does not specify that the original grade will appear on the transcript, but rather indicates "The grade received in the repeat of the course shall replace the grade received on the first attempt." Senator Sullivan responded that the proposal is exactly the same as the university's present policy as it applies to undergraduates, with the exception of the C grade. He added that Law faculty grade policies require that it remain on the transcript.

A voice vote indicated approval of motion 1992/93-30 with one dissent.

14. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 2, 1992

- [1992/93-17 through 1992/93-24: Honorary Degree motions]
1992/93-25 Approval of Martin Luther King, Jr./Civil Rights Holiday.
1992/93-26A Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 14, No. 11, Section I as amended.
1992/93-26B Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 14, No. 11, Section II.
1992/93-27 Approval of revisions to Guidelines for Periodic Reviews of Deans, Directors and Department Heads of Academic Units.
1992/93-28 Approval of Academic Personnel Policy Committee's Report on Sanctions.
1992/93-29 Approval of Plus/Minus Grading for Graduate Students.
1992/93-30 Approval of Grade Replacement Policy for College of Law.