

1990/91-79

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, February 4, 1991 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, February 4, 1991, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Fifty-nine members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Vivian L. Cox presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Aquilano, Atwater, Avery, Badger, Bickel, Bizik, Braden, Burkhardt, Butler, Chen, Cole, Cork, Cox, Cusanovich, Elliott, Enos, Ewbank, Ganapol, Ganguly, Goetinck, Hildebrand, Joens, Johnson, Jones, Kermes, Knight, Koffler, Krager, D. Larson, LaSalle, Mautner, McCullough, Mitchell, O'Brien, Pao Tao, Parsons, Phipps, Redeker, Roemer, Rollins, Sander, Schneider, Silverman, Smerdon, Spera, Steinke, Sugnet, Sullivan, Thompson, Tomizuka, Tomoff, Valenzuela, Vezino, Witte, Woodard, Zeigler, Zukoski and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Adamec, Beigel, Bootman, Dalen, Dvorak, Escalante, Fenstermacher, Fernandez, Garcia, Hershberger, Hetrick, Kolodny, L. Larson, Lei, Masone, Ratner, Salomon, Shisslak, Sigelman, Smith, Songer, Valdez, and VanMetre.

Dr. Cox requested brief reports today so a maximum number of agenda items could be addressed prior to the start of the 4:00 General Faculty meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: There being no request for amendments, the Minutes of January 14, 1991 were approved as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Koffler apologized that his report would not be brief, but noted it could be postponed if desired. Dr. Cox asked him to proceed. Dr. Koffler noted that his remarks today concerned financial items: this year's budget recision and prospects for next year.

"This past Saturday the Legislature approved a bill that would require the three universities to return approximately 3 percent of their General Fund appropriations for this year. The Governor is expected to sign the bill today. This means that we have to return about \$7.5 million to the state. The immediate question becomes how best to minimize the damage that this will inflict. In this respect I want to acknowledge the advice that I have received from the ad hoc Advisory Budget Planning Priorities Task Force, a group broadly representative of the campus community that has been chaired by Professor Tom Rehm and included also Elizabeth Roemer, Lynn Nadel and Doug Jones of the Senate Budget Committee.

"The Task Force has provided me with a set of prioritized recommendations for meeting recisions of varying severity. It is my intention to follow this advice as closely as possible, with only limited departures. The bulk of the required funds will be recovered from the hiring freeze in non-instructional areas that I instituted in December, from excess funds in the Employee Related Expenses account, and from interest received on University investments. Other lesser amounts will come from areas such as Intercollegiate Athletics, from delaying building renovations and remodeling, and from other areas. It will not be possible to use funds from utilities savings, as was recommended, since it now appears that the utilities account will end the year in deficit.

"Now that the Legislature has fixed on a precise sum to be returned to the state, we can do our final arithmetic on these reductions. I shall, of course, inform the Senate of the final arrangements and also use Lo Que Pasa to keep the University informed of developments. These mid-year budget cuts, particularly our inability to replace personnel in non-instructional areas, will place severe burdens on many units. I understand this and we will do our best to relieve pressures to the best of our ability.

"This brings me to the matter of our budget prospects for next year. Senators will find on their desks a summary of the budget recommendations from the Joint Legislative Budget Committee. At first glance, these appear to be encouraging but, in fact, they make sobering reading.

"The JLBC has recommended a Total Operating Budget for the Main Campus that is only \$2.3 million below the original figure for this year. Moreover, the proposal includes new money for certain items. These include: \$281,000 to cover part of the costs of increased enrollment in recent years; \$639,000 for Risk Management, representing an increase in our premiums that simply flow through our budget and back to the state; \$1.23 million in ERE, an amount that reflects this year's salary increases; and \$2.11 million in New Facilities Support, a substantial part of the \$3 million we had requested to cover the cost of operating new buildings.

"Now, at first sight, this restricted reduction in our Total Operating Budget and the new money for a variety of purposes may appear encouraging in a difficult budget year. Closer analysis, however, shows the problems that lie behind these components in the proposed budget: there is no money for the second installment of catch-up salary increases that we need for faculty members, professional staff and classified staff alike, which totaled \$11.2 million; there is no money to cover inflation, even though this will have a substantial impact on our expenses, \$7.4 million; our Operating Expenses would be reduced by almost \$2 million, including cuts in funds for Travel and for Professional and Outside Services; there is a reduction of almost \$1.4 million in Equipment funds, a cut of 12.6 percent; and finally, the proposed budget assumes a higher level of collections on the University's part than we are likely to attain, that is, it includes perhaps a half or one million dollars.

"What at first sight appears to be a budget only \$2.32 million below the original funding for this year in fact represents a proposal many millions below this year, despite our increased expenses. We are working at present to determine the precise level of the deficiency. The plain fact is that the proposal would fund its 'new monies' at the expense of our own budget.

"Now it is clear that a budget for Fiscal Year 92 that approximates the recommendations of the JLBC will require major adjustments in the way we operate. This will be particularly true to the extent that cuts are to be carried over into subsequent years, a not unlikely prospect given the state's financial condition and current problems in the national and state economies. Again, I am indebted to the Budget Planning Priorities Task Force for its advice regarding the kinds of changes that we must consider. I received the Task Force's report on reducing expenditures and reallocating resources only last Friday, and I find it a most thoughtful document that recognizes the realities we face and that cuts right to the heart of the matter.

"I shall provide you with a copy of the full report, Madame Chairman, and you may wish to consider printing it with the Minutes of the meeting so that the

entire faculty has an opportunity to read it. Let me, however, review some of the salient features at this point.

"The Task Force has arranged its suggestions for reducing expenditures and reallocating resources in what it terms 'tiers,' with the recommendations in tiers 1 and 2 capable of implementation in 1991-92 and the items in tiers 3 and 4 requiring longer to execute, if adopted, because of the time they would require in extensive consultation. The idea is that we progressively involve more tiers of action as our financial pressures increase.

"Tier 1 recommendations include methods of reducing costs while protecting the quality and level of services as far as possible. They include changing our operating practices by contracting our services, by requiring revenue-generating activities to support themselves, by expecting higher workloads on the part of faculty and staff, and by reducing administrative inefficiencies. They also include eliminating weak, unnecessary and low-demand programs in both academic and support areas.

"Tier 2 recommendations involve temporary measures to achieve savings by suspending and deferring academic and non-academic programs, again provided that the University's core mission is protected.

"Tier 3 measures involve permanent steps involving the reduction or elimination of academic and non-academic programs, even though they are important, in order to protect the core mission.

"Tier 4, the last to be adopted, would involve program elimination even though they affect the core mission. Needless to say, we all hope the need for using the last two methods will not arise.

"The Task Force has suggested sample criteria for evaluating programs. It is my hope that we can handle next year's problems through Tier 1 activities, and perhaps Tier 2 as needed. It is too soon to speculate about later years at this point. As the Task Force points out, we have exhausted the possibilities of stop-gap measures that have allowed us to handle budgetary problems such as mid-year recisions to this date. We cannot avoid the serious rethinking that will be needed both in the coming months and the coming years to plan our future in a rational manner.

"I shall, of course, consult with the Senate and its committees as we develop our plans for next year, and I would hope that my successor will do the same. For the moment, given the insight and information that our Task Force has developed, I am going to ask the members to extend their service, if they are willing, even though their work was supposed to end in January. Madame Chairman, this is not exactly a cheerful note, and I am sorry this has been inflicted upon us, but it is perhaps better to be prepared to handle a situation than not."

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Cox reported that she had been asked to represent this campus on a Tri-University Committee on Teaching and Research in Relation to Undergraduate Education. The committee met in Phoenix February 1 and developed its overall, two-pronged plan: (1) the committee will identify common goals and issues related to teaching and research in undergraduate education, and (2) each university will develop its own unique issues. In the coming months committee members will contact individuals and

organizations as appropriate for input into this process.

She also reported the Ad Hoc Library Committee has been formed, and its first meeting scheduled. Those who agreed to serve are Senators Terry Badger, Frances Chen, Jean Goetinck, Darren Kermes, and Charles Zukoski; and Professors Leland Pederson and Marc Tischler.

Dr. Cox reported she is working on the formation of a committee regarding language for Rules for the Maintenance of Public Order. Membership will include four or five members of the General Faculty who are members of the Senate, plus two students selected by ASUA, and ex officio a member of the Dean of Students staff. Thus far, the following have agreed to serve: Senators Gavriel Salomon, Christopher Sugnet, Barry Ganapol, Nicholas Aquilano and William Bickel. ASUA appointed Paul Allvin and Senator Lee Knight. She said the committee will maintain close communication with Professor Charles Ares, chair of the University committee, to develop acceptable language; the committee will keep the Senate posted on its progress.

Dr. Cox announced that Dr. Ernest Boyer, President of Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, will be a guest on campus on February 21. The Faculty Fellows are sponsoring a discussion on research and teaching in the afternoon, and a lecture on the role of the University in the 21st century has been scheduled for the evening.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY: Senator Burkhart reported that two key dates to keep in mind concerning Constitution and Bylaws balloting are February 22, for the mailing of the ballots, and April 1 for announcement of the results. Voting will occur February 22 through March 19.

Senator Burkhart then asked Senators to assist in gathering information on degree of participation of units and how faculty participation can be facilitated with the budget responses that are required this year for next year's budget. He asked if Senators could simply let him know if there are problems or success stories by faculty within units. He also invited anyone who has a particular interest in that problem to contact him, with the goal of forming a group, formal or informal, to discuss options and ways to facilitate participation of the faculty in the budgeting process.

"A third item is consideration of the Arts and Sciences college. I have a feeling this will come to the forefront in the months ahead and I would invite Senators from the Arts & Sciences College who have an interest in taking part in discussions about the Arts & Sciences College reorganization to forward ideas to me. More specifically, perhaps if there are faculty who would like to be part of an informal group to discuss faculty options for having a voice in the process to determine how to best match up what we teach in Arts & Sciences, and how we organize ourselves as colleges and subdivisions of colleges, it would be appropriate to get in touch with me and we can proceed."

A fourth item would be the Gulf War. He said the last time we met was a day or two after the Congressional debate which illustrated the principle that participation is a good process. We have had a very effective faculty teach-in and the faculty response was excellent. He wished to thank all those who took part in the teach-in two weeks ago. A second faculty-organized teach-in will occur February 5. He added that there will, no doubt, be more of those faculty teach-ins to follow and anyone who is interested should get in touch with him or the Faculty Center so they might try to keep track of that type of activity.

Senator Burkhart also commented about the good work that was done in the last several weeks by the group on Conditions of Faculty Service. This group represents the faculties and the administrations of the three universities and is painstakingly going through the document. It appears this is going to be an excellent one with much left to do on that especially with regard to academic professionals.

Finally, he invited any Senators or others who would like to discuss long-range plans for the Faculty Center and delivery of its services to academic professionals, faculty and others in the University to contact him. Some items of interest are how we coordinate our work with representation and advocacy for other groups within the campus, and where the Faculty Center can be constituted to meet more effectively the needs of these various groups in our community.

REPORT FROM THE ACTING SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Avery announced that ASA has planned a gubernatorial forum February 13; Mr. Goddard has confirmed his attendance, but Mr. Symington's plans are as yet uncertain. Senator Avery reported that the meeting of ten PAC-10 student body presidents on this campus last week was very successful. He also reported that last week ASUA had initiated a new service which will provide assistance and representation for students with disabilities. He reported that ASUA will add two student senators, graduate students, to the current body of eight, to provide improved representation for graduate students.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator O'Brien asked what the Senate could do as a body to indicate its concern for the continuing problems faced by faculty members, academic professionals and staff concerning their inability to count on merit, market and COLA. President Koffler responded that individuals have been working on plans, soon to be finalized, which would address this topic and which would include faculty.

Senator Zukoski asked Senator Burkhart whether a realignment of Arts & Sciences is really occurring and, if so, he felt strongly that faculty should be provided with more than just a few words with him on this topic. Senator Burkhart said he would like to ask for the views of Senator Zukoski and anyone else who has a feeling about the nature of participation. "This has been a long-term item over the last few years and I just wonder whether anyone else is interested in talking about it" Senator Burkhart said. Dr. Cole said this might be an appropriate time to inform the Senate that he asked the Deans of the four faculties in Arts & Sciences to submit recommendations for membership on a committee to study reorganization, and appointment letters were now being mailed. He said he is asking the committee to look at the College of Arts & Sciences, what it has been in the past, what it is today, and what they would like to see in the future. Dr. Cole said, "The charge to that committee not only includes their review but also asks that information that is recommended to the administration be presented to the Arts & Sciences faculty for their review. I hope the information will be available in the fall so that our new President would have an opportunity to review that information and to consult with the faculty about that matter."

Senator Silverman commented that he was glad to learn President Koffler will include faculty in a legislative effort, and he said he encouraged faculty, perhaps even the Senate, to become involved in this kind of work. He commended students for their efforts in this area. Referring to the Arts & Sciences study

committee, he added that he hoped the committee will seek recommendations and that faculty will be well represented in any reorganization of Arts & Sciences.

Senator Avery invited any member of the Senate interested in a visit to the State Legislature to accompany students who go on a regular basis, two or three times a week. He said he planned to be there all day tomorrow, and this type of trip could be easily organized: students develop ten or twelve questions and talk to different legislators about those issues.

Senator O'Brien said he thought it would be helpful to have the protocol for interaction with legislators set out clearly. He said he would like to know what faculty can do individually and collectively to have some impact. Dr. Cox responded that this appeared to be a question worthy of more discussion on the Senate floor, and she would bring it to the attention of the Senate Executive Committee at its next meeting.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Ewbank said the committee continues to meet and bring items to the Senate.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Roemer said the committee will meet tomorrow to discuss budget and finance matters with Provost Cole. The committee will also respond to a particular overture with respect to the Legislature. Regarding the questionnaires on market salary adjustments, the committee has received just under 750 responses. She said responses indicate a tremendous amount of feeling among the faculty, and the committee is in the process of analyzing the reactions and comments.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mitchell said the committee discussed the status of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee, and agreed to endorse the Undergraduate Council's proposal to retain the committee with a modified charge. That recommendation will be forwarded to the Acting Chair of the Faculty soon. The committee will meet this month with Dr. Juan Garcia, Director of the University Teaching Center, on issues of mutual concern.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Larson reported the committee has reviewed the latest version of the Conflict of Interest Policy and is making suggestions for changes. It is continuing to interact with the Technology Transfer Committee and the committee that is looking at indirect cost, and is continuing to transmit faculty input to those committees.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Enos said the committee is still working on three projects: mall noise problem, for which they are trying to obtain more information on mall usage policy before proceeding further; Senate ratification of degree recipient lists; and the 484 responses they have received to the advising questionnaire, which was mailed to over 2,000 individuals. She added that responses seem to be providing a very representative sampling from all colleges, and they have begun to compile the information. She said the committee hopes to have a full report for the Senate soon.

CHANGE IN AGENDA ORDER: Dr. Cox asked the Senate if it would accommodate a change in the order of agenda items, skipping discussion on Guidelines for Periodic Reviews of Deans, Directors and Department Heads, and proceeding directly to discussion on ASUA's proposal concerning Recognition of Excellent Teaching. There being no objection, she called on Senator Avery.

DISCUSSION ON ASUA PROPOSAL FOR RECOGNIZING EXCELLENT TEACHING: Senator Avery

1990/91-85

called for discussion on ASUA's proposal, which had been distributed with the call to the January 14 meeting, and noted that Dr. Juan Garcia, Director of the University Teaching Center, was present to respond to questions.

Senator Atwater asked Dr. Garcia to comment on whether the proposal was feasible and if the University could afford the costs associated with implementation of the questionnaire. Garcia said no: if each student had four classes each semester, and each evaluation cost a nickel, multiplied by the number of students enrolled, cost of forms alone would be approximately \$120,000 per semester. Given the financial state of the University, that cost is prohibitive, he said. In addition, processing costs run about 25 cents for each evaluation, and more scanners would be required in order to turn the data around in a 48-hour period.

Senator Avery agreed present funding could not adequately handle the costs involved, but if a new form is implemented, funding will be provided through the central administration rather than through departments.

Dr. Cole said "There is no question at this particular time, and students have discussed this with me, that we are not in a position financially to go forward with this. I think to some extent the students have offered a very good plan, a broader evaluation than we now have, but it is very expensive. I would probably support the plan but we're not sure when we're going to be able to fund it. Budgets being what they are, and the time frame being what it is, it seems highly problematic that we would be able to support this program at this time. This should not take away from the fact that it is a very good plan."

Dr. Garcia said he would like to raise another issue which faculty should be aware of: "If we ever do reach the state where we have a campus-wide, centrally funded form for faculty it raises a critical issue that faculty have addressed, and that is who owns that information, and who can release that information? If the University pays for that form and the processing, the information belongs to the University and therefore the possibility of how and to whom and when that data is released is somehow taken out of the hands of the faculty. So we're dealing with much more than simply who pays for the form and what kind of form is used. We're getting into substantial policy issues that merit deep thought and consideration by the Faculty Senate and by the faculty at large."

Senator Avery commented that the reason students formed the committee to look into teacher evaluations was due to some of the problems inherent in the current system. He said he agreed with Dr. Garcia that the problem warranted Faculty Senate discussion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

David Butler, Acting Secretary of the Senate

ATTACHMENTS TO THESE MINUTES

Report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Budget Planning Priorities Task Force