

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
March 4, 1996**

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Anne E. Atwater at 3:15 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Abrams, Adamowicz, Aleamoni, Anderson, Atwater, Barrett, Buras, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, David, Desai, Driggs, Emrick, Feltham, Forbes, Gerber, Hallick, Hill, Houk, Larson, Lei, Levy, Mare, McElroy, Medine, Mitchell, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Reiter, Reynolds, Schooley, Schwarz, Sharkey, Silverman, Smith, Spece, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Troth, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Witte, and Zwolinski. Observers Jull (APOC), Rochlin (Alumni Association), and Vos (SAC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Arechederra, Ayers, Dvorak, Erickson, Goggans, Gruener, Jacobs, Joens, Marchalonis, Mount, Pintozzi, and Taylor.

2. **OPEN SESSION:**

Senator Robert Feltham, a member of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC), distributed an information sheet on enrollment projections for the Arizona University System, which indicated a new resident undergraduate admission increase of 144 students per year between 1994 and 2010, as opposed to the 12,400 total number of anticipated students projected by the Board of Regents' consultants for the same time period. He noted that the UofA spent \$607,000 in fiscal year 1995 on Arizona International Campus (AIC), is proposing to spend \$1,938,600 in 1996, and has requested \$2,582,800 for 1997. He questioned the advocacy of spending more than \$2 million a year for the next 15 years to educate perhaps 2,300 students. Based on reduced enrollment projections, he said he believed there is no justification for an additional campus. He said any increase in enrollment might be able to be accommodated by reimplementing Saturday classes.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Senator Atwater reported that the Senate Executive Committee removed formal reports from today's agenda in order to provide additional time for discussion on other agenda items. A brief Question and Answer Period had been scheduled, to accommodate those with pressing issues.

4. **QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

Senator Witte asked Chair Schwarz what changes were being planned that might affect the composition of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT), in connection with the Board of Regents' request that tenure issues be reviewed. Chair Schwarz responded that a task force chaired by Senator Smith is looking into this area. It will submit its findings and recommendations to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC), which will submit a proposal to the Senate for action.

Senator Witte asked Chair Schwarz why there appears to be an increasing tendency to use "hybrid" committees for such activities, rather than already existing Senate standing committees. Chair Schwarz said that the task force that was appointed includes the entire membership of APPC, as well as some past APPC chairs, the Faculty Chair, the Chair of the Committee of Eleven, and the Presiding Officer of the Senate, as well as the Provost, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and one Dean. He added

that APPC will deal with the three proposals from the three task forces assigned to handle the three tenure issues, and will then presumably make some recommendation to the Faculty Senate.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 22 AND FEBRUARY 5, 1996

The minutes of January 22, 1996 and February 5, 1996, were approved as submitted.

6. DISCUSSION OF DECLARATION OF GOVERNANCE PRINCIPLES (PREPARED BY THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN) AND PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR COLLEGIAL DECISION-MAKING ON ACADEMIC POLICY (SUBMITTED BY THE CO-GOVERNANCE WORKING GROUP)

Senator Atwater noted that these documents will be discussed separately: 30 minutes for the Committee of Eleven document and 20 minutes for the Co-Governance Working Group document. Senators' questions and comments will be shared with the task force established by the Senate Executive Committee, charged with the goal of examining these two documents and developing some coherence in order to facilitate Senate debate and action on the issue of shared governance.

Senator Smith, Chair, Committee of Eleven, said that the Declaration of Governance Principles of the University of Arizona, prepared by the Committee of Eleven, had undergone substantial study and revision, and was intended to provide guideposts for long-term goals, not specific processes or policies. The Committee hoped that the Senate could support the document as a whole without necessarily agreeing with every detail in it, and that the principles could be useful as the Senate and the Administration search for improved policies and procedures for shared governance.

Senator Szilagyi moved (motion 1995/96-30) that the Senate adopt the principles and submit them for vote of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona for adoption. Senator Witte seconded.

Senator Abrams said he had noted that the Committee of Eleven and the Co-Governance Working Group had overlapping membership. He asked if they had all agreed unanimously to the respective statements, and if the Senate was simply required to harmonize the wording, or what the issue was. Senator Smith said there had been approval by the Committee of Eleven on its document as a whole, but not item by item, but there was not necessarily unanimous approval of both documents.

Senator Pitt said she had read these documents carefully, and she noticed that the Declaration of Governance Principles of the University of Arizona wasn't a Declaration of Co-Governance, but one very positive aspect was the principle that Deans be elected by the college faculty. On the other hand, one section appeared to indicate that any duly elected faculty representative could select committees, and if that was applied to Deans, she thought that was a conflict. She also asked who specifically was referred to by the term "academic administrators." Senator Smith said he wasn't sure if he could clarify those points, but it was the Committee of Eleven's intent to create a set of principles and guideposts rather than specific policies or procedures to be followed. Senator Pitt said she saw some flaws in the document that made her uncomfortable.

President Pacheco asked, since this is a co-governance issue, if administrators had participated in the preparation of this document, and secondly, which body should the administration be interacting with--the Senate or the Committee of Eleven? Senator Smith responded that the Provost had substantial discussion with the Committee of Eleven on some of these issues, but that the document should be viewed as a faculty group's views of principles appropriate for shared governance. In response to the second question, the Committee is elected by the faculty as a whole, it has no legislative authority, and it has influence to the degree that it represents faculty concerns.

Provost Sypherd said that he wanted to make it clear that, although he met with the Committee of Eleven, he objected to the document, and went over each of the seven items with them, telling them specifically what his objections were. He stated that he still objected to the document, and referred to it as being reactionary--a step back to yesterday. Concerning election of department heads and deans, he said that department heads, deans and provosts are chosen largely by faculty committees.

Senator Clarke asked why all academic administrators except department heads were excluded from the term limits provision from the earlier drafts of this document. Senator Szilagyi responded that the current version had been modified by a number of friendly amendments.

Chair Schwarz said he thought there was a fair amount of division on the Committee of Eleven on this document, but he wanted to respond to a statement made in reference to the Working Group's proposal, that administrators serve at their pleasure. He said that was not the case; administrators would be under faculty review in a decisive manner by faculty-chosen representatives.

Senator Szilagyi, in response to Provost Sypherd's comments, said he did not consider the Principles document reactionary. Second, he recalled that when the Provost met with the Committee of Eleven, he had objected only to the first two items. He added that faculty do not require permission from the administration to have these principles, nor do they expect the administration to necessarily agree with the principles.

Senator Silverman said that he was a member of both the Committee of Eleven and the Working Group, and while he didn't agree with each detail in each of the documents, he had voted for the Committee of Eleven document to come forward to the Senate for discussion. While he didn't agree with all the specifics of the document, he thought agreement could be reached on the principles, and he commented on some: (1) We need some procedures and structure for policy-making both at the University level and within colleges and departments--there are colleges and departments with no bylaws. (2) While he didn't agree with all the specifics of the Principles concerning selection of administrators, he agreed we need to think about how we select them at the department, college, and University levels. (3) He agreed that the budget should be reported to the Faculty Senate, but was not sure whether the Senate should vote on it or not. (4) He said he wasn't sure he could agree that a national, competitive search should be required for each administrative opening. And he generally agreed with (5), (6) and (7). He thought it was time the Senate discussed such issues, but he expressed concern about the Senate voting on the Committee of Eleven's document today, and stated he hoped instead it would be referred to the task force for review prior to Senate action.

Senator Anderson said she had seen searches that did not proceed as represented, and she thought we need to establish the principle that faculty should choose their department heads and deans. Details didn't concern her, but she thought the principle was important.

Senator Sharkey said she was encouraged and heartened by the willingness of a group of faculty and administrators to sit down and work out a series of procedures to ensure that faculty are not omitted from decision-making procedures. She said she regarded both documents as somewhat revolutionary and a step forward. She added that, as someone who has been bitterly opposed to many administration decisions, not only in this administration but the previous administration, she was greatly encouraged by the administration's willingness to work on these issues.

Senator Feltham offered his perspective on the difference between the two documents: the Committee of Eleven recognized that there was no way it could spell out all the details and instead concentrated on principles.

Senator Neuman said that he thought there are some very progressive elements in both documents, and while he would concede that there are many issues in each that not everyone could agree to, he did not understand Provost Sypherd's attitude to the Committee of Eleven's document as being reactionary. Rather, he thought it contained a number of highly progressive ideas and was heartened by the suggestion that administrators and faculty form one unit, as opposed to existing in two separate castes. He added that he liked the language of the Working Group document better because it was conciliatory as opposed to negative, but he strongly urged the Senate to seriously consider the basic fundamental principle that administrators are here to serve the students and the faculty, and not vice versa.

Provost Sypherd expressed concern that the motion on the floor would hamper the ongoing movement in the direction of co-governance, and he offered a substitute motion (1995/96-31) that the Senate receive and refer the Committee of Eleven Declaration of Governance Principles for ultimate resolution to the task force that the Presiding Officer referred to earlier. Senator Pitt seconded.

Senator Abrams requested the composition of the task force. Senator Atwater responded that the task force is comprised of two members of the Committee of Eleven, selected by the Committee of Eleven, two members of the Co-Governance Working Group, and the elected member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. She added that the intent of the task force would be to examine both documents for points in common and bring back their considered opinion to the Faculty Senate in April for discussion and action.

Senator Spece asked if review of the two documents would be transmitted to the APPC after the task force completed its examination. Senator Atwater said no; the intent of the Executive Committee was that the task force would bring this back to the Senate for further discussion and action.

Senator Witte said she would speak in opposition to motion 1995/96-31, because she believed it was inappropriate to refer this document containing faculty beliefs to a "hybrid" task force.

Senator Troth addressed Senators Szilagyi and Witte, noting they had both referred to the Declaration of Governance Principles as views of the faculty. He expressed the opinion that these were views of the Committee of Eleven, and only the Faculty Senate could express the views of the faculty. He added that he didn't think it was an insult to the Committee of Eleven to refer this issue to the task force so that the Faculty Senate could obtain recommendations.

Senator Spece said he needed clarification. He has felt reassured when the Faculty Chair reports that major issues are being referred to a standing committee, like the APPC. And he felt troubled that this matter was not being referred through an existing committee. Senator Atwater responded that the Senate Executive Committee had suggested proceeding in this way.

Senator Witte stated that the APPC's charge was to consider issues of governance, and this issue should have been referred to that standing committee. Chair Schwarz said he would be comfortable with that if the issue involved only faculty review of a faculty declaration, but the proposal being submitted by the Working Group was related to shared governance principles and practices and will be binding on both faculty and administrators. In order to attain shared governance, he believed that administration must be a part of the discussion and review component. Senator Spece commented that it seemed reasonable that after administrative input had been received, the issue could go to a standing committee prior to submission to the Senate.

Senator Schooley, a member of APPC, spoke in favor of referral to the task force as a first step. He noted that APPC already has a full agenda. He added that he would welcome seeing other views on how these two documents could be merged in useful fashion before APPC considers them.

Senator McElroy said he would like to see the motion to refer defeated and the motion to adopt the Committee of Eleven's principles approved. He thought that too much in the recent past has been transmitted to ad hoc groups, while the General Faculty Constitution has been set aside or ignored.

Senator Witte called for the question, but it was defeated by a show of hands. Discussion continued.

Senator Smith asked Provost Sypherd what he meant in his motion by final resolution. Provost Sypherd said his wording was "ultimate resolution," and what he had in mind was synthesis of the two documents for submission to the Senate, rather than the Senate dealing with two separate documents.

Senator Sharkey said she didn't think we had received a response to Senator Spece's question whether this matter would be sent to the APPC prior to Senate submission. Senator Spece asked Provost Sypherd if he would be willing to accept, as part of his motion, that these two documents go to the task force, then move on to APPC and then return to the Senate. Provost Sypherd said he thought the documents should come back to the Senate for more input before referred to the APPC. Senator Atwater added that it had not been the Executive Committee's intent for the task force to make any ultimate resolution, but to bring back the issues to the Senate for discussion.

Senator Feltham asked why, if there had been significant administrative input to the Working Group document, there should be opposition to sending it, together with the Committee of Eleven document, to a Senate standing committee. Chair Schwarz said that what he meant was if the standing committee decided it wished to amend the Working Group document, then the administration should be asked how it felt about that, or some direction taken to assure a meeting of the minds.

President Pacheco spoke in favor of referring the documents to the task force. He thought there were both interesting and positive points and some flaws in the Committee of Eleven document, for instance the principle that each academic administrator undergo periodic review by the faculty and retain the support of a majority of the General Faculty in order to continue in the position. He said that meant, for example, the Dean of the College of Engineering would be voted on for retention by the General Faculty. He said he didn't think the Committee of Eleven was proposing that.

Senator Atwater noted that motion 1995/96-31 was on the floor, and if there were no additional comments, was the Senate ready to vote on the motion that the Senate receive the Committee of Eleven document and refer it, along with the other co-governance document, to the task force for resolution and then for submission to the Senate. Senator Witte added that the task force would transmit the documents to APPC prior to their being submitted to the Senate. Provost Sypherd said he would accept this addition as an amendment to his motion. A voice vote indicated the motion was approved. Senator Atwater suggested that if Senators had additional comments to make, they could e-mail them to the Faculty Center (ekrauz@ccit.arizona.edu), or transmit them by fax or mail. Reference to the specific document, page, and paragraph would be helpful.

7. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Senator Atwater reminded Senators that the Senate had previously discussed this item in October. The proposal had come forward late last spring, and had been submitted to the Committee of Eleven for recommendations. She called on Senator Smith, Chair of the Committee of Eleven, to update the Senate on the Committee of Eleven's work on this issue.

Senator Smith said there had been much discussion on this issue in the Committee of Eleven. He said the Committee of Eleven recognizes the need for a structure to perform the functions that are now being performed under the name of College of Arts and Sciences, and also recognizes that the name

Arts and Science is no longer appropriate. However, the Committee of Eleven did not approve the name change to University College or the use of University in the name. One name they came up with was University Undergraduate College, but other possible names also were discussed. He said the position of the Committee of Eleven is that it recognizes the need for a name change, but would object to a name change which included the word University in it.

Senator Hill, Chair, Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), said that because this matter had been approved by the Undergraduate Council, ICPC decided to discuss it informally, aware that it had been assigned to the Committee of Eleven. ICPC saw a definite need for some sort of action. Continuing to call it the College of Arts and Sciences was not acceptable. Some names that were considered were: Undergraduate College, University Undergraduate College, even Campus College. At the most recent Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting, a straw vote indicated that most thought University College was the best choice.

Senator Hill then moved (motion 1995/96-32) that the Senate approve the name University College. Senator Levy seconded.

Senator Williams asked Senator Smith why the Committee of Eleven found the name University College to be inappropriate. Senator Smith said that (1) all of our colleges are University Colleges; (2) the Committee believed that the name University College allowed enormous opportunity for growth and development; and (3) an entity already exists to deal with similar matters on the graduate level: the Graduate College—not Graduate University College, or University Graduate College. Because it was suggested to the Committee that students would feel better if temporarily housed in a unit named University College, the Committee of Eleven referred the matter to student governance; he said they reported that they really didn't care.

Senator Levy said he thought that the term University College was brief, clear and dignified, and he urged that the Senate adopt it.

Senator Silverman said that, even though we now have an entity called the Graduate College, it seemed to him that the term College should be used for degree-awarding entities, rather than mixing it up with other kinds of functions. He thought it would be more appropriate to name the unit Undergraduate Center, for example. Senator Schooley said he agreed with Senator Silverman, and he thought the term University College was confusing.

Senator Witte noted that Committee of Eleven had discussed the fact that this unit would serve as a service center for displaced people, in a unit that went from Faculty to College, and this latest recommendation represented a more serious administrative set-up. She said the Committee expressed concern that, when more staffing is needed, it will be taken from the departments, and there appeared to be more potential for growth if core curriculum is instituted, with the name University College.

Provost Sypherd noted, for the record, that the current College of Arts and Sciences does award degrees in Interdisciplinary Studies. Secondly, it's not just a few homeless students that wander through Arts and Sciences—80% of entering freshmen are undeclared. He added that he recently discovered that over 50 universities in the United States have University Colleges as a part of their administrative composition, and they primarily administer to the undeclared undergraduates and oversee interdisciplinary studies programs.

Senator Buras noted that today we have a large number of undeclared students, but there is no guarantee this large number will continue. He wondered whether we couldn't handle the workload through a name that better represented the function.

Senator Feltham said he thought he would prefer a name that had Undergraduate in it, in order to reflect function. Senator Clarke suggested the name College of Interdisciplinary Studies.

Chair Schwarz noted that there appears to be a fair amount of concern about the word University. He asked Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Gottfredson if he had any alternative name in mind.

Dr. Gottfredson said he would echo Senator Levy's comments, and added that using the word University will serve to remind all of us that students enrolled in this college belong to the University in a very important way, and that all faculty across the University should think of these students as part of their obligation.

Senator Smith moved (motion 1995/96-33) to amend the motion by striking the word University and replacing it with the word Undergraduate. The motion was seconded.

Provost Sypherd asked whether this motion was an amendment, or rather a substitute motion. Dr. Sankey confirmed that it was an amendment, and it was in order.

President Pacheco asked if it would be appropriate for the Senate to vote on this matter without it having been considered by the appropriate Senate standing committee first. Senator Atwater noted that it had been considered by the ICPC. Dr. Gottfredson said he thought that both the Undergraduate Council and the ICPC had approved the University College name.

Senator Neuman said he wouldn't want to send his children to an Undergraduate College, but would send them to a University College. He cited a fundamental difference between the Graduate College and an Undergraduate College: every student who is a member of the Graduate College is also a member of a department or a well-defined college, but many of the students in this Undergraduate College would belong only to that college, and he found that to be undignified. He said he supported the University College concept.

In response to a question about student opinion, Senator Driggs said that Senator Arechederra had obtained some student input on this issue, and there did not appear to be any strong feelings either way. He said that his opinion, as student body President, however, was strongly in support of the University College name. Interdisciplinary Studies majors will be graduating from that college, and he thought they deserved something better than a college named Undergraduate College.

A voice vote on motion 1995/96-33, to amend by striking the word University and replacing it with the word Undergraduate, was defeated by a show of hands.

Senator Williams then moved (motion 1995/96-34) to change the name to University Undergraduate College. Senator McElroy seconded.

Senator Zwolinski said he found it disconcerting that several committees had reviewed this matter, and had recommended the name University College, and now changes were being drafted on the Senate floor. He thought it would be presumptuous of the Senate to change the name without sending it back for more input.

The vote was called. A voice vote on motion 1995/96-34 was then taken, to change the name to University Undergraduate College, and it was defeated.

A vote on the original motion (1995/96-32), to change the name from College of Arts and Sciences to University College, was then approved by a show of hands.

8. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A PROCEDURE FOR INFORMING ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN UA UNDERGRADUATE LOWER-DIVISION COURSES AND REQUIREMENTS**

Senator Atwater reminded Senators that they had discussed this topic at the February meeting, and had tabled it (motion 1995/96-29: to approve a procedure for informing Arizona community colleges of significant changes in UA undergraduate lower-division courses and requirements), and it was coming forward again for discussion. Senator Hill, Chair of the ICPC, said he had carefully reviewed the Senate's February 5 comments, and ICPC had examined the procedure in detail and saw no way they could improve it--the initial language seemed reasonable to them. The procedure did not appear to take any authority away from the University or individual departments. He said he thought it would be a good idea to approve this.

Dr. Sankey reported that he had checked the files to see how many courses this procedure would involve. There would have been 38 at the 100- and 200-level in the last year, with no more than 11 per college.

Senator McElroy suggested replacing every slash with an and. Senator Hill said he would accept that change.

A voice vote indicated approval of motion 1995/96-29.

9. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON A RESOLUTION PROPOSED BY THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN CONCERNING THE ARIZONA INTERNATIONAL CAMPUS**

Senator Aleamoni, chair of the Committee of Eleven subcommittee which evolved this resolution, noted that two changes had been made since the resolution had been placed in Senators' packets: (1) first page, first paragraph after the first four points, "should not" should be changed to "does not;" and (2) second page, #2 should be changed to "As it is presently being administered, the Faculty Senate does not recognize, etc."; and (3) #3 should be eliminated.

Senator Neuman suggested rewording #2 to read: "As the Arizona International Campus is presently administered, the Faculty Senate does not recognize it or its administrative leadership." Senator Aleamoni accepted that change.

Senator Aleamoni stated that the resolution had evolved from much discussion and debate in the Committee of Eleven. They examined Sierra Vista as a model, and found Sierra Vista conducted its business in accordance with procedures for a branch campus, while Arizona International Campus (AIC) had not. He moved (motion 1995/96-35) that the Committee of Eleven's resolution be adopted. Senator Smith seconded.

Senator Williams said he would reluctantly vote against the resolution because it is too formalistic, it has an arbitrary character, and it does not reflect an understanding of several influences at work in the evolution of the AIC. He said he has served as a member of the Planning Committee and the Curriculum Committee, and as Chair of the Faculty Senate's oversight committee. AIC's mission is different from that of the University of Arizona. It was designed to serve students and Arizona taxpayers differently. It is not another UofA. It is not really a branch, except that it is in transition in an administrative sense. Because it is different, it should be governed by different rules and

regulations that are appropriate to its own personality. But the Faculty Senate has a responsibility of oversight. The Curriculum Committee for AIC has a majority of UofA faculty including two Faculty Senators (Jocelyn Reiter and Ed Williams). The Recruitment Committee of AIC counts half of its members from the UofA faculty, all three chosen by faculty governance procedures (Senators Reiter and Williams, and Professor Lanin Gyurko, Spanish Department).

Senator Williams added that there are three outstanding issues: one refers to site, and two to the issue of tenure. The site, in many people's opinion, is an unmitigated catastrophe. It is inaccessible to and its milieu is inappropriate. The Faculty Senate has an obligation to monitor the operation of the site in anticipation that in five years it will play an influential role in the selection of a more appropriate site.

The first problem relating to tenure has to do with the so-called experiment with the absence of tenure at AIC. The Senate must be especially bold in taking a leading role in the design and implementation of the experiment so that they can produce useful and objective measurements for our analysis. A second tenure problem is that the AIC Provost continuing to hold tenure at the UofA is blatantly inconsistent with his leading role at an institution without tenure. That inconsistency threatens the integrity of the AIC and promises to destroy the morale of its other administrators and the faculty now being hired.

Senator Smith said that, as Chair of the Committee of Eleven and as a member of the oversight committee chaired by Senator Williams, he found Senator Williams' comments remarkable in view of the fact that he personally presented this resolution to the oversight committee, and the oversight committee, without dissent, agreed to support this resolution in principle. Senator Smith asked Senator Aleamoni if he would accept an amendment to his motion, re-inserting item 3 ("The Faculty Senate requires that the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona follow standard University of Arizona and Arizona Board of Regents policies for hiring faculty, offering programs and courses, and all other activities.") on page 2, and preceding it with the words "If AIC wishes Senate recognition,". Following some discussion, both Senator Aleamoni and Senator Neuman, the seconder, agreed to re-insert #3. Senator Neuman then proposed that #3 essentially subsumes #2, and #2 ("The Faculty Senate does not recognize the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona and its administrative leadership.") should be deleted. Dr. Aleamoni also agreed to that change.

Senator Sharkey asked about accreditation. Her understanding was that AIC was to be considered a branch campus and thus automatically accredited. President Pacheco said that we have received notification from North Central that this campus would be accredited under the existing accreditation of the University of Arizona. Senator Sharkey asked if AIC was, in fact, being designated a branch campus so that it could receive accreditation under the umbrella of the University of Arizona. President Pacheco acknowledged that it would be coming in under the umbrella of the University of Arizona, but it did not meet the criteria for a definition of a branch campus, either. When it was created, the Board of Regents did not classify it as a branch campus, which would require five years of experience as an on campus center. Senator Sharkey asked if AIC was the first of a new kind of unit created by the Board of Regents. President Pacheco said he believed that that would be an appropriate conclusion. It is undefined, but it is a campus of the University of Arizona, and not a branch campus nor an off-campus center.

Senator Spece commented that when the Senate speaks against an individual, it is speaking against tenure, because an individual has the right to attack tenure, and it serves to attack the very principle of freedom of speech and ideas of which tenure is important. He therefore moved (motion 1995/96-36) to delete #1 ("The Faculty Senate has no confidence in the administrative leadership of the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona.") from the bottom of page 1. Senator Sharkey seconded.

Senator Smith said he objected to this amendment, because the document makes no reference to an individual person at all.

President Pacheco said that it was not clear that the first three items had been violated, and in fact, there had been a high level attempt to comply with them, as addressed by Senator Williams.

Senator Williams said he believed the administrations of both UofA and AIC could have been much more forthcoming as this procedure unfolded, but resolution of some of the outstanding issues appeared to be underway, and it seemed to him that this sort of resolution would simply poison the waters after the situation has begun to resolve itself.

Senator Reiter said that, as members of the Senate's oversight committee, she and Senator Williams had become members of the AIC Curriculum Committee and Search Committee. She said AIC is starting to function as a school, and they are accepting applications. The Regents wanted this to happen, and she thought approving the Committee of Eleven's resolution would send a negative message from the Senate to the Regents. She said she was personally upset about the site's location, but was impressed with the actual building. People applying for faculty positions do not seem concerned about the tenure question. Concerning the issue of the AIC Provost retaining his tenure at the UofA, she compared it to faculty on the UofA campus who become part-time administrators, with basically split contracts, but who retain their tenure.

Senator Sharkey asked Senator Smith whether it would be advisable to delay action on the resolution until definition of AIC's status could be clarified, in view of the fact that it has been determined to not be a branch campus. Senator Smith responded that he has attended every meeting of the Board of Regents during the past year, and he had heard it regularly and routinely referred to by members of the Board of Regents as a branch campus.

Chair Schwarz said when he went to Provost Fernandez with some concerns, he found him to be responsive. Virtually everything that Chair Schwarz went to him with, he agreed to do. He added that the document that the Senate was being asked to approve today indicates that until AIC meets our procedures in every respect, we cannot recognize it. He said that would take us completely out of the action. He thought it would be reasonable to ask the oversight committee to meet with Provost Fernandez and President Pacheco and come back to this body by May with a proposal. If they had no proposal then, the Senate could choose to approve this resolution.

Senator McElroy said he had yet to speak with any faculty member who thought that this had been handled correctly or who showed any confidence in the whole procedure. He said he failed to see how it was possible to obtain accreditation for AIC without curriculum to be presented to an accreditation committee, without faculty to be evaluated, and with no students in place. He concluded that the way this has been handled fully warrants the Senate's expressing no confidence in the administrative leadership of AIC.

Senator Anderson said she was not persuaded that censuring AIC's leadership would undercut his academic freedom. She thought that academic freedom meant that an individual could say whatever they wished, but they would be held accountable to the judgments of their peers. She said she remembered that this person had been installed in this office with no search, and when the position is an important one, the lack of a search casts a pall over the legitimacy of the person to begin with. She added that she still didn't see the demographic or educational rationale for AIC, and she believes that resources will drain away from the UofA.

President Pacheco indicated that as campus enrollments are capped, it is estimated that approximately 11% of the student pool in Arizona will not be admissible to existing institutions. The population of Arizona is projected to grow from 4 to 6 million. We do need to plan for that future. The Regents gave the UofA authority to plan in 1994 for a new institution, with a charge of opening in 1996. He said that was a tremendously fast timeline when you consider that other new institutions have had seven or eight years of time to plan. We had to operate in an environment that was by no means optimal, but those weren't the cards that we were dealt. He said he believes we do have to have more input from the UofA faculty and the Faculty Senate.

Senator Feltham stated that the following expenditures have been assigned and proposed for AIC: 1995, \$607,000; 1996, \$1,936,600; and 1997, \$2,582,800 of main campus funding.

Provost Sypherd said that the former Surgeon General, Jocelyn Elders, lost her job for using the word masturbation in public, and if masturbation is defined as something that is unproductive, that's what this entire discussion is about. He said he felt item number one is clearly a censure and a vote of no confidence in Celestino Fernandez. He indicated that to treat him this way diverts far from the pathway that we've been trying to travel in the last few years. He said Chair Schwarz is absolutely correct, that passing this document takes us right out of the action. There will be no need for that campus to confer with this Senate at any time in the future. He said Senator Feltham's numbers about AIC are all wrong as it was a separate line item. Provost Sypherd felt that this document is an embarrassment, and it is intended to be the finger jabbed in the eye of the administration, the Provost of the International Campus, and frankly, in the eyes of the Regents, and it gains us absolutely nothing. He urged that the resolution be defeated.

Senator McElroy said he resented the Provost's characterization of the debate as "masturbation."

Senator Medine asked President Pacheco if it would be fair to say AIC will receive accreditation by virtue of its being under the UA umbrella. President Pacheco responded affirmatively. Senator Medine asked why the normal procedures that govern the UofA not been followed in this matter. He added that until this question can be answered, he could see no alternative but to support the first item of the resolution.

Senator Abrams proposed a change in the last paragraph on the first page, which ends with "The Faculty Senate must express its serious concern." He suggested adding the phrase "and request that immediate steps be taken to bring AIC into conformity with University policy." He also proposed eliminating 1, 2 and 3. Senator Atwater stated that no additional amendments could be accepted; the Senate would have to first deal with the amendment currently on the floor.

By a vote of 17 in favor, 12 opposed and 4 abstentions, motion 1995/96-36 was approved which deleted item #1 ("The Faculty Senate has no confidence in the administrative leadership of the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona.") from the bottom of page 1.

Senator Neuman then proposed that, in the second line, the resolution be reworded from "Arizona is indeed," to "Arizona is de facto a branch campus." Senator Aleamoni and the seconder agreed to that change.

A voice vote indicated approval to close debate and vote on the original motion. By a vote of 17 in favor, 15 opposed, and 2 abstentions, motion 1995/96-35 (the Committee of Eleven Resolution) was approved as amended, to read as follows:

Presented to the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona
by the Committee of Eleven

Resolution:

Whereas it has been determined that the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona is de facto a "branch campus of the University of Arizona" and not an independent institution, the Arizona International Campus and its programs will not be approved until established guidelines and regulations regarding branch campus establishment and program approval be fulfilled as in the case with other branch campuses such as Sierra Vista, established at the University of Arizona;

1. The academic program shall follow the approval process which includes action by the Faculty Senate and Arizona Board of Regents as required by University Regulations¹, the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual², and the Arizona Shared Governance Law (ARS15-1601b)³ according to the established guidelines.
2. According to the University Curriculum Procedures Manual⁴, the entire curriculum, not just "experimental" courses, shall be presented to academic department and college committees for approval.
3. Recruitment of faculty shall be approved by the appropriate academic departments at the University of Arizona in accordance with Board of Regents Policy Manual and the University of Arizona Recruitment/Hiring procedures^{2, 5}.
4. Program Planning shall be carried out by advisory committees composed of elected faculty representatives as provided for in the Arizona Shared Governance Law (ARS 15-1601b)³. A tenure system similar to that in operation at the University of Arizona, Arizona State University, and Northern Arizona University shall be put into place according to the Constitution and By-Laws of the University of Arizona and Arizona Board of Regents policy².

Up to the present time the establishment of the Arizona International Campus has not been in compliance with the existing rules and regulations of the University of Arizona, Arizona Board of Regents policy², and the Arizona Shared Governance Law³, and, therefore, the Faculty Senate does not recognize the Arizona International Campus as a branch of the University of Arizona. Because the leadership of the Arizona International Campus has carried out the organization of this campus in violation of these guidelines and also bypassing the faculty governance mechanisms, the Faculty Senate must express its serious concern.

Therefore:

If Arizona International Campus wishes Senate recognition, The Faculty Senate requires that the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona follow standard University of Arizona and Arizona Board of Regents policies for hiring faculty, offering programs and courses, and all other activities.

Kenneth J. Smith, Chair

Committee of Eleven Members: L. Aleamoni, A. Bhappu, N. Buras, T. Downing, H. Ewbank, R. Feltham, S. Jacobs, K. Montanaro, J. Schwarz, A. Silverman, M. Szilagyi, and M. Witte

FOOTNOTES

¹Item 1, page 3, of the Handbook of the Faculty Senate. This item reads, in part, as follows: "To recommend curricula and degrees for approval. While matters pertaining to courses, major and minor requirements, the kinds of degrees and requirements for each will originate in the various colleges, the final formulation to be recommended to the Board of Regents shall be determined by the Faculty Senate."

²Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, Chapter II, Academic Degree Program Planning and Implementation, Section C; Chapter VI, Personnel Policies, Section D.

³ARS 15-1601b, Arizona Shared Governance Law.

⁴Requirements for submitting experimental courses are delineated in the University Curriculum Procedures Manual (Approval Process for Academic Courses) and require departmental, college, and Curriculum Office approval. Programs require approval by the Faculty Senate (Approval Process for Academic Programs or Units).

⁵University of Arizona Recruitment/Hiring Form requires approval by academic departments.

10. **ADJOURNMENT** The meeting adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Andrew Silverman
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix*

1. Declaration of Governance Principles, prepared by the Committee of Eleven.
2. Principles and Guidelines for Collegial Decision-Making on Academic Policy, submitted by the Co-Governance Working Group.
3. Proposal to change the Name of the College of Arts and Sciences to University College.
4. Procedure for Informing Arizona Community Colleges of Significant Changes in UA Undergraduate Lower-Division Courses and Requirements.
5. Arizona University System Enrollment Projections and State of Arizona, Summary of Expenditures and Budget Request FY 1997, Schedule 3, New Campus in Pima County.

*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 March 4, 1996

- 1995/96-29 A motion to approve a procedure for informing Arizona community colleges of significant changes in UA undergraduate lower-division courses and requirements: approved.
- 1995/96-30 A motion to adopt the Declaration of Governance Principles of the University of Arizona, Prepared by the Committee of Eleven, and submit them for vote of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona for adoption: replaced by motion 1995/96-31.
- 1995/96-31 A substitute motion that the Senate receive and refer the Committee of Eleven Declaration of Governance Principles for ultimate resolution to the task force charged with reviewing both documents, and then to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, prior to continued discussion in the Faculty Senate: approved.
- 1995/96-32 A motion to approve the change of name from College of Arts and Sciences to University College: approved.
- 1995/96-33 A motion to change the name from University College to Undergraduate College: defeated.
- 1995/96-34 A motion to change the name from University College to University Undergraduate College: defeated.
- 1995/96-35 A motion to approve the Committee of Eleven resolution concerning Arizona International Campus, as amended: approved.
- 1995/96-36 A motion to delete #1 from the bottom of page 1 of the Committee of Eleven resolution: approved.