

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, November 1, 1993 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 2:40 p.m. on Monday, November 1, 1993, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-two members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Malcolm J. Zwolinski presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Atwater, Badger, Barrett, Buras, DaDeppo, Desai, Dickinson, Enos, Ewbank, Garcia, Hammond, Hill, Impey, Inman, Jones, Lei, Manke, McElroy, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Parsons, Pitt, Reynolds, Roemer, Shoemaker, Silverman, Sjong, Sullivan, Sypherd, Troy, Warburton, E. Williams, J. Williams, W. Williams, Witte, Young, Zukoski, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Anderson, Bertram, Brichler, Coons, Dahlgran, Dvorak, Fajardo, Fernandez, Gruener, Hildebrand, Huete, Joens, Larson, Lewis, Ruiz, Songer, and Wright.

2. REPORTS

- 2A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Pacheco said he wanted to talk about two forward-looking activities, both of which need our attention during the course of this year. "One of those is the future new four-year college for Pima County. Some of you may be aware this was the subject of discussion by the Arizona Board of Regents this past week. The other is the contemplated Sequential Degree Program with Pima Community College.

"Let me address the Sequential Degree Program first. This, as you may recall, is based on the idea that there may be advantages in our joining with Pima Community College to offer selected cooperative programs at their new campus in southwest Tucson. A community college faculty member would handle the lower-division courses in these selected majors, and our own faculty members would be responsible for upper-division courses that would maintain the same level of rigor as instruction on our own campus. Students would be admitted initially to both institutions and would participate in a tightly coordinated, or 'seamless' program of study. It's possible that there would be some cost advantages in this arrangement, but perhaps the major advantage lies in the opportunity to attract students, especially minority students, who otherwise might be deterred from coming to our campus. I continue to be amazed at how strongly some students express a fear of coming onto this campus. When I first started hearing that, I was concerned about it being primarily a matter of trying to wean students away from that environment, and I now have come to the conclusion that perhaps there is more to it than that, and that we shouldn't necessarily close off opportunities to perfectly capable students because of that fear.

"I want to stress three points about this idea. First, at this time we are still involved only in exploratory discussions. There is no predisposition to any particular outcome, and we will continue to remain open to any suggestions. Second, I believe that participation in any such program should be limited on our part to existing programs. Perhaps in the future we could consider adding other programs, but I wouldn't go as far as to suggest that we would look at new programs in this arrangement. I'm not interested in developing new programs at a time when we're not able to fully support what we already offer and in point of fact we are looking at the elimination or reduction or a merging of existing

1993/94-68

programs. And third, I think that extensive faculty participation in the exploratory discussions is essential. An acceptable nuts and bolts proposal is to be developed in due course. I will be happy to respond to questions you might have at the appropriate time.

"Let me now turn to the new four-year college that is to be built in Pima County. As you may recall, Arizona is going to need at least 55,000 more places at university-level institutions by the year 2010. The Regents' plan for handling this increase includes creating two new four-year colleges of about 10,000 students each, one in Pima County and one in Maricopa County, and converting ASU-West into a four-year institution. These options, along with a number of others, are essential if enrollment at the existing main campuses is going to be kept within acceptable levels. In addition the intent is to provide Arizona's young people with a wider range of educational choice, and that's where the campus in Pima County comes into play.

"The planning commission which proposed the new colleges recommended that costs not be met at the expense of the existing institutions. That is an important point. I am pleased to say that last week the Regents approved our asking the state for a little over \$2 million for planning the Pima County campus as part of our budget request for 1994-95.

"I want to make a few points about this new college in order to clear up some uncertainties that I've heard about in the last several weeks. First, contrary to some recent discussions, no permanent site has been selected for this new college. The IBM plant in southeast Tucson has been mentioned as temporary quarters, but a permanent location remains to be settled. The IBM plant is being mentioned at this point first of all so that planning can move forward, but no decision has been made. It may develop that that's where it could be located, but I think that has to be subjected to review. We need to have some feasibility studies done as to where the best location is going to be. I have asked a community advisory committee, chaired by former Regent Don Shropshire, to provide recommendations on this and other matters. To be perfectly frank with you, we are attempting to use the same model that was used for the creation of the medical school some twenty-odd years ago, where community support could be developed for the enterprise. I suspect that this is going to be a relatively difficult issue to sell around the state, so we certainly want to have community support from the outset.

"The second thing that I want to mention is that we need substantial faculty involvement in the planning activities, but I think this involvement has to be an unusual type. The new college is not going to be a small-scale clone of the University of Arizona. Our charter from the Regents makes it clear that a very different kind of institution is intended. So we need to look at various models of high-quality four-year colleges across the country. I believe that the most appropriate and well-informed faculty participation is going to come from individuals with experience and interest in such institutions. I know that there are a number here at the institution and that's where we will draw our advice from.

"My third point is that we are not necessarily looking at far-off decisions. We have reached the enrollment cap on our own campus already, and the surge of graduates from Arizona's high schools will begin this next year. We would like to see anywhere from 500 to 750 students enrolled in the new college by Fall 1995. I don't know if that's possible, but we must include a projection in our planning processes. If we're going to do that, then we have to act promptly to

select a model, to assign the appropriate curricula, select the site, plan the physical campus and hire personnel, if necessary. We can expect 5,000 students enrolled by the end of this decade as the first stage in developing towards 10,000.

"There is perhaps one final point that should be made, and that is that this new college is not going to be a branch campus of the University of Arizona. That needs to be well understood. We were asked to design it, to give it birth, to nurture it, and to see it grow, but the plan is to turn it loose as an independent institution once it can stand on its own two feet. Experience from around the country, and my own experience in the past, shows that about 2,500 FTE is about the minimum that you would need to be able to set it free. I hope and expect that there will be close ongoing ties to the University. What the nature of those ties might be, I can't say. That will have to be a part of the planning process. I will be pleased to answer questions at the appropriate time on the agenda. Thank you."

- 2B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Sypherd said he had just a few comments, and later in the agenda there would be a presentation on progress made thus far in strategic planning. "We continue our progress on closer ties between the administration and the Faculty Senate: not only has the Chair of the Faculty joined the President's Cabinet, but the Presiding Officer of the Senate is now sitting on the Deans' Council. A number of issues have been referred to the Senate from my office for assistance and comment. For example, we're looking for comment from the Senate on the distribution of differential teaching loads across our faculty and in the various units; we have asked for assistance in naming a committee to study how a potential salary increase would be applied across the faculty ranks; and we have asked for assistance in naming search committees for a Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences and Undergraduate Education, and for the Dean of the Faculty of Science. In addition, there is a faculty committee on compensation, in response to an Arizona Faculties Council request to the Regents. That committee is well underway, and I anticipate that we will be reporting our recommendation out at the next meeting of the Senate. We have also asked for opinions and perspectives from the Senate on Emeritus Status. I am very heartened by these interactions. I hope they will continue and increase over the coming years as we make our way toward a real joint governance effort at the University of Arizona."

- 2C. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia reported that, in conjunction with the Board of Regents meeting on our campus the previous Thursday and Friday, the Arizona Faculties Council (AFC) also met. AFC discussed the fact that all three campuses have now polled their Senates and faculties in various ways to find out which issues should be addressed in coming months. He said that information would be included in the next Faculty Newsletter. AFC also discussed reorganizations, and he would address that topic under the appropriate agenda item later in the meeting.

The Committee on Committees elected its 1993-94 Chairperson, Dr. Norman Austin, Classics Department. The committee's annual survey of the faculty is underway, and he expressed the hope that each Senator would encourage faculty with whom they came in contact to respond, so that the committee will have available a list of resource persons with identified expertise and knowledge that they can draw upon when the Provost calls upon faculty governance to address a particular issue.

Senator Garcia said that the Guidelines for Review of Deans, Directors and

Department Heads is currently awaiting approval of some changes requested by the Senate. He reported that, in the Provost's most recent reports on the review of three deans, the essence of what the Senate requested had been included. "Not only did he say that there was a committee and it followed procedure x, but here are the issues that evolved or were considered by the committee....I am very pleased to tell you that he is following the format that we requested, and I am hopeful that he will recommend full approval of the policy. It is possible that we may have a finalized policy in the near future."

Senator Garcia reported that, for the committee referred to by the Provost, which had been asked to consider the application of a potential salary increase across faculty ranks, nominations had been drawn from the membership of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee and the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee, and submitted to the Provost. The nominations comprised approximately half of each of those committees, and Senator Garcia found this to be a very hopeful note.

Dean Ernest Smerdon, Chair of the Search Committee for the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, has extended the deadline for filing application materials from the original date of November 9 to November 19. Senator Garcia urged Senators to self-nominate or to nominate others who would qualify as good candidates. Materials should be submitted to Dean Smerdon, and details can be obtained from the Faculty Center (621-1342).

Senator Garcia recalled that at the October meeting, the Senate voted to have the Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee and himself meet with Vice President Fernandez to discuss the Sequential Degree Program advisory committee structure. That meeting occurred, and "we came to some understanding concerning what ought to be done, and we have written a letter with our recommendations to Vice President Fernandez. I don't know whether he has acted on those yet."

2D. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

2E. REPORT OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Zwolinski reported that an orientation meeting for new Faculty Senators had been held on October 7 at the Faculty Center, and Chairman of the Faculty Garcia, Secretary of the Faculty Roemer, and he were very pleased with the good discussion and with the strong commitment of the new Senators. A good representation of student Senators was very much appreciated.

Senator Stan Reynolds has been elected 1993-94 Chair of the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee, which has now set its Fall meeting schedule.

Dr. Zwolinski, noting that Senate standing committee reports had been placed higher on the agenda today, said that because of the length of recent Senate meetings, reports of many of the Senate standing committees had not been heard. "Much of the work of shared governance is done by these very important committees and presented to the full Senate for action. I have been very impressed with the tremendous activity of these committees, and especially of the Chairs. Several of the committees have very heavy workloads involving important agenda items which require substantial data collection and also communication. As Provost Sypherd indicated, there are a number of items that have recently been referred come to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee and the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, and those two committees have particularly heavy agendas. The Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee has undertaken

tremendous responsibility, as well as the Research Policy Committee and the Student Affairs Policy Committee. The committees are very active and form the backbone of the Senate. That's where the real work gets done. I would like to publicly thank every member of these committees, and acknowledge their significant contributions to the Senate."

Concerning the last major item on today's agenda, Reorganization, Dr. Zwolinski said that he and the Senate Executive Committee believe more open discussion is needed on the Senate floor on issues of key concern. He said he has been a member of the Senate for more years than he cared to remember, and good, in-depth discussions on major issues had been rare. He said he hoped that more issue-oriented discussions can be scheduled at future meetings.

Dr. Zwolinski reported that the Faculty Center, in compliance with University policy, will be closed during the winter holiday from December 23 through January 2. He requested that matters for the Senate's attention be submitted before or after those dates.

- 2F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator J. Williams said Senator Lewis asked him to announce that he was unable to attend the meeting today, and would postpone his report until the next meeting.
3. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Silverman said he was pleased that President Pacheco mentioned that both the Sequential Degree Program and the new four-year college need faculty input during the planning process. "The problem is that sometimes this message does not reach the people charged with the planning of these programs. The Sequential Degree Program was discussed at the November Faculty Senate meeting, and it became very clear to us that faculty involvement was not being provided for. That is why we asked Senators Garcia and Inman to meet with Vice President Fernandez. I think it is important that when you talk about these matters, and I am glad that you do, that you make sure when you charge your administrators with these responsibilities, that one of the things you tell them is that they need faculty, and at times, staff and student input as well, and that faculty, staff and students should participate in the selection of these individuals." He then asked Senator Garcia about the meeting he and Senator Inman had with Vice President Fernandez. He asked if he could share what had been discussed, and what had been suggested. Senator Garcia: "We suggested just the points that had been made in the Senate discussion: that a faculty member be added to the steering committee, that two additional faculty members be added to the curriculum committee, and that one faculty member be added to the tuition and fees committee. We provided specific names for each of those committees. We have not yet received a response."

Senator Witte, commenting on faculty input to the new four-year college plan, wondered if President Pacheco wanted only faculty who might agree with a certain type of model. "When you ask for faculty input, you need to trust that the faculty will come prepared to give you the best advice, even if questions are raised that will require time to think about, but which must be raised." President Pacheco said he did not disagree with that whatsoever. There was no predisposition toward a particular type of institution, except that it would not be research-oriented. Other than that, he said he believed that faculty who have had experience in the past with alternative modes of offering higher education would be most helpful. Senator Witte added that she believed it was important to ensure that our campus not change its character, and that there should be no less pressure on us to provide a first-class undergraduate experience. President Pacheco said he agreed with Senator Witte absolutely. "In

fact, I believe that this will make it possible for us to be the kind of institution that many of you have wanted it to be and haven't been able to have for whatever the reason."

Senator J. Williams asked if establishment of either the new four-year college or the Sequential Degree Program would drain minority enrollment on our campus. President Pacheco said that the point was well taken, but our institution is strongly committed to encouragement of underrepresented groups.

Senator Parsons said that, based on President Pacheco's comments, she was assuming that UA and ASU will be involved in the planning of the new four-year colleges in Maricopa and Pima Counties, and that these two models will probably be different, based on the fact that ASU-West is really a spin-off of ASU. President Pacheco responded that "The result of the discussions was a compromise between the University of Arizona and Arizona State University. I felt very strongly, and with a good deal of support from the Board members, that in fact we needed a different type of institution in Pima County. Officials at ASU felt equally strongly that that institution should develop its branch campuses. The compromise was that what would develop here would be different from what developed in Maricopa County, but with a caveat that the Board would look at the governance structures in seven or eight years to determine whether that was, in fact, the best way to deliver higher education. My own experience in Florida, California and Texas tells me that in seven or eight years those institutions, too, will become independent."

Senator Inman asked President Pacheco about funding for additional faculty for the Sequential Degree Program. President Pacheco: "My concept at the present time is that it will not require additional faculty members. However, I may be mistaken about that, and I believe that as we move forward with the planning, this will become clearer. Both Chancellor Hockaday's and my view is that we will try to do as much as possible within existing resources. Certainly, if it develops that we need additional resources, we will know that early on in the planning process."

Senator E. Williams asked President Pacheco how the Evening and Weekend Program would fit into the larger picture of the new four-year college and the Sequential Degree Program. President Pacheco: "When the Commission on Enrollment Growth was considering the various alternatives, they formulated several different approaches to meeting the enrollment needs. One had to do with providing more learning opportunities around the state; a second included offering more evening and weekend opportunities to students; and another would establish new physical facilities or new campuses. The Evening and Weekend Programs will be a vital part of this planning. Our estimate at the University of Arizona is that through evening and weekend planning, we will be able to accommodate approximately 3,700 students of the 55,000 that will be coming."

Senator Myers said he would like to pose a number of questions, not necessarily for answers today. He said he wondered if he had understood President Pacheco correctly to say that the proposed new east campus for Pima College would ultimately become a separate institution, and if he would be correct in interpreting that to mean that students enrolled there would not be enrolled simultaneously on our main campus. President Pacheco said he believed that would be a proper assumption. Although students sometimes enroll in two different institutions, that was not the intent. Senator Myers asked if, in comparison, the Sequential Degree Program in collaboration with Pima College, would be a separate institution, so that students enrolled in that program would in fact be essentially on-

campus students. He wondered if students would have the privilege of being able to "mix and match," to take courses at Pima College as a part of the Sequential Degree Program as well as on the main campus. "If that is the case, then it is likely that some students presently on main campus will attempt to take advantage of the Sequential Degree Program. That is a serious problem that needs to be addressed. Secondly, relatively senior faculty should be involved in the teaching process of the upper-division program, which will involve transportation and time to get from main campus to the other campus and back again. How will it be determined who is going to teach such classes and what compensation will be offered for the extra involvement? I think there are issues that need to be addressed, such as library facilities at Pima College, specifically related to upper-division programs. It seems to me there are a number of potential hidden costs here which need to be examined. I think the faculty needs to be more involved." Senator Myers stressed that he posed these questions not for answers necessarily today, but merely to raise the issues.

President Pacheco: "The only response that I would have on this is that I don't believe that I would want to preclude or preempt the work of the planning committees that are already working. These are some of the types of issues that they will need to be working on. We are starting from the assumption that this is the kind of program that can work, that will enhance the already existing cooperation between the two institutions, and that will make it easier for students to go through that seamless program. It may well be that, in the end, this program will not work. But we would prefer to start with the assumption that it will, and if it does cost more, then we will simply have to make a cost benefit analysis and make the proper determination. Those are the kinds of questions that will have to be addressed.

Senator Hill asked Dr. Sypherd about the Evening and Weekend Program, which he understood was going to be turned over to Extended University. He said the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC) met with Extended University, and had been told that the program targeted adults in the existing community rather than a growing student population. Dr. Sypherd: "In current thinking, since we cannot move immediately to implement what many regard as the optimal Evening and Weekend Program, contained in a report from a committee chaired by Holly Smith and reported out four or five months ago, we should go now to some interim process that would get the culture of an evening and weekend program started. The decision was to use the same rules and processes as for Extended University and Summer Session, essentially a cost-recovery mechanism. One might hope that we will migrate to a different model when we can afford to do so. For the near future, I believe we are looking at an intermediate model that will help us migrate to a more appropriate Evening and Weekend Program. I do think that the students we have in mind are working adults who need an evening and weekend setting to carry on their education."

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 1993: The minutes of October 4, 1993, were approved as distributed.
5. RESULTS OF SURVEY OF FACULTY SENATORS: Dr. Zwolinski reported on the Survey of Faculty Senators. The summarizing tally was distributed to Senators with their agenda material. Forty-six Senators participated, and identified the five key issues that they considered to be the most important on the list of 23 items. The issues which received the highest score: (1) Shared governance (faculty participation at department, Faculty/College, and central University levels; (2) Better evaluation processes to balance teaching, research and service activities in Promotion and Tenure and merit decisions; (3) Internal salary inequities

(compression, inversion, gender, and age/years of service); (4) Recognition and reward for quality teaching; (5) Administrative accountability (reviews of administrators); (6) Low faculty and staff morale. He said the issue of salaries had been excluded because it was already recognized as highest priority. He said the Senate Executive Committee will keep these items in mind as it sets future Senate agendas.

Dr. Zwolinski reported that Arizona State University handled their survey a bit differently: They divided their Academic Senate into nine sub-groups, and each sub-group identified what they felt should be the key issues on their campus. He said their results were not yet collated, but some of the items that came out on top were student literacy, entrance requirements, philosophy of recruitment, status of faculty on campus--he said he was not quite sure what that implied--library acquisitions, enhanced University support for research, East and West campus issues, and insufficient funding resources for external compensation. He said Northern Arizona University and ASU-West are in the process of conducting their surveys now, and results will be provided, perhaps at the next Arizona Faculties Council meeting.

6. REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES

6A. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Atwater said the committee has two items later on the agenda today.

6B. REPORT OF THE FACULTY BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Senator Reynolds said the committee has set its meeting schedule for the Fall semester, and will meet tomorrow primarily to set its agenda for the year. He said several members of the committee are members of the University Budget and Strategic Planning Advisory Committee. He added that several committee members had been recommended to serve on the new committee that the Provost is putting together to plan for the distribution of projected salary increases.

6C. REPORT OF THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Inman reported that in October the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee conducted a survey of current procedures and criteria related to revisions in curriculum and introduction and approval of new courses. The committee requested information from fourteen Colleges and Faculties, and received information from eleven of those units. After reviewing the responses, the committee sent the information to Chairman of the Faculty Garcia and Presiding Officer Zwolinski with a summary report and some conclusions that the committee reached during its review.

Senator Inman said the committee had been considering plans for the Evening and Weekend Program, and one of its subcommittees prepared a response to the plan worked out by the Task Force chaired by Dr. Holly Smith. But, she said, the committee was informed that that plan was off the table, and Vice President Fernandez invited the committee to speak with him about the new proposal, which was to offer the program under the auspices of the Extended University and Summer Session. That meeting did occur, and, as Senator Hill mentioned, a subcommittee met with Dr. June Dempsey, Director of Extended University and Summer Session, to discuss the plan. She said she believed she could speak for the subcommittee in saying that they were well impressed by what Dr. Dempsey had to say. Dr. Dempsey has submitted a rather detailed plan to Provost Sypherd, which has not yet been approved, but Senator Inman anticipates that ICPC should have a full report available for the Senate's December meeting.

Other committee agenda items include the Sequential Degree Program, mentioned

by Senator Garcia; the Task Force on Undergraduate Education's statement on faculty workload--a joint venture with the Academic Personnel Policy Committee and a few individuals from colleges not represented by the two committees to revise the task force's statement on faculty workload for Provost Sypherd--this item will be submitted to the Senate on December 6; and a report on registration figures of all courses that satisfy General Education requirements to see whether more courses are being offered and more students being served this fall than last fall--in other words, a study of the General Education program in terms of performance.

- 6D. REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Witte said that several brief discussions of the Research Park Subcommittee Report had been held, and the discussions had brought forward a number of important issues related to the mission of the University, conflict of interest, and decision-making processes. She said the committee will meet on November 12 to proceed with further consideration of the conflict of interest issue. She noted that the Senate had not acted at the October meeting on the key recommendations of the Research Park Subcommittee Report: (1) It is essential that there be a well-thought out management plan, particularly with regard to maintenance and the "scientific" structure and the administration of the research park. (2) It is important to create a management board with the inclusion of expertise in the form of an individual who has been head or vice head of a successful park of this kind elsewhere. (3) There should be a faculty oversight committee. Senator Witte then moved acceptance of the recommendations of the Research Park Subcommittee (motion 1993/94-25). She added that consideration might well be given to the fact that the faculty oversight committee could be the same committee that produced the initial report. That motion was then seconded. Senator Jones, as a point of order, asked if consideration of a motion was appropriate at this point. Dr. Zwolinski ruled that action on the motion could proceed, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.
- 6E. REPORT OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Pitt, on behalf of Dr. David Williams, said that the committee had discussed five issues at its most recent meeting: graduate student representation on all committees; a report from Senator Justin Williams, a student member of the committee, who has been keeping the committee updated on the late fees issue--the committee has spent much of its time on this issue, and has invited Registrar Becella to meet with it; the evaluation of courses--undergraduate and graduate--in a timely manner; the issue of graduate tuition after all class work is done; and the minority view of the Senate concerning the inclusion of some arts or humanities units in high school requirements for University admission.
7. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE PROMOTION AND TENURE/PROMOTION AND CONTINUING STATUS REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN IN 1992-93 TO BE EFFECTIVE IN 1993-94: Senator Atwater said the Promotion and Tenure/Promotion and Continuing Status Report has two parts: the promotion and tenure statistics for Chapter 3 faculty, and the promotion and continuing status statistics for Chapter 4 academic professionals. She said she learned that this report is prepared solely for the use of the Faculty Senate, and is intended to keep the Senate informed of the statistics and the various decisions that have been reached. The Academic Personnel Policy Committee's role has been to carefully review the statistics, to monitor the outcomes in light of comparability to previous years' statistics, and to examine the pattern of outcomes as they affect personnel categorized in different ways: male, female, and minority. The committee has also attempted to check the accuracy of the statistics, based on members' rather limited knowledge of the processes operating in their respective colleges. She said she wanted to pre-

sent a few comments for clarification, and then share some of the concerns of the committee members regarding the process and the data.

Senator Atwater said the second and third pages of the Chapter 3 section summarize, over the past eight years, the results as yes or no decisions, broken down into various categories. On the second of those two pages, the percent of positive decisions for 1993-94 closely reflects the average over the past eight years. On the subsequent five pages, she said, a clarification of the notes might be helpful, as it was for her: where one vote is separated into two votes, this means that a separate decision was reached on the promotion vs. the tenure --it might have been yes on one and no on the other; where a vote was split in a certain number of cases, that committee had equal numbers of yes's and no's. In the section covering Chapter 4, Professional Personnel, Senator Atwater said there is not a wealth of statistics available covering past years, and the numbers totals are consequently somewhat smaller.

She encouraged Senators to look closely at the data, take it back to their colleges, and do as APPC committee members did--if they saw something that did not jibe with what they knew or believed to be the case, they could check the statistics. Records in the Provost's Office are kept of individuals, and those individuals are tracked through all of the different decision-making groups. One can literally follow these as needed.

Senator Atwater said she would like to address some of the concerns expressed by APPC committee members, which included the validity or correctness of the data, because they had noted a few errors. They found an unusual phrasing of decisions for people in second- or fourth-year reviews who are not retained: a yes vote not to retain, which was categorized as a yes when they are not retained. She said that had to be clarified, and those actions relocated to where "pro" was understood to be retain and "con" to be not retain. Some discrepancies in committee members' colleges were noted, and those were corrected, as well as a correction in the number of appeals.

Senator Atwater said she believed this is a valuable report for Senators to have at hand, and hopefully for the administration as well, when summary statistics are needed, and to identify how the results of promotion/tenure/continuing status decisions have changed over the years. She said the committee believes it would be helpful if individual cases could be tracked along the way, without identifying individual names. For instance, the numbers of 5 pro and 3 con at the department level might not be the same individuals as the 5 pro and 3 con at the department head level: someone who voted yes at one level, may be no at another level, but someone else has taken their place with a reverse decision. She said there was committee interest in following where reversals occur, to see if there is any pattern that might be helpful in trying to understand the procedures.

In conclusion, Senator Atwater said the committee would like to have additional information available to the faculty in how the appeal process is working. She said it appears that about 50 percent of the individuals who were denied tenure chose to file an appeal to the President, and typically, one or two of the appeals have led to a reversal each year during the past three years.

Senator Silverman commented that we appear to have made little progress in promotion and tenure for women and minorities. For minorities, perhaps some progress was made: 12 out of 82 for 1993-94, and 10 out of 88 in 1992-93. Concerning women, he said, it appears we are not doing as well: in 1993-94, 24 out of 82, versus the previous three years with 30 out of 88, 22 out of 73, and 25 out

of 75. He added that it would be helpful if the Senate could receive a similar report on hire statistics, perhaps on a monthly basis.

Senator Witte reminded Senators that nine or ten years ago, the Senate approved a format for affirmative action reports that included hires. The first report was prepared by Senator Myers, but no more recent reports have been made. She said the format included a breakdown by types of minorities. She said the federal government does not classify as minorities certain groups that this institution does classify in that way, and she believes it is important to look at minorities in clearly protected groups, rather than in broader categories.

President Pacheco said he would like to respond to Senator Atwater's question about the appeal process. The process is controlled by formal policy, contained in Chapter 3.12.08 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. Individuals appeal directly to the President, indicating the reasons why they believe the denial was inappropriate. His review is limited to the existing Promotion and Tenure file. He said he does not look at anything else, because if he were to ask the departmental committee for more information, that information would then have to be reviewed at all levels, and all comments that occurred in that process would be added to the file for his consideration. He added that in his tenure here, that provision has rarely been used. When all of the information arrives in his office, he has a staff member identify the issues on a separate sheet of paper, and then he reviews every bit of every file, and makes a determination. With respect to 1992-93, there were a total of nine appeals, five for tenure, and four for promotion. He reversed one decision, and permitted the other eight to stand. Some cases are more straightforward than others. In one case, for example, every level of review from the department to the Provost was opposed to tenure, and in that particular case the decision was very easy. In other cases, the record was mixed. In general, when that happens, then his conclusion usually is that it wasn't a strong enough case to justify the positive decision, and so in most of those cases he does not overturn the decisions.

Senator Impey said he was confused by Senator Silverman's comments, because as he scanned the statistics contained in the report, taking a three-year average from 1986-88 and then 1991-93, it appeared to him that the percentage of decisions involving women increased from 20 percent to 30 percent, while the percentage of successful decisions increased from an average of 75 percent to 85 percent.

Dr. Zwolinski asked if the Senate wished to accept the report. Acceptance of the report was moved and seconded (motion 1993/94-26), and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

8. DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW CHANGES: Senator Atwater noted that Senators had received two documents related to proposed Academic Program Review changes: (1) an October 18 memo, with three pages of comments produced by the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC); (2) the July 9 Report of the CORE Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Program Review. She said the report was reviewed closely by APPC, and in presenting its recommendations to the Senate, APPC chose to focus on the need for greater faculty involvement in some of the processes. Changes were proposed for eight of the fifteen original recommendations. Sections within quotes were taken from the CORE Ad Hoc Committee Report; APPC additions were underlined.

Recommendation #1: "The term 'academic program review' should be abandoned and in its place, the term 'program quality evaluation and development' should be

adopted." Senator Atwater said addition of the words "and development" focused attention on the purpose of the review and changed faculty perception of its relevance. She said no change was proposed for the subsequent paragraph, but APPC proposed adding a third paragraph: "Likewise, incorporation of the term 'development' is intended to focus attention on the need for follow-up by the administration to carry out the goals set forth by the program quality evaluation."

Recommendation #2: "All units, in consultation with their faculty, should be required to produce a detailed, written mission statement to which they should be required to adhere and to which evaluation objectives should be addressed. The Committee believes that all evaluations of units, not just program quality evaluations, should be inextricably tied to the unit mission. Therefore, program quality evaluation should start with an examination of a detailed mission statement of the unit and all objectives of the evaluation should be directed toward that mission or arguments to change it. This examination must involve all of the faculty within the unit. Thus, the pertinent data for evaluation are those having to do with the mission the unit has proposed and the dean and provost have approved. With this in mind, the Committee believes that the campus manual to guide units undergoing evaluation may warrant expanded attention to detail in this regard."

Recommendation #3: No change was proposed.

Recommendation #4: "Adequate resources ~~should~~ must be made available through the Provost's office to ensure the conduct of high-quality evaluations. The resources currently allocated to program review are not commensurate with the importance of this activity to the academic enterprise. Additional staff and operations funds are needed within the Office of the Vice President for Academic Services and Undergraduate Education. There is, in particular, a need to relieve units of the necessity of diverting unit secretarial and clerical time for protracted periods to carry out the self-study mandate. Most units are already understaffed in these two areas and the burden of self-study is disruptive to unit function. We suggest permanent staff under the Office of the Provost, experienced in program quality evaluation, be made available to the units undergoing review. We also recommend that resources be provided for functions such as secretarial support and travel, per diem, and consultation fees for external reviewers." Senator Atwater said that APPC understood the burden placed on faculty and staff by an academic program review, so it expanded on the original committee's recommendation.

Recommendations #5, #6 and #7: No change proposed, but Senator Atwater noted the importance of #5: "The cycle for program quality evaluation should be ten years rather than seven years."

Recommendation #8: "Procedures for evaluator selection should be standardized and a majority of the internal and external review teams shall be drawn from a prioritized list, voted on by the faculty within the unit." APPC proposed splitting the second paragraph in the original document in two, and inserting a new paragraph in the middle: "To these ends, a majority of the members of the internal and external evaluation teams shall be drawn from a prioritized list which has been assembled by and voted upon by the faculty within the unit to be evaluated. The faculty may wish to partition the list into sub-groups corresponding to significant and distinct programs within the unit to insure proper evaluation of those programs. At least one representative of each sub-group

shall be selected to the internal and external evaluation teams."

Recommendations #9, #10, #11 and #12: No changes proposed.

Recommendation #13: "Following receipt of the external team report, the unit head and dean should develop a five-year rolling plan ~~for presentation~~. This plan should be presented to the faculty within the unit for their input. The revised plan should then be presented to the provost at a meeting ~~of the three including the unit administrator and the dean~~. The committee advocates this new step in the process to ensure that a clear template is established against which the progress of the unit can be assessed between major evaluations. In addition, it is important to have a well-conceived rolling plan as a map for the unit to follow between evaluations. It is equally important to have faculty input to this plan prior to its submission to the provost. Many faculty members have expressed concern to the Committee that the outcomes of reviews are not used systematically and past provosts have often provided only perfunctory feedback to units following review. In fact, in recent times the unit head has been excluded from participation in discussions about revised plans based on review outcomes. The Committee believes that the process suggested in this recommendation would solve many of these past concerns ~~and involve the three individuals most responsible for the academic well-being of the unit~~. As a final note, it is assumed that the development of the proposed five-year rolling plan would be based on comprehensive faculty input to the unit head in response to evaluation outcome."

Recommendation #14: No change proposed.

Recommendation #15: "As part of continual assessment between major ten-year evaluations, the dean should review each unit at the end of each calendar year in relation to its approved rolling plan and determine ~~compliance and progress in meeting the goals of the rolling plan~~."

Dr. Zwolinski said that the purpose of discussion today would be to provide Senate opinion on APPC's proposals. He offered Senators the option of making comments today or submitting them in writing to APPC. Action on a finalized proposal would be scheduled for a future Senate meeting.

Senator Myers said he had several comments to make: (1) He objected to use of the words "consult" and "input" because they do not comprise faculty participation. He said that "if faculty participation in the process is desired, then you need to say that." (2) Some sentences should be turned around for clarification. For example, under recommendation #2, for the insertion in the middle of the paragraph, he suggested a more direct statement, e.g., all the faculty within the unit will participate in this examination. (3) In recommendation #4, "to ensure the conduct of high-quality evaluations," he wondered what was intended--an evaluation that produces a high quality conclusion, or a high quality process? He said he presumed it referred to the latter because of the context. (4) In recommendation #8, he said he wondered about the phraseology "voted on by the faculty." He said if you want to say that the faculty are going to elect a group, then say they will elect them, don't say they vote on them. (5) Also in recommendation #8, he questioned whether "prioritized list" would be considered standard terminology. He believed clarification as to the intent of a prioritized list is needed. He said he assumed it would mean a list of individuals in an order that corresponded to the order in which selections were to be made.

Senator Neuman said that, as one who recently chaired a review committee for a large department, he generally agreed with the spirit of APPC's proposals. "But I would suggest that perhaps a bit less micromanagement would make the task of these committees easier. In particular, I strongly support your recommendation that resources be provided to these committees rather than their drawing on their own department's resources. I think I also agree with recommendation #5, that the review occur every ten years, rather than every seven years." He said he did have a slight problem with recommendation #8, "...a majority of the internal and external review teams shall be drawn from a prioritized list..." He wondered why a majority, rather than some. He suggested that "majority" be replaced with "at least some" in two sections in recommendation #8, and that the last sentence of the final paragraph be strengthened by eliminating "in large part." He said he did not believe evaluators without major stature in their field should be brought in. With respect to recommendation #11 in the original document, "All faculty members should be interviewed in the unit undergoing program quality evaluation," he said this appeared to be unnecessary micromanagement and would pose a tremendous burden on reviewers of large departments. Senator Witte commented that what Senator Neuman might refer to as micromanagement, she would term the essence of the democratic process. She said "majority" is important because it is hard to ignore. Senator Neuman responded that the issue is not related to majority of faculty, but rather the majority of the external evaluators. Senator Witte said her comments were related to his more general comments.

Senator Hammond said he was also concerned about the use of the word "majority." Perhaps the review could be self-serving and inaccurate. Senator Witte said she wanted to clarify that faculty selected should be representative of, as opposed to diametrically opposed to, the consensus of the faculty. Senator Neuman said he saw, in this issue, an analog to the review of an individual faculty member. While it made sense to ask the faculty member to recommend external reviewers for his promotion and tenure case, those recommendations are not necessarily followed, and he suggested that the same principle should apply here.

Dr. Zwolinski requested that, if Senators had additional comments, they transmit them to Senator Atwater, as the revised proposal will be submitted to the Senate at a later date.

9. REPORT FROM DEAN OF LIBRARIES CARLA STOFFLE CONCERNING THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SYSTEM: Dean Stoffle thanked Faculty Senators for providing her the opportunity to share with them activities related to the Library's organization.

Dean Stoffle said the Library embarked on a planning process in March 1992, and she reviewed the background and reasons. The Library was experiencing inflation in price increases for library materials, especially serials, that was far beyond the consumer price increases, limiting its ability to serve the campus needs. An examination of data from the 1981-1990 indicated that the Library budget experienced minimal growth, at a rate below inflation at a time when its materials budget was increasing. Staff growth was essentially static during that time period, but the student population increased from 27,000 to 35,000.

Just prior to searching for a new Dean of Libraries in 1990, a staff task force completed a study on access versus ownership. The task force surveyed faculty, gathered data on price increases and peer institutions, and produced a report, which indicated the Library could no longer conduct business as it had been doing. "Ownership is no longer within our realm. We must have a combination of access and ownership in order to serve this campus and the needs of the faculty and the students." The report also provided valuable data related to

price increases and staffing, and responses from faculty that indicated the collections were inadequate, that reliability of service needed improvement, that the Library was no longer able to provide all services to the campus community, and that reshelving was becoming an increasing problem.

Dean Stoffle said when she arrived, she met with the staff early on and discussed (1) the need to review the organization to determine if the best use was being made of the Library's human resources to meet the mission defined by the campus community, (2) implementation of new information technology, and (3) budget and staffing reductions. In her two years on campus, twenty positions and over \$500,000 have been cut, and another \$100,000+ had to be reallocated. The ground rules of the planning process were that it would be staff-driven, starting from the ground up, from the point of view that, if they were building a University of Arizona Library today, how would they organize it?

She said one of the key assumptions was that the Library is a user-centered organization that must work closely with its users to understand and meet their needs. Another principle for restructuring was that the Library must be made easy to use. Users should be able to come into the Library and be able to find and get at as much information as they wish, without having to seek assistance from a librarian or staff member. Efforts must be focussed on assessment, evaluation and planning, and that a better job must be done of serving undergraduates. The Library staff had to be empowered, and made more accountable for that empowerment. A commitment had to be made to continuous staff development and learning, and to the fact that change is going to be continuous and must be built into expectations. Dean Stoffle said the process took eighteen months, involved nearly a hundred people, a national consultant was hired, and assistance was provided internally by the CORE staff. She said she was not involved in the process until the final stage.

Dean Stoffle said the newly implemented organization, with a likeness to the CORE process, demands different behaviors and skills on everyone's part. Respect and trust are inherent, and administrators must let go of control and become consultants and coaches, not controllers. Walls have to be broken down between departments in the Library and between the Library and its campus constituency, all Library personnel have to understand the Library mission, and individuals must have responsibility and accountability for problem-solving and improvement.

The results of the restructuring will include increased access to locally held materials and information sources. SABIO has helped to achieve that. Systems of access will be improved, as well as hours of service, access to the collections, reshelving, document delivery, reduction in material ordering time and processing time. Staff have been reallocated to do a better job of expanding education in the identification and use of traditional and new resources and technologies. Dean Stoffle said this is one of the items faculty indicated needed to be done. Local collections and online information resources will be developed to better meet campus needs and a staff reallocation will occur to collaborate with faculty and others to build educational programming and to create new knowledge bases.

The Library's organizational chart has been restructured and flattened: a complete level of middle-level managers has been eliminated--nine positions--and those positions were reallocated to front-line service to improve student and faculty access to materials and to needed education programs. Users are at the top of the chart, and the units that deal directly with users are placed right below them. All other units support the teams working directly with users. The

number of departments has decreased from sixteen to eight.

Senator Myers asked if any thought had been given to exploring digitized data, noting in particular that maps in the future probably will be in digitized form, rather than hard copy. Dean Stoffle said that will be the next step, and is one of the reasons for the restructuring--to organize staff, to get the technology in place, and then to begin to work with faculty on those kinds of projects. Staff are already looking at a humanities text digitizing project in Virginia to see if something similar could be implemented here, and the English Department has asked the Library to make available on line full text poetry from the 1200s through the 20th century. She said the Center for Creative Photography has an unparalleled collection of images, and perhaps digitizing could make them available to a broader audience without violating copyright laws.

Dr. Zwolinski thanked Dean Stoffle for the report.

10. DISCUSSION OF THE CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR POTENTIAL REORGANIZATIONS: Senator Garcia said that on October 15 and 16 he had attended a conference in Washington which consisted of Chairs of the Faculty from about 100 institutions all over the country. Faculty Senate involvement in the process of reorganizations triggered by fiscal crises was the primary topic. He said he learned that those institutions that have dealt most successfully with these kinds of changes have dealt with them by involving the Faculty Senates from the start. To cite one example, the University of Maryland underwent a \$45 million budget cut, from a budget very similar to ours, and was forced to cut 21 degree-granting programs, seven departments and one college in response. They did that without laying off a single tenured faculty member, and with the eventual concurrence of even the faculty whose departments were reorganized. He said the Dean of Liberal Arts told him that at the meeting of the Senate at which the final votes were taken, there were faculty members who stood up and said they did not like what was happening to them as individuals, but it was the right thing for the University of Maryland. Senator Garcia said the University of Maryland held many public hearings, conducted through the representatives of the faculty within colleges, as well as University-wide. "The process by means of which reorganizations are dealt with is very important. Today we would like to begin in the Faculty Senate a discussion of the criteria and procedures which the University of Arizona is putting in place for dealing with reorganizations. As background for that discussion, Assistant Provost Roger Caldwell is going to give us a briefing."

Dr. Caldwell distributed copies of an outline of his presentation which included overview of the process which the Strategic Planning Subcommittee has been working to develop, and which provided background on the issues that are being considered. He said he wanted to talk about the overall approach and the fact that multiple methods will be needed, rather than an individual technique, about the restructuring criteria--clearly there are limitations and cautions--and then summarize the main points. He said the subcommittee is not really engaged in strategic planning, but rather in assessment. Actual planning will occur later on. Dr. Caldwell said the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee is the result of and was structured following the Gottfredson Report; its primary subcommittees are Budget and Planning, and he would be reporting on the latter today. He noted that six of the Committee members are Faculty Senators: Douglas Jones, J.D. Garcia, Donald Myers, Paul Sypherd, Derek Lewis, and Elizabeth Roemer. Further, the Subcommittee has been working with Senator Reynolds and the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee.

It is clear that the University has, in fact, been restructuring all along, as

indicated in statistics provided by the Curriculum Office: there have been 22 additions to and 34 deletions from degrees/majors since 1988; course additions have consistently outnumbered course deletions since 1977; degrees currently offered include 133 Bachelor, 135 Master, and 96 Doctoral degrees--typical of land grant universities, but not typical of major universities generally; graduate courses represent 48 percent of catalog offerings, upper-division 37 percent, and lower-division 11 percent. The Senate probably has a good overall view of the changes occurring because it must act on all curricular additions and deletions.

Dr. Caldwell said multiple reviewing methods will be required, because there really is no one good method. The PAIP process was an extensive exercise involving many faculty; other universities have conducted similar reviews, although not as extensive as ours. PAIP reports that assigned a designation of 0 ("does not meet criteria"), or those that assigned a designation of 1 ("meets criteria"), but only if the text suggests it was a low 1, will be the initial triggers. If units come out low on the variables and low on PAIP, the Subcommittee will sieve through those units in more detail. He noted that currently all units are coded for anonymity. The Subcommittee will also use some internal data prepared from the results of PAIP; if the two match, it will tend to confirm PAIP assessments. He said the Deans have been asked, by December 1, to give their perspective on strategic directions of activities within their colleges: how they see teaching and research demands, other kinds of needs, and what kinds of recommendations they would make concerning the units within their areas that would need acceleration or deceleration.

Dr. Caldwell said the Subcommittee has been trying to come up with a set of criteria that might enable them to classify units into four different categories: (a) augment resources; (b) do nothing; (c) internal restructuring; and (d) combination or elimination. Examples of (a) might include units which have a very high student credit hour number and need more resources--the review process could produce positive results; (b) would include units that look all right; (c) is where the graduate to undergraduate mix comes in, and might be the most fruitful, for example a graduate program that awards one graduate degree every three years or so, but has a tremendous number of undergraduate student credit hours; (d) would encompass a combination of small units or units that are similar, or elimination of a unit. Because of the criteria selected, only the 83 units that are degree-granting can be considered. He said if a unit does get to the point of a recommendation for elimination, the Board of Regents has a process for that. Dr. Caldwell said the Subcommittee will be looking at units where it might have to ask more questions vs. those that will not require further review, and it is searching for sorting criteria which involve PAIP but are enhanced in some way because of concerns expressed by some about the PAIP process. If the Subcommittee can get consistent answers, then it will feel more comfortable.

Concerning the primary criteria choices, Dr. Caldwell provided some background. Dr. Sypherd asked the Center for the Study of Higher Education to do a survey to see what the literature suggests about how to conduct such a review process. The report they submitted made the point that when you look at these questions, you also need to look at how the investment occurred. He said the Subcommittee has a study on nine years of program changes and decision packages--how much money was put into certain areas; results of that funding can be observed now. The Subcommittee has another study, conducted by Suellen Crano, that indicates what other universities are doing. He repeated that there is no single best way to conduct this review, and the Subcommittee is searching for the best combination of criteria. He said process and criteria developed by the PAIP task

force, which reported in December, formed the basis of some items reviewed by the Subcommittee; also used was material developed by a CORE team dealing with the kinds of decisions that are made on campus, and the kinds of criteria that might be useful as basis for those decisions; and, finally, internal subcommittee discussions.

Criteria developed by the Subcommittee "to do a quick sort" all have some kind of numerical quality to them: (1) Centrality: a large, research-oriented university has certain units, like an English or Chemistry Department, that are central. There are other specific units that are unique and central to land grant universities and that address the needs of the state. Centrality might also relate to our geographic location in the southwest. (2) Efficiency: this can be addressed by evaluating size relative to output, i.e., the number of student credit hours (SCH) per faculty member, and comparisons with other universities. The AAU numbers the Subcommittee has now are perhaps too broad, but if a unit appears to be targeted for possible elimination, a few universities could be selected for a more detailed comparison. (3) Quality: how can the Subcommittee come up with a quantitative scoring system to assess quality, short of counting papers, or conducting a peer assessment, or other methods that might be equally suspect. He said that right now, emphasis will be placed on the other two because they are easier to do.

Dr. Caldwell said that examples of criteria variables are SCH (lower division, upper division, graduate), Faculty (instruction and research), Faculty (tenure-track faculty, GATs, and other), Degrees (undergraduate, masters, doctorate, and other), Sponsored Projects expenditures, State budget (instruction and total), SCH/Degrees (undergraduate and graduate), % SCH by GAT and tenure-track faculty, Sponsored expenditures/State expenditures, Total and normalized to per faculty member, Unit size, Gender and diversity for students and faculty. The Office of Institutional Research prepared some statistical reports for the Subcommittee which indicated, for example, how many student credit hours are generated by each unit on campus. On the main campus, the sum of research and development expenditures for about seven units accounts for about 50 percent of the total. He said that everything listed is unit-specific, which misses the institution as a whole and the interactions of the interdisciplinary components.

Dr. Caldwell said he wanted to comment on a couple of limitations. There is no university strategic plan yet, so it is inappropriate to say that something is central because of priorities. But there is some indirect guidance: the mission summary contained in the PAIP December report; general University committee reports on various subjects; a letter written by the Provost to Deans about six weeks ago which gave some guidance on how they might do their own strategic planning, and a framework in which planning is to be placed; and the draft mission statement and institutional objectives now under review. The Subcommittee also has a data problem. "Some of the processes were not designed to collect data for the uses that they are now being put to. Further, if data are not entered in the right form, you can't get them out no matter how good the data system is. Even if data are right, it's sometimes hard to find them and put them in the right form and then people may view data differently. If it's in your best interest to look at it one way versus some other way, you will do that." Since there are those variations, the plan is to use both qualitative and quantitative approaches. He summarized by saying that PAIP is the old driver on the process, since so much work had been done. The intention was to add on to the PAIP process, supplementing it with different kinds of variables and seeing how they match. "Then we will identify those units that might warrant further study. Eventually this will build into the strategic planning effort,

which will occur next spring."

Senator Pitt asked if, in connection with the request to Deans that they submit by December 1 their perspectives on their units, a directive had been issued requiring that Deans gather input from department heads. Dr. Caldwell said he did not believe there was a directive, but perhaps a suggestion to that effect. He said he was aware of Deans who were doing that.

Senator Young asked if Dr. Caldwell could tell the Senate where faculty participation occurred in this process, and how he envisioned the role of the Faculty Senate, members of the faculty and the student body in shared governance. Dr. Caldwell said he could guess at it. In its last five meetings, the Subcommittee had been laying out the process as it moved along, and working on the question of what kind of data it should look at. "That took a lot of debate to try to come to some closure on it. Once we get to the point where certain units are identified for additional evaluation, then that information must be transmitted to the Dean, to the units affected, to see first if the data on which the identification was made are even correct. Once a unit enters a category where more review is required, then there will definitely be faculty involvement."

Dr. Nadel added that the Gottfredson Report, which led to the creation of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, specified how many members were to come from faculty governance. The requisite number was appointed, and the five Faculty Senators, not counting the Provost, are the Senate's representatives to that committee. He said faculty governance was involved from day one, as mandated by the Gottfredson Report.

Senator Desai said he was concerned that the important component of follow-up appeared to be missing from the process. While a small reorganization might not require any follow-up, one involving a consolidation, an elimination, or a "transplant" could benefit from a follow-up procedure to ensure that the reorganization progresses in such a manner as to accomplish the desired goals. "This is like a minor surgery. After surgery, you want to follow up. Otherwise, the patient may go to sleep. Somebody should keep tabs on it, what is going on, how the resources are distributed among the units, so that no unit is affected in an adverse manner, and I suggest that the follow-up part should be added to the process." Dr. Caldwell agreed that it was not on the list, but Senator Desai's thinking was right on track with some of the issues the Subcommittee has raised related to formalizing the process in future years, when some of these actions will have to be tracked. Senator Desai added that after a reorganization has been approved by the Faculty Senate, there should be immediate, as opposed to future, follow-up to ensure there is not a problem. He said he was speaking from first-hand experience.

Senator Silverman said he had a comment and a question. Senator Garcia had reported that on those campuses where reorganization was successful, the Faculty Senate was intimately involved. Although the Senate does have representatives on the Subcommittee, it always seemed that the Faculty Senate received a report of what was being done. Perhaps today's session should have been held weeks ago, so that Senators' input would have had a more proactive impact. He said material presented thus far appears to be "a done deal. I'm not saying this is bad--it may be perfectly good, but I don't know where we stand and at what stage we are. Maybe it is the responsibility of those Faculty Senators who are on this Subcommittee to bring this to us. Because this is such an important matter, perhaps at each Senate meeting at least one Senate member of the Subcommittee could make a report." He added that it is difficult to assess and react to

something in an intelligent way when it is first presented. He then asked Dr. Caldwell what would occur after the Subcommittee had completed its recommendations--to whom would it submit its recommendations and what would happen then?

Dr. Caldwell said it might be difficult to respond, because the Provost had left the meeting, but he would try. He said the University Budget and Strategic Planning Committee's original charge was strategic planning, and did not include this activity. But because of the budget situation and other restructuring questions, and many of the same points that drive the library reorganization, many departments could be pushed to look for more efficient ways to use resources. The Subcommittee decided to concentrate on the restructuring aspect this semester, writing the process as it proceeds. He said he has talked with Senator Reynolds, but, in view of Senator Silverman's comments, perhaps something more needs to be done about communication between the Subcommittee and the Faculty Strategic Planning and Budget Committee. "All I can tell you is that there is clear agreement on the committee that at the time a unit is chosen for more detailed review, then there has to be a lot more involvement with everybody."

Senator Garcia said that "Today's discussion is the Senate's opportunity to comment on those processes that the Strategic Planning Subcommittee is considering. Nothing has been done. No units have been identified. Nothing is on the table. This is the opportunity to discuss what criteria and processes to use. That's why we are here today. If you don't like what you've heard, then you better speak up. The process, as I understand it, is the following: the Strategic Planning Subcommittee, through the mechanisms described, will identify some number of units for further study. The names of those units will be transmitted to the Deans and to the units involved. They will provide additional data and documentation. There may be open forums, sponsored by the Strategic Planning Subcommittee. If any of those units are still on the table after that process is over, then the Provost, who chairs this Strategic Planning Subcommittee, will submit a recommendation to the President. The President will then ask the Faculty Senate to initiate the process mandated by the Board of Regents if that is the route which is appropriate at that point. In loose terms, that is the sequence that will be followed. What I have described has not been agreed to by anyone, only discussed."

Dr. Nadel added that, while the intermediate steps have not yet been determined, in terms of the final steps, nothing will occur that doesn't go through the President and back to the Senate, in compliance with the ABOR-mandated reorganization policy.

President Pacheco: "I think what I needed to say has been said. There's just one addition that I would make, and that is that we need to remember that the composition of this particular committee was, in essence, a compromise to make sure that we didn't have dual committees dealing with the same issue."

Senator Dickinson asked about the "initial triggers for further analysis": would only 0s and 1s with narrative uncertainty be reviewed? Dr. Caldwell said he did not want to say absolutely, but generally, yes. "The idea was that if a faculty group accorded a unit the level of 2 ("exceeds criteria"), then maybe we don't want to waste our time on it. There's a feeling that we don't know exactly what the right answer is. The next meeting of the committee is going to be a broad discussion on just what these kinds of variables are. Everybody is reviewing a great deal of data right now, and if a unit comes up through multiple sorts... and if the unit is pretty low on whatever the variable means, and it had a 2 on PAIP, that seems like an anomaly, so maybe we ought to go back and look at it."

But generally speaking, what we have found so far--the two of us that have the codes, the Institutional Research office and me--the Os on the PAIP are the ones that tend to be low on some of these other variables."

Senator Neuman asked about one item on the overview list, which he said disturbed him: Primary Criteria Choices. There appeared to be agreement on the essential nature of centrality, but questions on the issue of efficiency and recognition of the difficulty in measuring quality. "But are we talking about retaining, maintaining, or supporting programs which are central and efficient but that don't necessarily have quality? Or perhaps if they are identified as being central, and important to this institution, we could help them to attain the requisite efficiency and quality, but if we cannot muster the resources, we will consider eliminating those programs?"

Dr. Caldwell: "This is a problem...Once the codes are broken, and the Subcommittee members can address individual issues more openly, some of that will be taken care of....Most likely, the PAIP report narrative picked up something on that, and we can pick that up as well. But the units that will fall through the system are easier to find than the ones that should have fallen through but didn't. Your point is a good one. We are aware of it, and we need to progress on how we will deal with it."

Senator E. Williams said he had centered on the same point, and he wished to pursue it further. Another way of looking at it is that those units which may not be central or efficient may be difficult to evaluate quantitatively, and therefore they might be looked upon in a special way. He asked if he had understood Dr. Caldwell to say this matter was so "difficult to ascertain" that the Subcommittee had just set it aside.

Dr. Caldwell said it hadn't been eliminated, just set aside. In response to his first question, a unit low in numbers will show up easily. It will be easier to address the quality issue after the first cut.

Dr. Nadel noted that the PAIP review did address the quality factor, but not centrality. There are some measures of quality built into what has been done so far, for example, the amount of sponsored dollars and external funding is one aspect of quality, although for some units it is not a relevant issue. He said he thought Dr. Caldwell's main point was that quality will become a factor when the codes have been broken, and the units identified by name. "Quality is defined on a unit-by-unit basis. The way to measure quality differs between, for example, the Departments of English, Physics or Psychology."

Armando Vargas, Staff Advisory Council observer, noting that reorganization affects the whole University community, asked what would be the involvement of students, classified staff, and academic professionals, and secondly, would the reorganized university be more customer-focussed, both internally and externally?

Dr. Caldwell, in answer to the first question, said the Subcommittee membership includes one staff member, Pat Pringle, and one student member, Derek Lewis. When a unit has been identified as requiring further review, there will have to be more involvement with other people. Secondly, he said he was familiar with the debate on the word "customer," but his sense was that the world is heading towards "customer focus." How it is defined may be a temporary problem, but the campus will probably focus on "user" kinds of questions in the future as the planning and management improvement process continues.

Senator Inman asked how many 0-rated units there were. Dr. Nadel said there were six or eight academic, degree-granting units in that category, although there were more 0-rated units in the PAIP process as a whole. Dr. Caldwell added that there were about 15 units in the 1 category that contained some narrative comment that would indicate they should be flagged and reviewed.

Senator J. O'Brien said he was involved in the PAIP process, and wondered if an attempt would be made to test the reliability of the PAIP data. Would another group of researchers have come up with the same identical reading? Dr. Caldwell responded that there were some variations among the teams. Team members were new and had to become accustomed to the process. "If we believed that PAIP was the complete answer, we wouldn't be searching for other kinds of supporting evidence; we would simply review units with the designation of 0. Because of that kind of concern, the Subcommittee decided to review additional criteria, and then compare. "The point we're making is neither way should stand alone; a review of the data, a comparison with the AAU institutions as an external check, and feedback from the Deans on what they think about their own units--all of those put together start to suggest something if the same unit keeps appearing in various measures. That provides a comfort level. Even at that, once you identify the unit, then you have to go back in and reevaluate that unit. This process simply cuts down a large number to a manageable number for in-depth review."

Senator Hammond asked if he understood Dr. Caldwell to say that the Subcommittee did not know how to define centrality. If that was the case, why was it being used? Dr. Caldwell said the Subcommittee didn't know how to say, strategically speaking, which areas would be classified as high priority. But it did know what is central in a major university. Senator Hammond asked him to explain. Dr. Caldwell said if student demand, for example, is very high in some units, there could be two reasons for that. Either it is central to a big university and we ought to be providing it, or it's the easy way through the university, and "a bunch of students are flocking there." That, he said, was a quality issue. Units that are in high demand, award many degrees, generate many student credit hours and sponsored projects, and the latter would not be funded if the program did not have some quality, could be an indicator of centrality. Senator Hammond expressed concern about viewing centrality as a function of student demand, because student demand is a function of all sorts of things not related to centrality. Dr. Nadel stated that, in principle, if there was a clear university mission, centrality would be driven by that mission. But even when a clear statement of the university mission exists, and everyone buys into it, it would be so multi-faceted that it would be very difficult to differentiate the central programs from those that are peripheral. Centrality is an easy word to use to describe a certain feature of what characterizes a program. It differs from efficiency, effectiveness, and quality, and is a demand type of characteristic. But he said Senator Hammond was right: "We certainly wouldn't want to put all the money where all the students show up, but on the other hand, you wouldn't want to ignore that, either."

Senator Atwater asked how recent the data are that will be involved in this evaluation, and whether they have been updated since the PAIP reports were written. Dr. Caldwell said the data are one year newer: Fall 1992. Some suffer from some of the questions raised in PAIP, with reference to individual departments. He said the process is not on automatic. It needs more work, and the Subcommittee has to check out the data. He stressed the triage kind of approach.

Senator Jones, addressing Senator Silverman's earlier comments, said he would like to hear Senate thoughts on how the Subcommittee should address a very high quality department identified for review, in terms of the University's limited resources and other departments, for example English, that may need more resources. He said he did not know how to do that, and he thought the Subcommittee would welcome comments or suggestions to help it deal with difficult issues. He also said he was sensitive to the matter of coming to the Senate after decisions have already been made. "What we have been trying to do so far is to identify the kinds of criteria, the kinds of concerns that might be used in the preliminary identification process. We have put a lot of work into developing many kinds of criteria and data to be addressed. If you have comments or suggestions, now is the time for addressing them. Perhaps we should, if the Senate wishes, make a regular monthly report so that we can gather your comments.

Senator Garcia reiterated that this is early, not late, in the process. Nothing had been done thus far. A few indicators were chosen to be reviewed, but nothing was firm.

Dr. Zwolinski commented that the hour of 5:00 was at hand, and asked if the Senate wished to continue on for a few minutes. There being no objection, Dr. Zwolinski permitted discussion to continue.

Senator Myers said he did not know the full details of what happened at the University of Maryland, but he had heard about their process. It seemed to him there was a fundamental difference between what occurred there and the process being utilized on our campus. They looked at their University as a whole and started with the premise that faculty would, in fact, not be fired, but might be shifted to different positions. Our institution is looking at units as independent, unrelated organizations, and not looking at departments that do not award degrees. "Departments don't award degrees. The University awards degrees. A major consists of perhaps 30 to 40 units, and a degree of 120 to 130. All parts of the University contribute to the education of the student, not just a single unit, even at the graduate level. It is insufficient merely to look at units...you must look at the University. Centrality must be a basic and fundamental part of the question."

Senator Neuman said he was in support of Senator Myers' comments. The problems being faced are serious, and with the lack of formal strategic directions and priorities for the University, decisions taken by the University will be piecemeal.

Senator Silverman said he believes the Subcommittee should bear in mind, as it proceeds, the need for sensitivity to faculty and staff morale. The longer the process drags out, the more difficult it will be for people who may think that this will affect them. The campus community should be kept informed, not just the Faculty Senate. He suggested articles in *Lo Que Pasa*, as well as other vehicles, to let people know exactly what is happening as activities proceed. He said he believes many people are fearful of the process and what will occur.

Dr. Zwolinski thanked Dr. Caldwell and Dr. Nadel for their presence, and Faculty Senators for their comments.

11. APPROVAL OF CURRICULUM BULLETIN: Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 7, Section I, was moved (motion 1993/94-27) and seconded. Senator Myers requested 'disestablish,' which appears in paragraphs A, B and C, be deleted and replaced by 'terminate.' A voice vote indicated approval as amended.

Approval of Section III was then moved (motion 1993/94-28A) and seconded. Senator Zukoski asked if any progress was being made to find out what these new courses cost. Dr. Zwolinski responded that the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee is making some progress, and is reviewing the whole process of curriculum development and how new courses get approved. Senator Myers said he noted, under Psychology 571, a statement that indicates for a description of course topics, the reader should refer to Psychology 471, but there were no course topics listed under 471. He wondered whether 571 and 471 would be convened together. Senator Garcia said he did not think the Senate should approve something that was not well written. Senator Myers then moved (motion 1993/94-28B) that consideration of these two courses be tabled. That motion was seconded, and a voice vote indicated approval. A voice vote on motion 1993/94-28A, with approval of Psychology 471/571 tabled, also indicated approval, with one abstention.

12. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

13. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 1, 1993:

1993/94-25 Approval of three recommendations submitted by the Research Park Subcommittee.

1993/94-26 Acceptance of the Promotion/Tenure/Continuing Status Report of Actions Taken in 1992-93 to be Effective in 1993-94.

1993/94-27 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 7, Section I.

1993/94-28A Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 7, Section III, except for two courses.

1993/94-28B Approval of motion to table consideration of two courses listed in Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 7, Section III.