

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
November 6, 1995

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

Present: Senators Abrams, Adamowicz, Aleamoni, Anderson, Arechederra, Atwater, Barrett, Buras, Clarke, Dahlgran, David, Driggs, Emrick, Erickson, Feltham, Forbes, Hill, Houk, Huete, Joens, Larson, Levy, Mare, McElroy, Mount, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pintozzi, Reiter, Schooley, Schwarz, Silverman, Smith, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troy, Warburton, Witte and Zwolinski. Observer Tenney (SAC) and Jull (APOC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Ayers, Coons, Desai, Dvorak, Gerber, Goggans, Gruener, Hallick, Jacobs, Marchalonis, Medine, Mitchell, Neuman, Reynolds, Sharkey, Spece, Troth, and Williams.

2. **OPEN SESSION:**

Senator Karen Anderson proposed Faculty Senate oversight of the new campus to ensure a faculty role in its development and in the decisions that will be made concerning tenure, academic programs and structure. Senator Ken Smith pointed out that the Senate has such a committee, chaired by Senator Williams.

Senator Marlys Witte proposed that, for those who might be feeling negative on issues, they consider reading The Joy of Negative Thinking.

Senator Jim O'Brien commented on the recent change at the Park Avenue Garage, whereby 200 spaces were reallocated for the public. He conjectured that the move would increase income from the Garage by 1/4 of a million dollars a year.

3. **REPORTS:**

- 3A. **President Manuel Pacheco**

President Pacheco reported that the Arizona Board of Regents had approved the University's recommendation concerning a leased space for the initial site of the new campus in Pima County, covering a period of three to five years; it also approved the setting aside of 100 acres at the Science and Technology Park for a possible permanent site.

President Pacheco also reported that the Board approved a change in title for Vice Provost James Dalen to Vice President for Health Services. He noted that, since 1992, Dr. Dalen has had the general coordinating responsibility for the entire Arizona Health Science Center. More recently, however, the entire field of health care delivery has become increasingly complex in Arizona and the nation at large, and these problems involve internal relationships as well as external relationships with state governance and the health care delivery system in Arizona. He noted that some management responsibilities will be reallocated, but that the change will not increase the number of administrators nor involve a change in salary.

4B. Provost Paul S. Sypherd

Provost Sypherd, commenting on President Pacheco's October announcement regarding the 14+% increase in contract and grant support brought to the University by faculty, noted that the increase did not mean that state dollars had been reallocated to research, but that it represented funding that faculty and staff competed for--effectively--on the national scene, providing a tremendous fallout for educational programs for both undergraduate and graduate students.

He stated that major improvements will be made to existing classrooms over a five-year period through the expenditure of \$10 million which will come primarily through reallocation of University funds.

Concerning core curriculum guidelines, the Spring 1996 pilot courses continue under faculty supervision. As soon as there is a concrete proposal to present to the Faculty Senate, that will happen.

Provost Sypherd, with the aid of an overhead projector, presented some statistics and characteristics of recent high school graduating classes and the Fall 1995 freshman class (copy attached in Appendix) (1) 26% of Arizona students who enter their freshman year in high school will drop out before finishing; the figure for Pima County is 44%. Of those who graduate from Arizona high schools, 40% are not eligible for Arizona universities, 34% are eligible, and of the total graduating from Arizona high schools, 14% ultimately enroll in Arizona universities. The freshman class of Fall 1995 showed improvements over past classes: average grade point average is 3.23; SAT scores have gone up a small amount; and minority admissions increased by 2%, bringing them to approximately 35%. (2) Of the 20 Flinn scholarships awarded state-wide, which must be used within the State of Arizona, 13 came to the UofA, bringing the UA to a total of 56 of the 80 Flinn scholarships in the State. (3) This Fall, there were 64 new National Merit Scholarship recipients, for a total of 184 on our campus, placing us 19th in the nation in terms of attracting National Merit Scholars. (4) There are 46 new Robert C. Byrd Scholars in the freshman class, for a total of 100 on campus. (5) There are 550 Regents Scholars in the new freshman class. (6) 600 Finish-in-Four Contracts were written during the summer orientation. (7) 44% of Fall 1995 freshmen from Arizona entered the UA, 25% NAU, and 31% ASU.

He said some troubling features about the freshman class included the following: Of those that enter, 23% will be unable to take a college-level English composition course; 42% will be unable to take a college-level mathematics course. 70% of our entering freshman class plan on working while going to school, of which about 28% will work more than 20 hours a week.

Provost Sypherd urged Faculty Senators to find out more about our freshman class by volunteering for a Freshman Colloquia. There are approximately 100 freshman colloquia in operation this semester, and the administration has made a commitment to the Regents that by this time next year, there will be 145.

3C. Faculty Chair John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz reported that the Board of Regents has had two discussions on tenure: one in July and one in August. Provisional plans appear to call for at least three more discussions in January, February and March of the coming year and possibly extending beyond that. He said that the Arizona Faculties Council, together with the chief academic officers of UA, NAU, ASU and ASU-West, are engaged in the gathering and analysis of information concerning a variety of aspects of tenure, in order to be able to have input into the Board of Regents as its discussions proceed. Among the topics that the AFC and the chief academic officers are looking at are: the role of tenure in protecting academic

freedom, market considerations concerning the role of tenure in the recruitment and retention of top flight faculty, and recent developments in the personnel policy of the universities in the context of tenure systems.

He also expressed appreciation to Senators who had presented comments on the co-governance proposal discussed at the October 30 Senate meeting. The comments were recorded and will be considered along with ideas and comments from meetings with faculty, deans and others. A revised draft will be resubmitted to the Senate at a later time.

He shared the balance of his report time with Senator Smith, who had placed on Senators' desks a revision to the Committee of Eleven's comments on the co-governance proposal. Senator Smith noted that at a recent meeting, the Committee had made some revisions in the document it had presented to the Senate at the October 30 meeting. (1) On page 1, the sentence "We...reject as a step backwards both the process used to develop the so-called co-governance document and the substance of this document circulated to the Faculty Senate and academic deans and college council chairpersons on October 18, 1995, which we believe will seriously weaken and dilute the faculty voice and reverse the aforementioned progress already made" had been deleted and replaced with the following statement: "We hereby in furtherance of the goal of implementing shared governance offer the attached declaration of principles." He noted that the Declaration of Governance Principles Concerning Shared Governance had also been modified (copy attached to Appendix).

3D. Secretary Andrew Silverman

Secretary Silverman commented that, concerning shared governance, the bottom line is really not structure and process, but attitude, both on the part of the administration and the faculty to bring about shared governance where the administration and faculty are equal partners. Nothing is written in stone yet, and even though we may disagree about some of the particulars, he hoped faculty would agree on the goal of a stronger position for faculty in the area of shared governance.

3E. ASUA President Ben Driggs

Senator Driggs reported that ASUA had appointed its seventh 1995-96 representative to the Faculty Senate: Clinton David, a senior with double major in Molecular and Cellular Biology and Psychology.

In addition, one student Senator had to resign due to a conflict with the meeting time, and that spot has been filled by Chris Houk, a senior in Political Science.

He reported that the date set for Spring Fling coincided with Easter weekend and the Passover period. ASUA was unable to change the date, but is reviewing as many options as possible to lessen the impact in terms of the religious commitments students may have at that time.

Senator Driggs also reported that on February 22, the Arizona Students Association will host a debate on the ASU campus for Republican Presidential candidates. The event will be co-hosted with the State Republican Party. Students will be able to ask the candidates questions; at least 150 tickets will be available to UA students. He also reported that three UofA students attended a higher education financial aid form held in Washington, D.C. a few weeks ago. The students met with several members of the Arizona Congressional delegation to talk about the proposed cuts in federal financial aid.

Senator Driggs said that he was a participant in an Arizona Town Hall, and was surprised that most of the panels discussed the tenure issue. He noted some negative perceptions from people in the private sector on this issue.

Senator Driggs, in support of Provost Sypherd's request for volunteers for freshman colloquia, said he has talked with many freshman who have spoken very positively about the freshman colloquia. He encouraged faculty to get involved.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Witte asked if she could be informed as to the schedule of Faculty Senate Executive Committee meetings, and be provided with a copy of the committee's minutes. She believes the issue of the committee's role is an important one, particularly because of the proposed changes of the committee under the co-governance proposal. Senator Atwater noted that all that information can be made available.

Senator Szilagyi asked Provost Sypherd what was the role of grant funds in the evaluation of faculty research performance. Provost Sypherd responded that it was clear that the University could not apply criteria of obtaining funds to a large segment of the faculty because their scholarship is usually done without outside grant funding. In those cases, the scholarship is evaluated, during the P&T process, by obtaining peer opinion. He said that there is a tendency to evaluate scientists and engineers in the P&T process as to whether or not they have been able to obtain outside funding, not as a dollar evaluation, but as an indication of peer evaluation. He added that in some areas it is virtually impossible to carry on state-of-the-art research without significant financial resources that are not made available by the State of Arizona.

Senator Feltham asked President Pacheco if there had yet been consideration of the northwest corridor for a location for the new Pima County campus. President Pacheco said that a corridor in the northwest section of the city was considered in the recommendations that were made by the Citizen's Committee. When the Board authorized the search for appropriate locations, they limited the search to cost-effective sites: one downtown and two at the Science and Technology Park. With the Board's recent action, he thought it likely that other sites will be reviewed.

Senator McElroy asked Provost Sypherd to clarify his comments on core curriculum. Provost Sypherd responded that, during the summer, a group of about 70 faculty thought about and developed criteria, objectives and principles that would be applied to three core areas, although he believed that they limited themselves to Tier One. As a result, several of those individuals said that they would like to develop courses to be piloted in the spring semester. The courses were submitted to the Arts and Sciences General Education Committee, for approval as experimental courses. Senator McElroy asked if it has been decided that we will have a core curriculum. Provost Sypherd said that has not been decided, but that issue would eventually come before the Senate.

Senator J. O'Brien said he appreciated the demographics Provost Sypherd presented on our student population, and he wondered if the University's liberal drop policy mitigated finishing in four years. Provost Sypherd said it was his understanding that the withdrawal and grade replacement policies are policies of the faculty and can be reviewed by them.

Senator Smith asked President Pacheco when courses and curriculum for the new campus would be submitted to the Faculty Senate for review, in view of the fact that the program will be initiated next fall. President Pacheco noted that the Board of Regents, when it approved the creation of this new campus, specified that classes would start in the Fall of 1996. At its last meeting, the Regents approved a general academic plan. President Pacheco said he assumed the beginning curriculum will

be presented to the Board sometime in early 1996, but at the present time, he was not sure if it would be presented to the Faculty Senate.

Senator McElroy asked Chair Schwarz for an update on the Administrative Costs Committee. Senator Schwarz reported that the committee's first scheduled meeting is scheduled for November 15, and that he has tried to arrange support assistance.

Senator Silverman, following up on Senator Smith's comments about the new campus, noted that so far the Faculty Senate has had no input into any facet of the new campus. While an advisory group was appointed by the new campus Provost, the Senate has no representative on it. He wondered whether the Senate should become more pro-active, and request a report. Although the new campus will eventually be free-standing, the faculty and administration of the UA campus has a responsibility.

Senator Anderson commented that this is an issue where co-governance could start. Since decisions are being made, and since those decisions will have a long-term effect on the structure of that campus, she thought the Senate should be involved in oversight because how the new campus gets structured will affect the kind of students we can recruit, the kind of collegial community we will have available in this area, and the reputation of higher education in the State of Arizona.

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of October 2, 1995 were approved as amended: on page 1, President's Report, paragraph three, the second sentence was changed to read: "President Pacheco said he believed that Affirmative Action has accomplished basic improvements over the past 25 years, and that it is still needed today; he thought it would be a mistake for us to be guided by the most recent debate in the University of California system. The Regents also continued their discussion on tenure as part of their ongoing intent to review Conditions of Faculty Service. The President said that tenure is a necessary condition for the future well-being of this University for two reasons:"

5. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON CURRICULAR PROPOSAL CONCERNING NAME CHANGE FOR THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

Senator Fred Hill, Chair, Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), reported that the proposal to change the name of the College of Agriculture to the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences had been approved by the Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council, the Deans Council, the Provost's Advisory Committee, and the President's Cabinet. ICPC was bringing the proposal to the Senate for consideration and action, but with no recommendation. In summarizing the arguments for and against the proposed name change, he said, in favor of the change, that the College of Agriculture does other things besides agriculture, much of which are in the area of life sciences. And, in opposition, the addition of Life Sciences to the name of the College might imply some sort of exclusivity to the area of life sciences.

Senator Joens then moved (motion 1995/96-10) for approval to change the name of the College of Agriculture to the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Senator Zwolinski seconded.

Senator Zwolinski said that the College of Agriculture believes it is in need of a name change because it houses programs that are not reflected by the name Agriculture. He reviewed the long process followed by the College in seeking input from its faculty, and there was strong support shown.

Senator Witte said that she was in agreement with Senator Levy's comments as contained in the Lo Que Pasa article. She said she thought the name would result in confusion, because Life Sciences are not exclusive to Agriculture. She suggested an alternative like Agriculture and Related Sciences, and indicated she would vote against this proposal.

Senator S. O'Brien, in favor of the name change, offered the School of Family and Consumer Resources as an Agriculture unit that, with Family Studies in its curriculum, was a good example of Life Sciences in Agriculture. She said the majority of undergraduate and graduate students in such programs as Child Development, retailing, and the Southwest Retail Center are surprised to learn that their programs are housed in Agriculture.

Senator Emrick, a member of ICPC, said there was a great deal of discussion and disagreement on this issue when it was discussed in committee, and it was his personal opinion that the term was misleading and implied that all Life Sciences programs were contained in that one college. He said the committee did discuss a possible alternative, Agricultural Sciences, to indicate the broader scope.

Senator Mare commented on one letter in the information packet which stated that the present name is short, inclusive, and informative, but in his nearly 20 years in Agriculture, he has struggled with the fact that it is anything but informative or inclusive, but is rather exclusive and misleading. He reported that close to a majority of the faculty in the College of Agriculture have nothing whatsoever to do with agriculture, and possibly more than half of Agriculture's students are not in agricultural sciences, but are in Microbiology, Pre-Vet, or Pre-Med. He added that this same issue has been raised on other major college campuses, which have chosen a more descriptive name.

Senator Smith stated that the fact that units in the College of Agriculture are doing things that are not agricultural is not an argument for changing the name, but rather removing such units and placing them where they logically belong.

Senator Huete commented that the majority of the Agriculture faculty were requesting this name change. He added that the name of the College of Medicine is so self-explanatory that they would have no need to attach Life Sciences to it. Focusing on the miscommunication provided to students, he said that as the Environmental Science major advisor, he has many students who transfer into Agriculture in their third or fourth year because they were unaware the program existed, and they must spend five or six years to get their Bachelor degree. Other students don't want an Agriculture degree because they feel it would not be marketable, so they enroll in other colleges, but use Senator Huete as their advisor. They want the program, but note the Agriculture degree. He thought this was a serious disservice to students.

Senator Clarke said he would not object to a name change, because it was clear that the College of Agriculture is doing a lot more than agriculture, but he wondered why some of those units are housed within Agriculture. He agreed with Senator Witte and others that the proposed name is too broad and misleading.

Senator Mount, of the Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology (MCB), sought input from his department and from the Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (EEB) Department and the Biochemistry Department. He reported that EEB voted unanimously against this proposal, MCB voted 8 against and 4 abstentions, and Biochemistry's results were similar to those of MCB. Science faculty appear to be strongly supportive of Dean Levy's comments concerning the name change.

Senator McElroy said he had been persuaded by Dean Levy's written remarks on the basis of language and the meaning of words. The naming of a college should indicate what is predominantly going on in the college, and life sciences are distributed among a number of colleges, but Senator Mare made a persuasive argument in pointing out that current academic practices are not strictly agriculture. He thought this problem should be remedied by organizational changes.

Senator Joens asked for permission for Dean Eugene Sander of the College of Agriculture to address the Senate. Hearing no objections, Senator Atwater invited him to speak.

Dean Sander said that the problem with the name of Agriculture is that it is stereotypical. The general public believes Agriculture relates solely to farming. Because farms are becoming larger, there are fewer people actually involved in that stereotypic view of what this name implies. Across the nation, the leading Colleges of Agriculture have expanded into the Life Sciences in relation to the agricultural industry, and our College has also done that, successfully. The Agriculture faculty believe that the addition of Life Sciences to the name, for which there is strong precedent in this country, would be very positive. He added that it would be presumptuous of Agriculture to determine that it had exclusive license for life sciences courses. He noted that the proposal for the name change had been approved by every college encompassed within the Arizona Health Sciences Center.

Senator Silverman said he had a sense that the motion might not be approved. He moved (motion 1995/96-11) that the motion be amended to read that the College of Agriculture be renamed to the College of Agriculture and Related Life Sciences. Senator Smith seconded.

Senator Dahlgran said that he thought it was not a good idea for the Senate to propose a renaming without giving Agriculture units an opportunity to consider their own modifications. Senator Hill urged withdrawal of the amendment. He said that if the motion fails, it would not be the end of the issue. ICPC would be willing to assume some responsibility, and another name could be negotiated and brought forward at a later time. After further comments, the amendment was withdrawn.

Senator Levy said that, although he has spoken against the proposed name change, he wanted to make it clear that his opposition did not constitute a diminishment of his admiration for what the College of Agriculture does. His primary concern was that the name change might cause miscommunication, and he said he would be supportive of changing the name to something more suitable.

Upon a "show of hands" vote, the motion was defeated by a vote of 14 for approval and 20 opposed, with 2 abstentions.

6. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON CURRICULAR PROPOSAL CONCERNING NAME CHANGE FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACY PRACTICE

Senator Fred Hill, Chair, Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), said that the Department of Pharmacy Practice had submitted a proposal for a name change to the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science. The proposal had been approved by the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council, and ICPC was submitting it for approval as a seconded motion (1995/96-12).

Senator Atwater asked if the Senate thought it would be in order to hear from a representative of the College of Pharmacy. There being no objection, she called on Dr. John Murphy, Head, Department of Pharmacy Practice. Dr. Murphy said that the name has evolved nationally from the Department of Clinical Pharmacy to its present name, and the Department has a number of different faculty groups,

including clinical faculty. He noted that both the Department and College had overwhelmingly approved the proposal. A voice vote indicated approval.

7. **DISCUSSION ON THE INTEGRATED INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITY (IIF)**

Dr. Michael Gottfredson, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, said that the IIF building is one leg of a three-legged stool designed to improve instructional facilities for our undergraduate students. An upgrade of equipment for undergraduate classrooms represents the first leg. The first phase is now underway as approximately \$400,000 of instructional equipment will be added by the end of this semester. The second leg of the stool is the physical reconstruction of many existing classrooms, with the next phase starting in December and scheduled to be completed by the end of Summer 1996, focusing on PAS and Harvill Buildings as the principal targets. The third leg of the stool is the development of a new undergraduate classroom facility, designed to be high technology and dedicated to the first-year students, which is the IIF Building. A large committee worked on the design and the site most of last year. The primary criteria in selecting a site was close proximity to the Main Library, to residence halls, and to the Student Union. The three possible sites chosen were the Visitor Center Parking Lot, Bear Down Gymnasium, and on the Mall in front of the Library with an integrated/underground building. A top-ranked architectural firm has been hired. The building will cost approximately \$20 million.

Senator Feltham asked if anyone has looked into the psychological problems of people housed in a building without windows. He noted that those who work in the Pentagon experience major problems. He also wondered if students would want to come to Arizona to go underground for the year. Dr. Gottfredson said that one of the firms they are in discussion with will have as one of their consultants the director of the academic underground space program at the University of Minnesota, and there is considerable opinion that windows present an obstacle to high technology.

Senator McElroy said that, of the three original sites, he thought that the underground one was the least desirable choice because of his own personal views on teaching underground. Secondly, he asked if any consideration had been given to the \$1 million in overdue maintenance expenses reported by Provost Sypherd in 1994-95. The \$20 million for IIF, combined with the \$10 million for the five-year improvement plan, he said, could well take care of maintenance costs. He also asked if cost had been taken into account in choosing the underground site. Dr. Gottfredson responded that some classrooms are, indeed, an embarrassment, but the \$10 million program was designed to correct that problem. But we also need new, modern classrooms with facilities akin to our peer universities. He concluded that we need both improvements to current facilities and additional new facilities. Concerning the cost factor, he said that cost was taken into account. Senator McElroy asked if the mall site represented the cheapest alternative. Dr. Gottfredson responded that it was not one of the least expensive, but it would be difficult to say whether it would be less expensive than the Bear Down site.

Senator Anderson said she was surprised to learn no study has been done on the psychological effects of being underground. She expressed concern with the possible linkage of the building to a core curriculum which does not yet exist. She concluded that classroom size is being predicated on assumptions about the core curriculum, in effect adapting curriculum to buildings. She concluded that decisions about instructional technology are often made without consultation with faculty and without appreciation for the range of pedagogical issues related to different fields.

Senator Clarke said that the Visitor Parking Center seemed like it would have been an ideal site for the IIF. He wondered if it had not been selected because of the parking spaces it would displace, and if thought had been given, instead, to creating a parking garage under the mall. Dr. Gottfredson

responded that that site had a number of obstacles, the primary one being size and the consequent need to employ a Harvill-like design, which would not easily accommodate 4500 students a day.

8. **DISCUSSION ON THE 120-UNIT MAXIMUM**

Senator Atwater reported that the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC) had joined with the Undergraduate Council this fall until the Undergraduate Council was restructured, so Senator Hill, Chair of ICPC and Chair of the Undergraduate Council, was representing both groups in presenting the information gathered by the Undergraduate Council on the status of units required for all University degrees.

Senator Hill said that a year ago, the Board of Regents passed a resolution that all undergraduate degrees at the University of Arizona should require only 120 units, and the Regents have now requested a progress report. During the summer, the Provost's Office requested that all departments submit their 120-unit curriculum or request an exception. He said 75 departments achieved the 120-unit requirement, but a large number of programs requested exceptions. If an individual unit insisted on keeping a particular program or a particular number of units, that's the way it went into the report, and it's a matter of seeing how the individual deans and the Regents will resolve the issue.

Senator McElroy said he was concerned that the Board of Regents initiated the 120-unit requirement without consultation with faculty. Senator Hill responded that if the Regents accept the report, really major damage has not been done to our programs, but if they challenge it and request further cuts, then the faculty can react. Senator Smith commented that it seemed likely the Regents would challenge the report, because the 120-unit requirement was aligned with their desire that students finish in four years.

9. **ADJOURNMENT** The meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.

Andrew Silverman
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix*

1. Statistics on Fall 1995 UofA Freshmen
2. Modified Statement of Declaration of Governance Principles Concerning Shared Governance: Committee of Eleven
3. Curricular Proposal Concerning Name Change for the College of Agriculture
4. Curricular Proposal Concerning Name Change for the Department of Pharmacy Practice
5. Summary of the Response to the 120-Unit Regents Mandate.

*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.