

**MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA**  
**January 22, 1996**

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

**Present:** Senators Abrams, Adamowicz, Anderson, Arechederra, Atwater, Ayers, Barrett, Buras, Clarke, Dahlgran, David, Desai, Driggs, Emrick, Forbes, Gerber, Gruener, Hill, Houk, Jacobs, Larson, Lei, Levy, Mare, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Reynolds, Schwarz, Smith, Spece, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troth, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Witte and Zwolinski. Observer Jull (APOC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

**Absent:** Senators Aleamoni, Coons, Dvorak, Erickson, Feltham, Goggans, Hallick, Joens, Marchalonis, McElroy, Medine, Mitchell, Mount, Pintozzi, Reiter, Schooley, Sharkey, and Silverman. Observer Schafer (SAC).

2. **OPEN SESSION:**

Senator Atwater introduced Senator Polin Lei, who is joining the Senate for the remainder of the year, replacing Senator-at-Large Huete, who is on sabbatical this semester.

Senator Witte, in response to comments made by Dr. Mike Gottfredson, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education concerning the disheveled state of some of the University's classrooms in which learning is unimaginable, said that in her opinion some superb learning and teaching was taking place in those very classrooms.

Senator J. O'Brien said that the Senate appeared to be becoming an agent of negative energy. He encouraged everyone to pull together and be more friendly.

3. **REPORTS:**

3A. **President Manuel Pacheco**

President Pacheco reported that, at the January Regents meeting, there was a tenure discussion facilitated by Dr. Richard Chait, a Professor of Higher Education at Harvard. He said the Board as a whole has come to appreciate the advantages of tenure and the willingness of the Faculty Senate to review the situation and to propose improvements. He expressed appreciation to those members of the Senate who took the time to speak to individual Board members about tenure. He said it had a very positive effect.

Concerning our 1996-97 State budget, the Governor and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC) recently released the budget proposals that will be the basis for legislative discussions over the coming weeks. The starting position is not encouraging for the universities. New funds for decision packages were recommended in only two cases: one from NAU (dealing with telecommunications) and the other from the College of Medicine (\$1.2 million for TeleMedicine Services). He said the Governor did not recommend funds to annualize the 2% salary increase that went into effect this month. In contrast, the JLBC did recommend \$3.2 million for this purpose. But, the Governor recommended a 2% merit increase effective January 1997 and .5% for classification review

adjustments. The JLBC recommended removing 2% from our Personal Services and ERE funding, about \$4 million, representing 118 FTE positions, with 1% going to the State General Funds and 1% reverting to the Board of Regents for reallocation on the basis of improvements in efficiency. The JLBC also recommended an additional \$279,000 for the Sierra Vista Branch Campus but proposes to reduce the new Arizona International Campus \$956,000 below this year's appropriation. With respect to building renewal funds, the JLBC has recommended \$17.2 million, and the Governor \$14.9 million. Historically, the UA has received about half of these appropriations because our buildings are older. President Pacheco stressed that because of increasing utility costs, the lack of new money for the Library and inflation, these budget proposals represent a multi-million dollar loss for us.

President Pacheco reminded Senators that some months ago, Provost Sypherd announced the administration's commitment to investing several million dollars on improvements to our classrooms, as part of the efforts to create first-class settings for undergraduate education and for faculty working conditions. The first 31 classrooms to be renovated were recently selected, and these projects should be complete in time for the Fall Semester.

**3B. Provost Paul S. Sypherd**

Provost Sypherd said that he has been here for three years, and there is no place he would rather be and no faculty he would rather serve. As our chief academic officer, he urged that we work together to pass on an institution that is better and stronger than the one that was passed to us. He proposed that we at the University of Arizona maximize the efficiency of our support, service and administrative dealings through process improvement. Interactive technology will play an important role in increasing efficiency in learning and will give our faculty new tools to do a better job. The issues of class sizes and the proposed core curriculum will continue to be addressed. If we are to become a great University, we must all join forces, use our resources wisely, cease quarreling, and respect and value each other.

**3C. Faculty Chair John Schwarz**

Chair Schwarz reported that, at its most recent meeting, the Board of Regents passed a motion making it clear that it did not want to alter the tenure system. That action represented a dramatic change since last summer. In its motion, the Board asked the three universities to undertake a post-tenure review process and to bring a proposal back to the Board on implementation. He said the concept is broadly compatible with the performance-based review system that the Senate adopted last April. The motion also requested the universities to review the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure procedures so as to assure that those procedure will stand up successfully in court, and to consider expanding membership on CAFT to include some personnel with judicial training. In addition, the Board is requesting the universities to review the promotion and tenure guidelines as they relate to the balancing of teaching and research in such decisions. Proposals from the three universities will be due by the late Fall, with general reports due in the late Spring and Summer. Chair Schwarz reported that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee referred the preparation of these proposals to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC), which will include for this effort the unofficial participation of the Chair of the Faculty, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Chair of the Committee of Eleven, and Past-Chairs of the APPC. The committee's charge will be to prepare the proposals, which will then be brought to the Senate for full deliberation and input.

**3D. Presiding Officer of the Senate Betty Atwater**

Senator Atwater reported that the Senate Executive Committee decided that the shared governance proposals that have been put forward by the Co-Governance Working Group and the Committee of Eleven would be discussed at the Senate's March meeting. Shortly after the February Senate meeting, a committee of five will be appointed, to include two members representing the Committee of Eleven, two members representing the Co-Governance Working Group, and one member from the Faculty Senate (Senator Malcolm Zwolinski). She said this ad hoc committee would be asked to review the Co-Governance Working Group and the Committee of Eleven documents to determine what general principles both documents seem to embody, and to identify areas of commonality and differences between them. The committee would report to the Senate no later than the April meeting.

Senator Atwater reported that the Executive Committee also discussed a motion approved at the December Senate meeting concerning the Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy (CICP), which called for printing the document in Lo Que Pasa, and requesting comments from the faculty by December 20. The Committee found it was unable to comply specifically with the motion because Lo Que Pasa had already gone to press, and the next issue didn't occur until January, plus it would have cost \$1,000 to publish the document as an insert. The issue was resolved by sending a memorandum to Deans, Directors and Department Heads, including the full copy of the proposed CICP, with a note asking that this be photocopied and a copy placed in each faculty member's mailbox. Responses were requested on or before January 26. Senator Atwater said the Executive Committee agreed to put together a committee made up of people who represent different points of view on the matter, with the objective of bringing the policy to the Senate for discussion and, hopefully, resolution.

**3E. ASUA President Ben Driggs**

Senator Driggs reported that ASUA is doing some research, in conjunction with Chair Schwarz, on what the student experience has been with graduate teaching assistants compared to their experiences with professors. He said that ASUA believes in the importance of ranked faculty in the classrooms. He also reported that ASUA has awarded the 16 \$1000 merit-based scholarships reported at the December Senate meeting.

**4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

Senator Neuman told Senator Atwater that he had not received the copy of the Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy which was to have been copied to all faculty by Deans, Directors and Department Heads. He asked if the deadline for response could be postponed so that every faculty member had the opportunity to review the document. Senator Atwater agreed to extend the deadline for response until February 2, 1996.

Senator J. O'Brien asked Senator Driggs if ASUA had any plans to publish faculty evaluations. Senator Driggs said that ASUA has submitted to the Undergraduate Council a proposal that a portion of the student evaluations be published and made available to students; a straw vote was taken, which showed support for the proposal. A more specific proposal will be presented to the Undergraduate Council at their next meeting.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 1995**

Senator Atwater reported that Secretary Silverman made a correction that was pointed out to him on page 4, line 3 in the first paragraph, under Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy, to indicate that the Policy was discussed by the Senate on both March 6 and March 20, 1995, and sent back to the

Research Policy Committee on March 20. Approval of the minutes of December 4, as revised, was then moved (motion 1995/96-23), seconded, and approved.

6. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON CURRICULAR PROPOSAL: CHANGE THE TERM USED FROM B.A. DEGREE IN ART, MEDIA ARTS, MUSIC, OR THEATRE ARTS TO THE B.A. WITH A MAJOR IN ART, MEDIA ARTS, MUSIC, OR THEATRE ARTS**

Senator Hill, Chair, Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), said that the change proposed (motion 1995/96-24) is straightforward, changing the name of the degree granted to those in Fine Arts from a Bachelor of Arts in a particular area to just a Bachelor of Arts degree. He said the General Education requirements are at this time exactly the same as in all the other colleges that were formerly a part of the College of Arts and Sciences.

A voice vote indicated approval of the motion.

7. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON CURRICULAR PROPOSAL: EXCEPTIONS TO THE 42-UNIT UPPER-DIVISION REQUIREMENT**

Senator Fred Hill, Chair, ICPC, noted that the Faculty Senate had approved a resolution to the effect that all Bachelor degrees granted would have 42 upper-division units. Following that action, some departments indicated to the Undergraduate Council that, because of the broad nature of lower-division backgrounds that these degrees require, it would be impossible for those degrees to meet the 42 unit upper-division requirement. The Undergraduate Council and ICPC agreed.

The ICPC brings the following seconded motion (1995/96-25): Any department that feels it cannot meet the 42-unit requirement can make a request to the Undergraduate Council which will consider the request and possibly authorize a way to reduce the number of upper-division units.

Senator Levy asked if there is a definition of an upper-division class, other than that it has a 300- or 400- designation. Senator Hill said he knew of no criteria that helps us decide whether a course should be numbered 300 or 400. Senator Levy said that a couple of years ago he served on a committee wherein a number of departments and colleges put together some proposals with similarities to the current core proposal, with first- and second-tier courses. First-tier courses were to be 100-level, and second-tier 200-level. He missed a few meetings, and when he returned, the second-tier courses were designated 300- and 400-level courses. When he asked about this change, it was explained that it was necessary in order to fit the necessary 42-unit upper-division units into the programs.

Chair Schwarz said that his assumption has been that the 300- and 400-levels are significant. He wondered whether a Senate committee should look at this issue and report back if there is some way of addressing the issue of expectations for 300- and 400-level courses as opposed to those for 100- and 200-level courses.

Provost Sypherd asked if there are funding implications for upper-division and lower-division courses that he was not aware of. He also wondered about ongoing discussions with community colleges about articulation and transfer units. He thought this topic might have an impact on those discussions, and he wondered whether that had been discussed by the Undergraduate Council.

Senator Hill said he did not believe that issue was addressed. Concerning the funding question, he noted that the only aspect that he was aware of was that 300- and 400-level courses can be offered with fewer students.

Senator Levy said it was his impression that the distinction between lower-division and upper-division courses has eroded considerably over the years, and the notion of moving up through the sequences of sophistication in the curriculum seems to have been lost. He said he thinks the issue needs to be examined.

Senator Anderson said that experience has shown her that there are meaningful distinctions between the 100- and 400-level courses, but prerequisites are not meaningful measures—even if a course has six prerequisites, it doesn't mean a thing if minimal readings and skills are being offered.

Senator Hill commented that the notion of defining upper-division courses is an issue that could be taken up separately by the Undergraduate Council. He said he hoped the motion would not be defeated because that had not yet been done.

A voice vote on motion 1995/96-25 resulted in approval, with one abstention.

8. **REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON NEW CAMPUS**

Senator Williams, Chair of the Senate Task Force on New Campus, said that the Task Force had been appointed by then-Faculty Chair Garcia in April 1995. Members included Herman Bleibtreu, Anthropology; and Senators Roy Emrick, Physics; Jocelyn Reiter, Music; and Ken Smith, Educational Psychology. The Task Force held four meetings, one with Dr. Celestino Fernandez, Provost of the new campus, and one with Faculty Chair Schwarz. He said the Task Force supports the foundation of Arizona International Campus (AIC) in Southern Arizona and recommends to the Senate that it also support the new Campus. The Task Force is ready to cooperate with the administration in the spirit of co-governance, and it encourages UA faculty to contribute to the design and facilitation of intelligent policy-making for the new campus. A few years ago, Board of Regents enrollment projections indicated that by the year 2015, there were going to be 55,000 new students seeking an education at the University level in Arizona. Around the same time, the decision was made to cap enrollments at the UA and ASU. The 55,000 additional anticipated students were to be taken care of by expanding ASU West and by initiating new universities in the east valley in Mesa and in Pima County.

Senator Williams said that this task force was one of four committees which served the new campus, two of which are now defunct and one which is newly organized. The first of those was the Community Advisory Committee, which issued its report in July 1994. The second was the National Advisory Committee, composed of a group of nationally known educators. The third committee is the Academic Faculty Advisory Committee, composed of 18 UA faculty and students, chaired by Professor Gary Fenstermacher, College of Education. Senator Williams reported that he is serving on that committee, and he had provided the Senate with a copy of its report, which was approved by the Regents in late October. The task of specific curriculum has been assigned to a subcommittee, the Arizona International Campus Advisory Team, composed of thirteen members, including personnel from AIC. He reported that he is also serving on that team, as is Senator Reiter.

Senator Williams said there are three issues of controversy: the site; the issues of tenure and conditions of service; and the programs and curriculum, including the hiring of faculty. The last one is the most complex. The first two are profoundly important, but their explanation is less complicated and interim decisions have already been made. Concerning the site, he said a number of alternatives were considered throughout the process, and were narrowed to three: Pima College West, the Regina Cleri Center located on the East side, and the IBM site. The Regents chose the IBM location as a temporary site last week. Concerning conditions of service, from the outset there was a vocal stream

of opinion against tenure, fostered by the community committee, and concurred with by Provost Fernandez. Last week the Regents voted to proceed without a tenure system, on an experimental basis. Concerning the third issue, he reported that the specific curriculum is scheduled for the end of May, and is being formulated by the Academic Faculty Advisory Committee. The first round of classes will be defined as experimental, and will be submitted to the University's Undergraduate Council. The final curriculum will come to the Senate, but only after an experimental period of time in the class. Student recruitment is underway. The new campus is looking for 100 to 150 students, focused on Southern Arizona with some other initiatives. Entrance requirements will be the same as the UA's. The administration will entail certain distinctions between administration/staff and administration/faculty; most of the administrators will teach. On board now are Provost Fernandez; Dr. Ed Clausen, Director of Academic Programs; and Dr. Charles Paulsen, an academic planner. When the faculty of four or five are being hired, depending on the budget, UA faculty will be asked to serve on the selection committee.

Senator Williams summed up his final observations: (1) UA faculty need to address the issue of the relationship between the UA and AIC; (2) the Task Force needs some guidance from the Senate on a number of the issues that have been presented today; (3) it would be useful for the Senate to study the academic plan contained in the material presented to them.

Senator Anderson expressed concern that the Senate was being asked to endorse the concept of a new campus in view of the fact that higher education enrollment projections seem to be decreasing. She said she would appreciate more information about the demographic profile and how it articulates with plans for the new campuses in the State, and an assessment of resource allocations, student load, and student experience. She commented that History faculty on this campus struggle to keep upper-division class enrollments below 100, while faculty at ASU West teach classes of 20. While this may simply be a transitional problem, in the meantime, our students are being herded into classes in large numbers, and the same sort of situation may occur on the new campus, with our student and faculty interests undermined as resources are allocated to our new campuses. Secondly, while she was happy with resolution of the tenure issue for the main campuses, she expressed concern with the experimental situation at the new campus, which has not yet been fully articulated. She wondered whether the decision was accepted in order to spare ourselves and the other established campuses from the erosion of tenure elsewhere.

Senator Szilagyi commented that an institution without tenure is not a university, and he proposed the following motion (1995/96-26): The Faculty Senate believes that an institution without tenure is not a University the way we know it. Therefore, we no longer consider the new campus as part of the University of Arizona. Senator Neuman seconded the motion.

Senator Smith said that this matter has been discussed at length by the Committee of Eleven, and it was the Committee's general consensus that it would be immoral for individuals now holding tenure at the UA, who will be part of the new campus, to maintain their tenure at the University of Arizona while being administrators or otherwise employees at the new campus.

Senator Neuman said it was important that the Senate be provided with a clear understanding of the legal relationship between the two universities, whether they are wholly separate or not, in view of the non-tenure issue.

President Pacheco said that the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona is equivalent to the branch campus at Sierra Vista. The relationship between the branch campus and the main campus is that the branch is a part of the University of Arizona. When the new campus was

conceptualized by the Board of Regents, it was their intent that this campus be developed under the nomenclature and guidance of the University of Arizona, but given as much autonomy as possible as it developed because of the intent of having a different kind of institution. UA is now faced with providing that degree of autonomy, of fulfilling the charge of the Board that it be a different kind of institution—liberal arts, strictly undergraduate, a lower-cost alternative—and at the same time balancing the new campus with existing governance structures at the UA. He said it is an almost impossible task to fulfill those three almost conflicting requirements, but the relationship is clearly that the new campus is to be developed under the aegis of the University of Arizona.

Senator Gruener said he agreed with the essence of the motion, but he thought it would be a mistake to approve it because we would be abrogating the influence we might have to change the issue of non-tenure at the new campus.

Chair Schwarz commented that there are several well-known and respected universities that do not have a tenure system. While he is a strong supporter of tenure, he questioned the concept of not recognizing a University for its lack of tenure.

Senator Abrams asked if ASU West has tenure. Chair Schwarz responded that ASU West is governed by the same Conditions of Service as the UofA.

Senator Anderson proposed a friendly amendment to Senator Szilagyi's motion: that the Faculty Senate at the University of Arizona strongly supports the maintenance of tenure as necessary to preserving academic freedom, integrity and excellence in all of Arizona's universities and colleges, including the Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona.

Senator Szilagyi responded that he could accept the following as an amendment to his motion: that the Senate condemn the decision of the Board of Regents to establish a university campus without tenure. Senator Neuman, as seconder, said he could not agree with that amendment. Senator Anderson said she believed that the Senate should approve a statement concerning the defense and strengths of tenure.

Senator Atwater called on Senator Szilagyi to finalize the wording of his motion. Senator Szilagyi and seconder Neuman then agreed to accept Senator Anderson's proposed changes, rewording motion 1995/96-26 to read as follows: The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona strongly supports the maintenance of tenure as necessary for preserving academic freedom, integrity, and excellence in Arizona's universities and colleges including Arizona International Campus of the University of Arizona. A voice vote indicated approval, with four abstentions recorded.

Senator Gruener proposed that the Faculty Senates at ASU and NAU be solicited to provide a similar motion. Chair Schwarz said he would communicate this action to the other three universities.

Senator Pitt asked if curriculum for AIC will be approved by the main campus. Senator Williams said that the experimental courses would be submitted to the Undergraduate Council, and eventually the entire curriculum will come before the University.

Senator Witte asked for a description of the experiment on non-tenure that will be conducted at the new campus. Senator Williams said that Provost Fernandez is putting together a proposal, and Senator Williams had suggested that we would need to find comparable institutions with tenure systems to generate a comparative analysis, such as the new Cal State campus on the Monterey peninsula, to

include criteria such as degree-granting institutions, number of publications, quality of letters of recommendation, and quality and quantity of previous teaching.

Chair Schwarz added that the non-tenure experiment will occur with full knowledge of what the market situation is. Dismissal rates in a tenure system will also be examined; the rigorous requirements for tenure may be the cause of higher dismissal rates. In terms of measuring academic freedom, complaints will be examined.

Senator Mare noted that the first two or perhaps three committees that looked into the feasibility of initiating this new campus were basing their decisions largely on demographics that have since been shown to be wrong. At the Regents' breakfast last week, he asked if any effort had been made to reassess the need for this institution in view of the evidence that our State is not willing to support the institutions we now have. He said that the answer he got was that this is very political, which was personally disquieting to him. He asked Senator Williams if he knew if a reevaluation had been made.

Senator Williams said he thought there was some evidence that a reevaluation occurred, but he suspected other factors urged the Regents and others to move ahead with implementation.

Senator Anderson said she still thinks there is a need to look at the projections for the State as a whole and where we expect institutional needs to develop. She added that she would like to see an examination of the projections that were made for ASU West and why the enrollments have not met expectations. Why are the demographers right today and were wrong five years ago?

Senator Buras asked what will be the mechanism for faculty at AIC to increase their knowledge.

Senator Emrick asked why a site was chosen that appeared to ignore bicycling as an alternative mode of transportation and to place the monetary issue higher than other factors.

President Pacheco noted that the location selected is for a period of three to five years, and the cost factor had to be taken into consideration.

Senator Smith asked Provost Fernandez three questions: (1) Will departments on the main campus participate in the hiring of faculty for the new campus; (2) will the experimental courses to be taught at the new campus be approved by main campus departments; (3) will the Provost and others at AIC give up their tenure on the main campus? Provost Fernandez responded that the answer to the first question was no. In response to the second question, he said the experimental courses will be recommended by the Curriculum Advisory Committee. Concerning the third question, he said he did not think that issue was the business of Senator Smith or the Faculty Senate.

Chair Schwarz, returning to Senator Buras' question about dealing with the faculty's ability to keep current and grow, said that the prospectus provided to him suggested that about 25% of faculty time is for "reflection," for preparation of classes, and other kinds of activities, and it was his understanding that faculty at the new campus would have something like a 3/3 or 3/4 load, as opposed to a 4/4 load, and included a statement to the effect that somewhere between 15 and 25% of faculty time would be allocated to the very kind of thing that Senator Buras was talking about.

Provost Fernandez confirmed that the intention was to have a strong faculty development program, and that he is looking at the possibility of how many units a faculty member will be responsible for over the course of a year, with the expectation that faculty development units would be included in the total number of annual units assigned.



Chair Schwarz noted that the Academic Plan for the New Campus in Pima County, Faculty Load Policy, describes a 4/4 load, but Chair Schwarz had understood formal teaching duties would be 3/3. He asked for clarification.

Provost Fernandez responded that there will be an expectation of faculty contact with students beyond the formal classroom; in terms of definition of the actual teaching load, he is still working on that, but it will be more of a unit approach, assigning responsibility for x number of units, including service learning.

Senator Williams requested clarification on Provost Fernandez's response to Senator Smith's first question. He said he thought that there was an agreement that the recruitment committees would be composed of personnel from AIC and from the appropriate University department. He asked if that was incorrect. Provost Fernandez said it was not.

Senator Neuman asked President Pacheco (1) about service revenues for the University from possible rental payments on the new campus and the IBM site; he said it was the Senate's understanding that all empty space at the IBM site was to be rented out to potential R&D industries and that the revenues from that would keep the site going and be an additional source of revenue for the University. If the new campus is going to occupy that site, how will this affect those revenues for the future? And (2) what precisely is and what is not the business of this University with respect to this new campus?

President Pacheco said that, in response to the first question, the site designated for AIC is primarily space that is owned by IBM, and not by the Research Park. There was no additional space available. Currently, negotiations are ongoing for that leased space to be bought back from IBM; the revenues from that, at least initially, would probably be used to retire the debts that would be incurred. The site being proposed, he said, represented approximately 15% of what it would cost to construct the space. He speculated that, at the end of the term, the facility would belong to either the Research Park or to the University. In response to the second question, we will have to work on the relationship between the new campus and the University, and it will be a process of compromise and making the best of a situation.

Senator Smith asked President Pacheco if he agreed with Provost Fernandez that giving up his tenure at the University was not the Senate's business.

President Pacheco said he thought it would be inappropriate for this faculty to request those individuals to give up their tenure here. He said he thought that, in a sense, it was an unfair question.

Senator Smith noted that these individuals are asking others to function without tenure, but they are unwilling to function without tenure themselves, and on that basis, it didn't appear to be an unfair question.

Senator Abrams asked the meaning of International in AIC's name.

President Pacheco said it did not mean that we will be recruiting a lot of international students, but is rather recognition of the fact that the university of the future is going to have a more global involvement. The name is consistent with what is happening in other states, such as Florida International University and Texas A&M International University.

Senator Hill suggested that Professor Williams' Task Force formulate a set of criteria that would justify the use of the term branch campus, and then monitor those criteria for a period of time to see if the criteria were satisfied.

Senator Williams noted that the Senate also has a Sierra Vista Task Force, and he thought it would be appropriate for the two Task Forces, along with the appropriate administrator, to clarify the definition of the relationships.

Senator Szilagyi asked Senator Atwater if she could promise that the dialogue between Provost Fernandez and Senator Smith will be reported verbatim in the minutes of this meeting. Senator Atwater said she would transmit that request to Secretary Silverman. Senator Szilagyi then moved that the Senate demand the verbatim recording. Senator Smith seconded, but in response to a point of order asking if a quorum was present, Senator Atwater determined that a quorum was not present, and therefore a vote was not taken.