

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
March 3, 1997**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Jeffrey L. Warburton at 3:00 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Anderson, Barrett, Charney, Chen, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, T. Davis, Desai, Dyl, Emrick, Erickson, Garcia, Gerber, Gore, Gruener, Huete, Hurt, Jacobs, Joens, Larson, Levy, Maré, Medine, Mitchell, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Poss, Reeves, Schiffer, Schooley, Schwarz, Sharkey, Silverman, Sliger, Sugiyama, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troy, Warburton, Weinand, Williams, Wilson, Witte, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Brown, D. Davis, Dvorak, Feltham, Forbes, Glittenberg, McCaslin, and Meyer.

2. OPEN SESSION

Anne Jones, Executive Vice President of the Staff Advisory Council, voiced that group's enthusiastic support of the plan to include classified staff in the shared governance process. She cited section H of the shared governance document (Draft 6b, dated Feb. 18, 1997), which calls for the participation of students, staff, and professional personnel in the process where appropriate. On behalf of the Staff Advisory Council, Ms. Jones urged that the proposed wording of section H be retained as is, and she pledged the diligent participation of a SAC member on the task force that will be formed if the shared governance document is implemented.

Senator Garcia expressed concern that the University of Arizona Science and Technology Park may have a negative financial impact on the campus, especially now that the Microsoft Corporation has announced its intention to leave the park and some governmental entities have removed their support from previous agreements. He cited similar research and technology facilities at ASU, Minnesota, and Utah that have become a drain on their institutions. He said he hoped that the Senate, as representatives of the faculty, would monitor this situation closely. He also commented that the University perhaps should not be in the business of development and job creation, but rather should concern itself with being a University, doing research, and helping students. Senator Garcia concluded by suggesting that the University consider donating the Science and Technology Park to the City of Tucson after the mandated lease expires.

Senator Aleamoni gave a brief report on an effort the Committee of Eleven is coordinating to provide faculty input into the presidential search process. The committee is currently organizing a series of interactive sessions in the MIS decision lab at McClelland Hall for faculty to comment electronically on the role, responsibilities, and personal characteristics desirable in the new UA president. The four sessions, which will each involve two Committee of Eleven members, three Faculty Senate members, one dean, one department head, and 18 General Faculty members chosen at random, are tentatively scheduled for March 12 and 13 (12:320-2:30 p.m. and 3:00-5:00 p.m. each day). Dr. Roger Caldwell is the point person for this project.

Senator Szilagyi expressed his concern about the way the shared governance document is being treated and handled. He noted that originally there were two documents, one developed by a specially appointed working group and the other by the Committee of Eleven. The Senate then established a task force to find common ground between the two documents. The task force accomplished this through a series of lengthy and careful negotiations, reaching a compromise on four major issues. The task of the Appointed Personnel Policy Committee now is to fine-tune the document, not to change it fundamentally. Senator Szilagyi's additional points: (1) The most important item of the task force document was item #1. (2) The task force never agreed to the "watered-down" version of section J that the APPC now proposes. (3) In its present form, the entire document is now unacceptable to him.

3. REPORTS

3A. President Manuel Pacheco

President Pacheco reported on the most startling development of the past month—Microsoft's announcement of their intention to leave the UA Science and Technology Park. UA officials had no advance warning of Microsoft's plan to turn over its space and operations at UASTP to the Keane Company. Although this decision creates problems for the park in the

short run, because some financial aid promised by the city, county, and state will no longer be forthcoming, there is no threat to the long-term stability of the park. President Pacheco pledged to keep the Senate informed of developments at the park, and he reiterated a comment he had made on previous occasions: While the University has helped the park to begin operations, it will not be developed at the University's expense; the park's existing financial plan still provides for reimbursing the University in full by the year 2000. President Pacheco then highlighted noteworthy actions at the Arizona Board of Regents meeting on February 13-14, 1997: (1) The authorization of a new Bachelor of Arts degree in Engineering; (2) the redesignation of the UA's Women's Studies Program to the Department of Women's Studies; and (3) the incorporation of the UA's recent agreement on post-tenure review into ABOR policy. He concluded by congratulating Prof. Rodger Thompson and his colleagues on the development and successful installation of the NICMOS instrument on the Hubble Telescope.

3B. Provost Paul Sypherd

No report.

3C. Chair of the Faculty John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz provided an update on the presidential search committee: Originally, the Regents planned to have two faculty members, including Dr. Schwarz, on a 15- or 16-member committee, and to choose the other faculty member from a list Dr. Schwarz presented to them. After Dr. Schwarz wrote a memo to Regent Munger stating that there should be more faculty representation on the committee, the Regents agreed to appoint four faculty members. At Dr. Schwarz's suggestion, the three faculty members in addition to himself would be chosen from a list provided by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. After the Regents reviewed the list provided by the Executive Committee and realized that there were no Regents' professors among the nominees, they requested that Dr. Schwarz prepare within 24 hours a short list of Regents' professors to be considered. Dr. Schwarz agreed to do so, provided that any Regents' professors appointed to the committee would be in addition to the four faculty slots already agreed upon. Regents then chose two from that list, with the end result being that the presidential search committee is now a 21-member committee with a total of six faculty members serving on it. The executive search firm of Heidrick & Struggles has been hired to assist with the search, and William Bowen from that firm's Chicago office has been assigned to the UA search. Mr. Bowen has participated in searches for presidents or chancellors of Brown University, Cornell, Dartmouth, Johns Hopkins, and many other institutions. The position announcement will appear soon in various publications such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and the search committee plans to hold its next meeting on April 4.

With regard to the presidential profile being developed by the Committee of Eleven, as described earlier by Senator Aleamoni, Chair Schwarz thanked Committee of Eleven members Roger Caldwell, a Professor in the College of Agriculture, and Ms. Anita Bhappu, a graduate student in the College of Business and Public Information, for conceiving of the idea and leading the way in carrying out the project.

Dr. Schwarz reported that a UA committee is currently addressing the issue of how post-tenure review policy will apply to continuing personnel. On March 20-21, the Regents will receive a progress report from the committee. By May 30, the Board wants to have a report on how policies regarding continuing personnel will be coordinated on the state's three campuses. By the end of the summer, there will be a report on implementation issues. Dr. Schwarz then yielded the floor to Senator Shirley O'Brien, who is heading this committee. Senator O'Brien noted that her committee would be working with counterparts at ASU and NAU; however, it is likely that the UA will take a leadership position in this effort, since we have considerably more continuing personnel than the other two institutions (more than 250, compared to ASU's 150 and NAU's 50). The goal of the UA committee, which consists of eight individuals including Senators Mitchell and Troy, is to craft a document almost identical to the one adopted for faculty. Senator O'Brien concluded by requesting that Senators relay this information to continuing personnel in their units.

3D. Secretary of the Faculty Rose Gerber

No report.

3E. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Jeffrey Warburton

Senator Warburton reported that the Senate Executive Committee had requested that Faculty Senate meetings conclude by 5:00 p.m., if possible. Since a number of people leave at 5:00, it is difficult to maintain a quorum for votes after that time. Senator Warburton asked that Senate business proceed as quickly as appropriate, so that the agenda can be completed by 5:00.

Senator Warburton also pointed out the information item contained in today's meeting packet regarding the requirements for academic minors; he asked Senators to review this document and bring it with them for discussion at the next Senate meeting.

3F. ASUA President Rhonda Wilson

No report in the interest of conserving time.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Witte noted that the Faculty Senate had unanimously passed an amendment to the post-tenure review document to the effect that all academic administrators holding tenure must undergo the same reviews as faculty members, or a similar set of reviews. However, the document that came back from the Regents does not contain this provision. She asked Senator Schwarz if this amendment was presented to the Regents; if not, why not; what action the Regents took on it; and why the provision is not in the final post-tenure review document. Senator Schwarz responded that it is his view that any policy adopted by the Senate that does not run counter to Regents' policy is a valid policy. The statement including administrators in the post-tenure review process is not in contradiction to Regents' policy and therefore is valid. Since the provision can be implemented here, there was no need to take it to the Regents unless they wanted to include something in the final document that would prevent the inclusion of administrators in the review process. However, that issue never surfaced in the Regents' discussion. He concluded by saying that anyone familiar with the implementation of continuing review at the UA is aware of his efforts to include this provision in practices being developed for this campus.

Senator S. O'Brien asked if ballots would be sent to Emeritus faculty for the Spring 1997 elections. Senator Warburton responded in the affirmative, since Emeritus faculty are members of the Voting Faculty as defined by the Constitution and Bylaws.

Senator Myers asked where the document regarding academic minors originated; Senator Warburton responded that it had come from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee. Senator Myers suggested that the document should have a source and date referenced on it.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 1997

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on January 27, 1997, were approved as distributed.

6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEM (Attachment)

Senator Warburton commented that the consent agenda item—a request from the College of Medicine to establish M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Biomedical Engineering—had been forwarded as a seconded motion [Motion 1996/97-45] from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), after having received the appropriate approvals at the college and the Graduate Council. Motion passed unanimously.

7. CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL (Attachment)

Senator Warburton called on Dr. Ann Weekes, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, and Dr. Janet Sturman, Chair of the University-Wide General Education Committee, to continue the discussion of the general education proposal. Dr. Weekes began by reminding Senators that the approval of the general education proposal comes as a seconded motion [Motion 1996/97-43] from the ICPC, originally introduced at the Faculty Senate meeting on January 27, 1997. After some discussion at that time, action was postponed until today's meeting. Dr. Weekes noted that the proposal in Senators' packets for today's meeting is the same one that was discussed at the January meeting, with the addition of criteria for samplings from Tier 2. She then briefly reviewed sections of the proposal and other materials comparing the current situation to the proposed general education curriculum.

She concluded her introduction by highlighting some benefits of the new proposal: Faculty can expect students to have covered some foundational material, and students will be able to transfer from college to college without losing general education units.

Dr. Sturman noted her pleasure in reporting that the University-Wide General Education Committee had met the Faculty Senate's charge to provide flexibility at the Tier 2 level. She read the exception policy formulated by the committee in conjunction with several departments and the Undergraduate Council: "Any degree program, with the approval its Dean, may petition the University-Wide General Education Committee for an exception from some aspect of the Tier 2 requirements, if it is shown that the number of credits associated with those requirements damage either student opportunities or the educational program. Possible bases for petition include inability to meet accreditation requirements, decreased student opportunities upon completion of degree,

and significant reduction in competitiveness.” Dr. Sturman added that even with this adjustment, it is the committee’s consensus that the proposed general education curriculum offers students greater cohesion between disciplinary areas within each tier and between the offerings of Tier 1 and Tier 2. One indication of the strength of the proposal in the quality of the courses faculty are developing. Dr. Sturman concluded by saying that after much deliberation the University-Wide General Education Committee agreed that the benefits of the proposed general education curriculum outweigh the adjustments required to make the new structure work. The committee as a whole voted to adopt the new curriculum, and she urged the Senate to do the same. The floor was opened for discussion.

Senator Garcia confirmed with Dr. Sturman that the exception allowed for Tier 1 Natural Sciences (outlined on page 4 of the descriptive report accompanying the proposal) is similar to the exception she had just read regarding Tier 2 requirements.

Senator Jacobs commented that two costs associated with the new general educational curriculum appear to be the loss of one course requirement in Traditions and Cultures and the lack of laboratory requirements for Natural Sciences. Dr. Sturman responded that most courses the General Education Committee has reviewed have had laboratory components included as part of the course, rather than a separate lab, and the committee has not seen any course that does not have any lab experience at all. With regard to the reduction in the course requirements for Traditions and Cultures, Dr. Weekes noted that the new proposal represents a compromise.

Senator Sliger reiterated the position she took in an article published in the *Arizona Daily Wildcat* on February 18, 1997: The general education proposal is a bad idea that will mean more bureaucracy and paperwork, with more centralization of decisions that should be made at the departmental level. It also tends to punish the prepared student who wishes to begin specialization. She urged Senators to vote against the proposal.

Senator Anderson commented that diluting the gender-race-class-ethnicity requirements is a serious error; she cited the O.J. Simpson trial as a perfect example of the racial abyss in this country. She also reiterated her concerns regarding resource issues.

Senator Myers read passages from the Mathematics section (page 4 of the descriptive report) and minimum competencies listed in the content of the Tier 1 Natural Science requirements. He noted that the expectation of these minimum competencies without any prerequisite course reveals a lack of understanding about how a math or science course actually would be taught. He also noted that the idea of a core curriculum is a delusion, since many students would be exempted from the general education requirements.

Senator Schwarz responded to Senator Sliger’s comments by noting that the ASUA Senate and several ASUA presidents have endorsed the general education proposal in a more stringent form than the present one, indicating that student support for the idea is fairly broad. He also related several instances of a student encountering a life-changing experience as a result of taking a required general education course.

Senator J. O’Brien reported that he teaches general education classes by choice, largely because the “eureka” factor is so intense. He then called for the question.

Senator Garcia asked for a point of clarification: Which of the two documents, the unnumbered proposal or the numbered descriptive report accompanying the proposal, is being voted upon? Dr. Weekes responded that the report is a clarification and extension of the proposal and that both documents are included in the motion for approval.

Senator J. O’Brien’s motion to close debate and call for the question [Motion 1996/97-46] was seconded and passed.

Senator Warburton called for a vote on the approval of the general education proposal [Motion 1996/97-43]; motion carried.

8. CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON REVISED SHARED GOVERNANCE DOCUMENT (Attachment)

Senator Warburton noted that the revised draft of the shared governance document was enclosed in Senators’ meeting packets, and he called upon Senator Schooley, Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, to lead the discussion.

Senator Schooley began by noting that Senators currently have two drafts of the shared governance draft in their possession: Draft 7, which was mailed out in the meeting packet, and Draft 8, which was placed on Senators’ desks today and supersedes Draft 7. He explained that the APPC had intended that Draft 7 would be the committee’s final recommendation. However, due to the illness of several APPC members, a few changes that had been agreed to and should have been made in Draft 7 were missed; also, several excellent suggestions were received after Draft 7 was mailed out. Thus, Draft 8 represents the unanimous recommendation of the APPC and is the version submitted for further discussion and action today. Dr. Schooley congratulated APPC members and

thanked them for the many hours invested in the document. He also commented on the issue of the secret ballot, which was raised during the discussion at the last Senate meeting: The deletion of the requirement for a secret ballot in Section D, Faculty Representation, does not prohibit secret ballots—it simply has the effect of no longer requiring them; Parliamentarian Sankey confirmed that secret ballots can still be requested at any time, provided that there is no prohibition of them in the governing document. Senator Schooley concluded his introduction by making several points: (1) This is a living, working document which will continue to evolve, as pointed out in Section J of Draft 8; (2) Section I, Consistency with Other Documents, has been rewritten; and (3) the last sentence of Section A at the bottom of page 1 has been changed to state that extraordinary reviews of academic administrators and vice presidents may take place upon the written petition of *one-third* of the constituent faculty. This fraction represents a compromise between the one-fifth called for by the task force that created the shared governance document and the one-half which is currently required by the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel*.

In response to an inquiry from Senator Desai regarding Section C, Position Searches, Senator Schooley said the APPC had changed the wording to exempt temporary and adjunct faculty positions from the requirement for open competitive searches. He added that the committee had agreed that arrangements for providing some type of faculty input for temporary and adjunct positions could be made at the unit level, as part of the implementation details to be addressed later by individual units.

Senator Garcia initiated a discussion regarding the logic for striking the phrase, “through regular periodic review,” in II, Section A, Selection and Review of Academic Administrators and Vice Presidents. He reasoned that deleting it, as the APPC did in Draft 8, would imply that the Senate does not favor periodic review of administrators, especially given the substance of Section I, which states that the shared governance guidelines are intended to conform with existing documents (e.g., UHAP, ARS, ABOR policies), but in cases where they do not, the guidelines are designed to provide a framework for revising the pre-existing documents. He suggested leaving the phrase in. Senator Schooley responded that the APPC had received several written comments from others who held the opposite view. He added that (1) UHAP currently calls for regular periodic reviews, (2) UHAP supersedes the shared governance guidelines, and (3) the APPC intended that regular periodic reviews would remain as they are now. Chair Schwarz clarified that there are places where the shared governance document intends to be different from pre-existing documents, and in those cases, it explicitly states that. Thus, if the document actually intended to say that there should not be periodic reviews, it would have stated that.

Senator Garcia moved [Motion 1996/97-47] to unstrike the phrase “through regular periodic review” in II, Section A of the Guidelines for Shared Governance, Draft 8; motion seconded.

Senator Silverman commented that leaving in the aforementioned phrase would imply that regular periodic review is the only way administrators can be retained or released, when in fact they can also be released through an extraordinary review or perhaps occasionally without a review.

Senator Sharkey expressed the opinion that this is an extremely important document in which the language should be carefully crafted and explicit; she suggested rephrasing the passage to make it clear that both periodic reviews and other procedures can be undertaken to retain or release administrators.

Senator Jacobs suggested a friendly amendment to Senator Garcia’s motion: To change the phrase “through regular periodic review” to “subject to periodic review” and insert it immediately after the word “selected,” so that the passage would read, “... will be selected, subject to regular periodic review, and then retained or released...”

Senator Schwarz suggested an additional friendly amendment to Senator Garcia’s motion: To insert “and” before “subject;” thus, the affected passage would read, “... will be selected, and subject to regular periodic review, and then retained or released...”

Senator Pacheco suggested a third friendly amendment to Senator Garcia’s motion: To delete “or released” in the passage under discussion. He commented that there are occasions when it is advantageous to both the individual and the institution to release someone without having a review process.

Senator Garcia accepted all three friendly amendments to his motion. Motion 1996/97-47 carried unanimously as amended. Thus, the second sentence of II, Section A of the Guidelines for Shared Governance, Draft 8, now reads: “Except for the provisions of paragraph F, below, all such administrators will be selected, and subject to regular periodic review, and then retained on the basis of mutual agreement of the faculty and the administrator superior to the individual in question.”

Senator Mitchell commented that he was uncomfortable with the fact that in Section C, Position Searches, the term “all faculty” had been changed to “all tenured and tenure-eligible faculty” with no mention of academic professionals on continuing or continuing-eligible status like himself.

After some discussion, Senator Silverman moved [Motion 1996/97-48] to change the first sentence of Section C to read: “All tenured, tenure-eligible, continuing, and continuing-eligible faculty, academic administrative and vice-presidential appointments will be made following open competitive searches with selection based on merit and due consideration of intellectual and cultural diversity;” motion seconded and carried.

Senator Charney noted that the problem seems to be broader than Senator Mitchell’s concern, since the document discusses academic units in two different places, but not all continuing people are in academic units. Also, there are two definitions of “faculty” in use on campus—one from UHAP and the other from the Constitution—and the document does not specify which definition it is using.

With regard to the last sentence of II, Section A, Senator Pacheco noted his concern about the possible destructive effects of having numerous extraordinary reviews within a limited period of time. He moved [Motion 1996/97-49] that the following sentence be added at the end of section A of the shared governance document: “No more than one extraordinary review shall take place in any review cycle;” motion seconded.

Senator Schooley noted that the APPC is not opposed to the idea of Senator Pacheco’s motion, but it is another example of a provision that is already stated in UHAP, and the committee assumed that the same limitation would apply without being expressly restated in the shared governance document. It was clarified that this same limitation applies to the review of deans and department heads.

In response to a question raised by Senator Maré, Senator Garcia noted that administrators are subject to a review every five years to determine if they will remain in the position, and they also undergo an annual review to assess their performance in the job. The annual review, which is sometimes pro forma, is conducted by the superior administrator and does not necessarily involve faculty.

After further discussion, Motion 1996/97-49, to add the sentence, “No more than one extraordinary review shall take place in any review cycle,” at the end of Section A, was carried.

Senator Szilagyi made a motion [Motion 1996/97-50] to change “one-third” to “one-fifth” in what is now the penultimate sentence of Section A. Thus, the sentence would read, “Extraordinary reviews, using the same procedures described above, may take place upon written petition of one-fifth of the constituent faculty.” Motion seconded and carried, with 22 votes in favor and 20 opposed.

Senator Sypherd made a point of information that the passage just amended now conflicts with UHAP. It was noted that the provision for a one-third vote was also in conflict with UHAP.

Senator Witte commented that the word “confusion” had been used several times in the day’s discussion of the shared governance document. She noted that the document is extremely important because it has tremendous legal implications, and it would be foolish to adopt it without closely scrutinizing it, particularly since it whittles away and dilutes faculty rights prescribed in Arizona’s shared governance law. The Senate owes the General Faculty the opportunity to review the document again, since it contains rules and procedures they will have to live by, she said.

Senator Pacheco stated that if Senator Witte would restate her comments in the form of a motion, he would second it, provided that the shared governance document would be sent to a conference committee consisting half of faculty members chosen by the Chair of the Faculty and half of administrators selected by the President. After review and revision by the conference committee, the document would return to the Senate for ratification.

Senator Witte said she would also like to have the document distributed with the minutes to the General Faculty. Senator Silverman said he was not sure what the proposed motion was. It appears that what the Senate is being asked to vote on is to have the document go to the conference committee and then be returned to the Senate for a vote with no amendments allowed, he said. If that is the case, Senator Witte stated, she would not make that motion. She reiterated her desire to have the document, as revised up to this point in the meeting, distributed to the General Faculty and then to continue the process of discussing the document in the Senate.

After further discussion, Senator Witte moved [Motion 1996/97-51] to distribute the shared governance document, as revised up to this point, to the General Faculty for review and input, and then to bring the document back for further discussion in the Faculty Senate; motion seconded.

There was some discussion about whether Senator Pacheco's suggested change to Senator Witte's motion represented a friendly amendment, a substitute motion, or a hostile motion. Senator Witte stated that she would not accept the change as a friendly amendment. Parliamentarian Sankey noted that it is the prerogative of the Presiding Officer to decide if changing the wording to indicate that the document would be sent to a conference committee rather than to the General Faculty would be appropriate and germane.

Senator Szilagyi pointed out that the conference committee Senator Pacheco had mentioned was actually the task force that worked on this document some time ago—a five-member committee on which the Provost served. Senator Schooley commented that the APPC had done all it could do with the document and did not want to serve as part of the conference committee.

Senator Gruener moved [Motion 1996/97-52] to table the previous motion and the entire discussion, since the Senate appeared to be moving into a point of confrontation, which is not in the spirit of shared governance; motion seconded and passed.

Senator Warburton noted that the revised shared governance document would be distributed to members of the General Faculty. Senator Schooley invited Senators to send comments to the Faculty Center, so that the revision and discussion process could continue.

9. FACULTY EVALUATIONS UPDATE (Attachment)

Senator Warburton yielded the floor to Senator Williams, so that he could provide an update on the publication of faculty evaluations, which was approved last year by the Faculty Senate and scheduled to begin in Fall 1997. Senator Williams noted that the ASUA's original intent was to publish the evaluations in booklet form. However, after reviewing the relative costs of various publishing methods, the ASUA committee charged with publishing evaluations had concluded that it would be much more economically feasible to publish the evaluations electronically. Senator Williams displayed an overhead slide which compared costs, noting that it would cost twice as much to publish the evaluations in booklet form as it would to publish them on-line. He explained that the ASUA committee was considering publication on a website with appropriate security measures to limit access. Senator Williams moved [Motion 1996/97-53] that ASUA be permitted to publish faculty evaluations on-line rather than in hard copy form; motion seconded.

Senator Sharkey expressed reservations about moving too quickly on this issue. She noted that electronic publication with potential access worldwide is very different from publishing a booklet that is available to students on campus. She noted that, even though she consistently receives excellent evaluations, she is uncomfortable with the idea of having faculty evaluations in a form that conceivably could be available to anyone in the world. She added that she would like to see a document describing the planned security measures. Senator Williams noted that a website with restricted access actually could provide more security than the hard-copy publication of a booklet which then could be duplicated and distributed anywhere.

Senator Sharkey moved [Motion 1996/97-54] that the previous motion to allow electronic publication of faculty evaluations be tabled until the next Senate meeting, so that more information can be obtained about access and security issues. Motion seconded and passed, with 21 votes in favor and 17 opposed.

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Rose M. Gerber, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Biomedical Engineering Interdisciplinary Graduate Program Synopsis and Major Components (consent agenda item)
2. Proposal for a University-Wide General Education Program and related documents (exception guidelines and summary of the current situation)
3. Guidelines for Shared Governance (Draft 8, dated 2/25/97)
4. Memo dated 2/19/97 regarding teacher evaluations
5. Rationale for Examination Of and Proposed Changes To Policy On Requirements for Minors

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

Motions of the Meeting of March 3, 1997

- 1996/97-45 Motion to approve the consent agenda item (establishment of M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in Biomedical Engineering); motion carried unanimously.
- 1996/97-46 Motion to close debate and call for the question on the previously postponed motion to approve the general education proposal (see below); motion carried.
- 1996/97-43 Motion to approve the general education proposal; motion carried.
- 1996/97-47 Motion to unstrike the phrase "through regular periodic review" in II, Section A of the Guidelines for Shared Governance, Draft 8; motion carried with three friendly amendments. Thus, the affected sentence now reads, "Except for the provisions of paragraph F, below, all such administrators will be selected, and subject to regular periodic review, and then retained on the basis of mutual agreement of the faculty and the administrator superior to the individual in question."
- 1996/97-48 Motion to change the first sentence of Section C to read: "All tenured, tenure-eligible, continuing, and continuing-eligible faculty, academic administrative and vice-presidential appointments will be made following open competitive searches with selection based on merit and due consideration of intellectual and cultural diversity;" motion carried.
- 1996/97-49 Motion to add the following sentence to the end of Section A of the shared governance document (D 8): "No more than one extraordinary review shall take place in any review cycle;" motion carried.
- 1996/97-50 Motion to change "one-third" to "one-fifth" in what is now the penultimate sentence of Section A; motion carried. The affected sentence now reads, "Extraordinary reviews, using the same procedures described above, may take place upon written petition of one-fifth of the constituent faculty."
- 1996/97-51 Motion to distribute the shared governance document, as revised up to this point, to the General Faculty for review and input, and then to bring the document back for further discussion in the Faculty Senate; motion tabled (see below).
- 1996/97-52 Motion to table the previous motion and the entire discussion of the shared governance document; motion carried.
- 1996/97-53 Motion to permit ASUA to publish faculty evaluations on-line rather than in booklet form. Motion tabled until next meeting (see below).
- 1996/97-54 Motion to table Motion 1996/97-53 until the Faculty Senate meeting on April 7, 1997; motion carried.

CAMPUS MAIL

Faculty Senate Office
1400 East Mabel Street
PO Box 210473