

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
January 27, 1997**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Jeffrey L. Warburton at 3:03 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Anderson, Atwater, Barrett, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Desai, Dvorak, Dyl, Emrick, Erickson, Feltham, Forbes, Garcia, Gerber, Gore, Gruener, Hurt, Jacobs, Larson, Levy, Maré, McCaslin, Medine, Meyer, Mitchell, Myers, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Poss, Reeves, Schiffer, Schooley, Schwarz, Silverman, Sliger, Sugiyama, Sypherd, Taylor, Troy, Warburton, Weinand, Williams, Wilson, Witte, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Brown, Chen, T. Davis, Garrard, Glittenberg,, Huete, Joens, Neuman, Sharkey, and Szilagyi.

2. OPEN SESSION

Observer Rochlin said he wanted the Faculty Senate to know that both the House and Senate appropriations committee hearings on university budgets are taking place January 28 and 29 at 1:30 in Phoenix. The Alumni Association believes the faculty salary increases are probably the University's top priority and should be supported. Alumni representatives from both Phoenix and Tucson will attend those meetings and will speak in support of that issue. The Alumni Association is also concerned about the issue of mandated faculty teaching loads—the kind of issue that's much more difficult for an alumnus or a citizen in general to articulate a position. He encouraged Faculty Senate members to take more time to interact with alumni, with business community members, and with legislators to talk about what they do, and to impress upon them the inordinate amount of time it takes to assemble lesson plans or develop courses. He also noted that at tri-university events, all three universities' alumni associations work together. Generally ASU and NAU have strong faculty representation there, but representatives of The University of Arizona's faculty governance body rarely attend any of these events to talk about what faculty do and why what they do is important to all of us all the time. He encouraged Senators to take part.

3. REPORTS

3A. President Manuel Pacheco

President Pacheco began by commenting on his decision not to serve as President beyond his current contract, which expires at the end of 1997. He reiterated his long-standing opinion that a university president is most effective during his first five to seven years in a post, and he noted that the average period of service for presidents of major universities is approximately five years. By the time his contract ends, he will have served six and a half years. Thus, last summer he began discussions with the Board of Regents about his plans, and he informed Regents of his decision as early as possible in order to provide ample time for a search.

President Pacheco then discussed the University's state budget for 1997-98, noting that he had spent a good deal of time in recent weeks meeting with individual legislators to discuss the UA proposals. Later this week, he will present our proposals to the respective legislative budget committees. The UA proposal was guided by the agreement between the Regents and the governor to limit requests from the three universities for new money to approximately \$38 million plus salary increase funds. For the UA main campus, an increase is proposed of \$12 million above the current budget plus \$2.2 million for the Health Sciences Center plus whatever salary funds the Legislature provides. Our proposal included three decision packages for new or expanded programs: (1) approximately \$1.5 million for improvements in undergraduate education, specifically for technology to improve math and science instruction; (2) approximately \$1 million for better preparing Arizona's work force through outreach to the state's schools, in the form of partnerships between schools and business; and (3) slightly over \$1 million for activities to support economic development, including a new technology extension service, funds for the UA's work in optics, and support for research in biotechnology.

Senator Pacheco noted that, although the governor's recommendation is less than what the UA had requested, it departs from the pattern in recent years in that the governor has proposed a sizable increase for all three universities, an additional \$43 million for all the institutions. This breaks down to approximately \$27 million in operating expenses. It includes an additional \$3 million for building renewal and \$13 million for salary increases. Our request had been for \$19 million for salary increases statewide. This amount from the governor's recommendation does include money for some decision packages, and they would be appropriated in a lump sum through the Arizona Board of Regents, which is a departure from the way these funds have been appropriated in the past. The recommendation from the Joint Legislative Budget Committee is lower still by approximately \$9 million than the governor's. It does, however, include three unusual proposals that merit attention. One of these proposals would affect the College of Law by increasing in-state law tuition by \$1000 and out-of-state tuition by \$2000. This recommendation reflects last year's program authorization review, which found tuition at the Arizona law schools to be significantly lower than at national peer and western institutions. Moreover, the JLBC proposes specific uses for the additional revenue raised. Whatever the merits of the increase, he said, it would be better to support the authority of the Regents to set tuition and the use of resulting revenues. A second suggestion is that if enrollment at the Arizona International Campus does not reach 300 by October 1, then all funding would be withdrawn

before the end of the fall semester. Senator Pacheco expressed the opinion that this is an ill-judged suggestion, because the very existence of the suggestion prejudices the outcome. "Would you send your child to any campus if you thought it would close a month later?" he asked. This suggestion also ignores the damage what will be inflicted on students if their programs are terminated in mid-semester. President Pacheco commented that he would keep Senators informed of the developments as our 1997-98 budget proposal moves along. He also noted that Provost Sypherd would address an additional provision in the JLBC recommendation that would put some incentive funds into the budget so that faculty who teach more would be rewarded for that teaching. This is a direct way of getting to the question of increasing faculty loads, he said, an issue that is fairly high in legislators' priorities and that will require some discussion in the months ahead. He concluded by saying that the issue will need to be addressed, but he would leave it to the faculty leadership to consider that particular proposal and offer ideas at the appropriate time.

3B. Provost Paul Sypherd

Provost Sypherd reported that at the last ABOR meeting, the Regents were presented with three opportunities to address the issue of workload, and there was high expectation among faculty leadership and the university leaders who were there that this would certainly come on the table. They were grateful that that issue did not come up on the floor without advance notice of the universities so that they could prepare for that. Almost simultaneously with the issuance of the agenda for the Board meeting was the JLBC's suggested budget. This was the staff suggestions to the JLBC, and in that report was, as the President mentioned, a section on increasing university teaching. A part of that report suggested that the Legislature set aside \$8.5 million to serve as incentive—develop an incentive program that our faculty might be incentivized to spend more time in the classroom. Dr. Sypherd said he thinks this is a tremendous challenge to the University, as he and most of us believe that the amount that we teach is appropriate to our mission as a research university. If we have faculty who are underemployed in that regard, it is incumbent upon the universities to understand that and to have a teaching load policy that is variable across the colleges and that takes account of the different ways our faculty teach. He said he is confident that ABOR will want to see these differences with respect to their own educational objectives. Such policies will obviously be worked out in the fires of discussion between the universities and the Board, but the Senate should be aware of those conversations and the way they proceed.

Senator Sypherd noted that he had distributed two documents responding in some way to a local editorial entitled, "How Good is the U of A?" Each document describes accomplishments of the UA in both teaching and research. He then yielded the floor to Senator Levy, so that he could make a special announcement from the College of Science.

Senator Levy noted that The University of Arizona is one of 140 leading research-intensive universities in the country. He added that the National Science Foundation would soon cite The University of Arizona, along with nine other leading universities, for their distinguished and innovative accomplishments in combining the research and teaching missions of a large research university. The NSF will award \$500,000 to The University of Arizona in recognition of this. Senator Levy concluding by acknowledging the efforts of Randall Richardson, the Associate Dean of the College of Science, in guiding the proposal that resulted in the award.

3C. Chair of the Faculty John Schwarz

Dr. Schwarz congratulated the College of Science for the integration of teaching and research and the accolades that the University is getting in that area.

He also noted that the Board of Regents adopted a policy on post-tenure review in its January meeting; it is based almost entirely on the policy that the Faculty Senate adopted last October. There were a few changes that the Board made in the policy, but only one of real significance. In our adopted policy, development plans would apply only to faculty with unsatisfactory reviews in the individual area of teaching. Board policy asks that the development plans apply to faculty with unsatisfactory evaluations in the areas of research and service, also. He added that he had taken this issue to the Senate's Academic Personnel Policy Committee to see how we can apply the changed policy faithfully but at the same time in a manner that is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the policy that the Senate approved.

Dr. Schwarz also noted that he would like to inform Senators of an issue that is coming up that has to do with faculty workloads. The interest in the Legislature has heightened during the past few weeks both among staff and representatives about the sufficiency of faculty workloads. The faculty representatives at the Arizona Faculties Council are keeping a close watch on this issue, and their approach is to ask the Board of Regents to look at this issue thoroughly, with the idea that it is far better to look at this issue thoroughly and extensively with considerable university input, as opposed to receiving some mandate with little consultation or little opportunity for university input. The approach that is thought to be most successful is to talk this issue out in the same way that we've done with other issues recently, so that we will achieve a balanced result that is in keeping with the values and missions of this University.

Dr. Schwarz reported that the President of the Board of Regents, John Munger, had asked him, as Faculty Chair, to serve on the search committee for a new president. Regent Munger asked Chair Schwarz to work with representatives of the Faculty Senate to nominate five faculty members from whom one would be selected to serve as a second faculty member on the search committee. Chair Schwarz communicated to President Munger his strong belief that two faculty representatives on the search committee of approximately 15 members was insufficient and asked him to consider increasing faculty representation; President Munger had not yet responded. In the meantime, Chair Schwarz has asked the six other elected members of the Senate Executive Committee (Larry Aleamoni, Rose Gerber, Peter Medine, Larry Schooley, Jeff Warburton, and Mal Zwolinski) to constitute a committee that will

select the names of nominees to forward to the Board. Nominations, including self-nominations, were encouraged. Finally, President Munger asked Chair Schwarz to submit a presidential profile, a kind of description of the characteristics that the faculty would like to see in a new president. Dr. Schwarz took this request to the Senate Executive Committee, and he also raised it in the Committee of Eleven meeting. The Committee of Eleven plans to work with the Department of Management Information Systems and its electronic decision laboratory to ask a representative sample of members of the faculty to exchange views and then to decide the characteristics they would like to see in a new president. Hopefully, there will be an open public forum for all faculty on the same question.

3D. Secretary of the Faculty Rose Gerber

No report.

3E. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Jeffrey Warburton

Senator Warburton reminded everyone that the February meeting is next week. The agenda for the February 3 meeting was included in the packet for today's meeting. He added that the latest draft of the shared governance document was placed on Senators' desks today and will be discussed at the next meeting.

3F. President of ASUA Rhonda Wilson

President Wilson invited Senators to go to the budget hearings in the next two days. A lot of students are getting involved by either going in person or sending e-mail messages, writing letters, and making phone calls to representatives to tell them how they feel about the University and its importance in the state. ASUA is working with the Legislature regarding three bills: the work-study program, the prepay tuition, and the ASPIRE program. She added that ASUA is quite confident that they will be able to get two, if not all three, passed by the end of the session. A legislative conference is scheduled for February 27; ASUA representatives will be asking to meet with classes to recruit students to go to this conference. This year the format will be changed so that there will be a time that students can meet with Board of Regents members. Hopefully that will help to promote more dialogue with the students and the people who make the decisions that directly affect education. President Wilson concluded by mentioning that election season starts Monday, February 3, and ends on March 5; ASUA is trying to ensure that campaigning does not disrupt the learning process but allows students a time to learn about the candidates.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Schiffer asked Chair Schwarz if he thought it would be useful for the Faculty Senate also to write a resolution in favor of adding faculty members to the presidential search committee; Senator Schwarz responded in the affirmative.

Senator J. O'Brien asked Dr. Schwarz in which year post-tenure review would begin, to which Dr. Schwarz replied that it would start with the 1997-98 academic year.

Senator Witte addressed a rhetorical question to Provost Sypherd: She wondered why, when we list the recent contributions to Arizona, we don't think of ex-Senator Herb Abrams' reminders from time to time; that we also do for the poor, the downtrodden and disadvantaged; that we serve all segments of the people in the state of Arizona.

Regarding faculty workload, Senator Desai wanted to clarify that we as faculty members not only teach in the classroom, but in our offices or wherever there are students. Perhaps we should classify our offices as classrooms, he added.

Senator Medine asked President Pacheco for clarification of the decision package to fund outreach to schools. Dr. Pacheco responded that it is part of the effort to have the University become more involved with the public schools, by funding activities related to preparing students for the work force or for university study.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 1996

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on December 2, 1996, were approved as distributed.

6. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS (Attachment)

Four consent agenda items were presented as seconded motions from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), chaired by Dr. Ann Weekes. Presiding Officer Warburton announced that Item C, the proposal to establish a B.A. with a major in Fine Arts, had been pulled and tabled for now. Other consent agenda items:

Item A: Proposal from the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources to discontinue the Ph.D. degree in Water Resources Administration. [Motion 1996/97-39]

Item B: Proposal from the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources to rename the M.S. in Water Resources Administration to Water Resources Engineering. [Motion 1996/97-40]

Item D: Request to change the name of the Department of Veterinary Science to the Department of Veterinary Science and Microbiology. [Motion 1996/97-41]

There was no discussion. Consent agenda items A, B, and D were approved unanimously.

7. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON PROPOSED POLICY REGARDING DATA OWNERSHIP, ACCESS TO, AND RETENTION OF SCIENTIFIC DATA (Attachment)**

The proposed policy regarding data ownership, access to, and retention of scientific data was presented by Dr. Ara Arabyan, Chair of the Research Policy Committee (RPC). This policy comes to the Senate as a seconded motion [Motion 1996/97-42] from the RPC.

Dr. Arabyan provided some history on the document. The data retention policy was invoked by the Research Policy Committee on March 25, 1996, and was brought to the Senate on April 29, 1996. At that time the Senate requested that the proposal be published in *Lo Que Pasa* and be brought back to the Senate. The document was published in *Lo Que Pasa* on November 21, 1996, and faculty were asked to comment on it, either in writing to Dr. Arabyan or to the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, or by using the faculty caucus. One response was received. Dr. Arabyan acknowledged Vice President Cusanovich, who was present to answer any questions.

Senator Witte commented that she had served intermittently on the Research Policy Committee since it was founded and has heard many generations of these issues. She said she thinks sharing data is certainly appropriate, but wondered whether other faculty also were concerned that the University owns the data and that disputes would not go through a faculty committee procedure, but would instead go to the Provost, who could decline or not; to have a policy that is not strictly faculty-based with appeals processes is inappropriate.

Senator Myers commented that there are issues that are not addressed by the policy. Today we have to worry about the procedures whereby the integrity of the data set can be maintained in a computer file. The document doesn't really address that question. Also, it ought to say something about not permitting a private organization to fund research at the university where the data can then be kept secret. Science proceeds in most cases by reproducibility, and often this means access to original data must be possible. Consequently, there needs to be some way of ensuring that the data is preserved. Something needs to be said about the retention of the particular data to ensure that it is identical with the data generated by someone else, if it is then used in the research.

Senator Schiffer noted that there is one fundamental ambiguity running throughout this document, and that has to do with the nature of research being sponsored. That is, what happens in those cases and disciplines where a lot of research gets carried out that is not sponsored and in a sense is being paid for by an external entity through a contract or grant? Is it the intent of this committee that the data produced by those research activities is also covered under this policy? Senator Garcia responded that the second paragraph of the data ownership section of the document states that, in a case of unsponsored research conducted at the UA, The University of Arizona retains ownership.

Dr. Arabyan pointed out that there are several related policies: the conflict of interest and commitment policy, the data retention policy, the consulting policy, and the intellectual property policy.

Senator Witte noted that, precisely because these are pieces of the puzzle, we did ensure that there were protections of the faculty in that there is parallel track, appeal, and discussion in the other three policies. She added that her concerns would be allayed if Dr. Cusanovich would just say, "Yes, we don't have a problem with that; we can include that same appeals process," and not have it go to the Provost. What is the point of our sitting here approving a mechanism when we have no voice? If we are truly trying to put something together that is going to protect the faculty, then let's do it the same way we meticulously did for the past seven or eight years; let's provide a mechanism so that if a faculty member feels aggrieved in this matter, he or she can go to a parallel faculty track and get some exposure of the agreements. She asked Dr. Cusanovich if he had a problem with that. Dr. Cusanovich responded he that did not, as long as there is a final point where when it is over, and it is in compliance with federal requirements. He described a problem: almost all of the disputes in the last eight years have been between faculty and staff or between faculty and students. It is far less clear which committee processes these disputes. An ad hoc approach was used to deal with each of those unique situations in the past. He added that he thinks students and staff would feel that a faculty committee is totally inappropriate in such a dispute, because the non-faculty member would be severely disadvantaged. In the past, a combination process was developed.

Dr. Arabyan pointed out that the document actually states that any disputes regarding access to data should be settled at the lowest possible level, if circumstances permit. Otherwise, each dispute should go before the appropriate University conciliation committee. It does not go to the Provost directly; the Provost is the court of last resort. Vice President Cusanovich confirmed that.

Senator Gruener stated that when the issue of conflict was discussed in committee, they agreed that if a staff member is in conflict with a faculty member, the staff member is very likely to go to the Staff Advisory Council. If a student is in conflict, the student is very likely to go to one of the ombudspople in the University. He expressed confidence that if an undergraduate student, or even a student who comes to the campus for some research activities, gets into conflict, he or she will find the appropriate authority for this kind of resolution.

Senator Barrett spoke in favor of this motion as the former chair of the Research Policy Committee. He noted that Senator Witte voted in favor of tabling the data retention policy and having it published in *Lo Que Pasa*. It was published, and no one responded.

Senator Hurt called for the question; seconded. Debate was closed by a majority vote, with one vote opposed.

Senator Warburton then called for the question on **Motion 1996/97-42**, to adopt the policy regarding data ownership, access to, and retention of scientific data. Motion carried, with three votes opposed.

8. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON GENERAL EDUCATION PROPOSAL (Attachments)**

Presiding Officer Warburton thanked three committees—the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, the Undergraduate Council, and the General Education Committee—for the amount and quality of work they have provided for the Senate on this proposal. He explained that this item was placed on the agenda by the Senate Executive Committee, without an indication of what the final action would be today, because it is not known what issues might arise. Also, there are several Senators who would like to learn the basic criteria that the General Education Committee will use with respect to determining exemptions. Therefore, he noted, the Executive Committee had called for a debate with a possible vote. Senator Warburton introduced Dr. Ann Weekes, Chair of the ICPC; Dr. Janet Sturman, Chair of the University-Wide General Education Committee; Dr. Michael Gottfredson, Vice President for Undergraduate Education; and Dr. Susan Steele, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education.

Dr. Weekes referred to Senators' packets, which included a letter from her, a report from the ICPC, and the proposal for the university-wide general education program. The letter from Dr. Weekes indicates the areas in the report which have been developed since the Senate meeting in December in an attempt to answer questions raised at that time. Dr. Weekes pointed out that the ICPC particularly wished to credit the Provost with initiating this conversation, which has continued for two and a half years, although the ICPC has taken it away from the Provost, so to speak. The faculty committees have changed it a great deal in response to various departments and curriculum bodies who had problems with the original proposal. Dr. Weekes noted that the general education proposal is a seconded motion [**Motion 1996/97-43**] from the ICPC. It has also been approved by the Undergraduate Council and the University-Wide General Education Committee. Dr. Weekes reviewed both the report and the proposal in detail. She summarized the proposal as having a clear structure, but not something set in concrete. She noted that the ICPC asked that the general education program be evaluated continually. The ICPC is asking for the proposal to go into effect in Fall 1998. Dr. Weekes noted that students are already enrolled in pilot courses, and the ICPC hopes the number of pilot courses will increase during the coming academic year; that students' progress in those courses be monitored, so that any problems can be eliminated before the proposal goes into effect in 1998. Dr. Weekes then introduced Dr. Janet Sturman, Chair of the University-Wide General Education Committee, and Laura Casper, a student on that committee, and invited them to inform Senators about the work of their committee.

Dr. Sturman stated that she was honored to represent the University-Wide General Education Committee. This committee, created and empowered by the Faculty Senate, is made up of a very dedicated group of professors serving as elected and appointed representatives of departments and schools across the campus. A complete list of the committee members was included in the packet that was mailed to Senators early this month. The responsibilities of this committee center around approving courses for the general education curriculum, which influences the scope and nature of general education. As a result, committee members vigorously debated and helped reshape the proposals put forth to change our current general education requirements. She described the process and noted that each course that comes before this committee for approval sets into motion a dialog between the proposed instructors, the departments housing the course, and the General Education Committee. Deliberations regarding pilot courses have helped committee members refine their primary concern that this curriculum offers students cohesion between disciplinary areas, within each tier, and between the offerings in Tier 1 and Tier 2, she noted. The committee is convinced that the enhanced articulation between disciplines and tiers is one of the strongest features of this new curriculum, and that it represents an improvement over the existing curriculum. Courses in Traditions and Cultures, Tier 1, will provide students with a broad foundational background upon which to build more focused explorations in the areas of arts and humanities, as well as in other areas—and this despite the fact that Arts has requested the option of taking courses before Tier 1. Still, that broad foundation is in place and available, and the committee expects most students to benefit from that. This same kind of relationship is evident between the tiers for all of the other categories, including Individuals and Societies and Natural Sciences. Committee members have been pleased to notice how many faculty have found the Tier 1 emphasis on connections between disciplines to be a very liberating perspective. In some cases, the perception of new possibilities has enhanced the stature of teaching general education, at least the perception of teaching these general education courses. The committee has received some exciting new courses as a result of that. Other faculty have been delighted to note that this emphasis matches the kind of teaching that they are already doing. In closing, Dr. Sturman stated that, after much deliberation, the committee agreed that the benefits of the new proposed curriculum far outweigh the adjustments required to make this new structure work. As a whole, the committee voted to adopt the new curriculum, and she added, it is hoped that the Faculty Senate will do the same.

Laura Casper, who has served on the University-Wide General Education Committee for two years, commented that she had two things to add to this discussion. One comment was related to transferring between colleges. We are now in a day and time, she said, when many people are changing their minds about their career and educational opportunities. Offering a personal example, she mentioned her father, who just received a Ph.D. at age 61 and is now teaching at UCLA, after having been a real estate broker. So it is impossible to say to 19- or 20-year olds that they need to make their life decisions now and never change them. She noted that our current program does not appear to, but having seen and worked on this new general education proposal, she is encouraged that it will. She expressed the opinion that The University of Arizona needs to be on the cutting edge by establishing a new

curriculum. She also noted that there have been misconceptions; for a while the idea of a core curriculum was being considered, and that terrified her more than anyone. The proposal before the Senate is not a core curriculum, she emphasized. On a personal note, she commented that she is on the "Arizona five-year plan," as students like to joke. She finished all of her major courses last year and is now fulfilling her general education requirements. There is something wrong with this, she said. Class rosters of general education classes probably have a large percentage of students who are seniors. Shouldn't that large percentage be freshmen? This type of proposal will allow students to obtain the education they need, and to obtain it through a systematic approach. She added that the Renaissance experience is what she thinks a university should stand for. Ms. Casper related the unique perspectives that she brought to this committee: One was being a student. At first it was very intimidating, she said, to work with faculty; however, she soon learned that this was a good thing. She also noted that the committee carefully reviewed and discussed the general education proposal, considering such factors as seat availability; the committee's approval was not by any means a "rubber stamp." Another unique perspective Ms. Casper had was that of having a faculty member in her own family and therefore recognizing how difficult and time-consuming it can be to prepare a class. She concluded by commenting that a number of proposals for new general education courses are so exciting that she almost regrets she will graduate before having an opportunity to take them.

Professor Warburton opened the floor for questions, and Senator Anderson asked about feasibility statistics regarding seat availability and how the numbers were calculated. Dr. Susan Steele, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education, responded that the figures are based on the number of seats that are actually offered now in various areas and the number of entering students who will need the courses. Senator Anderson asked if the assumption was that the new curriculum would basically absorb the old, to which Dr. Steele responded that the numbers merely indicate what the institution's capacity is in various areas. Senator Anderson then asked how much the new proposal would require faculty to revamp classes—how often existing course offerings could be utilized, how much innovation would be required, and whether that would vary from area to area. Dr. Sturman responded that the adjustments would be more of an issue in some areas than others; some courses are currently articulating appropriately for foundational classes, but other departments will have to do some rethinking. When Senator Anderson asked Dr. Sturman to generalize about the nature of the changes that would need to be made, Dr. Sturman cited (1) including more writing opportunities, and (2) adapting courses so that they actually fit within an area. Senator Anderson expressed her concerns that the general education proposal dilutes the diversity requirement, and that the Traditions and Cultures component of the proposal is constructed so that it has to cover at least a subcontinent, with the apparent result that U.S. history, literature, and so forth do not fit into Tier 1 or Tier 2. Dr. Weekes responded that, with reference to diluting the western civilization requirement, the proposal represents a compromise: while some students may take fewer classes in western civilization, the minimum requirement will now be extended to all UA students.

Senator Clarke complimented the committee for their fine work in responding to the concerns raised at the December Senate meeting. He also noted that the structure is much clearer, and the proposal now incorporates the flexibility needed by some colleges. He expressed one remaining reservation, which he characterized as not overriding because it can be worked out: the lack of interdisciplinary thrust, which was the original concept. He noted that many of the pilot courses appear to be quite traditional. Dr. Sturman replied that some courses will not be as broad as others, but faculty have a right to design courses that work for them, and there will still be an opportunity to position courses in ways that invite integration. Dr. Clarke concluded by noting that if more writing will be required, class sizes will have to be reduced; Dr. Sturman agreed.

Senator Feltham asked if all courses have to be submitted to a group for approval, to which Dr. Weekes responded that the current procedure is that the University-Wide General Education Committee approves all courses for the new curriculum. Senator Feltham also commented that he doubted the general education proposal would change student behavior. Dr. Weekes responded that the approximately 500 petitions for waivers or substitution of general education requirements that are currently received should diminish, because the requirements will be the same across colleges.

Senator Garcia also complimented the committee on its work. The program has been made more flexible, he commented, but this increased flexibility also introduces the charge that the content of the general education program has not changed much. However, he added, the flexibility is necessary in order to make the program more workable for transfer students and others. He also noted that, as resources are freed up due to the greater efficiency of the program, those resources should continue to be dedicated to teaching and the improvement of courses, rather than being considered available for other purposes.

Senator Troy expressed his only concern about the program: that students might delay taking the general education requirements, resulting in a deluge of students attempting to enroll in general education classes at the same time. Dr. Weekes responded that this is also a problem with the current program, but the new general education program should allow planners to predict the demand more accurately.

Senator Myers made three observations: (1) having TAs and adjuncts teach basic language, composition, and introductory-level math classes runs contrary to the Hurwitz goals; (2) student attitudes need to be changed with regard to writing requirements (e.g., currently students do not think they should be expected to write in math classes); and (3) math students are penalized by the system, in that they cannot use any of their major courses to satisfy general education requirements. With regard to the last comment, Dr. Weekes noted that the Math Department might want to pursue an exemption; Dr. Myers responded that the issue had been brought to the committee previously but not acted upon.

Senator Witte noted that the centralization required by the general education proposal runs counter to what will happen in the 21st century, where self-organization will be the norm. She also expressed the following concerns: (1) flexibility will be lost with the

general education proposal; (2) one of the most important aspects of a core curriculum, a small class seminar format, will not be possible, thereby depriving students of potentially life-changing experiences; and (3) the general education program is experimental and could be a disaster. With regard to the last point, she suggested that a pilot program involving perhaps 20 percent of the students, or only those who want to participate in this type of curriculum, could be tested and evaluated before implementing it for the whole University. Responding to the comment that the proposed curriculum is experimental, Dr. Weekes noted that the curriculum currently in place could be considered experimental, because there is such a huge variety of classes with no logical structure or unifying factor. She added that she has greater concerns about the current curriculum than she ever would have about an experiment.

Senator Emrick identified himself as a member of the ICPC and made the following points: (1) as Senator Clarke indicated, we have retreated from the core concept; if "one size fits all," we would have only one college; (2) with the help of faculty input, the proposal has moved back in the direction of diversity; (3) small seminars would be great, but that could mean that 2500 faculty members might be needed to teach 4500 students. With regard to the issue of students delaying the fulfillment of their general education requirements, he noted that the committees involved with the implementation of the proposal are hoping to meet with computer personnel to devise a method of flagging records so that students cannot move on to advanced standing until Tier I requirements are met.

Senator Medine commended the committee as well. He noted that he had had profound reservations about the general education proposal from the outset, but they have been mostly allayed. He also commented that he and a colleague had proposed a writing course that they plan to teach in sections of 150 students, with two lectures and a breakout section with a teaching assistant; he said he has no doubt that composition can be taught effectively that way. There are a variety of ways to accomplish an objective, he said, and a seminar format of teaching is only one method. He also noted that he shared Senator Witte's concern about loss of departmental autonomy and her horror of the centralization of authority. However, he concluded, watching the emergence of the structure that will be in place for general education requirements has caused him to feel encouraged and confident.

Senator J. O'Brien commented that the committee had done an awesome task in developing and refining the proposal, and he noted that his greatest fear had been that the status quo was being reinvented. Although that no longer appears to be the case, he said he remained concerned about the way courses are chosen. He asked if the committee could provide some information on the optimal number of courses for the general education program, as well as on how the program would be evaluated. How will the outcomes be measured? Dr. Sturman responded that an evaluation instrument was devised at the same time the pilot courses were being developed; those pilot courses are now being evaluated for how effectively they worked, and the evaluation instrument itself will also be tested. She added that some pilot courses are now on their second round through the committee process. In response to Senator O'Brien's inquiry about what the instrument measures, Dr. Sturman referred the question to Dr. Steele, who noted that the Office of Instructional Assessment and Evaluation Services is developing the instrument. Currently a questionnaire is being distributed to all faculty members who taught pilot courses, asking them various things about what they wanted to accomplish and what they thought they accomplished; after those questionnaires are completed, they will be matched with the course evaluations. She concluded by noting that the evaluation instrument, like the curriculum itself, is a work in progress.

Senator Schooley spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that he also had many reservations originally. However, he said, the faculty committees have done a marvelous job of retaining most of the practical, pragmatic advantages of earlier proposals while still providing the flexibility that is so central to its being workable. He referred to the proposal as a noble experiment and urged that the Senate move forward with it.

Senator Anderson reiterated her concerns regarding resources and diversity.

Presiding Officer Warburton announced that the time allotted for debate was almost over, and that the Senate could either vote today or continue the discussion at the Senate meeting on February 3. It was determined that there was still a quorum present.

Senator Zwolinski moved [**Motion 1996/97-44**] to postpone further debate on the general education proposal until the Senate meeting on March 3, because of some unresolved issues, such as criteria and guidelines for exemptions; motion seconded. Senator Zwolinski added that he was concerned about the very few number of faculty present to vote on the issue today. He concluded by saying that he would support the proposal, but he needed more information.

Parliamentarian Sankey clarified that, although Senator Zwolinski initially phrased his request as a point of order, it was actually a matter of substance that needed to be stated as a motion.

Presiding Officer Warburton called for a vote on Senator Zwolinski's motion to postpone debate on the general education proposal until March 3. **Motion 1996/97-44** passed, with 22 votes in favor and 16 opposed.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Rose M. Gerber, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Consent agenda items for Senate meeting on January 27, 1997
2. Proposed policy regarding data ownership, access to, and retention of scientific data
3. General education proposal, related report from ICPC, and cover letter from ICPC chair

*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 January 27, 1997

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 1996/97-39 | Proposal from the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources to discontinue the Ph.D. degree in Water Resources Administration; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1996/97-40 | Proposal from the Department of Hydrology and Water Resources to rename the M.S. in Water Resources Administration to Water Resources Engineering; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1996/97-41 | Request to change the name of the Department of Veterinary Science to the Department of Veterinary Science and Microbiology; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1996/97-42 | Motion to adopt the proposed policy regarding data ownership, access to, and retention of scientific data; approved. |
| 1996/97-43 | Motion to approve the general education proposal; postponed (see below). |
| 1996/97-44 | Motion to postpone debate on general education proposal until the Faculty Senate meeting on March 3, 1997; motion carried. |

CAMPUS MAIL

Faculty Senate Office
1400 East Mabel Street
PO Box 210473