

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
February 5, 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, Aleamoni, Atwater, Barrett, Buras, Clarke, Coons, Dahlgran, David, Desai, Driggs, Emrick, Forbes, Gerber, Hallick, Hill, Houk, Larson, Lei, Levy, McElroy, Medine, Mitchell, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pintonzi, Pitt, Reiter, Schooley, Schwarz, Sharkey, Silverman, Smith, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troth, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Witte, and Zwolinski. Observer Vos (SAC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Anderson, Arechederra, Ayers, Dvorak, Erickson, Feltham, Goggans, Gruener, Jacobs, Joens, Marchalonis, Mare, Mount, Neuman, Reynolds, Spece, and Sypherd. Observer Jull (APOC).

2. **ADDRESS BY EDDIE BASHA, PRESIDENT, ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS:**

Eddie Basha, President of the Arizona Board of Regents, indicated that the Board has recently been dealing with the following issues: (1) Residency status, underway for some time and now completed, has been tightened to ensure that Arizona students get the full benefit of our Arizona universities. (2) Stronger admission requirements to ensure that students who enroll at our universities are well prepared to succeed academically. (3) Graduation requirements, streamlined so that students will be able to complete their studies within 120 credit hours. (4) Affirmative action: the universities have been asked to submit to the Board this summer an overview and a comprehensive evaluation of the affirmative action programs that they have in place. He said the Board has reaffirmed its commitment to affirmative action both in the workplace and for students. (5) Conditions of Faculty Service, including tenure: because of public concerns about the purposes and benefits of the system through which University faculty are awarded tenure, the Regents have undertaken extensive review of tenure and the conditions of faculty service. The Board has asked the faculty to come back within a year with recommendations on how we might improve tenure and post-tenure review. (6) Information technology: by year's end, the Board hopes to have reports from all three universities on how they deal with distance learning. (7) Articulation with the community colleges: the Legislature wants us to have a better process and may reduce the budgets of the universities and the community colleges 10% if an agreement is not reached. (8) Enrollment growth: by the creation of additional campuses. (9) Program and resource duplication.

Senator Silverman asked Mr. Basha if he had any suggestions for the universities to get the message to Legislators in a better way than they have thus far. Mr. Basha said that the Board created an outreach committee chaired by Regent Gignac. It brings together parents, students and faculty of the three universities in an effort to promote higher education before the Legislature.

Senator McElroy noted that there had been no consultation with faculty prior to Regents' action on the 120-unit credit hour maximum, and given the faculty's responsibility for the curriculum of the universities, he wished to object to that action. Mr. Basha responded that he would share this concern with the Council of Presidents, with the Regents' Executive Director, and his fellow Board members.

Senator S. O'Brien noted that on February 23, there will be budget hearings on campus, but Senator Springer, chair of the Legislative committee, has indicated that she will not include the testimony as part of the record, and she expressed concern with that decision. Mr. Basha said that Senator Springer had stated last year that her job was two-fold: to cut taxes and build prisons. Mr. Basha added that he was terribly distressed with that attitude and philosophy.

Senator Buras proposed that a yearly, one-day seminar be organized for Legislators, scheduled alternately at the different campuses, to show Legislators first-hand what these institutions can do for the State. Mr. Basha said he thought it was a wonderful idea, and he hoped the University of Arizona would be the first to institute the idea.

Senator J. O'Brien asked how the recent Auditor General's Report dealing with University Administration and Support was viewed by the Board. Mr. Basha said he thought the Regents realized that that report was flawed and placed no credence in it. He noted that there were no benchmarks to relate that report to our peer institutions.

Senator Barrett asked that, assuming the Legislature continues to approve money for the new Arizona International Campus, did Mr. Basha think there was any possibility that it would be housed anywhere other than at IBM, on a permanent basis. Mr. Basha said he couldn't answer that question, and he would defer to his colleagues on the Board who live in southern Arizona. However, the IBM property was acquired by the Board of Regents for two specific purposes: one as an investment, and secondly for the purpose of housing a new university. He thought the facility would be located at that site over the next six to ten years because of the monetary question.

Senator Clarke said it was hard to imagine what this University would have become without tenure. He asked Mr. Basha if he agreed that the tenure issue goes far beyond the job interests and careers of individual faculty members. Mr. Basha said the Regents now are only looking at how the system might be more effective, and he didn't think tenure was in jeopardy. He expressed concern on how tenure affects women who have and raise children and thought that, when faculty report back to the Regents, they might well indicate the need to extend that period for women. While he didn't know what the outcomes would be, he didn't believe that the Board would do away with tenure.

Senator Clarke noted that the Regents had done away with tenure on the new Pima campus. Mr. Basha countered that the Board did so upon the request of Provost Fernandez which was approved by the President, and the Board was merely acceding to that request. President Pacheco acknowledged that that was correct. Senator Clarke said that the Senate views the concept of no tenure at the new campus to be a serious problem.

Senator Medine commented that tenure is seen as lifelong employment security. However, it was his opinion that University faculty are reviewed and evaluated more consistently and continuously than any other profession, assuring a great deal of quality and control. Secondly, it is important to preserve both freedom of inquiry and the matter of empowering the faculty to preserve the academic mission of the University. Without tenure, the faculty would be disempowered, and it is important for the taxpayers to understand that the University's academic mission depends on what the faculty can do. Mr. Basha said he agreed that academic freedom is vital to not only the pursuit of knowledge but to the substance of our democracy.

3. OPEN SESSION:

Senator Silverman said he was reporting on behalf of the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee (FBSPC) and the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC). He noted

that this year, all of the members of FBSPC are also on SPBAC. FBSPC has met on two or three occasions to discuss SPBAC issues and to develop recommendations. Currently, SPBAC has two major items on its agenda: (1) identification of issues which should be considered in University planning; preparations are in the final stages for a report that will be shared campus-wide. (2) a review of the number of degrees offered, awaiting recommendations from individual units. He said that if faculty have any issues or questions concerning the FBSPC or SPBAC to call him or Senator Stan Reynolds, who is the Chair of FBSPC.

4. REPORTS:

4A. President Manuel Pacheco

President Pacheco said he recently appeared before the Legislative Budget Subcommittee to discuss 1996-97 budget proposals, and his remarks were centered primarily on three basic themes: (1) Actions taken in recent years to bring our programs and resources into better balance; we have completed 31 CORE projects to date, and have approximately 120 projects underway, and already these are saving over a million dollars a year. (2) The numerous ways in which we are improving our academic programs. (3) Since the universities bore the brunt of the State's budget cuts over the last five years when financial times were hard, and now that financial conditions have improved, it is time to repair some of the damage and universities should benefit at least to the same degree that they had to suffer over that period of time. He also emphasized to the Subcommittee the importance of the recommended 2% merit salary increase as a minimum, preferably starting July rather than next January, and the funding of this year's 2% increase on a continuing basis. He said he thought he detected considerable sympathy for our position, unlike what he has experienced in the last five years.

President Pacheco reported on a fire that occurred yesterday in the Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering building, wherein four offices were gutted. He noted that, while the College of Engineering is doing its best to assist those affected, there is no doubt that faculty will be seriously inconvenienced. It was distressing to learn that there were indications that arson was involved.

4B. Faculty Chair John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz reported that the Task Force on the Conditions of Faculty Service has been formed, and its members consist of the Senate's Academic Personnel Policy Committee and past Chairs of that committee. The Task Force will begin to meet during the week of February 19. It will seek faculty input and develop proposals over the next three to five months, which then will go through the normal process and come before the full Senate for discussion and action.

He noted that, placed on Senators' desks today was a revised proposal prepared by the Co-Governance Working Group, representing the fulfillment of one of the most important promises he made when he ran for election to Chair of the Faculty. He said this document had been revised substantially from the original draft discussed by the Senate on October 30, and benefited significantly from contributions of a large number of faculty. If this proposal is approved by the Senate, it will mandate such things as (1) faculty involvement in the recruitment, hiring, review and retention of all key members of the administration, including all Vice Presidents, Deans and Department Heads; and (2) a process to formulate new policies and amend existing ones which involve faculty participation from the start and mutual acceptance of those policies.

He added that a second document had been placed on Senators' desks: a revised version of the Committee of Eleven's Declaration of Governance Principles. He said its preamble had been adopted

unanimously by the Committee, but the remainder of the document was in progress and thus still an interim document.

In preparation for the Senate's March meeting, he asked Senators to read both documents, which would provide the focus for open debate. Following that debate, a committee appointed by the Senate Executive Committee will work to combine the documents, finding the themes and ideas they share in common and also identifying where the documents differ in philosophy and specifics. The committee's results will be reported back to the Senate in time for its April meeting, so that final discussion and action can occur at that time.

Chair Schwarz then turned the floor over to Senator Smith, Chair of the Committee of Eleven. Senator Smith noted that the preamble in the Committee of Eleven's Declaration of Governance Principles is the State shared governance law, and that the document is indeed in process. A copy of the final document will be submitted to the Senate with the March meeting call.

4C. Presiding Officer of the Senate Betty Atwater

Senator Atwater reported that, concerning the request for faculty input on the Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy draft, she had received more than 35 e-mail messages or faxes. Those responses will be shared with the committee that will be appointed to develop a further draft of this policy.

4D. ASUA President Ben Driggs

Senator Driggs said that the Student Regent position for next year will be a UA student, and the selection process is underway. He reported on the Spring 1996 election dates for ASUA. Primary elections will occur March 27-28 and the general elections will occur April 2-3. Spring Fling will be held April 4-7. ASUA completed its voter registration drive, and registered 2,800 students.

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Abrams said that a former member of the Senate asked him to take up with President Pacheco the issue, expressed in a recent editorial in the New York Times, entitled "The NCAA Gets It Right," in which the NCAA voted to replace its governance structure which was controlled primarily by coaches and athletic directors with one that placed college presidents in charge of all planning and policy activities including budget. He asked President Pacheco what the UA was planning to do about those changes, and if he would seek the advice of the faculty. President Pacheco said that the governance of the NCAA has actually been in the hands of university presidents for at least the last four years. The recent change that occurred was to make the structure more well-defined, with specific responsibilities assigned to the various subdivisions of the NCAA. He added that, for years prior to his arrival, the UofA had an Intercollegiate Athletics Committee which included faculty representation. Four months ago, he created a committee, chaired by Dean Taylor of the College of Education, to look specifically at compliance issues having to do with student academic progress and eligibility, and the committee will report to him at least on an annual basis.

Senator Szilagyi noted that, as Chair of the Committee of Eleven's subcommittee working on revisions to the Declaration of Governance Principles, he wanted to clarify statements made today. The Principles were adopted by the Committee of Eleven in a previous version, and were submitted to the Senate as a seconded motion for approval. The subcommittee is now working on friendly amendments. The statements made by Senator Smith and Chair Schwarz should be understood to mean that some clarifications are needed in the Principles, but he did not anticipate fundamental changes.

Senator Witte asked if all members of the Co-Governance Working Group formally approved the document placed on Senators' desks today, and if not, which members did not. Chair Schwarz said that all have been asked for their views on the document. Although the Working Group did not have a formal vote on the document, to his knowledge it was approved by consensus of the group.

Senator McElroy asked Senator Smith why the Principles document did not carry the names of the members of the Committee of Eleven, as the Co-Governance Working Group document had listed its members, and whether the Committee of Eleven's approval on the document had been unanimous.

Senator Smith said he could provide no reason for leaving off the committee members' names from the Committee of Eleven document, but he could provide those names now: in addition to himself, who serves as Chair, the members are Larry Aleamoni, Anita Bhappu (the graduate student representative), Nathan Buras, Theodore Downing, Henry Ewbank, Robert Feltham, Scott Jacobs, Kimberly Montanaro (the undergraduate student representative), John Schwarz, Andy Silverman, Miklos Szilagyi and Marlys Witte. Senator Smith added that the original document, which was presented as a seconded motion, had been approved unanimously, but with the document that is still in process, he couldn't answer that question.

Senator Witte said she was somewhat confused because it had been the clear intention of the Committee of Eleven that the names of its members appear on the document, as evidenced by the copy that had been provided to her. She said she did not know how the names came to be removed.

Chair Schwarz noted that the Committee of Eleven document was not a final document. He added that the earlier committee document came into being at a meeting where not all members were present, and approved at a special Sunday meeting where some members saw the document for the first time and were not sufficiently prepared.

Senator Witte said that each of the Committee of Eleven's meetings had been duly called, and had a majority of the members present. While unanimity is desirable, it isn't always possible. On the other hand, she said, the Co-Governance Working Group document was not even considered at an official meeting, and no vote taken, in contrast to the Committee of Eleven's process.

Senator Smith indicated that the Committee of Eleven's final document would contain committee members' names.

6. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 22, 1996**

Senator Atwater reported that the minutes of the January 22 meeting would be submitted for approval at the March Senate meeting.

7. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON PROPOSAL TO AWARD FACULTY SENATE OBSERVER STATUS TO THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION**

Senator Atwater reported that, at the January 22 Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting, the committee agreed to recommend that Senate observer status be allocated to a representative from the Alumni Association. Currently, two other organizations have been awarded Senate observer status: the Staff Advisory Council and the Appointed Personnel Council. While they have no vote, they are permitted to address issues and are provided with a nameplate. It was then moved and seconded.

Senator Williams asked how the representative would be selected. Senator Atwater called on Jay Rochlin, Assistant Director of the Alumni Association. Mr. Rochlin said that the representative would

probably be Kent Rollins, the Executive Director of the Alumni Association or himself. Senator Williams said he thought it would be useful if the members of the Alumni Association elected their representative. Mr. Rochlin said that would definitely be appropriate, and the matter will be placed on the Association's March 6 Board meeting agenda.

A voice vote then indicated approval that the Alumni Association be given observer status (motion 1995/96-28).

8. **DISCUSSION ON A PROCEDURE FOR INFORMING ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN UA UNDERGRADUATE LOWER-DIVISION COURSES AND REQUIREMENTS**

Senator Hill, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), reported that the committee was presenting for approval, as a seconded motion (1995/96-28 or 29), a procedure for informing Arizona community colleges of significant changes in UofA undergraduate lower-division courses and requirements. The proposal, which was approved by the Undergraduate Council, sets forth a procedure that the community colleges be included earlier in the planning process for changes in lower-division requirements than they have been in the past.

Senator Aleamoni noted that the proposal indicated that the community colleges be informed at an early stage of significant changes in undergraduate courses, but in reviewing the process, it appeared to him that any action taken on courses would be sent forward, with no judgment exercised to determine if they were significant changes. Senator Hill said it was his interpretation that a judgment would be made, and that the change would have to have some material impact on the community colleges before the units of the University would be required to give notice. He thought that it would be up to the individual units to determine what would be significant and to provide notice, but if an individual unit determined that a change was insignificant, notice would not be provided.

Senator Medine said he was particularly concerned with a section in Objective 2, "To provide Arizona community colleges the opportunity to comment on anticipated changes in UA undergraduate lower-division courses..." He said this seemed to indicate that the University would have to obtain approval for the revision and creation of its undergraduate courses. Senator Hill said he didn't think the community colleges intended to participate in the creation of our curriculum, but just wanted notice within a sufficient time to deal with the change.

In response to Senator Medine's concern, Senator Troth noted that this issue was addressed on page 2, Curriculum Office Responsibility, in item (5): "Comments will be considered as part of the approval process, but approval authority remains with the UA faculty."

Senator Levy moved to table motion 1995/96-29. President Pacheco seconded. A voice vote indicated approval.

9. **REPORT ON UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE ARTICULATION ISSUES**

Senator Atwater called upon Assistant Vice Provost Lynne Tronsdal to talk about the articulation system between the University and community colleges. She said it is a well-developed program: (1) The State articulation task forces bring together faculty from the community colleges and universities to discuss curricular matters and to decide, by discipline, which courses are equivalent. There are 38 University of Arizona faculty who serve on the State Articulation Task Force, and there are 33 local articulation task forces. (2) From state articulation meetings, a Course Equivalency Guide was put together which includes all the courses from community colleges and their equivalencies at the three

universities. (3) Transfer guides were prepared for each community college, which indicates every major at the UA and what courses at that particular community college will fill the requirements. (4) The Transfer General Education Core Curriculum was negotiated with all the community colleges and the three universities, and was accepted in 1993. (5) Advisors: The College of Arts and Sciences has a full-time advisor who goes to all four Pima Community College campuses and advises students.

Dr. Tronsdal reported that some new legislation has been proposed by some of the community colleges that there be a General Education Core that would fulfill all of the General Education requirements, and that no institution could have a requirement that all the others would not also have. Another part of that legislation is that there would be a core of lower-division major courses agreed to by community colleges and the universities.

Senator McElroy asked for an explanation of the proposed legislation that would cut 10% from our budget if a better articulation system was not adapted. Senator Atwater asked President Pacheco if he could address this issue.

President Pacheco responded that there are a number of proposals being introduced to the Legislature. There appears to be an assertion that community college students are being disenfranchised by the three universities, because while there is a transfer guide, it does not exist especially for rural community colleges. The proposed core would eliminate all diversity in course work; in essence we would be committing ourselves to a common curriculum at all three universities and the community colleges. While on the surface it seemed to be very simple and do-able, in fact it would eliminate any possibility for universities to define their own curriculum. One of the three proposals being considered in the Legislature calls for a solution to be presented to the Legislature by September 30th, or 10% of our appropriation would be taken away. A second Legislative proposal creates a state-wide committee with representatives of the universities and community colleges, as well as public members, that would define what the core curriculum should be for the universities and community colleges. The third Legislative proposal is that a small committee be put together of community college and University representatives to try to reach a resolution.

10. REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

10A. Research Policy Committee

Senator Barrett reported that the Research Policy Committee will be working on the issue of data and research retention this semester.

10B. Committee of Eleven

Senator Smith reported that the questionnaire for administrator evaluation should be in the mail in about a week.

11. ADJOURNMENT The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Andrew Silverman
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix*

1. Proposal for a procedure for informing Arizona community colleges of significant changes in UA undergraduate lower-division courses and requirements.

*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 February 5, 1996

- 1995/96-28 A motion that the Alumni Association be given observer status: Approved.
- 1995/96-29 A motion to approve a procedure for informing Arizona community colleges of significant changes in UA undergraduate lower-division courses and requirements: Tabled.