

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, April 4, 1994 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, April 4, 1994, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Thirty-two members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Malcolm J. Zwolinski presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Badger, Barrett, Brichler, Coons, DaDeppo, Desai, Dickinson, Dvorak, Ewbank, Garcia, Hammond, Hill, Inman, Joens, Jones, Lei, McElroy, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Pitt, Reynolds, Roemer, Silverman, Songer, Sullivan, Warburton, E. Williams, Witte, Wright, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Aleamoni, Anderson, Atwater, Bertram, Buras, Dahlgran, Enos, Fernandez, Gruener, Hildebrand, Huete, Impey, Larson, Lewis, Manke, Pacheco, Parsons, Ruiz, Shoemaker, Sjong, Sypherd, Troy, J. Williams, W. Williams, and Zukoski.

2. ADDRESS BY REGENT DOUG WALL, PRESIDENT, ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS: Dr. Zwolinski introduced Regent Doug Wall, President of the Arizona Board of Regents. Regent Wall thanked the Senate for inviting both Dr. Frank Besnette and himself to join the Senate today. "Frank and I discussed what remarks we might make that would be of interest to you. Over the last couple of months we've been looking at issues to review at our summer retreat, what we see as the "front burner" issues in higher education in Arizona and nationally. About a week ago, we received a report from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and it contained ten public policy issues for higher education in 1994. These issues were arrived at with a great deal of study and time with administrators and faculty at various schools around the country, to learn what they saw as the ten most burning issues in 1994. Those issues appear to be pretty much in line with what we see here in Arizona. I will talk very briefly about those ten issues.

"#1, the Budget Squeeze. Fortunately, in Arizona, we've now had a little bit of a reprieve. It looks like the Legislature is being more generous with us, and things are looking quite a bit better than they did a few months ago, even last year. But competition for public funds will become more acute at the federal, state and local levels, further squeezing the budget for higher education. I think we are talking about the long-term future, ten years out, rather than a year-by-year basis. A surge in economic growth will not solve the problems. I think it dipped, however, to some extent in Arizona. The economic activity has helped to provide additional funds this year, but for the long run, I don't think we can depend on that.

"#2, Oversight and Accountability. Public agency oversight at educational institutions will continue to grow. So will demand for greater institutional accountability regarding finances, administration, and academic affairs. The whole concept of accreditation is in jeopardy. College officials may lose valuable allies in maintaining the tradition of self-regulation.

"#3, Access, Productivity and Cost Containment. State and federal policy makers will intensify their pressure on educational institutions to increase productivity and provide access at reasonable cost. More than ten years of tuition increases have caused the public to worry that a college education will soon be

priced beyond the reach of all but the wealthy.

"#4, Student Aid Reforms. I see that Student Regent Spencer Insolia is here. I know this will meet with his approval. New student aid legislation promises dramatic change. Direct loans, national service, and income-contingent loan repayments are on the way.

"#5, Changing Priorities for Research. Growth in federal funds for University research will slow. Priorities may continue to shift to research that supports economic development. There are increasing demands for practical applications of knowledge and results in return for federal investment. Stricter accountability by institutions and individual researchers is very likely.

"#6, Race and Diversity. Institutions will be asked to do more to address practical societal problems, including issues concerning race and diversity.

"#7, National Health Care Debate. Every college and university will be affected by the outcome of this national debate on health care reform. Every member of the academic community will be affected. Educational institutions will feel the effects as employers, as providers of health care services and research, and as educators of health care personnel. As you are most likely aware, a Regental commission was recently established in Arizona to plan for some of these changes.

"#8, Intercollegiate Athletics. Public scrutiny of intercollegiate athletics will continue amid ongoing controversies about cost containment, gender equity, and the effects of reforms. Concerns about the integrity of college sports refuse to go away.

"#9, Involvement in Public School Reform. Colleges and universities will be asked to do more to advance school reform in K-12 education. They will have to adjust their admissions and academic policy to deal with the realities of school reforms.

"#10, Faculty Retirement. You all are in a much better position than we to know what effect this will have on you here at the University, or at ASU or NAU. Nationally, it is considered to be a very important concern. The elimination of mandatory retirement in 1994 could affect the finances and faculty demographics of many institutions. It could lead some educational institutions to re-examine existing tenure policies and early retirement plans.

"These are the hot issues that the Association of Governing Boards views as the top ten issues nationally. I believe, and I think Frank agrees, that these are also the front-burner issues here in Arizona. I appreciate being here very much."

3. ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK BESNETTE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS:
Dr. Besnette said he appreciated both the invitation to meet with the Senate and to see some friends of many years. "I thought I'd give you a sense that the Board is really on track with a lot of the issues that President Wall just enumerated for you. In the next few months, the Board will be dealing very directly with the emphasis on continuing to improve the undergraduate experience at all three institutions. There is a continuing emphasis of the Board on ensuring excellence in teaching, and on emphasizing even more the role and importance of advising and academic counseling for undergraduate students.

"The Board, although it doesn't get nearly the amount of attention that the first

topic received, will also be focusing on improvements in research and graduate programs. I suspect that some of you may feel that the focus has been almost exclusively on undergraduate education, and this being a Research I institution, you may believe that not enough emphasis has been given to the importance of research. But I can assure you that the Board will pay due attention to that.

"I was concerned that I would not be able to say anything about a bit of pending news, but I assume that it's now public knowledge, because I heard it on the radio in Phoenix. If any of you do not know, you are no longer the only Research I institution in Arizona, but you are now one of two Research I institutions. Arizona State University has just received word that the Carnegie Commission will reclassify ASU to the status of Research I. I am sure you will join me in congratulating your sister institution up north.

"There will be a continuing concern of the Board for enrollment demand because we forecast a sizeable increase in demand for access to a University education. We have yet to figure out with any certainty how we are going to address that demand. The Board has put in place what I believe is a well-thought out, long-range strategic plan: Develop ASU-West to the next level; develop ASU-East, with a campus probably at Williams Air Force Base; develop a four-year institution, with predominantly an undergraduate emphasis, here in Pima County; utilize our existing facilities and resources more extensively than we have in the past to serve part of this population; and also to emphasize the considerable advances that have been made in what we could call distance education or outreach, serving the outlying populations, the placebound, the career bound. NAU has been a leader in that, and has moved with great distinction in that area. But all three universities are committed to doing that. All that is relatively easy to outline as a plan, and it makes sense to most people who have reviewed it, but in terms of finding the wherewithal, the resources, the funding, given what Doug has talked about in terms of the continuing pressures on State funding, that's going to be a tough challenge.

"Yes, there will be a continuing focus of the Board, as well, I think, as every other governing board of public universities in this country, on the issue of productivity and faculty workload. That's an area where we have a lot of interest, a lot of confusion, and we, I think, have to do a better job of telling the story of what faculty do and how they utilize their time and why what they do is appropriate, if it is. Possibly some efforts should be shifted elsewhere, and along with that, of course, is revision of the reward and recognition system we've had in this country. There will also be in this Board a continuing increase on accountability of the Arizona Board of Regents. This has been a focus of the Board for the last few years, and will continue to be. This Board is attempting to be more communicative with constituent groups, to be more direct in dealing with public perceptions, and that will be a continuing emphasis of this Board.

"As President Wall indicated, the Board will continue its emphasis on health professions education. I was given the privilege of heading up a Tri-University Council on Health Care Professions Education in the state, and I am looking forward to that. Another issue of Board concern is the whole area of cost of attendance for our students, as well as the amount of support our students are given in terms of financial assistance, a subject which the Board, I think, attributes in good part to the presence of Student Regent Insolia. This Board knows more about this issue--student assistance, student aid--than any Board in the past, but they also know how much more they need to know to make good public policy. So we will continue to pursue that."

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Silverman said that he appreciated Regent Wall and Dr. Besnette addressing the Senate. It appeared to him that there sometimes was a communication gap between the Regents and the University communities. The result was that the campus communities were not always aware of the issues the Regents are working on and of their efforts to benefit the University communities. He wondered if more could be done by the Regents to establish a communication link through Lo Que Pasa, and its equivalent at the other state universities, to better inform the University communities about issues the Board was addressing. He also asked why higher education has such a problem in the Legislature, and why every year so much work has to be done to tell the universities' story. He wondered whether the Regents were working on any strategy to better tell the story and to make higher education's value clearer.

President Wall said he could offer his personal viewpoints. "Addressing your first concern, I've been on the Board six years now, and I've heard similar concerns from the faculty of all three schools, about what the Board was doing. I can honestly tell you that the Board of Regents has done everything within its power to try and gain recognition with the Legislature about the job that the Universities are doing, and the need that the faculty have had for increased compensation. I have no reservations in telling you we have done everything possible, going out to communities and alumni and trying, last year, to put political pressure on the Legislature. We have tried to gain for you the resources that we know you need and certainly are entitled to. Fortunately, the State was in a position, and I think the political climate was such this year, that we have been moderately successful. But I don't know that it was through any effort we made. I couldn't say that, yes, we did this and that. I really don't know whether it was anything we did or didn't do, or whether it was the fact that they just had some more money to give. As to why we've had such a difficult time, I think there are problems of perception. As Don Pitt always reminded us, perception is a big part of our problem, and we spent hours talking about how we could change the perception of the Legislative people regarding the University. We probably haven't resolved it, but we tried. In the future, I think, it is going to be very important that the University work with the Legislature in trying to solve the problems of this State. I can't tell you how much I think that would gain for us. If somehow we could get together with them and say, 'Look, you've got these problems, we've got this brain power; let's put it together and let us help you solve these problems.' I think if we could reach that point, we could jump over the hurdle and we would have resources thrown at us that we've never seen before. But getting over that hurdle is a real problem, and probably you are in a much better position to figure out how to do that than I am. Those are just my personal comments."

Dr. Besnette: "These are my personal views also, and do not reflect those of the Board of Regents. I've been following higher education for a long time in this State. There used to be a lot of money and not such close scrutiny of how it was spent. Now, there is cognition of the distribution of public dollars for Corrections, for AHCCCS, and for all the other programs, and that is part of it. Society is cranky about a lot of things, and their feeling of not getting a good return on their tax dollar investment is one. They have read more and seen more headlines about universities in the last ten years than they probably ever saw before, because we have become subject to much closer scrutiny. What do we do about it? We're doing a lot of communicating, but it doesn't seem to register. I'm not sure whether the Faculty One-Stop Shop started here or at ASU. The idea that faculty have said they will stand ready to serve sounds corny in some ways, but I think that really has a lot of potential, because when I get the best feelings from public officials, it is because faculty members have been

interacting with them. That's when they realize how important you are, and how good you are. One issue that I am very concerned about is term limitation. I think we have to worry about what that means for higher education. In my experience, it takes a few years, generally speaking, to develop a champion for higher education. An elected official in the first term has got to learn so much, and becoming a champion for universities just doesn't happen until they have had some experience and been there a while. The universities aren't perfect, but they are worth bleeding for--they are worth funding. But they are not easily understood, and we need folks that are really willing to go to bat for us."

Senator J. O'Brien asked if President Wall or Dr. Besnette could explain the Regents' ideas of faculty productivity, and explain why the Legislature has the perception that faculty are not productive.

Dr. Besnette: "I really think that the Regents appreciate that you work hard, and that you work long hours, and that you are very dedicated professionals. I do not believe that there is any question on the number of hours that you have indicated you work. It's not an issue of the amount of time. They are concerned about how that time is apportioned, and with the reward and recognition system. I think most Legislators think most faculty work pretty hard and long. Again, it's a question of how that time is apportioned. I don't like the word 'productivity.' I don't know what it means, really. It means a lot of different things. What I think we've got to deal with is having people understand more what it is to be a faculty member, what that involves. The Board will worry about where the emphasis is on the use of faculty time in the aggregate."

President Wall said he agreed with Dr. Besnette. "I don't think the Board has any feeling that faculty are not working long enough or hard enough. I think the pressure is on the Board concerning the undergraduate area. Students continually complain, and when the Legislature says 'fix it,' we say we need more money to fix it. I think these complaints bring about the perceptual problem that there is not enough time being spent in the undergraduate training area, that it is being spent elsewhere. It's a joint effort, I think, between the Regents and the administration, more the administration's responsibility, and then the faculty's, to help fix this problem. That's how I personally view it."

Senator Witte said she wondered if the word 'productivity' was being defined in economic terms, as it often is on this campus, for example in the clinics--how many patients you see, how much money is brought in--or in the research arena --how many dollars are brought in. She countersuggested use of the term 'value of faculty members' because the definition would determine the productivity of a person. "If it is defined economically, then many things of value, such as time spent with a student, the mentoring, the advising, the development of programs, would not look very productive, and yet they may be the most valuable things faculty do. So we need your help, perhaps in determining the definition of 'value.' Although the faculty could be viewed as just another vested interest, probably in many ways we do represent the public, and we are also a sounding board." Following up Senator Silverman's comments, she said most would agree that the ten items referred to in President Wall's report are burning issues. Many have been discussed in the Senate, and she thought that Senators' viewpoints could be very useful.

Dr. Besnette said he agreed that the word 'productivity' was unfortunate. "Whenever I find myself in a discussion, I try to shift it to what I believe the real concern is: 'learning productivity.' I believe that is a concern of our general

society. How can we be more productive in the learning process, and address the concerns of the undergraduate experience, the time required to earn a degree, availability of classes, transfer from community colleges to universities, and placebound students whose studies have had to be intermittent. I think we won't get away from the word 'productivity.'

Senator Garcia asked if the Senate could have a copy of the report, "Ten Public Policy Issues for Public Education" that he had drawn on in his remarks. President Wall said that he would be glad to leave one.

Senator Songer said that "one topic rarely discussed in relation to improvement of the undergraduate experience is the preparedness of students entering the university. The increased sophistication of what students should know coming out of the universities has increased demands on faculty. It seems that secondary education has not kept up with universities' increased admissions requirements. What, if any, is the role of the Board of Regents in addressing that problem? We will probably never provide the best undergraduate experience we can until we have students optimally prepared coming in."

President Wall: "I don't know the answer, but I spoke earlier about the assistance of the universities in solving the problems of the State. Let me say that I think that you all are in a better position to help solve that problem than the Regents. If you come to us with a plan, it would get a great deal of enthusiastic support, in all likelihood. You have the experience, the training, and the ability. I want to throw out one thing about perception that I have gained in my years as a Regent. I have met continually with groups of faculty, and they have asked what are the Regents doing, why did you do this or why don't you do that. But faculty, as a group, have more authority on how to run this University than the Board of Regents, in my opinion. We have very little ability to do anything, and I mean that sincerely. It is very difficult for the Board to reach a decision. We have to go through every hoop, every committee, every level, and if something does not get approved at some point, it probably is not going to go anywhere. So, the Board of Regents is a body that has certain alleged authority, but carrying out that authority in this day and age is a totally different thing. So, please, don't be too critical. You probably have more authority to cause a change in your governance at this University than the Board of Regents has."

Senator Joens said he would like to share an experience that he had this semester. His department had received a letter from a Legislator, complaining that his constituents' children were not graduating on time. He said that, in his case, he was teaching a rather small class this semester, with about 13 students. Six had dropped after the mid-term, all with a C or below. "Do you think that's the University's fault? Or do you think it's the student's fault? If they're going to drop our classes, and they have to take them over again, how can that be our fault for not graduating these students?"

Dr. Besnette: "The time required to earn a degree is an issue that more and more people are paying attention to, and it's something that won't go away. A lot of misinformation exists about why students require more time to earn their degrees. Part of this was referred to earlier, I think, and relates to learning productivity. Preparedness is another part of the problem, as well as many other issues, including maturity, readiness for college, the older students, and those that have to work, dropping in and out. There are a whole lot of dynamics here. When people say they remember when they could graduate in four years, I always ask when that was, because I think we first started tracking this after the

Korean conflict. And at that time, graduation time was well over 4-1/2 years. We have to do a better job of educating, and it's a much more complex problem. We are dealing with a whole array of issues here, not the least of which is students having a hard time finding the wherewithal to get through. A lot more have to work, and that takes them more time. A lot of them do not come to us prepared to write. At its April meeting in Tucson, the Board will address increasing the admission requirements for the three Arizona universities. That will be an interesting discussion. I believe we will hear much discussion on the consequences of changing the requirements, and the impact of the requirements, particularly on certain smaller, outlying, rural school districts. If we are not preparing our students as well as we should now, why in the world would the Board of Regents increase the requirements? The Board will probably act on this, and I invite you to join us on April 14 and 15.

Dr. Zwolinski thanked President Wall and Dr. Besnette for addressing the Senate. He said the Senate sincerely appreciated their remarks.

5. OPEN SESSION: Senator Reynolds said that the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee wanted to provide some input to the administration on the 1995-96 budget request, which would be submitted to the Board of Regents during the summer. He had placed on Senators' desks a memo from the committee, requesting comments on the priorities for that budget request, to be turned in at the end of today's meeting or faxed to him the next morning (621-8450). He said the committee would meet the next afternoon to finalize the results, for submission to the Senate on its April 18 agenda.

Senator S. O'Brien encouraged each Senator to bring their daughters, real or adopted for the occasion, to the Daughters on Campus Day, to be held on Thursday, April 28. She distributed information on the scheduled events, and noted that the President had adopted a daughter for especially interesting events over the lunch hour.

Senator Warburton, a member of the Dean of Students Search Committee, said he had distributed the list of faculty forum dates for the Dean of Students finalists, and he encouraged Faculty Senators to attend. He said all input would be appreciated, would be treated confidentially, and the open forums were for anyone who wished to attend.

Senator Witte said that on the previous Saturday afternoon, as others were watching the Final Four, she was outside reviewing 64 undergraduate student research proposals that she considered to be extremely well written by true "heroes and heroines" on this campus.

6. REPORTS:

- 6A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Zwolinski reported that President Pacheco was out of town, and had asked Dr. Zwolinski to read his report: "I regret that I am unable to attend today's Senate meeting, because I had intended to speak on the topic of our 1994-95 budget.

"I suspect that everyone has followed the saga of our 1994-95 budget as it made its way through the Legislature in recent weeks and was adopted by both the House and the Senate last Wednesday evening. Since the Legislature remains in session, there is still a theoretical possibility that the figures could alter, but further change is highly unlikely. So the figures that you have read in the press are almost certain to be final. From my point of view, the results are

mixed. We got some of the important things that we wanted but we are going to have to manage without certain others.

"Let me, first, draw attention to some things that we did not get. We will not be receiving the additional \$778,000 that we requested to help meet our utility costs. This is a major problem, because we will have to reallocate funds from elsewhere to pay these unavoidable expenses. We will not be receiving \$467,000 that we requested for the Library and this, again, is no small matter. Our Library moved up in the national rankings in the latest annual assessment, but it will take a lot of money to keep that trend moving.

"What did we get? I am delighted to say that we were successful with our two highest priorities. We have stopped the downward spiral in budgets that has dominated recent years, and we shall be receiving funds for pay increases. There will be across-the-board pay increases for all state employees of 3 percent in July and another 2 percent next April. In addition, the Main Campus and the College of Medicine combined are to receive approximately \$2 million for further faculty salary adjustments. This represents about another 2 percent, so total new funding for faculty salaries will be approximately 7 percent. I would have preferred to see a high proportion of these funds distributed on the basis of merit. As it is, considering the salary drought in recent years, it is good to have done as well as we did.

"With regard to the additional \$2 million, I am not yet in a position to say how these funds will be distributed. We have to submit a plan for approval by the Regents, probably when the Board meets in May. In this respect, the work of the advisory committee that Provost Sypherd appointed will be important.

"I am pleased to say that we are to receive \$1.6 million to partially fund this year's modest enrollment growth. The Poison Control Center is to receive an additional \$300,000 next year, plus another \$175,000 to cover this year's expenses. This is an important improvement, because it removes one nagging pressure on our resources. As the Senate knows, the Poison Control Center has been seriously underfunded in recent years, and the University was expected to pick up the difference by moving funds from other purposes. We also are to receive \$1.5 million of the \$2 million that we requested to begin planning for a new four-year college in Pima County. In the absence of this money, I was not prepared to dig into University funds to meet the costs of planning, so these funds mean that we can finally move ahead to prepare for the new college.

"Other welcome components of the new budget are the \$1.4 million to meet the increased cost of employee benefits and the almost \$1 million in pass-through Risk Management funds that will be paid into the state's liability insurance account. The significance of these appropriations is that they will reduce the need to reallocate resources from elsewhere.

"Finally, the Board of Regents is to receive \$13.6 million for Capital Outlay purposes. We can expect to receive a large portion of this sum for building repairs, as well as our share of the \$1.2 million that is included in this item for improvements connected with the new Americans With Disabilities legislation. This figure of \$13.6 million is a vast improvement over the current year, when the three universities combined received only \$3.3 million. Even so, whatever share comes our way, the money will only let us begin to tackle a deferred maintenance problem that now exceeds \$85 million.

"In summary, then, our 1994-95 budget presents a mixed picture. We achieved some

of our important goals and got nowhere with others. We ended up somewhat ahead of the Governor's recommendation and well ahead of the initial Legislative proposals. Overall, these are encouraging results, not least because they include substantial new funding for faculty salaries. Even so, I have to stress that this budget does not remove the need to press ahead with assessing all our programs with a view to reducing or merging or terminating selected activities. As I have told the Senate on previous occasions, we are entering a prolonged period of resource difficulties along with the rest of American higher education. We cannot afford to attempt to do more than our finances will support. Thank you."

- 6B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Zwolinski reported that Provost Sypherd was also out of town and had asked him to read his report: "I regret that I am unable to attend this meeting of the Faculty Senate and to join in what I am sure will be a warm welcome to and a stimulating discussion with Regent Wall and Dr. Besnette. I understand that everyone is anxious to see the outcomes of the work of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee's Strategic Planning Subcommittee. This Subcommittee is now putting the finishing touches on a list of preliminary recommendations. Within the next two to three weeks, opportunities will be provided to the units that are referenced in these preliminary recommendations to discuss them with this Subcommittee.

"I expect the Subcommittee will first consider the input provided by the units and then finalize its recommendations. I anticipate receiving the Subcommittee's report before the Senate's May meeting, at which I expect that we will have an opportunity to discuss it. Since I see that the Senate's agenda is a full one, I will refrain from providing any further comments at this time, and will look forward to our next meeting."

- 6C. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia reported that, to provide a framework within which the University community can participate in the activities that follow after the report of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the Faculty Senate had cooperated with the Staff Advisory Council and others to bring on campus April 27 Dr. Marianne Jennings, who will be speaking on three different occasions throughout the day on the topics of ethics in the work place, ethics in research, and ethics in health issues. Announcements will be mailed. He said Dr. Jennings is a well-known ethicist from ASU. He encouraged Senators to attend at least one of the sessions.

Senator Garcia said the first part of the reorganization schedule, described in Provost Sypherd's report, would end in roughly three weeks, when the Strategic Planning Subcommittee submits its final report to the Provost. Those recommendations that require Senate action, such as the termination of a degree program or the closure of a department, will begin a second, more open phase in which faculty, departmental, and other kinds of input will occur, whether solicited or not, and the Senate committees will carry out their charges. A additional phase will occur when the Board of Regents receives recommendations. He said there are still many phases in this process, which is not an easy one. He added that all of this activity represented the beginning of a long-haul process if the University of Arizona is to trim its budget. "We probably should figure out how to do it right, because we'll be doing it more than once. It is important that each Senator monitor the processes that are occurring within each college, and report back to the Senate on the propriety of the processes that occurred. I think it is very important that we air all of the difficulties, and fix them before they turn into problems. It is incumbent upon you to examine the processes and to determine whether the system is working the way it should be."

Senator Garcia said that faculty governance should begin at the local level, and departments should ensure that proper mechanisms are in place. He said a report had recently been released which indicated that only 7 percent of our departments have operating rules. "Bylaws sound terribly technical, and to some people might sound useless, but if there isn't a written document by means of which you know how the unit operates, then I don't know how you can operate properly without them."

Senator Garcia reported that restructuring of Senate committees is being considered, and recommendations will be submitted to the Senate, perhaps early in the Fall. Concerning reorganizations, he said, the Senate Select Committee on Reorganizations, created in the fall of 1993, will report on Environmental Engineering at the April 18 meeting. The committee will meet with Regents Counsel Joel Sideman on April 18 for the purpose of making sure that we understand the legal processes associated with reorganizations."

6D. REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

6E. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Zwolinski reported that, because of the length of today's agenda, it was likely that the meeting would have to be recessed at 5:00 p.m., and continued on April 18. On April 18, he said, neither Open Session nor reports from the President, Provost, etc., would be scheduled, but action would be required on some agenda items, and he emphasized that a quorum would be needed. He requested that all Senators make an effort to attend that meeting.

Dr. Zwolinski announced the results of the Spring 1994 General Faculty Elections: Secretary of the Faculty, Andy Silverman; Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure: Victor Hruby, Sally Jackson, Hugh Laird II and Mary Wetzel; Committee of Eleven: Nathan Buras, Billie Raye Erlings, Henry Ewbank, Kenneth J. Smith and Marlys Witte; Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee: Douglas Jones and Michael Rieber; Faculty Senate College Representatives, who will be installed officially at the May 4 meeting: Agriculture: Roger Dahlgran, Lynn Joens, Dennis Larson, and John Mare; Architecture, Robert Dvorak; Arts and Sciences: Ludwik Adamowicz, Roy Emrick, Billie Raye Erlings, Richard Hallick, John McElroy, David Mount, Jocelyn Reiter, Jeffrey Warburton, and Ed Williams; Business and Public Administration: Stanley Reynolds; Education: Kenneth J. Smith; Engineering and Mines: Nathan Buras and Fredrick Hill; Law: Roy Spece, Jr.; Medicine: John Marchalonis; Non-College: Robert Mitchell and Chestalene Pintozzi; Nursing: Rose Gerber; and Pharmacy: Stephen Coons.

6F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: No report.

7. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator E. Williams asked about the \$1.4 million for employee benefits mentioned in the President's report. Senator Garcia responded that it was the ERE (Employee Related Expenses) that goes along with the pay raises.

Senator Jones asked if the Legislature had funded the 2% April salary increase. Dr. Zwolinski responded that the Legislature had agreed to fund it.

8. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 1994: Senator Inman requested a correction on page 162, third line from the bottom of the first paragraph: APPC should read ICPC. Dr. Zwolinski thanked Senator Inman. The minutes of March 7, 1994, were then approved as amended.

9. REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES:

- 9A. REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. Zwolinski reported that, in Senator Atwater's absence, it was planned that Senator Buras would make the report. But he was absent due to illness, so there would be no report today.
- 9B. REPORT FROM THE FACULTY BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: No report.
- 9C. REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Inman said that the committee's last meeting of the semester would occur tomorrow, and ICPC would address two issues: (1) a complaint from Dr. Rudy Troike, Head of the English Department, regarding the new Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure; Senator Inman said she did not believe it would be necessary to bring a recommendation to the Senate. And (2) whether ICPC wanted to offer comments on the upper-division writing proficiency examination and writing emphasis courses to the Intercollegiate Writing Committee; she said ICPC had discussed this matter at length previously, and she said it remained to be seen whether the committee would be able to agree on conclusions. Senator Inman said ICPC has a major project underway: the Provost's Teaching Symposium, scheduled for April 20, with Diversity in the Classroom the topic. She said notices were in the process of being mailed to all faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants, and there would also be a reminder in the Wildcat.
- 9D. REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Barrett said that the main item of business at its March 28 meeting was further discussion on the Conflict of Interest and Commitment Policy document. Revisions had been submitted by Dianne Sagner, University Attorney's Office, with comments provided by Linda Sypherd, Assistant Dean, College of Nursing. Further recommendations for changes were made by the members of the committee. He said the committee's last meeting will be a joint meeting with the Technology Transfer Committee, sometime in the second half of April. It was hoped that agreement could be reached on a final version of the document, which would then be transmitted to the Senate for consideration.
- 9E. REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. David Williams, Chair of the Student Affairs Policy Committee, said that SAPC tended to hear of all kinds of problems from all kinds of people. But the committee was unanimous in its recognition of Arlene Becella, the Registrar, and Jean Johnson, the Bursar, as particularly insightful, creative, articulate, and compassionate. They wanted to go on record as saying that we are very fortunate to have such a good Bursar and fine Registrar.
- 9F. REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN: Senator Myers said that a document entitled "Responsibilities of Faculty Governance Representatives" had been placed on Senators' desks today. "There are frequent references to faculty representatives serving on various kinds of committees or task forces, and faculty governance, in one way or another, is frequently asked to nominate, select or elect people to serve as representatives of faculty governance. The Committee of Eleven believes that one problem that has not been dealt with in the past is the representation aspect, i.e., that individuals serving in that capacity should both represent the faculty's position and interest in the issue, but at the same time report back. The Committee of Eleven has drawn up a proposed policy statement for Senate consideration, stressing that individuals who are selected to serve as faculty representatives have certain responsibilities. This is not intended to be a critique of individuals who have served in the past, but rather a forward-looking policy statement about the responsibilities of such represen-

tatives: (1) When they serve, they don't represent their department or their particular group--they represent the faculty at large; they should be responsive to the faculty in terms of soliciting interest and positions, and take into account information positions which are espoused by elected faculty. (2) Reporting back would take place by going back through the body that was responsible for selecting, appointing or electing--we already do that in a number of cases. (3) Faculty governance does have the right to change its representatives if it believes that someone is not fulfilling the responsibility. Senator Myers wondered whether it would be appropriate to move approval at this time.

Dr. Zwolinski suggested that it might be better if the document could be placed on the April 18 agenda, so Senators would have time to review the proposal. Senator Myers agreed to that suggestion.

10. ACTION ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AD HOC CURRICULUM PROCESS COMMITTEE: Dr. Zwolinski reminded Senators that the Ad Hoc Curriculum Process Committee had presented its report at the March 21 meeting, and was now requesting formal action. Senator Garcia said that revisions discussed at the March 21 meeting had been included in the material sent to Senators with today's meeting call. The committee had received some additional comments more recently, and these had been placed on Senators' desks today, entitled "Wording Changes for Curriculum Process Policies." Referring to those latter comments, he said they included (1) a recommended change in Policy #1, because of an objection to the three-year moratorium on courses. Originally the committee proposed that if a course had not been taught in three years, it ought to disappear from the books. He said that people had pointed out that courses taught every other year, depending on when the count started, would then disappear from the books after only one cancellation. The proposed new wording under Policy #1 stated "...for three years, or two consecutive offerings, whichever is longer." He said that amounted to four years for those courses which are taught every other year, really only two consecutive offerings. (2) Department heads were inadvertently cut out of the process, and the revised proposal for Policy #3 would ensure their position in the process. (3) The third revision simply clarifies the Faculty Senate's position with respect to its role in the process--the faculty-level review. (4) The final proposed revision indicates the items that will require specific Senate approval--items that must be submitted to the Regents--the creation or elimination of degree-granting programs or units, mergers, transfers and changes in title. He said that other changes were discussed at the March 21 meeting.

Senator Ewbank moved (motion 1993/94-47) adoption of this policy. Senator Inman seconded.

Senator Desai asked if a mechanism had been set up for departments and colleges to evaluate duplication of a proposed course. Senator Garcia said that the committee had been informed that at the college level, there are already mechanisms to avoid duplication, so the committee believed that the current mechanisms, as they now exist, were adequate. The checklist contained the question, 'Is this course duplicative of another course?'

A voice vote indicated approval.

Senator Silverman asked if it was known whether the proposal would be implemented. Senator Garcia responded that the Presiding Officer of the Senate will transmit the approved document to the President, and indicate that the Senate is recommending revised policy for the institution's curriculum process. Senator Silverman noted that policies recommended by the Senate seem to go forward on

a regular basis, but the Senate never learns whether they have been implemented. He wondered whether the Senate could request a report on final action. Dr. Zwolinski said that normally action is taken through an announcement to the general University community after a revised policy statement has been received, but he agreed that it could be looked into. He said he thought this proposal would take effect in the Fall of 1994.

11. APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATTERS: Dr. Zwolinski called for approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 12, Section I. Approval was moved (motion 1993/94-48) and seconded. Senator Neuman asked if the Senate would not have to undergo this process beginning next fall. Dr. Zwolinski said that was correct. A voice vote then indicated approval, with two abstentions.

Dr. Zwolinski then called for action on Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 11, Sections I and III, distributed with the March 7 meeting call. Senator Ewbank moved approval (motion 1993/94-49), and a second was heard. A voice vote indicated approval, with three abstentions.

Dr. Zwolinski then called for action on Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 9, Section I, not acted upon at the close of the January 10 meeting due to lack of a quorum. Senator Roemer noted that this item concerned the B.S. in Agriculture, race track industry. Approval was moved (motion 1993/94-50) and seconded. A voice vote indicated approval, with two abstentions.

12. APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATTER CONCERNING MEDIA ARTS MAJOR: Dr. Zwolinski reminded Senators that a curricular item concerning Revisions of Qualifications for Declaration as a Media Arts Major had been tabled at the February 7 meeting. A motion was made (1993/94-51A) to remove the matter from the table, and it was seconded. A voice vote indicated approval. Dr. Zwolinski then called on Senator Inman, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), to lead the discussion.

Senator Inman read the proposal: "Title: Revision of qualifications for declaration as a media arts major. The Department of Media Arts, with the approval of the Faculty of Fine Arts, requests approval of its proposal to raise the GPA requirement in all courses for advanced standing in media arts from 2.25 to 2.5, effective fall 1995 for all students regardless of catalog. The proposal is in response to a need to reduce the number of undergraduate majors from the current 620 to a total of approximately 450. The department does not have the funds necessary to provide equipment and/or faculty for 620 students. The department is eliminating the current requirements of an acceptable portfolio and a 2.5 GPA in media arts courses because of time demands required to administer these requirements. By raising the GPA requirement for all courses to 2.5, the department expects to reduce the number of students to 450 within three years. The Undergraduate Council approved the proposal on November 2, 1993." In spite of that approval, she said, ICPC received a letter from Elaine Jones, Chair of the Undergraduate Council, asking, in effect, that ICPC use care with this issue. In addition, Provost Sypherd wrote, asking ICPC to take time to consider other alternatives, so that the Provost's staff would have an opportunity to deliberate on this matter.

Senator Inman said ICPC did discuss this issue at length, and tried to find an alternative, with additional information obtained from Media Arts. However, ICPC was unable to do so. "The question is not whether Media Arts should decrease the enrollment majors from 620 to 450; the department was told that it should do that after an academic program review. The question was to determine the

means. The problem people have with this method is the fear that it will cause a domino effect--more and more departments will want to control enrollment by raising the GPA, and we will soon have a large body of students who have been admitted to the University but who cannot get suitable majors. ICPC recognizes that problem, and there may be a domino effect, but we still do not know a better alternative for the problem that the Media Arts Department faces. ICPC is, therefore, proposing approval through a seconded motion (1993/94-51B). But we also believe that students should be informed, through the letter of admission, that this situation exists, and that admission to the University should not be interpreted to mean admission to any particular major at a given time. And further, all majors that require a certain GPA for admission should be listed, so that students would know before they come to the University that this is the situation."

Senator E. Williams said that he thought the fear of the domino effect was quite well taken. He asked Senator Inman if she had any sense of what other departments and colleges have been doing with respect to setting GPA admission standards. Senator Inman responded that several years ago, Nursing, Business, and Engineering, and perhaps some other colleges, had set grade point requirements. And approximately three years ago, the Undergraduate Council decided to stop approving such requests. Senator E. Williams asked on what grounds. Senator Inman said she supposed that it was due to the problem of looking to the future and seeing that there would be a real problem for students. Dr. Sankey stated that the Undergraduate Council had voted to deny the request of Health-Related Professions to establish such a grade point requirement; the concern was that this issue needed to be addressed University-wide, and one way to do that was to turn the proposal down. He said the current proposal resulted in a split vote, and the Undergraduate Council became aware that Media Arts was experiencing some real equipment and facility problems in their professional courses. Senator Inman added that the Undergraduate Council had reluctantly approved the proposal, which she thought might be the first one from the College of Arts and Sciences. "The fear is that students shut out of Media Arts would go to other units, like Communication and Journalism, and then Communication and Journalism would have to raise their GPA requirement, and then where would students go? We see that the problem may grow in the future....If they can't get additional funding for the students that they have, there has to be some way of reducing the number of students. We just didn't see any other thing they could do."

Senator Witte asked how the Media Arts Department felt about students who might be outstanding in Media Arts, but whose overall GPA was below 2.5. Senator Inman responded that the Department had proposed the GPA requirement, and it closely monitors, by semester, the grade point averages of its majors. If a student falls below the current requirement of 2.25, they are removed from the major.

Senator Warburton asked what other colleges require for the GPA. Is Business 3.0? Dr. Sankey responded that Business was 2.75. Engineering is an unusual case, in which the requirement fluctuates according to the department. Senator Warburton asked if the 2.5 is required only for courses in the major, or for the overall GPA. Senator Inman: "2.5 would be required for the overall GPA."

Senator Dvorak asked why the portfolio requirement was abandoned. Senator Inman said that the department had several other requirements, but they were no longer able to keep up with evaluation of portfolios. The other requirements would be retained, however.

Senator E. Williams: "I think I can speak fairly confidently for the Faculty

of Social and Behavioral Sciences in saying that a lot of my colleagues would be extraordinarily reluctant to approve of this because it will have possible deleterious consequences for us. I think the Provost's request is quite well taken, that we should hold it up until we have a chance to look at the entire University, at least the College of Arts and Sciences, since this appears to be the first request from that College." Dr. Sankey noted that Media Arts, which falls within the College of Arts and Sciences, already has a 2.25 requirement established. While the Undergraduate Council principally addressed the matter of the equipment, they recognized that a GPA requirement already existed. One other unit in Arts and Sciences, Computer Science, also has a requirement of an evaluation after 30 units; that was the first one in the college.

Senator Pitt asked what provision might exist for students transferring in from other universities. Senator Inman said that it is required that most students must wait for a year, so that their GPA can be checked. But often the rule is overridden, and admission is recommended provisionally.

Senator Garcia said it should be clearly understood that a dilemma exists. "The department does not have neither the resources, the manpower, or the equipment to deal with the number of students now knocking at their door. The department has been told it will get no more resources, and it simply cannot handle the problem. From the department's viewpoint, they have to do something. It is not an option to do nothing. If the Senate does not want to give its permanent approval, it might, as an interim measure, permit this, because they must do something. I think it would be a tragic mistake not to recommend some mechanism for this department. If we don't like this one, then we ought to propose another one, but we need to give them instant relief."

Senator Inman noted that the Provost had not asked for ICPC or the Senate to wait or to table the matter until the University had addressed the whole problem. "In fact, the Provost said that some decision must be given to Media Arts by the end of this semester. He was hoping that we could find some alternative. But he did not ask us to table this until the general problem was solved."

Senator McElroy: "Having observed what has gone on in Media Arts over the last ten years, I would say that this is the classic case of a department which succeeded in doing what it was instructed to do by the University. It has absorbed, from other colleges in this University, a great deal of enrollment in similar displacement. It has gone through every process that one would expect within the University to get this redressed by facilities or whatever. They are really left in a very terrible situation. It is not because of neglect, not because of lack of excellence, and it is not because they have not done their homework. Dr. Deming has gone to enormous ends to try to find solutions that would be appropriate at this University to handle such things, not just a departmental bandaid. So far, the University has not come through with any kind of solution that would stand in these cases. It is a very serious problem, and one in which Media Arts itself has been the victim in this situation."

Senator Badger said she supported this recommendation, because she believed that Media Arts needs some relief, and they obviously must reduce their enrollment. She said she did not know whether it was the Senate's job to deal with the general issue, but she would recommend that the University not admit students who must float from department to department, hoping to find a major. She said she thought that would represent a real problem for the future.

Senator Neuman voiced his support for approval of the recommendation, and added

that, in principle, units should have the right to set their own admission standards. "I recognize that this is going to cause a problem at the University-wide level, one that eventually will have to be faced. But at the same time, I don't think that anyone, the Senate or the University, should dictate to any unit that they must admit someone below the standard which they believe they can sustain. And certainly not if there is no budget to sustain."

A voice vote indicated unanimous approval of the proposal from the Department of Media Arts stated in Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10 (dated January 25, 1994), Notice I.B., together with instructions to the Admissions Office to list for accepted applicants in the notification of admission to the University the GPA required for admission to advanced standing in the various units that specify a GPA requirement.

13. NEW BUSINESS: Senator Ewbank, on a point of personal privilege, proposed a resolution (motion 1993/94-52): Resolved, that the Faculty Senate, at the University of Arizona, extend its congratulations to the Arizona State University on notice that it is to be classified, along with the University of Arizona, as a Research I institution. Senator Garcia seconded, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.
14. RECESS: The meeting recessed at 5:05 p.m., and will reconvene on April 18 at 3:15 p.m.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

15. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 4, 1994:

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 1993/94-47 | Approval of the three recommendations, with revisions, of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Process Review Committee. |
| 1993/94-48 | Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 12, Section I. |
| 1993/94-49 | Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 11, Sections I and II. |
| 1993/94-50 | Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 9, Section I. |
| 1993/94-51A | Approval to remove from the table Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10, Section I.B. |
| 1993/94-51B | Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 10, Section I.B. |
| 1993/94-52 | Approval of resolution extending congratulations to Arizona State University on its status as a Research I institution. |