

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
September 11, 1995

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, Aleamoni, Anderson, Arechederra, Atwater, Ayres, Barrett, Buras, Clarke, Coons, Desai, Driggs, Emrick, Erickson, Forbes, Gerber, Goggans, Hallick, Hill, Jacobs, Joens, Larson, Levy, Marchalonis, Mare, Mitchell, Neuman, J. O'Brien, Pintozzi, Reiter, Reynolds, Schooley, Schwarz, Silverman, Smith, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Troth, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Witte, and Zwolinski. Observers Schafer (SAC) and Jull (APOC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Adamowicz, Cooper, Dahlgran, Dvorak, Feltham, Gruener, Huete, McElroy, Mount, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Pitt, Sharkey, Spece, and Taylor.

2. **OPEN SESSION:**

Senator Chandra Desai, Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics, expressed concern that this year's procedure for allocating the 2% merit salary adjustment allowed colleges to make the allocation to departments based on the college's strategic directions, which would be potentially unfair to a meritorious faculty member assigned to a unit that had received a low allocation. (Senator Desai's written comments are attached to the original Senate minutes.)

Senator Bruce Barrett, Physics: On behalf of Physics Professor K. C. Hsieh, who was unable to attend this meeting, Senator Barrett read a statement he had prepared (which is attached to the original minutes). Professor Hsieh stated that, because the lab he was teaching on the afternoon of September 7 only meets once a week, and is for juniors and seniors, he was unable to dismiss the class early, contrary to the President's instructions about letting out classes early because of the football game. In order to avoid future insubordination, he requested a clear proclamation on the priorities of teaching and whether he should expect support from the University in carrying out his teaching duties. He asked how faculty should rearrange their declared duties of teaching, research and service in order to accommodate revenue-generating athletic activities.

3. **ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

Dr. Atwater introduced new Senator Levy, and reported that Senator Dvorak, Architecture, would be on sabbatical this semester; Ellery Green will be sitting in for him. She reported that Senator Sharkey would be on leave; no one had been designated to sit in for her. Senator Erlings had resigned, and in accordance with procedures in the Bylaws, Dr. Peter Medine had been invited to replace her.

4. **REPORTS:**

- 4A. **President Manuel Pacheco**

Because President Pacheco had to be in Washington, D.C. today, Provost Sypherd delivered his report. The President said that the following issues may be faced by the Faculty Senate this year:

(1) Concerning Conditions of Faculty Service, the Arizona Board of Regents has expressed interest in the tenure issue for the three universities. The idea of periodic post-tenure reviews, developed last year in association with the new plan for salary adjustments, appears to meet the reservations which

Regents have expressed, and it is an idea that deserves our further attention. (2) The University's financial condition continues to pose serious problems; any new ventures and priorities are likely to require reallocating funds from existing activities. (3) Affirmative Action has become the subject of a nationwide debate, and our University is not likely to avoid it. Some members of the Arizona Board of Regents already have raised the issue, and he had no doubt that the Senate would want and need to become involved.

4B. Provost Paul S. Sypherd

Dr. Sypherd reported that the Fall 1995 registration went very well and expressed appreciation for the efforts of many people in Student Services and the faculty who had volunteered over the summer. At the August Regents meeting, the administration reported on how UA had met the Hurwitz measures, which centered on the Regents' concern with teaching loads, class availability, graduation rates, and the number of ranked faculty in the classroom, and the percent of courses taught by ranked faculty. The UA's report indicated an increase of course availability in the last academic year over the previous one, and an increase in graduation rates. Concerning the number of ranked faculty in the classroom, the University indicated to the Regents that it has been difficult to comply with the measure as more lead time is needed. He reported that, at the Regents' July retreat meeting, the issue of tenure came under some discussion. Because it was a retreat meeting, no action was taken, but the issue would come up again. He also commented on the meetings that are ongoing between members of the administration and faculty leadership concerning joint governance. He said he is pledging his efforts to a successful conclusion of the matter. In order for the University to better inform the people of the State of Arizona about what we do and the importance of a research university, the UA Foundation formed a public relations committee, and its efforts will be funded with private money.

4C. Faculty Chair John Schwarz

Chair Schwarz also reported about the faculty-administration committee working on co-governance policies. The committee members are Ken Smith (Chair, Committee of Eleven), Betty Atwater (Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate), Andy Silverman (Secretary of the Faculty), Sheila Slaughter (Professor of Higher Education), Tom Volgy (Associate Professor of Political Science) and himself as Chair of the Faculty; and Provost Sypherd, Vice Provost Gilliland, Vice Provost Smith, Vice Provost Gottfredson, and Vice President Cusanovich. He said there was agreement that co-governance is essential to achieving the goals and objectives of the University, and that co-governance means structures that promote the development of mutually accepted actions relating to the academic enterprise. He said he was optimistic that the committee will move forward in a way that will enable the faculty and the administration to have a completely different relationship than the one that has characterized this University for many years. At some time in the near future, proposals about co-governance will be presented to the Faculty Senate.

4D. Secretary Andrew Silverman

Secretary Silverman urged that the Faculty Senate and its committees begin to be pro-active. While it is normal for the administration to send forward initiatives, perhaps it was time for the Senate to come forward with its own initiatives as well. He said he thought members of the Senate should become involved in dealing with issues before the Legislature and Board of Regents.

4E. Presiding Officer Anne E. Atwater

Dr. Atwater said she has been working closely with Faculty Chair Schwarz since last May, and they are closely monitoring issues which are now in committee and will be presented to the full Senate during the year. She cited several improvements made at the Faculty Center during the summer,

thanks to the efforts of Chair Schwarz and the outstanding support from Provost Sypherd: a new photocopier, two new computers, and increase of a second staff position from half-time academic year to full-time fiscal year. Concerning Senate standing committees, three of the four are organized, fully staffed and meeting: Academic Personnel Policy, Instruction and Curriculum Policy and Research Policy. The fourth standing committee, Student Affairs Policy, is not yet fully formed, but its membership should be finalized before the next Senate meeting.

4F. ASUA President Ben Driggs

Senator Driggs reported that ASUA is working on a peer tutoring program this year. The program would provide free tutoring by juniors and seniors to freshmen in designated 100- and 200-level large classes which often require special tutoring. The tutors would, in turn, receive one or two units of academic credit from the Honors Center, ASUA's partner in this endeavor. He thought that hundreds of students could be helped in this way. The University Learning Center has offered support for the training of tutors. Currently, he said, ASUA is contacting department heads to find out what requirements they might have for tutors. ASUA hopes to have the program in effect in Spring 1996. Tutors will have office hours in the Student Union. He added that ASUA hopes for faculty support on this issue.

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Abrams asked, in connection with Secretary Silverman's suggestion concerning a pro-active stance, if it would be appropriate for the Senate to consider a reaffirmation of its concept of affirmative action. Dr. Atwater suggested that question be placed on the next agenda of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Senator Hallick asked if any progress had been made during the summer in refining the core curriculum proposal. Dr. Sypherd responded that 70 faculty in different groups worked on a variety of documents that were provided by individual faculty members concerning the proposed first tier, or entry-level, courses. He believes reports will be ready within the next few weeks for distribution to the Faculty Senate. Because this is a faculty issue, colleges will be asked to schedule discussion groups so that faculty can examine the objectives of the core courses and their individual approaches.

Senator Neuman said he had recently met a young transfer from Pima College, who complained about the slow process of acceptance and registration here at the University. She had not been able to register in many classes, and she expressed her perception that there is a difference between the way the University processes high school applicants versus transfers from community colleges. He asked Dr. Sypherd if this was merely her perception, or whether it represented a real problem. Dr. Sypherd said that the perception was correct to varying degrees: many encounter problems in transferring even though we have a complex set of articulation arrangements with the community colleges. There are still gray zones, and the process cannot be done in a few days.

Senator Forbes commented on the pro-active issue: if you want to be pro-active, it is a good idea to come up with a formal statement in support of, for example, affirmative action, and to make time to attend Regents meetings to talk with them individually and informally. To achieve substantive influence, you have to understand where they're coming from and why, and inform them where you are coming from and why.

Dr. Sypherd suggested that, if Faculty Senators become pro-active, it would be prudent to do so with a plan, perhaps selecting three of four issues which they wish to take up.

Senator Levy said he would like to pick up on Provost Sypherd's remarks and carry them further. He believed that if the Senate is to become functionally pro-active, in an effort to make a contribution, that it is essential that the Senate not only express its sentiments, but that it try to understand what are the driving issues behind the concerns of the Legislature and of the Regents.

6. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Senator Szilagyi indicated that his question and the President's answer were omitted from the Question and Answer section of the May 1 minutes. As a result, the following will be added to the minutes of May 1 in the Question and Answer section: "Senator Szilagyi read from a statement distributed to faculty by Sharon Kha after the "60 Minutes" article and indicated someone had asked the question that when faculty get tenured, does that mean they have a job for life? He said the answer in that statement was no, that faculty members who do not perform well and get unsatisfactory evaluations are not entitled to keep their job; they can be asked to leave, and several have been asked to leave in recent years. He then asked President Pacheco: If this is what faculty tenure is not, then what is tenure? President Pacheco said the short answer is that he didn't think very many people in this room consider tenure to be a life-long assurance of a job. It is an opportunity to make sure that the academic freedom of a faculty member is maintained over the time a faculty member is on the faculty, and that any attempts for removal have to be for cause, and that cause is specifically outlined in the policies of the Board." In addition, Senator Driggs' report in section 4F, on page 2 of the May 1 minutes, was modified to read: "and Matthew Troth, Ph.D. candidate, Management and Policy;" The Senate then approved the minutes of May 1, 1995 as amended, and the May 8 minutes as distributed.

7. **APPROVAL OF 1995-96 CHAIR, STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE**

The Senate approved unanimously a seconded motion (motion 1995/96-1) submitted by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to approve Senator Jocelyn Reiter as 1995-96 Chair of the Student Affairs Policy Committee.

8. **FURTHER DISCUSSION AND APPROVAL OF DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN:**

Further discussion on Draft 20 of the Draft Strategic Plan was led by Senator Reynolds, Co-Chair of the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee, and the following seconded motion was presented:

Motion 1995/96-2: WHEREAS the Strategic Plan is a living document and not an unalterable one, the Faculty Senate endorses Draft 20 of the Strategic Plan as a positive statement of the future direction of the University in the knowledge that many issues will be reconsidered by the University community and the Faculty Senate as specific initiatives are proposed for implementation and that, in addition, there are ongoing opportunities to bring in new initiatives concerning any of the goals or other specifics now contained in the Plan.

Suggestions for future changes in the Strategic Plan included the following:

- Senator Troy wondered whether the TQM language could be replaced with faculty's own language.
- Senator Buras noted that the Board of Regents last year raised UA admissions standards, and that is not mentioned in the Plan. Secondly, there is no mention of the relationship between the instructor and the student.
- Senator Aleamoni noted that the Plan made no reference to the research application to the education enterprise.

- Senator Anderson noted that the enthusiasm for technology may conflict with the need for student discussions which include critical thinking. Secondly, she expressed concern with the way in which diversity appears in the document, obscuring that which it is supposed to reveal; she would prefer something more idealistic, for example, under the Social and Cultural section.
- Senator Abrams noted that he had sent to Senator Reynolds on August 28 some requested changes, and he just realized that may have arrived too late: 1) under Driving Forces on page 3, he would like to add a third point to the effect that there is a growing gap between rich and poor in our country, and the gap is greater today than at anytime since the Great Depression, and it's growing. 2) on page 8, under B.2.b, insert the word "labor," to read "business, labor and government."
- Senator Clarke wondered if there could be an addition to address the single most important variable quality: the student/teacher ratio. He asked if anything could be done to bring the ratio down.
- Senator Smith saw a substantial number of grammatical errors even in this most recent draft which should be cleared up before submission.
- Senator Szilagyi expressed concern with page 8, where research is measured by the amount of funds it brings to the University. He thought there were other measures that could be identified with productivity.

Dr. Sypherd asked Vice-Provost Smith if it was possible to make changes at this time, to capture some of these thoughts. Dr. Smith said that the document will be submitted to the State Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting in October, but it is a living document which will always be able to be changed. Dr. Sypherd said he believed that changes could still be made.

Senator Neuman asked if the document would be submitted to the Regents regardless of what action the Senate took. Vice Provost Smith said the document had been presented to the Regents twice, in June and in August, and it is due to be submitted to the Governor's Office on October 2. Senator Levy asked if there would be a substantive consequence to this Plan's failure or success as a result of Senate action. Vice Provost Smith said SPBAC has been working through this process to draft an acceptable document by soliciting comments and then incorporating them into the Plan. He said it would be helpful if the Senate could provide a sense of where they are now.

Dr. Atwater called for a vote on motion 1995/96-2, and by voice vote it was approved. Dr. Sypherd noted he had abstained. Chair Schwarz suggested that Senator Reynolds' committee consider today's requested changes, and bring future revisions back to the Senate. Dr. Atwater added that if Senators have suggested changes in the future, it would be most helpful if they submitted them in writing to the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee.

9. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON THE REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON TECHNOLOGY PARK:**

Senator Neuman, Chair of the Task Force on the Technology Park, summarized the statements in the report, noting that the report reflected updated information provided to the Task Force last week by Marshall Worden, Acting Associate Director of the UA Office of Economic Development and Project Coordinator for the Science and Technology Park. He also noted that one of the Senate's primary concerns had been expenditures, and the Task Force learned last week that the figure on page 2, at the end of the fourth paragraph, referring to total expenditures in connection with the land and property transactions, should total \$685,000, rather than \$565,000. He reported that the Task Force had been assured that, at the moment that the Park started producing revenues, the University will be repaid, including the operating costs of the Park.

Senator Neuman noted that originally, a Science and Technology Park Advisory Committee was to be appointed by the President, to include one member recommended by the Senate. The Task Force recently learned that such a committee has never been established; instead, Bruce Wright is preparing a plan to implement a twenty-person policy-setting committee, to include key UofA administrators, faculty, and various outside members. There will be a number of subcommittees dealing with specialized issues associated with the park, such as commercial leasing.

The Task Force made three recommendations, which were then moved and seconded:

Motion 1995/96-3: (1) The Faculty Senate endorse the idea that it will appoint a faculty member to the body which sets policy for the Science and Technology Park, be it an Executive Committee or Board of Directors. (2) The Faculty Senate participate with the University Administration in deciding when and where it is appropriate to appoint elected faculty to committees and advisory groups that deal with matters of the Park. (3) The above faculty appointee, and representatives, jointly constitute a revised Faculty Senate Task Force on the University of Arizona Science and Technology Park.

Senator Witte recalled that perhaps a year and a half ago, the Senate had approved a motion to set up an oversight committee. Senator Barrett recalled that three recommendations were approved by the Senate at that time concerning the Technology Park, and to the best of his knowledge, none of the three had ever been acted upon by the administration.

Senator Williams, speaking as Chair of a New Campus Senate Committee, said the committee's basic concern has been the relationship of the Faculty Senate and faculty to the new campus. Although the Committee has not taken a formal position on the location of the new campus, it has discussed the issue, and the committee clearly expressed severe reservations about the feasibility of placing the new campus in the middle of nowhere. He wondered whether new tenants might dissuade the University from making that choice. He said that the committee would report to the Senate in due course.

Senator Silverman then moved (motion 1995/96-3A) to amend the first recommendation to read as follows: "The faculty endorses the idea that it will appoint a faculty member or members to the body which sets policy..." The motion was seconded, and by voice vote the amendment was approved. By voice vote, the motion to adopt the amended recommendations (motion 1995/96-3) was approved.

Senator Witte then moved and it was seconded (motion 1995/96-3B) to empower the Task Force to act as the Faculty Senate's oversight committee. Senator Neuman asked for an explanation of the term oversight. Dr. Atwater replied that the term would empower the Task Force to obtain information on behalf of the Senate, and require that it report to the Senate. The motion was approved by voice vote.

10. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON TENURE BUY-OUT POLICY:

Senator Larry Aleamoni, Vice-Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC), in the absence of Chair Donald Thomson, reported that the committee had reviewed this policy, and it was coming to the Senate as a seconded motion from APPC. The motion was approved by voice vote:

Motion 1995/96-4: That the Faculty Senate approve the proposed policy on Tenure Buy-Out, modeled after Arizona Board of Regents Policy 6-213; the policy will be included in the University Handbook on Appointed Personnel, 3.21, Voluntary Release of Right to Continued Employment.

11. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON FOUR CURRICULAR ITEMS**

Senator Hill, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), reported that ICPC had reviewed four curricular changes, and was submitting them to the Senate as seconded motions:

Motion 1995/96-5: A request from the Department of Cell Biology and Anatomy to change the name of their major for the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from anatomy to cell biology and anatomy. Motion approved by voice vote.

Motion 1995/96-6: A request from the Department of Teaching and Teacher Education to require students to have a 2.5 gpa in their teaching major and in their certification courses in order to enroll in student teaching.

Senator Williams thought he recalled that the Senate had taken up this issue with different units in previous years. He thought several departments have, over the years, set higher requirements for their major. He expressed concern that, rather than having a University policy in effect, policy was being set in a piece-meal manner. He thought he remembered that he had been told, at one time, that a committee had been appointed to undertake a study of this issue. Senator Hill said he has not heard of such a committee. Dr. Atwater requested input from Dr. Sankey. Dr. Sankey said he believed the Senate had rejected a proposal by Media Arts to increase from a 2.5 to a 2.75 requirement, and that the Undergraduate Council had turned down a similar proposal from Exercise and Sports Sciences.

Senator Smith noted that as a representative of the College of Education, he could provide an explanation for the request. It is not possible to place all the student teachers for two reasons: the number of places available is inadequate, and since teachers are paid to take student teachers, there is insufficient funding to pay for them.

Motion 1995/96-6 was approved by voice vote.

Motion 1995/96-7: A request by the School of Family and Consumer Resources to delete the major in counseling and guidance for the Master of Arts degree. Approved by voice vote.

Motion 1995/96-8: A request by the Department of Physics to initiate a B.A. degree.

Senator Troth said he strongly opposed this motion for three reasons: 1) We would be creating another degree at a time when we are trying to reduce the number of undergraduate degree programs. 2) As the report itself states, many schools offer a Bachelor of Science program with two tracks: one for those who intend to pursue a graduate program, and one oriented more towards the general education area; those schools include ASU, NAU, University of Washington, University of California at San Diego, and the University of California at Irvine. 3) It seems inappropriate to have a Bachelor of Arts degree in Physics because Physics is an applied science.

Further discussion of the proposal brought up a question of the no language requirement. Senator Hill said he had assumed that there would be a language requirement with a Bachelor of Arts degree. Senator Emrick noted that the B.S. in Physics did not originally have a great number of specified upper-division courses so advisors could tailor a program for optical sciences, planetary sciences, or astronomy. For several reasons, the major is highly structured; the B.A. degree is needed to provide the necessary flexibility for the half of Physics majors not planning to do graduate work in Physics.

By a vote of 15 opposed, 11 in favor, and 4 abstentions, the motion was defeated. Chair Schwarz asked if ICPC could examine this issue again, and see if it could work out some of the questions raised

today, and present the matter to the Senate again without having the Physics Department go through the entire process again.

12. **REPORT ON RESULTS OF COLLEGE GOVERNANCE SURVEY**

Dr. Atwater reminded Senators that last November a resolution was approved by the Faculty Senate requesting each college to have an advisory council of faculty members, elected by college faculty to provide a voice for the faculty in the governance of that college. At the suggestion of Senator Silverman last spring, a survey was conducted during the summer to determine the status of these advisory councils. The results were obtained based on a questionnaire sent to the colleges, and included in the packet Senators received for today's meeting.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Andrew Silverman
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix*

1. Senator Desai's memo on the 2% Merit Salary Adjustment
2. The statement of Physics Professor K. C. Hsieh
3. University of Arizona Strategic Plan (Draft 20)
4. Report of the Task Force on the Technology Park
5. Tenure Buy-Out Policy
6. Report of Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee on Proposed Curricular Changes
7. Report on Results of College Governance Survey.

*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 September 11, 1995

- 1995/96-1 Approved: Senator Jocelyn Reiter as 1995-96 Chair, Student Affairs Policy Committee
- 1995/96-2 Approved: University of Arizona Strategic Plan (Draft 20)
- 1995/96-3 Approved: Recommendations of the Task Force on Technology Park, as amended by motion 1995/96-3A.
- 1995/96-3B Approved: Task Force on Technology Park to serve as the Faculty Senate's oversight committee.
- 1995/96-4 Approved: Tenure Buy-Out-Policy
- 1995/96-5 Approved: Request by the Department of Cell Biology and Anatomy to change the name of their major for the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from Anatomy to Cell Biology and Anatomy.
- 1995/96-6 Approved: Request by the Department of Teaching and Teacher Education to require students to have a 2.5 gpa in their teaching major and certification courses in order to enroll in student teaching.
- 1995/96-7 Approved: Request by the School of Family and Consumer Resources to delete the major in counseling and guidance for the Master of Arts degree.
- 1995/96-8 Defeated: Request by the Department of Physics to initiate a B.A. degree.