

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, February 5, 1990 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:15 p.m. on Monday, February 5, 1990, in Room 139 of the College of Law. Sixty-one members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Thomas R. Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Adamec, Aleamoni, Aquilano, Atwater, Barrett, Bootman, Braden, Brainerd, Butler, Chiasson, Chen, Cole, Conway, Cusanovich, Dalen, Davis, Elliott, Escalante, Ewbank, Fagan, Gall, Germeraad, Goetinck, Hartse, Hersherberger, Hetrick, Jones, Koffler, Kolodny, Krager, Larson, Masone, Mautner, McCullough, Mitchell, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Parsons, Peterson, Ratner, Redeker, Rehm, Rogers, Roemer, Rollins, Sander, Sanders, Sherman, Shisslak, Sigelman, Silverman, Smerdon, Smith, Spera, Steinke, Sullivan, Tomizuka, Uhl, VanMetre, Vezino and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Beigel, Bernhard, Blake, Chase, Cox, Doxtater, Fenstermacher, Fink, Garcia, Greve, Hiskey, Laird, J. O'Brien, Ridge, Ruiz, Williams, Witte, Woodard, Worley, and Wright.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF DECEMBER 4, 1989: Hearing no changes to the Minutes of December 4, 1989, Dr. Rehm declared them approved as distributed.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: President Koffler said that since the Faculty Senate last met, the Committee of Eleven had addressed letters to members of the Arizona Board of Regents and to himself. "According to these letters, the Committee believes that we need to give a higher priority to undergraduate education and to devote more of our resources to our undergraduate programs. These are matters that deserve the most serious consideration, and I want to use this occasion to provide Senators with information that is relevant to the questions that the Committee of Eleven has raised.

"As early as November 1, 1982, which is just a few months after I arrived here, I told the Faculty Senate that I thought the time had come to reexamine undergraduate education, our General Education component in particular, and that I would meet with the Undergraduate Council to get this started. From that day to this one I have never made any secret of the fact that I regard undergraduate education as one of my highest priorities and I want to remind Senators of the remarkable sequence of improvements that resulted from that priority.

"First, the faculty members in every college that offers an undergraduate degree revised their degree requirements so that today we have a more rigorous, coherent and appropriate set of General Education requirements. Subsequently, we went on to create eight new undergraduate majors in fields as diverse as Computer Science, Media Arts, and Russian and Soviet Studies. We also radically restructured the existing majors in the Life and Biomedical Sciences, and used our normal program review procedures to improve many other major programs. In addition, through the efforts of numerous faculty members, we have totally restructured and reinvigorated the Honors Program. Today, it provides an impressive new dimension in the education of over 1,400 undergraduates, the equivalent of many high quality liberal arts colleges. These achievements involved input from large numbers of faculty members at the departmental, college and university levels.

"One of the Committee of Eleven's concerns, expressed both in its recent letters and in a prior letter to me last summer, involves the quantity and quality of our teaching facilities. Let me share with you some information that I have provided to the Committee of Eleven last September and discussed with them, in part, in December.

"When I became President in 1982, I described our space situation as the single largest obstacle in the path of the University's continued progress. This was why I set in motion an impressive building program that is the envy of our colleagues at other institutions around the country, a program that is still vigorously progressing. Given the time needed to plan, finance and construct even a single building, it took several years to produce results. Even so, between 1985 and 1989 we added 125,000 square feet of classroom and instructional laboratory space. This has alleviated but not solved our problems, in large part because enrollment continues to climb. As of Fall 1988, judged by nationally accepted standards, we still had a space deficit of about 340,000 square feet in classroom and laboratory space, largely in laboratory space. We would have cut this deficit in half by 1992 were it not for the sharp increase in enrollment since 1988. However, if the Regents approve our construction plans, by about 1995 we can expect to occupy a further 120,000 square feet of classroom and instructional laboratory space. You will realize that the enrollment ceiling that I established last semester will help by setting limits on our space pressures in the coming years.

"In addition to planning, financing and constructing new teaching facilities, we have been renovating existing classrooms and auditoria. By the end of this academic year, we shall have spent some \$800,000 in the first three years of this program, even though funding for this work is difficult to acquire. The University Teaching Center has the responsibility for identifying what needs to be done and establishing priorities. In addition to these renovations, we have also completely renovated and updated the Language Laboratory, a basic teaching facility for several departments.

"When the Committee of Eleven says we need more and better teaching space, and need to improve existing space, it is correct. When the Committee says that we are disregarding the problem, it is flat wrong. It was ironic that the Committee's letter suggesting that I was disregarding the problem arrived on the very day that we broke ground for a new classroom and teaching laboratory building.

"Another concern mentioned by the Committee of Eleven involves understaffing in key required courses. The Committee did not identify which particular courses they had in mind. However, I believe the reference is to General Education courses in the College of Arts and Sciences, since the Committee has expressed concern about these last summer. Let me share with the Senate the information on this topic that was provided to the Committee of Eleven last semester.

"The enrollment shifts produced by our revised General Education requirements are not yet completely clear, and presumably are still subject to further change as departments introduce new General Education courses. Moreover, the resulting classroom pressures have been intensified by unusually high enrollments of new students in the past two years. To further complicate matters, Legislative funding to cover enrollment growth is based on a formula that uses a three-year rolling average of enrollments. This means that there is a delay before we get additional resources to use in the classroom. Even so, in response to enrollment pressures, we have allocated substantial resources to a number of colleges,

including the College of Arts and Sciences, which has received over \$19 million in the past three semesters, including 54 permanent faculty lines and 25 permanent staff positions.

"Since 1983 we have been successful in acquiring Legislative funding for no less than 20 decision packages that have provided over \$9 million to improve undergraduate education. These packages have provided a small part of the reallocations to which I just referred.

"Let me note also that our budget proposal before the Legislature at this time includes ten items requesting funds for undergraduate education, including \$1.3 million for the General Education program, \$1.1 million for new teaching technologies, and \$700,000 for teacher preparation programs.

"I also want to draw your attention to the truly dramatic improvements that we have made in student services in recent years. These range from course registration arrangements to improved academic record keeping and a more efficient distribution of financial aid, as well as extensive renovations of many residence halls. All these changes, by improving the overall quality of student life, reduce distractions and become positive elements that permit students to concentrate more effectively on their academic programs. Other changes that benefit undergraduate education include developments in the Student Resource Center, expanded tutorial services in the Office of Minority Student Affairs, the appointment of Faculty fellows attached to individual residence halls, and our improved arrangements for orienting and preparing graduate teaching assistants. Moreover, the newly established Center for Research on Undergraduate Education, led by Professor Sarah Dinham, will allow us to rely on longitudinal measures of undergraduate programs and performance rather than on individual perceptions.

"It is also worth noting our successes in attracting more admission applications and applications from better prepared entering students. Since 1983 undergraduate admission applications have increased by 76 percent, with applications from out of state more than doubling. The improvement in student quality can be seen in improving SAT and ACT scores, and in the fact that we now attract the bulk of the top five percent of Arizona's high school graduates who remain the state for their education. In a more particular sense, the improvement in student quality can be observed in the fact that we have enrolled 66 out of the first 80 Flynn Scholars, and that our number of National Merit Scholars is now 124, having more than tripled in only two years. The presence of higher quality students is important, of course, because it contributes to better undergraduate education by raising the overall atmosphere and expectations in the classroom.

"I mention increasing applications from better prepared students because each such application, in effect, is a vote of confidence in the University. These applicants are part of an information network that includes our current students, recent graduates, and older alumni. I would expect any deterioration in our work to be reflected in declining applications. Anyone who questions the reality of improvements in our undergraduate programs needs to ponder the significance of why more better-prepared students choose to come here.

"There is one area in which I believe we can all agree that we have fallen short of our ambitions. This is the area of student advising. Most advising has to be accomplished at the departmental and college levels, and our successes have been uneven, to put it kindly. It was possible, last Spring, to fund a new special advising center for the many undergraduates who have yet to select a major. This was a significant improvement, but we have a far distance to go.

"In its letters, the Committee of Eleven has suggested that if the faculty is to deliver high quality education, then it must have unambiguous signals and clear statements of priority from the administration. I suggest that the whole-sale revision of our degree requirements, the creation and restructuring of undergraduate majors, the revolution in the Honors Program, one of the largest building programs in American higher education, the allocation of over \$19 million to pressure points in less than two years, and the succession of decision packages for undergraduate education all represent unambiguous signals and a clear statement of priorities by any reasonable reckoning.

"The University's progress over the last decade, has extended far beyond undergraduate education. Our successes have also included attracting external funding, expanding our research activities, and increasing our enrollment of minority students, among others. I have no doubt that we could have made more rapid progress in undergraduate education had we been able to reduce our attention to other areas of responsibility. As it is, we do not have that luxury. The need to preserve a balance among all of our responsibilities is a point worth bearing in mind whenever we consider any one problem area.

"The Committee of Eleven and others also have expressed concern as to whether high quality teaching is adequately recognized through the promotion and tenure process and through merit adjustments. I have no doubt that there is room for improvement. At the same time, I believe that over the years our Promotion and Tenure Committees have recognized faculty members who are both effective teachers and productive scholars. This is a combination toward which all faculty members in a leading research university should strive, since the highest quality teaching is not likely without productive scholarship. At the same time, I recognize that no one is happy with the salary situation in recent years. Simply put, the money has not been there. This puts us in a difficult situation, and I will not rest until our Legislature has taken adequate action to address those problems.

"This brings me to one final and related matter that I want to address today, the matter of faculty participation in University affairs. Faculty concerns about participation in governance are not new, nor is the Committee of Eleven the first to comment on them. These same concerns became apparent to me shortly after I became President, and I believe that we have benefitted from some steps that I took at that time. At my direction, then-Provost Nils Hasselmo worked to improve communication with faculty groups, in particular with the Faculty Senate's Academic Personnel Policy Committee and Budget Policy Committee. Dr. Hasselmo's more frequent contacts with these groups and others, together with his willingness to share information, have served us well, and Provost Cole will continue in that same vein. Furthermore, my Vice Presidents, academicians in their own right, are committed to keeping open their lines of communication with the faculty at large, and to sharing information.

"The faculty's involvement into University affairs extends far beyond the Faculty Senate and the Committee of Eleven. It extends also to Faculty Senate committees such as the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and to other critical standing committees, such as the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, and the University Advisory Committee on Faculty Status. In addition, some of the most important and extensive faculty input occurs at the departmental and collegiate levels, where the overwhelming bulk of our programmatic and personnel decisions is determined. Perhaps our arrangements for faculty input at the University level are more consistent and more effective than at the departmental and collegiate levels. Perhaps not. These were the thoughts that occurred to me

late last semester when I received the Institutional Self-Study prepared for the forthcoming visit of the North Central Association reaccreditation team. This Self-Study was prepared by a steering committee consisting predominantly of faculty members.

"In suggesting future directions of the University in the 1990s, the steering committee drew comparisons with other major universities and concluded that the University of Arizona relies to a lesser extent on faculty members in decision making. This report impelled me to ask Provost Cole to appoint a faculty committee to examine the role of the faculty in the governance and administration of the University. I am pleased to say that Professor Rehm, the Chairman of the General Faculty, has agreed to chair this group. This special committee has been asked to report later this year. I look forward to receiving its views and recommendations. I shall share the report, of course, with the Faculty Senate and with the Committee of Eleven.

"I want to observe that I have served as a faculty member and administrator at a number of major universities, and I have visited many others. I have yet to find a university in which there is universal satisfaction with the existing arrangements for the governance and administration of the institution. Perhaps some conflict of views is an inherent and inescapable condition. Be that as it may, I am open to whatever suggestions our special committee may produce. Naturally this does not mean an end to differences of opinion between the administration and faculty groups, or between different faculty groups. There will always be cases where a president, any president, faced with the responsibilities of the office or with conflicting pieces of advice, cannot accept a particular piece of faculty advice. However, I want you to know that, for my own part, I remain willing to explain my decisions and actions.

"In closing, I want to suggest that we all need to pull together if the University is to continue to progress at the rate we have achieved in recent years. Recent activity in telephone polls, public letters, press releases and now, I understand, faculty petitions, has grown to a point where it is proving to be far more divisive than probably anyone had anticipated. This is harming the institution. I think that we can address our problems far more productively by calm discussion through the consultative arrangements that have served us well, the Faculty Senate, and our various committees at all levels, and by improving those consultative arrangements as need be. The recent pattern of events has not been helpful. I suggest that everyone involved in these recent events reflect on what they have been doing. Thank you."

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Provost Cole said that at the last Senate meeting, he had presented a report as the Acting Provost. This was a very exciting year for me, and I hope a very productive year for the University. About a year ago, when I was appointed Acting Provost, I indicated my feelings not only about the position but about this University and how important it was, not only to all of you but to me as well. I have spent almost all of my career at this institution. I said to you at that time that my office would always be open to you. I don't believe that changed during the year. Many of you have taken advantage of it, and I hope more will do so. On many more occasions than not, I have been given advice by not only the Senate and the Committee of Eleven but a number of faculty, and in almost every case we have accepted that advice and implemented it, turned it into action. This has to do with teaching and with suggestions in terms of procedures for various university functions. I think all in all we have tried to be responsive to the needs of our faculty. That will continue to be my goal for the future, and I hope that I can represent this

faculty in a way that not only do we listen, but that we take that advice and turn it into something that makes this institution much more productive.

"As an example, the Budget Policy Committee has been concerned about the Mission Statement that is being prepared for the Regents. We have had some correspondence and several meetings in which we have been able to develop a procedure that we hope will be effective in convincing the Regents that a more traditional type of Mission Statement will be prepared. Many of you have read the NCA report, and you will note that the committee preparing that report has indicated they were very concerned about this Mission Statement. We have, in cooperation with the Budget Policy Committee, appointed predominantly those individuals who served on that NCA committee to serve as members of this new committee to prepare a Mission Statement that would be more representative of what we think a Mission Statement should include. This is just one example, there are several others that we've had during the year where other issues have been suggested by various Senate committees and implemented. We will continue to do this. I would like to reiterate the President's words, that we are all in this together. That it is important that we work together to solve our problems. That we don't spend too much of our productive time simply arguing over the problems but that we sit down and work together to resolve them. I am willing to do my share. I'm sure that you are, too. Thank you."

REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Dr. Rehm reported that a class has been scheduled in Room 146 until 3:00 p.m. on Mondays, and there were thus two alternatives: (1) meet in a room similar to today's meeting room, at 3:00 or (2) continue to meet in Room 146 but at 3:15. He called for the Senate's thoughts on these choices. After some discussion, it was moved (motion 89/90-25) and seconded that meetings would be scheduled at 3:00 p.m. in a room other than 146 Law. By a show of hands, that motion was defeated. It was then moved (motion 89/90-26) and seconded, that meetings will be scheduled at 3:15 p.m. in Room 146 Law. On a voice vote, that motion was approved.

Dr. Rehm expressed his appreciation to Deans and Department Heads for responding with updates to the General Faculty census. Currently, he said, there are 2,318 members of the General Faculty, referred to in the past as Voting Faculty. This figure includes 1,715 Tenured/Tenure-Eligible, 242 Continuing/Continuing-Eligible and 284 Emeritus individuals. He reported that this matches the University's records within a half of a percent.

Dr. Rehm reported that the General Faculty election process is underway, and the deadline for Nominating Petitions to be submitted is February 14. College Representative positions will terminate on April 30, and newly elected individuals will be seated at the May Senate meeting.

The Arizona Faculties Council, as part of the arrangement made with the Board of Regents, is preparing part of the agenda for the Programs Committee meeting to be held at the Board meeting in February. Included in agenda items will be matters dealing with faculty salaries, class size, and the balance between teaching, research and service. Dr. Rehm said if there are other items Senators would like included in that agenda, he or the other two University members, Senators Jones and Garcia, should be contacted.

Conditions of Faculty Service, Dr. Rehm reported, has been sent to the Programs Committee by the Council of Presidents, and will be discussed at the February 15 meeting. Following that, it will hopefully be forwarded to the faculty/administration/Regents Tri-University Committee for review.

Dr. Rehm said that Parking and Transportation is obligated each year to bring to the university community proposed changes. Open forums have been scheduled on Tuesday, February 20 in Health Sciences and on Thursday, February 22 in the Student Union.

"As Chairman of the Faculty and Presiding Officer of the Senate, I view the occurrence of communication to be a very important item, and it helps in the handling of communication between faculty and administration and the other way around. Even communication which conveys unpleasant news can have a positive result, and tends to clear the air. The Senate, as you are aware, fosters communication through the reports and recommendations from its standing committees. The Senate itself serves as a forum for discussion between faculty, professionals, students and the administration. Faculty serving on the Senate and General Faculty standing committees continue to make outstanding contributions to the operation of the University. They all do good work. As Chairman of the Faculty my office probably hears much of faculty concerns, some of the administration's concerns, and it serves as a clearinghouse for problems we have. I am interested in hearing from the faculty, and my office is always open for that.

"In regard to recent items that been brought before you, to address these items there needs to be more involvement on the faculty, coupled with more recognition on the part of the administration and your faculty peers for the service that that involvement entails. You need to have recognition. Lack of recognition is partly due to faculty not demanding it from their immediate supervisors and the administration. A more involved and responsible faculty at the departmental level can help in establishing high curricular standards, budgetary goals for the University as a whole, as well as in establishing the criteria for recognition or reward for faculty teaching, research and service. The structure for doing this is already in place. There is the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, the Constitution and Bylaws, the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, all set in place for handling faculty input. I helped write those. I served on a committee made up of faculty which helped write those documents for the purpose of faculty input and how it should be handled. It is our responsibility as faculty to take up the challenge which has been brought forth here in the past few weeks, and make our University greater than it currently is in providing a high quality education for our students and for the citizens of the State of Arizona."

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS: In Senator Fink's absence, Senator Uhl reported that (1) election campaigns for ASUA offices begin February 18; the election will be held on March 7. (2) Official groundbreaking for the display system at Park Student Center will occur on February 12; it will promote programming and events, and corporate sponsorship is planned. (3) ASUA previously approved a resolution to encourage diversity among ethnic minorities in its offices. They are now in the process of compiling an affirmative action plan that will include under-represented groups and will eventually branch out to other clubs and organizations on campus.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Hetrick asked if the special committee on faculty governance, will be holding some open sessions to solicit input. Dr. Rehm responded affirmatively, and that the conclusions will be made available to the Faculty Senate and others. Dr. Cole added that opportunity will be provided for everybody to participate in the deliberations, and once the committee has made recommendations, they will be brought to the Faculty Senate for review and suggested modification.

Senator Mitchell asked President Koffler to comment on the fact that academic

professionals have been omitted from the Joint Legislative Budget Committee recommendations for the salary increase that had been recommended for faculty and career staff. President Koffler: "There has been no attempt on our part to accept that. I am confident that whatever money will be given will be given to faculty and professionals."

Senator Silverman asked Provost Cole who selected the members of the Faculty Governance Task Force and how members were selected. He also asked if groups like Committee of Eleven, AAUP or Faculty Senate committees were consulted. Dr. Cole responded that the decision was based upon a number of factors, the most significant of which was the NCA recommendations concerning what they perceived as a difficulty: the faculty perception that the administration was not calling on them as much as possible for participation in governance. At that point, he said, a decision was made to proceed with the committee as quickly as possible. This was prior to any of the activities now occurring, he said. He said he believed that he had consulted with Dr. Rehm about a month and a half or two months ago on the selection of this committee, and asked him to suggest a number of names. He had provided forty names, to which Dr. Cole added a number of his own, and the committee was selected from that group of names. At the time, he said, he did not consult any committees or the AAUP to obtain their advice on this. Believing this was a committee to advise the administration on this particular concern, as indicated in the NCA report, he didn't think it was essential to do so. Dr. Cole added that there was a time factor, and the Senate did not meet in January. However, he did ask the Chair of the Faculty to participate by chairing it. Dr. Cole said there was no intent to exclude anyone from involvement; his appointment letter indicated he hoped for interaction with the Faculty Senate and Committee of Eleven during this process, and that recommendations would be brought to the Senate for review and recommendations. All in all, he said, he thought the process was efficient and was primarily in response to the serious area of concern, as indicated by the NCA Report.

Senator Silverman asked Dr. Rehm if he had consulted with anyone when he submitted the forty names to Provost Cole? Dr. Rehm responded that he had selected names of well-known, prominent faculty on campus, whom he believed had information or knowledge that would help in the establishment of better faculty governance procedures. Senator Silverman noted that Dr. Rehm had just indicated in his report that he is interested in communication, but Provost Cole indicated he had initiated action on formation of the committee two months ago. Senator Silverman expressed his concern that Dr. Rehm had not consulted with any other group to solicit nominations for this important committee, resulting in another example of poor communication. He said he hopes the committee takes up this issue.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Ewbank said the committee is presenting, later in the agenda, recommendations for amending the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. The committee is also working on revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Roemer said the committee responded to Provost Cole's invitation to submit a list of items for improvement in the Mission Statement. The committee had been planning to draft a motion asking the Senate to appoint an ad hoc committee for review of the Mission Statement, and was delighted to learn that Provost Cole took the initiative to appoint such a committee, largely built on the Self-Study group, already well-informed and in a position to move much faster than a Senate ad hoc committee. She said Dr. Gottfredson has agreed to Chair that committee, and it will meet for the first time on February 6. Salaries, she said, particularly market



adjustments, had also been of concern to the committee; information had been requested from the Provost's office, and the committee was very pleased that the Provost offered to come discuss this subject with the committee. She said the committee discovered there is a well worked-out procedure in place for dealing with market adjustments on a college and departmental basis annually and on an individual basis, also for individuals who take special new responsibilities. She said the committee has suggested that a copy of the guideline be made available in the Faculty Center, to provide access to information. Communication, she believed, is a key to solving some of the governance problems. In that light, she said, returning to the matter of the Mission Statement, the supplements that have appeared in Lo Que Pasa on the NCA study are very much appreciated. Later in the agenda, she said, the committee has a resolution with respect to fee waivers. She said the committee was also concerned to learn about the matter of professionals in the salary enhancement package, and after discussing this with the Provost, can confirm that it is the intention of the administration to defend that matter strongly in the Legislature. The University of Arizona, as distinct from the other two universities, probably has more at stake with respect to the numbers of professionals on this campus, Senator Roemer said.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Aleamoni said the committee reviewed a request submitted by Senator Ewbank to review the University's methods and policies regarding the review of teaching in the promotion and tenure process, and that discussion will continue at the next meeting. In addition, a draft has been prepared of the questionnaire on teaching service from the University Teaching Center, and it will hopefully be finalized at the next meeting. The committee will seek input from the Committee of Eleven and the Student Affairs Policy Committee prior to its being distributed. Senator Aleamoni said the spring semester symposium on teaching has been set for April 3, 2:00 p.m. and will be co-sponsored by the Provost's office. Further details will be reported at the March Senate meeting. He said the committee's concern now is not so much with additional statements about the importance of teaching relative to research and service, but how the teaching role is implemented within the reward structure. That issue will be reviewed, and the committee will try to develop suggestions. He said the committee also examined the issue of why there is not a required ethics course on campus, and agreed to refer this topic to the Undergraduate Council.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Larson reported that the committee is reviewing the Proposal Review Policy and is interacting with the Technology Transfer Committee on the development of a revised conflict of interest policy.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Brainerd said the main agenda items of the committee's first meeting of the semester were: (1) academic fee waivers, referred from Vice President Woodard's office; (2) final exam schedules, referred by Dr. Sankey; (3) materials on the evaluation and reward of teaching, referred by Dr. Cole; (4) ASUA's academic teacher complaint form, referred by Senator Vezino; (5) student representation on the Undergraduate Council, referred by Senator Worley; and (6) proposed revisions to the Code of Conduct. Senator Brainerd reported that discussion focussed primarily on the academic fee waiver policy; some proposed revisions were drafted, motivated by committee concern that current students should retain the waivers and the value of the waiver as a recruitment device.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Chen asked Senator Roemer if the Budget Policy Committee had learned why academic professionals were singled out for

exclusion in salary adjustments. Senator Roemer said she thought it was more a case that they had been overlooked rather than singled out for exclusion. Dr. Cole added that this was only one recommendation, and the committee itself makes the final decision, but it appeared to have been a case of not recognizing the difference between faculty and General Faculty, familiar terms on campus, but not necessarily so among members of that committee. He said the administration is hopeful of convincing them that there should be no differentiation among all groups, including classified staff, in this particular salary increase.

Senator S. O'Brien asked if there is anything useful that could be done now in terms of helping to change this misunderstanding. Dr. Cole responded that he is hopeful the matter can be resolved through normal discussion, but individuals always have the right to discuss issues with legislators. In terms of the University, he said, it must be done through normal procedures, and currently the most important matter is where is the money going to come from? Dr. Rehm noted that he had alerted Senator Laird of the importance of this issue, and there is an indication he will contact Dean Sander so that they will work together on this.

APPROVAL OF CATALOG MATERIAL: Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 6, Section I was moved, seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 89/90-27). Approval of the same bulletin, Section IV, was then moved, seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote (motion 89/90-28).

Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 7, Section I, was moved and seconded. Senator Conway voiced his concern with the split of one department into three units, in view of current budgetary problems; he asked how many faculty would be assigned to each new unit. Dr. Cole responded that theoretically no additional cost is involved as division heads were already in place, although there will be some administrative costs for computers and stationery. He said this was intended to be simply a redistribution of existing resources. Issues related to subject matter had already been resolved, after close study over several years. Dr. Cole said it was his understanding that all concerned individuals were pleased with the split. Senator Adamec confirmed that, and noted the department was split only into two, not three, units, with ten faculty in the smaller unit. He added that the division is merely de facto, as faculty have retained the same offices. Dean Sigelman stated that the process has been underway for approximately two and a half years, and has enjoyed the full support of the faculty. While the Judaic Studies Committee is smaller, it is not a free-standing unit. Motion 89/90-29 was then approved unanimously on a voice vote. Approval was then moved and seconded for Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 13, No. 7, Section IV. That motion (89/90-30) was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

APPROVAL OF 1993/94 ACADEMIC CALENDAR: Senator Butler noted that the Regents staff had requested academic calendars be prepared five years ahead for planning purposes, and the Senate had previously approved the 1991/93 calendars. The proposed 1993/94 calendar had been prepared by the Calendar Committee, the membership of which includes Senators Peterson and Vezino and himself, as well as representatives from Intercollegiate Athletics, Public Affairs, Summer Session and Residence Life. Senator Butler said the proposed calendar does not differ greatly from previous calendars, and reflects the Senate's requirement of 44 MWF and at least 29 TTh teaching days, as noted on the proposal. The Calendar Committee must include a three-week pre-session and two five-week summer sessions which must terminate prior to cleaning residence halls before start of the Fall semester. He said the only difference between this and previous calendars is the Fall semester examination period and the customary "dead" day. Since classes end on a Friday, the Calendar Committee recommends final exams begin on the following Monday, with

the weekend considered as the "dead" day. The five-day exam period would permit Commencement to be held on Saturday, December 18; if extended one day, to Monday, Commencement would necessarily have to occur on Tuesday the 21st.

On behalf of the Calendar Committee, Senator Butler moved (motion 89/90-31) for approval of the proposed 1993-94 academic year calendar. That motion was seconded. Senator Roemer said there is a problem with the beginning of the spring semester, with the Monday, January 17 holiday coming so soon on the heels of the first day of classes on Wednesday, January 12. She said she teaches a section of Introductory Astronomy, with about 160 students, that is always over-subscribed by 20 to 30 students. This semester, she said, there were 30 students who didn't show up for class until the Wednesday after the Martin Luther King holiday, so that she couldn't respond to the students who needed to add because she didn't know who was in class for about ten days. She said she didn't know what the solution might be, but she wished there was one. Senator Butler said the committee wrestled with this, and this year classes were started on Wednesday as opposed to Thursday, with the belief that students might be less apt to skip the Friday class because of the Monday holiday. He said the catalog does contain a provision that says in those courses where enrollment is limited, missing the first day of class is tantamount to excessive absence, and students should be administratively dropped if they miss the first day of class. Senator Roemer noted that she had placed that in the syllabus, but such students don't read the syllabus until they show up the following week. Senator Butler said the Calendar Committee did recognize that problem. Dr. Rehm asked if that statement could be prominently displayed in Registration materials. Senator Butler said he would be glad to do that, although he despairs of it being an effective way of communicating. Senator Peterson said there is an easy remedy: start classes on the Tuesday after Martin Luther King Day, which some schools do. The vote was then called, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval (copy of calendar is attached to these Minutes).

APPROVAL OF BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING FEE WAIVERS: In regard to the reported possibility of loss of fee waivers for University employees, Senator Roemer reported, the ASU Faculty Senate approved a resolution addressing this issue. It now appears that institution of such a policy is less likely, but as a safety measure and as a means of calling attention to the salaries and benefits package, this resolution is coming to the Senate from both the Budget Policy and Faculty Senate Executive Committees. Senator Ewbank suggested adding "academic professionals" in the first sentence, after "faculty,". Senator Roemer said the committee could accept that. Senator Vezino asked if in committee discussion any consideration was given to fee waivers for graduate teaching assistants. Senator Roemer said there was no discussion on that subject. Senator Vezino said that ASUA has concern that graduate teaching assistants are being underpaid, and in view of recent events on campus regarding fees and salaries, that it might be a good idea for the committee to investigate that possibility. Senator Roemer noted that the intention is to not add anything to the present proposal, minimizing the possibility of a major loss. She believed Senator Vezino's suggestion should be addressed as a separate matter. The vote was called on the seconded motion (89/90-32), and was approved unanimously:

"It is resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona strongly supports the continuation of fee waivers for faculty, academic professionals, staff, their spouses and dependent children. This benefit is fundamental to the compensation package for university personnel, and becomes critical in attracting and retaining personnel, particularly as salary scales become increasingly uncompetitive."

APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING UHAP, CHAPTER 4: Senator Ewbank said that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee was submitting for Senate approval recommendations for changes to the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, Sections 4.11.02 and 4.15. He called for questions on the material which had been distributed with the meeting call, together with the committee's rationale and supporting comments. There being no questions on this material, which came to the Senate as a seconded motion (89/90-33), Dr. Rehm called for a voice vote, and the motion was approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS: DEFEAT OF MOTION TO INSTRUCT THE PRESIDENT ON A CAFT MATTER: Senator Ewbank reported that Professor William Bickel had requested the Senate's consent to address them. Dr. Rehm called for approval, and it was obtained unanimously on a voice vote.

Professor of Physics William S. Bickel: "I want to address that aspect of faculty governance dealing with faculty grievance against the administration. I'm going to present a specific case to underscore the gravity of this problem. My questions and requests toward the end of this presentation.

"The first time I appeared before you was on April 4, 1988, twenty-two months ago. I was here to present the case of a former colleague, Tien Wei Yang, and to ask you to accord him a hearing. The facts of my presentation of the Yang case were vigorously challenged by University Head Attorney Drew Ives, Acting Vice-Provost Jack Cole, and Acting Vice-Dean of the Graduate College Mike Cusanovich. The next and the last time I appeared before you was on October 3, 1988, sixteen months ago. On that day, subsequent to Senator Andy Silverman's oral report and my statement to you, you passed the Steelink motion by a hand-vote of 22 to 14 to offer Dr. Yang a hearing through the CAFT.

"Well, Dr. Yang has had his hearing. In the final report, delivered to President Koffler on October 17, 1989, the CAFT panel sustained portions or the entirety of twelve of Yang's fourteen charges against the University administration. The findings of the faculty panel also affirmed that even though Dr. Yang had had two previous CAPT hearings, he was denied a fair hearing before his termination in 1975; he was denied due process; and his academic freedom was repeatedly violated. To be sure, the panel's recommendation of one year's salary made a mockery of the magnitude of the panel's findings. As it should be, the panel's findings were based on evidence provided by extensive testimony and massive documentation. However, the panel's recommendation was based on speculations. In the academic community, with all of our scholarly investigations, the validity of our research conclusions come from our findings, not from speculations and assumptions.

"Now, three and a half months after receiving the CAFT report, Dr. Koffler has yet to act on the panel's substantive findings. My question to President Koffler and to you, my faculty colleagues, is simply this: Why has the decision on the Yang case been put on hold for this long, three and a half months, given the conclusiveness and the decisiveness of the findings against the University administration and in Yang's favor? Remember, Yang put up with fifteen years of denials, delays and continuous misrepresentations by the administration. Fifteen years! That's a huge block of time plucked from anyone's professional life, and in this case it was plucked away arbitrarily and capriciously as determined by the CAFT panel.

"Now, it is no longer a case of Yang vs. the University administration. It has become a case of the administration against the faculty and the University community in a continuing attempt by the administration to bypass the proper

procedures and standards of faculty governance and institutional justice.

"As the elected representatives of the University faculty, you are the individuals who made it possible for Dr. Yang to have a hearing in the first place, despite determined opposition from the administration over the years. Since you initiated the process which eventually vindicated Dr. Yang in this, the latest, CAFT hearing, it is now up to you once again to tell President Koffler to abide by the CAFT findings and to offer Dr. Yang immediate reinstatement. Therefore, I urge you to pass a resolution to instruct the President to reinstate Dr. Yang without any more delay. If the President truly entertains any respect for the views of his faculty, as he insists he does, he will listen. Thank you."

Dr. Rehm asked if anyone wished to move for acceptance of this resolution. Senator Mautner so moved (motion 89/90-34), and it was seconded. Senator Paplanus said it would be irresponsible of the Senate to take any action without seeing a copy of the report generated by CAFT, and that it was clear the Senate could take no action on the proposal without seeing such documentation. Senator Jones said he agreed with Senator Paplanus; this had been a case with many nuances, involving many individuals and administrations, and the Senate would be remiss in its duties in acting on the motion as proposed.

Professor Bickel said he thought this was what the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure had already done. Senator Paplanus noted the Senate had not seen a copy of that report. Senator Peterson said he would like to make the same point, and wondered whether CAFT recommendations are in the public domain and can be released to the public. Senator Mautner asked how many present had seen the CAFT report. There were no responses, and Senator Mautner asked if the report could be made available to the Senate. Dr. Rehm said that is a matter between CAFT and the President. Senator Mautner asked if the complainant could release the report. Dr. Rehm said that report is made to the President; it is not made public. President Koffler said the complainant can release it.

Dr. Rehm called the question on motion 89/90-34: that the recommendations of CAFT be carried out by the President. Professor Bickel noted that was not correct. Dr. Rehm asked him to restate his resolution. Professor Bickel said the resolution reads "I therefore urge you to pass a resolution to instruct the President to reinstate Dr. Yang without any more delay."

Senator Hetrick: "As a former Chairman of CAPT and someone involved in affairs involving the Faculty Constitution, I think we are being asked to do something that is impossible today. Much as I sympathize with Professor Bickel's speech and Dr. Yang's situation, this is simply impossible. This body has no authority to instruct the President to do anything." Dr. Rehm confirmed that the Senate may only advise the President. The question was called again, and on a voice vote the motion was defeated.

NEW BUSINESS: APPROVAL OF MOTION TO INCLUDE ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS IN SALARY PACKAGE: Senator Silverman moved that the Faculty Senate go on record in favor of including in any faculty salary increases all segments of the University community, and in particular, that academic professionals be included, and that this be transmitted to the appropriate administrator (motion 89/90-35). That motion was seconded and unanimously approved on a voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 4:36 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS OF MEETING OF FEBRUARY 5, 1990:

- 89/90-25 Motion defeated to schedule Spring 1990 Senate meetings at 3:00 p.m. in a room other than 146 Law.
- 89/90-26 Motion approved to schedule Spring 1990 Senate meetings at 3:15 p.m. in Law 146.
- 89/90-27 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 6, Section I.
- 89/90-28 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 6, Section IV.
- 89/90-29 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 7, Section I.
- 89/90-30 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 13, No. 7, Section IV.
- 89/90-31 Approval of 1993-94 Academic Year Calendar.
- 89/90-32 Approval of motion to support retention of fee waivers.
- 89/90-33 Approval of change to University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, Sections 4.11.02 and 4.15.
- 89/90-34 Defeat of motion to make recommendation to the President of the University regarding a CAFT case.
- 89/90-35 Approval of motion to include Academic Professionals in salary packages.

ATTACHMENTS TO THESE MINUTES

1993-94 Academic Year Calendar

Senate-recommended changes to University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, Sections 4.11.02 and 4.15.