

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 4, 1993 Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, October 4, 1993, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-six members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Malcolm J. Zwolinski presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Atwater, Badger, Barrett, Brichler, Buras, DaDeppo, Dahlgran, Desai, Dickinson, Enos, Ewbank, Garcia, Gruener, Hill, Huete, Inman, Joens, Jones, Larson, Lewis, Manke, McElroy, Myers, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Parsons, Pitt, Reynolds, Roemer, Shoemaker, Silverman, Sjong, Songer, Sullivan, Sypherd, Troy, Warburton, E. Williams, J. Williams, Witte, Wright, Young, Zukoski, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Anderson, Coons, Dvorak, Fajardo, Fernandez, Hammond, Hildebrand, Impey, Lei, Linn, Pacheco, Ruiz, and W. Williams.

2. OPEN SESSION: Susan Steele, Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences commented on the information sheet provided to Faculty Senators entitled "Transfer General Education Core Curriculum." She said that document represented an agreement reached by the public universities and community colleges of Arizona, after three years of work by a task force: community college students who have completed 41 units as described on the information sheet would be accepted into an Arizona university as having completed all university lower-division General Education requirements. She noted that this 41-unit core did not necessarily meet all college or major requirements, and the agreement does not abrogate such requirements. For example, students admitted to the University of Arizona's College of Arts and Sciences will still be required to demonstrate a four-semester proficiency in a foreign language. All community colleges now offer a set of core courses that they can recommend to potential University students. In addition, transfer guides have been developed for each community college, and are in use by advisors at both the community colleges and the universities to effectively guide students who know they will be attending a university.

Dr. Martha Gilliland said she wanted to discuss registration policy changes to be implemented for the spring semester. She said Chairman of the Faculty Garcia had reported that a number of questions have been raised. She noted that Bursar Jean Johnson was present, to provide information as needed. "The Short-Term Solutions Committee was initially set up to develop solutions to the computer overload problem which occurs each registration period. It identified a number of issues that could be dealt with through a change in registration policy. The goal of the policy changes, to improve service to students, is met in several ways: (1) Increased class availability: We are proposing to solve some problems associated with classes that appear to be over-enrolled but really are not; students get excluded when they really should not be, and I will explain the mechanisms for that. (2) Reduction in waiting lines: Changes will reduce embarrassingly long waiting lines in the Financial Aid area during the peak period at the start of classes. (3) More optimal use of financial aid resources: If tuition and fee waivers are not going to be used, they can be reawarded to others. (4) Reduction in peak load on the computer system: The registration policy changes will reduce the possibility of a system crash."

Dr. Gilliland said that the actual mechanisms designed to achieve the above results include (1) Move the due date for payment of registration fees two weeks earlier. She said that would come as a shock to some students, and a communication plan to ensure awareness is underway; changes will be announced in the course schedule. (2) Late penalties will be assessed the day after the payment deadline, and will escalate rapidly after one week. (3) Instructors will be given the ability to control "adds" as of the first day of class. Currently, the computer system can indicate a full class when in reality it is not. She anticipated this mechanism would make most of the faculty happy. (4) Students who are dropped for non-payment will not be able to re-enroll until they pay. In the past, students whose courses were dropped because they hadn't paid by the deadline could, the very next morning, re-enroll through RSVP; the system would drop them that evening, and they could repeat the re-enrollment the next day. "We have very bright students at the UA who know how to do this very very well." Dr. Gilliland said such activity resulted in locking other students out of classes, while using up RSVP phone time and computer capacity. (5) Financial aid checks will be mailed earlier, so that students who have qualified for financial aid will have their money in time to pay by the deadline. She added that temporary loans will be made available to those whose first paychecks for employment had not been issued by the time payment was due.

Senator J. O'Brien asked how item 3 in "mechanisms" would provide instructors with more control. Dr. Gilliland referred the question to Ms. Johnson, who responded that the intent was to provide instructors with more accurate enrollment lists through elimination of those who had not paid their fees, enabling faculty to know when they could sign "add" slips.

Senator McElroy said that one of the major problems for students in his department was courses that deny enrollment until portfolio reviews have been completed, for example. Students who wish to adhere to deadlines for payment of fees must "park" in some class, knowing they will drop that class and add the one which requires portfolio review. "We need a blank parking space for such individuals." Dr. Gilliland said she will telephone him on this issue, because, while the new system will not worsen that particular problem, neither will it solve it.

Senator J. O'Brien said the same situation is true with graduate students who must audition for level of performance. The process takes about a week, and the new registration policy will penalize them. Dr. Gilliland said students would not be penalized for complying with audition requirements. "We will have to deal with that on a department by department basis." Ms. Johnson added that Registrar Becella is communicating with various departments to determine where there are special needs.

Dr. Gilliland said that, as the changes in registration policy are publicized, members of the University community are encouraged to call herself or Registrar Becella with concerns. "Registrar Becella wants to solve the problems, and is perfectly willing to work department by department."

Senator Pitt asked what "payment in full" covered. Dr. Gilliland said she believed that term encompassed payment of registration fees, as well as tuition for out-of-state students. Senator Pitt asked if studio and lab fees were included. Dr. Gilliland responded yes, in compliance with Board of Regents policy which states that course fees will be treated and collected the same as other registration fees.

Senator Brichler expressed concern for students who would be charged late fees for adding a lab or class with a course fee on the first day of classes.

Senator Lewis prefaced several questions he had by saying that he recognized that efforts were being made to solve a number of legitimate problems. He then asked Dr. Gilliland how the Short-Term Solutions Committee knew that the desired results would be achieved through implementation of the particular changes in registration policy. He said he believed the plans to disseminate information on the revised registration procedures were well founded, but wondered whether some of the problems created by its implementation could have been worked out prior to publication. He said he was particularly concerned about those holding RA and TAs. While the Spring 1994 schedule indicates that departments requiring a student to register late could pay the late fee for the student, such payment might not be forthcoming from units experiencing a budget cutback. Secondly, a September 16 memo from the Provost and Mr. Valdez specified the ten days the University would be closed over the Christmas-New Year interval mandated closure on December 28, the date fees were due. Thus far, responses to his questions on how that problem could be solved were ambiguous. He indicated he would like an answer.

Dr. Zwolinski, noting that the two-minute time limitation for Open Session comments had been exceeded, said that because of the importance of the topic, he hoped there would be no objection to continuing. None was heard.

Dr. Gilliland said she would like to add a few more points, and then respond to questions. To assist it in developing registration policy changes, the committee used existing data on class availability, the length of waiting lines, and disbursement of financial aid resources. With respect to the closing, students are not required to pay their fees in person; they can be mailed ahead of time. "As long as students are aware of the new deadline, I don't really see that as a problem. Again, it all comes back to communication. Part of implementation is solving the related problems. Change is hard."

Senator Desai said he wanted to address a problem faced by some departments: some accreditation teams have indicated in the past that students are not properly advised. "Part of the problem is the current computer registration scheme. Could there be a flag in the registration system that the student is required to go to the department at least once for advising, to ensure that he/she is registering for the correct courses, in proper sequence?" Dr. Gilliland said that this was another issue. Senator Desai, agreed but indicated it is causing a lot of problems. Dr. Gilliland said she could not answer that question, but many kinds of problems do exist with advising, including faculty who do not take time to advise. Senator Desai said that students do not come to the department for advising because they can register by telephone without having to obtain a signature. Dr. Gilliland responded that perhaps the Short-Term Solutions Committee would consider taking on the advising issue. Again, she urged Senators and their colleagues to call with specific problems that have been raised about lab fees, etc., "because our intent is to make this work as smoothly as possible. No doubt there will be a few glitches, but this is a committee of about fifteen people who have worked very hard to try to serve students better. We don't want the glitches to derail what are really a lot of benefits, so we need to know if you have problems."

Senator Myers, 1993-94 Chair of the Committee of Eleven, said the Committee had asked him to express concern to the Senate regarding the closure announcement: "(1) The impact on staff and the potential loss of income at a time of year when

loss of income is not very satisfactory, especially given the past circumstance in terms of pay raises. (2) The fact that there has not been a unit-by-unit survey to determine the impact of the closure, and the possible consequences in terms of computer systems, laboratories, staffing, and faculty need to access their offices during the closure, to make up for times during the semester when they were unable to complete projects. He said a survey might well disclose the capability of closing some units and not others, and it appeared that a number of issues should have been addressed prior to the closure announcement, rather than afterward."

Senator Pitt said she had requested a few minutes to talk about fees. "Last year, during an Open Session of the Faculty Senate, the issue of fees was raised. Unfortunately, today the same issue still needs attention. New registration late fees approved recently by the administration have considerable drawbacks. But on the positive side, some problems have been identified.

"Late fees will be imposed on students, even when tuition and registration fees have been paid in full and on time, when they register for a course which has a lab or studio fee after the December 28 cutoff paid-in-full day. The student will be charged the late fee fine as if he had not paid his tuition at all. For example, after December 28 but before the first day of classes, if a paid-in-full student adds a science class with a lab fee, the student will have to pay the lab fee plus a \$50 late fee. On the first day of classes, if the student adds such a course, he will have to pay the lab fee plus a \$100 late fee. This fee policy sends out a negative message about the University of Arizona to students and parents which could simply be corrected by not including lab or studio fees within the late fees punishment. This situation affects the following departments which have lab or studio fees listed in the schedule: Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering, Architecture, Art, Chemistry, Exercise and Sports Science, Hydrology and Water Resources, Media Arts, Music, and Theatre Arts; additionally, I understand many other departments are requesting lab fees since we have a shortage of funding. Thank you all for your attention."

3. REPORTS

3A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: Provost Paul Sypherd reported that President Pacheco sends his regrets for not being able to attend this meeting today, but late last week he was asked to attend an awards ceremony in the Governor's office. He said the awards will be made in conjunction with the Governor's initiative to increase efficiency in government and to downsize. Dr. Sypherd said the President will receive a personal award from the Governor, and will observe two team awards for CORE activity: Telecommunications and Graduate Admissions. He said he understood that members of the teams will be there to receive their awards from the Governor.

3B. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Provost Sypherd said he felt an urge to answer some of the questions concerning late fees and lab and studio fees, and loss of pay because of the holiday closure. "Let me just comment on the holiday closure. The holiday closure issue is one of those things that was approached by successive approximations, and there needed to be a decision made about whether or not this university was going to close during the ten-day period, December 24 to January 2. During that period of time, the University would normally be open for business on only three days. All of us in this room have an idea about how much business gets done during those three days, and it's not a whole lot. The savings that would result from being able to turn off the heat to approximately 113 buildings is calculated at somewhere between \$300,000

and \$400,000. That's a large gap, but we do not know what the exceptions will be. A memo has been sent to deans, directors, department heads, and building supervisors requesting information on activities that must be carried on. We know, for example, many laboratories, animal facilities and biological and medical facilities working with altered cells must keep their laboratories functioning. A rough estimate indicates that we will have about 35 units that will be exceptions to this closure; the final number will determine the difference between \$300,000 and \$400,000 in savings in utilities alone.

"Concerning loss of pay, there are three ways to deal with those of us who would normally be here working: (1) Receive no pay. (2) Take accrued vacation time. (3) Make up the time, up to 24 hours. We are now discussing exactly how that time could be made up, whether it would be up to the unit managers or the supervisor, and whether deans, directors and department heads would set the policy. We don't know yet, but there is that opportunity. Who will not be able to make up their salary during these three days? Hourly employees. So it is true there are some folks among our employees that will not be able to make up that time, at least not during that interval. The potential savings, however, of \$3-400,000, if we go into another budget reduction period, will save jobs. Fewer people will have to be laid off in order to meet that budget reduction, which is always a possibility. That is the thinking that went into the decision for closure during the end of the year recess. I can tell you from personal experience that after one such closure, if the administration decided to return to being open during the holidays, there would be bodies swinging from the yardarm, mainly the administration's, because after the intensity of the fall semester, everyone will have discovered that ten days off is quite a welcome repast. I hope all of you come to agree with that. I suppose if you have some questions, you can ask them later on.

"I wanted to tell you that the Committee on Faculty Compensation has met twice. This committee was set up in response to the Regents mandate that we answer the question posed by the Arizona Faculties Council: could the universities establish a California-type merit system? Each university was to establish a committee like this, to meet with the Provost and examine the pros and cons of such a system. Our committee has listened carefully to how that California system functions, we have looked at what goes on in other major public AAU universities around the country, and we are now setting out to do some modeling to see how we would actually get into such a system, were we to adopt it at the UofA. I hope that before the end of the month we will have at least a preliminary report ready to make to the Senate at its November meeting.

"There is a rumor widely spoken of around the state that there will be a pay increase for state employees, including University employees. As all of you know, the only decision package that the three universities went in with was pay raises for faculty and staff. No one knows what the response is going to be. But the people who have their ears to the political ground believe that there is going to be something by way of a pay raise for state and University employees. In preparation for that, we are now considering within the administration, and in some discussions that I have had with the Chairman of the Faculty, how such pay raises would be administered at this university. I believe we need to get in very early with the plan that we would execute in order to administer pay increases. We hope we have that problem to deal with. Chairman of the Faculty Garcia and I have had several conversations with the Deans as well, and I hope that within the next few weeks I will be able to take to the Senate Executive Committee a proposal for how we would proceed.

"I know I'm taking a lot of your time, but I'd like to tell you about a few activities that are under way. One is a CORE activity looking at Human Resources at the University of Arizona. The team members are George Evanoff, Martha Gilliland, Andy Heck, Eamone Malone, Janie Nunez, Jay Parker, Ken Smith, Susan Strick, Paul Sypherd, Joel Valdez and Lynne Wood. These individuals, in one way or another, all deal with human resource issues, both from the academic side of the house and from the business and finance side. The effort is to examine the sense that we are not good employers at the University of Arizona. Have any of you ever heard that before? This effort is under the 'ownership,' to use proper CORE language, of Martha Gilliland. The team is asking what the problem is, why is there a belief that we are not good employers? This is a first cut at some of the issues we believe are significant with our human resources officers, and that includes the personal services that exist within the Provost's office. We are reactive and not proactive. There is no career development or progression, or at least very little. There is a tolerance for inappropriate behavior, for example, a lack of respect. I believe that is a very serious problem here. There is no culture for accountability within the University, at many levels, maybe especially as linked to reward. Employees are not allowed the opportunity to participate in decision-making, particularly those decisions that affect their well-being. This is the first cut at the statement of the problem. Based on this assessment, the group drafted the following vision statement, representing essentially the goals we would like to achieve as a result of this activity.

"To achieve the Human Resource vision of the University as a great place to work, we are committed to: an environment of respect and trust; being an employer of choice; developing the full potential of all employees by supporting their personal work welfare and career development; promoting cooperation, teamwork and sharing of knowledge; promoting employee empowerment and involvement; caring for our employees like we want them to care for our customers; respecting and valuing diversity; and achieving excellence in employee performance.

"I hope to be able to continue to report progress of that group. I think it's a very important function. I expect that we will be asking the Faculty Senate for their participation, too.

"Another activity that's going on right now, which many of you have heard about and on which I need to give you a quick update, is the action of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee. The Strategic Planning Subcommittee has been meeting to deal with the issue of program consolidation or elimination within the University. Many of you have heard me say that we probably offer too many baccalaureate degrees. I know we offer too many courses, and we probably have some other things that we do that we should stop doing. The subcommittee, over the course of a couple of meetings, adopted conditionally four criteria with which they would evaluate departmental programs: centrality of the program, efficiency, quality, and diversity. To come up with the criteria that we would use is the easy part. Managing 100 or so academic departments and a similar number of administrative and support units, and determining how we would actually pull data out of our systems, turns out to be a difficult problem. Through the use of the overhead projector, I want you to glance at the kinds of information that we have available [Sample, Selected Program Measures, FY 1992: Productivity Related Data by Department: Undergraduate Student Credit Hours, Graduate Student Credit Hours, FTE Students, Total Full-Time Equivalent Instructional and Research Faculty, State and Research Expenditures, Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, Masters Degrees and Doctoral Degrees, and Efficiency Related Data]. We want to be data driven in making

judgments. I am showing you a sampling of some of the measures that were discussed at the last meeting. Some of these categories were eliminated as duplicative of others, and several proposals have been made for different measures. The departments are real but coded, simply to provide you with a feeling for the range of the information we have to deal with. The subcommittee will continue to struggle with this issue. We meet again in about a week and a half to refine the kind of data that we would need to make a first pass at departments or programs that should be considered for consolidation or elimination. Ultimately, of course, there is going to be a value judgment, and that will enter into the quality issue. Those judgments are not going to be made by the Strategic Planning Subcommittee. They were made, in large measure, by the PAIP reviews. We have all of those documents available, plus a large number of external reviews from our external review program. I hope to be able to report on each of these activities to you in the future, and I thank you for your time."

- 3C. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia reported on the September 23-24 Board of Regents meeting. "As you may have read in the newspapers, the Board of Regents took an important action concerning the enrollment in the Colleges of Law throughout the state. They made the percentages of non-resident students, compared to resident students, to be the same as those on the campus: 25 percent non-residents and 75 percent residents. That was not an alarming or surprising action, but what was alarming and surprising to me was that was the second motion made. The first motion, which failed on a 4-4 vote, was to make the Law Colleges totally residential programs, eliminating all non-resident students. I am glad that motion failed, but it didn't fail by much. I think this represents a message from the greater community, and the Regents were simply responding to political pressure of various kinds. I will not attempt to categorize their responses, or whether I think it's a good idea or not. I would rather focus on the message that is being sent by the community to us concerning how we conduct our business. I think they are asking for more accountability, and I think that's the message in that vote. I would hope that the Regents would consider the effect on the quality of our institution when they take such votes in the future. The issue is not settled yet. It has been sent back to the Colleges of Law for further discussion.

Senator Garcia reported that the second research environment symposium, to gather information requested by the National Academy of Sciences, would be held on October 5, and he urged those present to attend because of the importance of participation in describing the campus research environment of the present and of the future in the context of this study. Continuing with announcements, Senator Garcia said that the Faculty Center can now be reached through e-mail at the address: ekrauz@gas.uug.arizona.edu. He reported that the Committee on Elections had met and elected Dr. Harris Bernstein as its Chairman for 1993-94. The Committee on Committees will meet later this week to elect its chair, completing the process of selection of leadership for the General Faculty standing committees.

Senator Garcia reminded Senators of the General Faculty meeting scheduled for October 5. The sole agenda item for that meeting was to be the State of the University address by President Pacheco, followed by a question and answer session.

As mentioned by Dr. Gilliland, he had received a number of calls concerning the coincidence between the earlier deadline for payment of registration fees and the closure of the University. Among the issues raised were the late fees, which appeared to faculty to be punitive in light of the fact that if students regis-

tered for a course with associated fees, and the department was closed during the time they had to pay those fees to be properly registered, it seemed that perhaps thought might be given to rescinding institutionally the late fee, "until we get our act together as an institution and not punitively penalize people for institutional behavior."

Senator Garcia announced that on October 11, Sharon Kha would present the data that resulted from the periodic survey conducted by the University to assess community attitudes with respect to the University. "This is both a state-wide and a Pima County opinion poll with questions which are repeated over a period of time so that responses from, for example, the 1986 survey can be compared with the 1990 and 1993 survey responses.

Senator Garcia also announced that the Provost had provided the Faculty Center with temporary wages this year in order to hire clerical help to assist the standing and ad hoc committees of the Senate and of the General Faculty with better communications. He said he wanted the Senate to be aware that additional assistance is now available at the Faculty Center.

3D. REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

3E. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Zwolinski said there were several items he wanted to report. An orientation meeting for new and re-elected Faculty Senators had been scheduled for October 7. Chairman of the Faculty Garcia, Secretary of the Faculty Roemer, and he planned to provide Senators with an overview of Senate procedures, including the structure and the functioning of the Senate Executive Committee and the Senate standing committees. Participants will be asked to share their thoughts on implementation of shared governance. He invited any member of the Senate to attend the meeting.

Dr. Zwolinski reported that an ad hoc Senate committee on Constitution and Bylaws has been appointed to examine the existing document and bring recommended changes to the Senate, and later to the General Faculty, for approval. Items they have been asked to consider include the possible representation of the Staff Advisory Council and academic professionals in the Senate; the composition of the Senate Executive Committee, to include committee chairs; increase in the size of the Committee on Conciliation from six to nine members; and the possibility of creating an Assistant Chair of the Faculty position. The committee will be chaired by Senator Hank Ewbank; other members are Secretary of the Faculty Elizabeth Roemer and Senators Nathan Buras and Doug Jones.

Dr. Zwolinski announced that confirmation had been received that Dr. Frank Besnette, the Executive Director of the Arizona Board of Regents, and possibly also the President of the Board, Regent Doug Wall, would address the Senate at the November meeting. [More recent information is that neither Dr. Besnette or Mr. Wall will be able to attend the November Senate meeting.]

"In closing, I would like to offer a personal thought, which ties in with comments made by Provost Sypherd in his report. As Senators, we are on a very historic journey, making a commitment to accept new responsibilities in providing leadership in the environment of change where trust and open communications are paramount. Old ways are fading, new directions are emerging. Everyone in this University community is or will experience changes. I wonder how many of our colleagues will be taking this trip, making this journey."

3F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Lewis said he had a couple of com-

ments and questions, and he wished that Dr. Gilliland had not already left, because some of the questions would have been directed to her. "She mentioned that change is hard, and I take that to heart, change is hard. When we are determining what change should be, we are going in the right direction. When I asked a question about the registration fee deadline, and discussion ensued, that is obviously a step in problem resolution. But there are still a couple of issues that need to be talked about, from the perspective of students all over this campus. First, concerning University closure December 24-January 2, the Bursar's Office and a number of other departments must remain open during the break. Hopefully, that will occur, ensuring that students can ask important questions of those departments as necessary in the couple of days prior to their paying of registration fees. Students often encounter what I would call 'the funneling effect' that occurs when they have questions, for example, about how to pay before deadlines. They call department x and get transferred to department y, until they get to department z, and then they find out that the department that can provide answers is department a. I don't know how to solve that. Certainly the University remaining open would solve the problem, but I don't think that is a viable option. So I would like to emphasize that access to various key departments on campus is critical, and that needs to be possible in order to alleviate problems that students will be experiencing. A number of anecdotal problems were raised today about different campus and student constituencies who will be impacted by this. We can all think of a number of anecdotes to define problems that people will experience as we a result of this change. Some might be legitimate, some might not be. We don't know the answer to all the questions, and we are having a difficult time grappling with this issue. I asked for the demographics of those students who do not pay on time, in an attempt to find out why they do not do so. If we knew the answer to that question, perhaps we could learn which factors impact them so that payment on time is not possible. One perfect example is the issue of late assignment of RA and TAs. I would contend that we do not know all the factors that impact payment of fees. Perhaps answers can be learned through implementation of the new policy, but I wish we had investigated these factors prior to initiation of the changes.

"I have a couple of other comments. I think that we have to look at the temporary loan situation, for instance. Many students apply for temporary loans to enable them to pay their registration fees on time. I have asked how much money is available in the pool for temporary loans, and how early the funds could be utilized, and the response has been ambiguous. I hope this issue can be resolved prior to implementation.

"There are solutions to these problems. Senator Myers suggested that a specific postmarked date for mailed payments could be a solution. I'm not certain what the solutions might be. I know that a committee will be meeting with Registrar Becella over the next couple of weeks to resolve some of these questions, and Senator Brichler is a member of that committee. But I would like to hear a response at a Senate meeting as to what headway is being made."

In conclusion, Senator Lewis said he wanted to thank the Graduate College for its pledge of financial and other support for the Student Showcase, referenced in his report to the Senate at the previous meeting, which will be held in November and will highlight the results and progress of approximately 70 undergraduate and graduate student research projects.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Silverman commended Provost Sypherd for adding the dimension of make-up time for staff adversely affected by the closure of the University in December. He suggested that, whatever procedure is set up,

it be liberally construed to facilitate the scheduling of make-up time. Senator Silverman added that he was concerned about the lowest paid group of employees taking the brunt of the closure's impact, and the position of faculty, who would not be hurt financially, but who would be unable to use their offices. He asked Provost Sypherd if he would be able, at some point, to report to the Senate how much money was saved. Senator Silverman then asked Provost Sypherd about the Human Resources CORE team, comprised entirely of administrators. He said he was glad to learn such a committee existed to address the concerns expressed in Provost Sypherd's report, but suggested that it would be beneficial to have staff on the team, as well as faculty, with staff members being selected by the Staff Advisory Council, and faculty being selected by the Chair of the Faculty or the Faculty Senate.

Armando Vargas, Staff Advisory Council (SAC) representative, stated that SAC had discussed winter break closure approximately two months ago, and at that time they had submitted a recommendation that if the University did proceed with closure plans, that it ensure a worthwhile saving would be made and secondly, that if a closure decision was made, that the University community be notified by early September. "Our concern was that classified staff, especially those on an hourly payscale, be provided enough notice to accrue vacation time." He said this item will also be on SAC's October 5 agenda. Regarding the Human Resources CORE team, he said SAC was allowed one representative, and that individual was assigned to the Communications Team.

Concerning the October 5 General Faculty meeting, and because the State of the University address affects all employees, Mr. Vargas requested that, in the future, consideration be given to avoiding scheduling a General Faculty meeting in the late afternoon of the first Tuesday of the month, as that time conflicts with the monthly SAC meeting.

Senator Myers said he was pleased to hear about the Human Resources CORE Committee, but suggested that an employee survey be commissioned in order to obtain more direct information from the employees themselves as to some of the key issues.

Senator J. O'Brien asked Senator Garcia if the 5 percent pay package approved by the Regents was above and beyond what other State employees would receive. Senator Garcia: "The University of Arizona requested a \$21 million increase, of which \$13 million is scheduled for staff and faculty salary increases. The remainder is for mandated increases, of one kind or another, including utilities." Senator J. O'Brien: "Well, if we are limited to 5 percent, and data indicates that our salaries are 15 percent below our peer institutions, then geometrically we are in the hole more every year. I don't fully understand the implications of the California system, but I don't think we can phase in something of that magnitude when we're dealing with 5 percent."

Dr. Sypherd: "The Governor's Office guidelines stated we could submit a decision package amounting to only 5 percent of our total budget. That works out to be approximately 7.5 percent of salaries. If the State government is considering a 5 percent across-the-board increase, the question is might the universities receive 12.5 percent. The political operatives for the University say probably not. But I am unfamiliar enough with the system here that I cannot answer that."

Senator J. O'Brien: "The factors that one could compensate for would be training, longevity, productivity, equity, merit and retention. Of those six, which ones would the California system address?" Dr. Sypherd: "The California system

is a merit-only system. During the last twenty years, cost-of-living increases were set, for example, at 3 or 4 percent, and merit is added to that. Merit reviews occur periodically at two- or three-year intervals; merit is sometimes given and sometimes not. The real issue is how to evaluate merit, and of course it is based on research, teaching, public service and service in the University."

Senator J. O'Brien said he would be interested in learning the sense of the Senate on a step system at some point. Senator Witte said she believed the Senate two years ago indicated, almost unanimously, that if the pay raise is 5 percent or less, that should all be across-the-board, not merit. So they did take a position at that time. And there was strong consensus.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 1993: The minutes of September 13, 1993 were approved as distributed.
6. SURVEY OF FACULTY SENATORS, PART II: Dr. Zwolinski asked Senators to complete part II of a survey to determine the most important issues they believe will be facing the University of Arizona this year. The first phase of the survey was completed at the September Senate meeting, and Dr. Zwolinski had collated and merged the 144 items submitted into a new, randomized list of 23 issues, which Senators had been asked to rank in importance. He said he would report the final results at the November meeting. He requested the assistance of Secretary Roemer and Dr. Sankey in collecting the surveys. Senator J. O'Brien asked how the results will be used. Dr. Zwolinski said the information will be submitted to the Arizona Faculties Council, which is conducting a similar survey of the other three institutions. The Senate Executive Committee will compare the results with issues with which the Senate's standing committees are involved.
7. ELECTION OF TWO SENATE REPRESENTATIVES TO THE 1993-94 FACULTY BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Dr. Zwolinski said that only two nominations had been submitted for Senate representation on the 1993-94 Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee: Senator Chandra Desai, a Regents Professor in the Department of Civil Engineering and Engineering Mechanics; and Senator Lynn Joens, Professor in the Department of Veterinary Science. Because two nominations were submitted for two vacancies, he said he would entertain a motion for election by acclamation. Senator Garcia so moved (motion 1993/94-20), and a second was heard. Senator Neuman asked Senator Joens, with respect to the formula by which faculty would be evaluated for merit in teaching, service and research, if he would share his opinion on this topic. Senator Joens: "I think that people should be rewarded for merit, and I like Provost Sypherd's California step system so people can be evaluated and paid for what they do. I think morale is very low. Five percent would help, but I think this should occur every year. I will be interested in seeing what I can do about it." Senator Neuman: "Do you have a specific formula in mind at this point?" Senator Joens: "No, I don't." A voice vote on motion 1993/94-20 indicated unanimous approval.
8. RATIFICATION OF THE PROCEDURE FOR SELECTING SENATE REORGANIZATION REVIEW COMMITTEES: Dr. Zwolinski, since this item had been tabled until today's meeting, requested a motion to take the matter from the table. That motion (1993/94-21) was moved, seconded, and approved without dissent on a voice vote.

Senator Garcia said that the Senate Executive Committee was requesting ratification of a procedure for selecting members of Senate Reorganization Review Committees, revised copy having been submitted to Senators with today's agenda material. "The Board of Regents charges us with the responsibility of establishing committees which will review, at the request of the President, recommendations

for termination of tenured faculty in connection with the reorganization or closure of a unit. A review committee, according to the Regents document, will conduct public hearings, receive statements from those who will be terminated, solicit opinions from the campus in general, request the Senate's opinion, and then submit a report to the President that includes a recommendation on the advisability of the reorganization or closure. That report will be included in the material which will go to the Board of Regents in the event that the reorganization or closure action proceeds. One such Senate committee is required for each unit for which reorganization is proposed. As you know, a Senate Select Committee is in the process of organizing itself, has already met, and is thinking about the global structure of reorganizations. The review committees, the structure of which is up for debate at this time, are the specific committees which would write the report concerning each individual reorganization." He then moved (motion 1993/94-22) to ratify the procedures as submitted to the Senate. That motion was seconded.

Senator Silverman asked about the wording of the last item: "One staff member, selected by the Staff Advisory Council, or an academic professional." He asked whose decision it would be to determine whether it would be a staff member or an academic professional and who would select the academic professional. He wondered whether it would make more sense to have it read either two staff members or a staff member and an academic professional, as each group would have concerns that should be addressed by the review committee. In answer to Senator Silverman's first question, Senator Garcia said that in one of the units where reorganization is contemplated, there are no staff, in which case there would not have been a staff member selected by the Staff Advisory Council, nor were there any academic professionals associated with the unit. He said it just depended on circumstances, and hence the question was left open. Special circumstances would be dealt with by the Senate Executive Committee, subject to consent of the Senate.

Senator Gruener suggested that parallel lines of selection or election should be followed with respect to staff, and he recommended that membership encompass one staff member, aside from an academic professional, and that staff member should come from the unit affected, and be chosen in much the same way as the faculty and student members.

Senator Jones offered a two-part motion (1993/94-22A) (1) for insertion of a footnote or clarification to indicate that the term "faculty" as used in this document means a member of the General Faculty and (2) to change "academic professional" to "year-to-year professional." The motion was seconded. Senator Garcia said he had no objection to the amendment, and the seconder also agreed to the amendment.

Senator J. O'Brien requested clarification on the terms "program" and "unit." Did they mean department, faculty, college, or any of these? Senator Garcia responded "All of the above...Unit is the word that the Regents use and will be defined by the President in his transmittal letter to the Senate. An individual from that unit will be selected in item 2, 'one faculty member from the program to be terminated (elected by the program).'" Senator J. O'Brien said he just wanted a guarantee that this process would be followed. Senator Garcia said that the Senate Executive Committee will be guided by this discussion.

Senator Myers requested clarification on another point: if the review committee is to be primarily concerned with the potential termination of tenured faculty, would insertion of the term General Faculty, which includes professionals with

continuing appointments, be in conflict with the Board of Regents' use of the term "faculty"? Senator Garcia acknowledged that the Board of Regents' language is very specific, and refers to tenured faculty; a separate procedure exists for termination of those with continuing appointments.

Senator Silverman said he understood the reorganization process to be that, when the University determined the need to eliminate a unit or program that contained tenured faculty, a specific procedure had been put in place by the Board of Regents. In addition to termination of tenured faculty, positions of staff, academic professionals, and year-to-year professionals might also be eliminated. But he said he found it difficult to understand why we should not define "faculty" as "General Faculty."

Senator Garcia attempted clarification and simplification of the proposal to determine committee structure for reorganizations due to financial reasons: "The Regents document mandates this committee under the circumstance when tenured faculty positions are to be eliminated. That's it....We can have as many other committees as we like, but with this proposal we are trying to comply with Regents policy. We can address the other issues some other time. This is all we can handle on one piece of paper."

Senator Jones said he wanted to make a third point. Current Regents policy does not mandate a Senate review committee for a reorganization in which an academic professional with continuing status will be released. However, a task force is currently reviewing the Conditions of Professional and Administrative Service, and both he and Associate Dean of Students Alexis Hernandez are serving on that task force. The task force is proposing changes to parallel the policy contained in the Conditions of Faculty Service. The proposal will go forward through a normal review process. He read the proposal:

"When a reorganization proposed by the administration calls for the release of any continuing or continuing-eligible professional before the end of the term of employment, the following procedures shall be observed. The President shall ask the Academic Senate to designate a review committee composed of faculty, academic professionals and students to review and evaluate the proposed plan...."

Senator Jones, referring to Senator Silverman's comments, added that current procedures call for a review panel to be established when a tenured faculty member is going to be released due to reorganization, but the procedures do not specify the composition of the committee. "That is what we are deciding here today. In the long run, it would be simpler to amend this document to include continuing professionals."

Senator Neuman requested clarification of the distinction between continuing and year-to-year professionals. Senator Jones said that the terms tenured and tenure-eligible are comparable to continuing and continuing-eligible, while year-to-year denotes nontenure-eligible.

Senator Witte questioned action that would be taken in expectation of future approval of another document. She said she believed the Committee Structure proposal could be amended quickly if that became necessary, that it was not advisable to muddy the waters now, and she withdrew her second.

Another voice was heard to second the motion, and Dr. Zwolinski called for the vote on the amendment (motion 1993/94-22A). A voice vote proved inconclusive,

but a show of hands indicated approval (26 in favor, 10 opposed, 1 abstention).

Senator Myers then moved (motion 1993/94-22B) to change item 2 from "one faculty member from the program to be terminated (elected by the program)" to "one faculty member from the program to be terminated (elected by faculty in the program)." That motion was seconded, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

A voice vote on motion 1993/94-22, as amended by motions 22A and 22B, was then approved on a voice vote, without dissent.

9. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CODE OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: Associate Dean of Students Alexis Hernandez said he wanted to make a few comments on the Code of Academic Integrity, which is observing its second year under the 1992 revisions, and on the Code of Conduct.

Dr. Hernandez said there are different versions of the Code floating around, but each department and college should have the 1992 version, which is the most recent. "The Code of Academic Integrity was revised with the intention of giving the faculty the power to manage Code of Academic Integrity violations. Currently, the Provost's Committee on Academic Integrity is reviewing some of the flaws in the system. Under the current Code, the Dean of Students' role is strictly advisory: we advise faculty and students as they work through the process. We neither determine sanctions nor decide if a violation occurred. To review the process in a nutshell: (1) preserve the evidence; (2) call the Dean of Students' Office so that we can answer any questions and provide detailed information about the process; (3) the faculty member then meets with the student to present the evidence and to hear the student's side of the story; the process requires that the instructor withhold judgment as to whether a violation of the Code of Academic Integrity occurred until after they have heard from the student; (4) if the instructor determines that a violation has occurred, a form in the packet must be filled out, providing a summary of the case, recommended sanctions, and instructions to the Dean of Students' Office for distribution of copies; (5) forms are available from your department or your college dean's office, or call our office; (6) the student has the right to appeal the instructor's decision to the department head; (7) the department head listens to both sides of the case and makes a recommendation to the faculty member on a form provided in the packet; this is strictly a recommendation to the faculty member--the department head does not have the authority to change any of the sanctions--it is merely a recommendation to the faculty member; (8) the faculty member should take that recommendation into consideration, but a change is not required; (9) the student can then appeal to a University Hearing Board; (10) the Hearing Board's recommendations are submitted to the Provost, who has the option to accept, reject, or modify the recommendations; (11) if the student wishes to appeal the Hearing Board's decision, the matter goes back to the Provost for review; (12) the Provost's decision is final. The student may then take the case to court, if they wish." Dr. Hernandez added that the Dean of Students' Office handles the administrative function of putting the Hearing Board together, but does not serve on the Hearing Board, sit through its deliberations, or make any determination as to whether or not there was a violation of the Code. The instructor presents his/her case, the student presents his/her case, and the Board makes its recommendations to the Provost.

Dr. Hernandez said he would like to have faculty remember three things: (1) preserve the evidence; (2) do not hesitate to call him (1-7059) with questions on the Code of Academic Integrity; he will be happy to assist in any way he can; (3) he will be more than happy to make presentations to groups, departments, or

colleges to explain the details of the Code of Academic Integrity.

Senator J. O'Brien asked for a comparison of the number of complaints filed during the last three years. Dr. Hernandez noted that the new Code went into effect at the beginning of the 1992-93 academic year. About 150 cases were submitted to the Dean of Students' Office in 1992-93, and perhaps four went to a Hearing Board. Most cases were resolved at the initial levels.

Senator Troy said he found the multiplicity of codes and procedures governing student conduct, cited in the cover letter which accompanied the 1992 Code of Academic Integrity, very confusing. Dr. Hernandez said he agreed that it is confusing, but they are all in use at this time.

Senator Young discussed a case in which he was involved last semester which led him to believe that the system may not be working well. He said a student forged his signature on a withdrawal slip, giving himself a W instead of the E that he had earned. He learned of this action through a check of the student's record. He said he obtained a copy of the withdrawal slip from the Registrar's Office, and the signature in no way resembled his. The student admitted forging his signature, and Senator Young proposed that the student be given the grade of E, be expelled from the University, and that a mark be placed on the student's permanent record. He said he considered the act of forgery to be a serious crime. But the end result of the complaint was that the student had to write a letter of apology, which consisted of three very short sentences, and was placed on probation, which was necessitated, anyway, because the grade of E brought his grade average down to the point where academic probation was required. "So the student got nothing more than a slap on the wrist for what I consider a very serious crime."

Dr. Hernandez noted that Senator Young's case represented a violation of the Code of Conduct, as opposed to the Code of Academic Integrity. The Code of Conduct carries a very different set of procedures. Sanctions, he said, were established and in practice prior to his arrival in 1990, and there is a difference between academic and disciplinary probation. In accordance with Board of Regents policy, only a University Hearing Board has the authority to place a mark on a student's permanent record, but the only way a complaint can get to a University Hearing Board is with a recommendation for suspension or expulsion through a violation of the Code of Conduct, as opposed to the Code of Academic Integrity. Dr. Hernandez said he had discussed this issue with Senator Young last week, and suggested that, because the system requires a grade report--assignment of a W or E--for withdrawal, in his opinion we are asking for trouble when any grade report form is handled by other than University employees. He said he would encourage Senator Young and perhaps the Senate to review this issue. Alternatives to the current procedure would include a paperless or electronic recording, changing the procedure to be completely internal to the University. He said he believed this would result in the elimination of forgeries, and he would encourage that. Senator Young said he intended to pursue the matter.

Senator McElroy said he was sure that many instructors have encountered similar difficulties. Several years ago, he pursued a case for which he had all the documentation, but was told by the Dean of Students' Office that it was too much trouble for their office to handle, and he should therefore drop it. Dr. Hernandez said he could not speak to what happened prior to his arrival, but he could assure Senator McElroy that if he filed a case with the Dean of Students' Office now, it would be pursued. Senator McElroy responded that, especially in large classes, instructors know that the percentage of those violating

conduct codes is very large, and to selectively pursue a few individuals, rather than ensure uniform enforcement of the codes, was a factor in creating the situation we are now in.

Dr. Hernandez said that 150 cases of Code of Academic Integrity violations were filed last year, as opposed to 400 to 500 violations of the Code of Conduct. He would like to see a system that discouraged any kind of cheating or forgery.

Senator Myers asked if he could interpret Dr. Hernandez' comments to be a suggestion that Drop/Add forms be handled internally, within departments and the Registrar's Office, rather than being given to students. Dr. Hernandez said that he was suggesting that if one desires to eliminate the possibility of forgeries on grade report forms, the form should be handled by University personnel.

Senator Buras said that in the example provided by Senator Young, of a Code of Conduct violation resulting in a slap on the wrist, perhaps the Code of Conduct should be reviewed. Dr. Hernandez said that was a possibility. Senator Garcia asked if the Code of Conduct is set by the Regents. Dr. Hernandez said that was correct. Senator Garcia asked if the Code of Academic Integrity is a campus document, established in conjunction with the Provost's Office. Dr. Hernandez said that was correct. Senator Garcia asked if there is any provision or leeway to amplify the Code of Conduct for local needs. Dr. Hernandez said he believed there was some leeway.

Senator Ewbank wondered if a partial solution could be achieved by merely adding "forgery" to the list of prohibited conduct in the current Code.

Joan Hirt, Acting Associate Dean of Students, explained that she was the one who administers the Code of Conduct. She said that assignment of a particular violation to one of the listed categories of prohibited conduct sometimes requires much thought, and she noted that forgery has been dealt with under the Code of Conduct. But "should the Faculty Senate or the faculty in general suggest to us that matters involving forgery, misrepresentation of I.D., and other kinds of conduct now treated under Code of Conduct be treated as Code of Academic Integrity violations, we can certainly take that under advisement. The Code of Conduct lists sixteen very general categories of prohibited conduct. The first one states that students shall not violate academic integrity standards as defined by the campus. The Code of Academic Integrity provides that definition for the UofA. Other categories of prohibited conduct contained in the Code of Conduct include theft and misappropriation of the property of others, drugs and other controlled substances, alcohol. They are broad categories, not situation-specific. When a complaint is received, we try to determine under which of these broad categories a situation is best handled. We would welcome guidance from the Senate if it feels we are not handling those situations correctly."

Senator Ewbank said it seemed to him to be clear that when a forgery has an impact on an academic record, that action should merit treatment under the Code of Academic Integrity. Senator Witte noted that forgery is a serious charge, and "you would want the fairest possible procedure and the greatest protections for the person accused, but if the charge turns out to be justified, then this violation should have a major penalty."

Dr. Zwolinski thanked Drs. Hernandez and Hirt for sharing information with the Senate. He said the Senate Executive Committee would take this matter under advisement, perhaps placing it on a future Senate agenda for further consideration.

10. DISCUSSION ON PCC/UA SEQUENTIAL DEGREE PROGRAM: Senator Inman, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC), provided the Senate with an overview of the PCC/UA Sequential Degree Program. "Last March, a think tank appointed by President Hockaday and President Pacheco presented its concept paper on the sequential, or seamless, degree program in which students could earn an Associate Degree or a B.A. or B.S. on Pima Community College's new campus at Drexel and Irvington through cooperation of the two institutions. The think tank consisted of Vice Presidents Beigel, Fernandez and Taylor from the University of Arizona, and Vice Provost Acuna, Vice Chancellor Gorsuch, and a senior assistant of Chancellor Silvers from PCC. On June 30, Provost Sypherd sent a copy to Chairman of the Faculty Garcia, and said that he would like the Senate to consider this matter, in its formative stage, and that he would like to have the Senate's ideas on it. On July 13, Presiding Officer Zwolinski sent a copy to me and asked that the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee prepare a position paper to be presented this Fall. At our first meeting on September 7, we discussed the matter and selected a subcommittee (John McCullen, Eustace Dereniak, and Sue Brichler) to write the paper. On September 14, the subcommittee and I met with Vice President Fernandez to find out what had happened since last March. He talked about the structure that had been appointed since that time to work out details."

Senator Inman said that at the committee's September 21, meeting, the position paper provided to the Senate with today's meeting call was approved, but she wanted to provide Senators with a little more information from the original concept paper, concerning the students for whom this program was designed. She said there is a general statement that PCC and the UofA cooperated in making the transfer from the community college to the university as easy and seamless as possible, but "There are still students in Pima County facing formidable barriers to accessing success in higher education. Many students, particularly those economically less advantaged, acknowledge that in addition to financial aid they are constrained by self-imposed limits on their expectations of achieving a four-year degree, by insufficient understanding of the technical requirements of the transfer process, and by discontinuity in the learning environments and support systems between PCC and UA."

Senator Inman said the Sequential Degree Program is being developed to help students overcome these constraints and, in that way, to increase completion rates for the Associate and Baccalaureate degrees. She said ICPC is divided on whether establishing such a program is a good idea, but the committee was not asked to express an opinion on that, so it will not. The position paper simply provides the background and asks some questions: where will the money come from, who will control the administration of the academic programs, who will control the academic quality of the programs, how will the programs be staffed, and what will be done to ensure that the degrees offered in these programs are of at least equal quality with the degrees on the parent campuses? After considering the planning structure, the committee concluded that there was not enough faculty involvement. Senator Inman said the steering committee was of nearly the same composition as the think tank--all high-level administrators. The Joint Operations Committee consists of two persons, the UofA representative being another administrator. There are four subcommittees: Curriculum Development/Program Articulation; Admissions and Records/Financial Aid; Tuition and Fees; and Counseling/Advising, Academic Support Services and Student Services. Of the four subcommittee co-chairs, one is a faculty member, appointed by Dr. Fernandez when the ICPC subcommittee met with him. Of the subcommittees' 12 members, she could identify only one faculty member who is not also an administrator. She said the entire structure appears to consist predominantly of advisers and administrators.

Senator Inman said ICPC's position paper contains a few recommendations: (1) There should be more faculty involvement in fundamental planning; (2) some action should be taken to ensure that standards will be maintained; (3) it is absolutely necessary that the University set and maintain admissions standards for these degree programs, and that upper-division courses be taught by full-time ranked faculty members from the University. "Just how they would be selected, we don't know, but in order to assure that these courses are as rigorous and as good academically as courses on campus, we feel that our ranked faculty should teach them and that the degrees approved under this program be the equivalent of degrees approved on this campus. ICPC wants to be sure that this information, from a faculty committee, is transmitted to the appropriate administrators. So, if you have written comments that you would like us to send along with our report, then we would be glad to receive them."

Senator Lewis said that, in an earlier discussion, the matter of the foreign language requirement was somewhat unclear, and he wondered whether that had been resolved. Senator Inman responded that the way Dr. Steele explained it earlier in the meeting was that colleges would continue to impose their own requirements, such as a foreign language, and she was present today to dispel any fears on this point.

Senator Silverman said he was particularly concerned about the lack of faculty involvement, and he moved (motion 1993/94-23) that because he believed there should be more faculty and Senate involvement in the planning of the PCC/UA Sequential Degree Program, Chairman of the Faculty Garcia and ICPC Chair Inman be asked to meet with Vice President Fernandez about this issue and try to work out some agreement about it, and to report back to the Senate concerning a restructuring of the committees to include more faculty, and perhaps students as well. That motion was seconded, and a voice vote indicated unanimous approval.

Senator Dickinson asked how serious this problem is. Senator Inman responded that a brand new program on PCC's new campus was involved, where University of Arizona B.S. and B.A. degrees will be offered without students having to transfer to the UofA.

Senator J. O'Brien thought there was danger in saying that upper-division courses would be taught by UofA faculty. Would it be handled as part of their regular teaching load, or for supplemental compensation? He said he had concern that faculty might tire of the additional workload, and the whole upper-division degree program would eventually be taught by adjunct instructors. Senator Inman: "That's what we don't want."

Senator Lewis said he had no problem with improving the articulation between the two schools, but he was concerned about Pima students who would satisfy the core curriculum requirements, reach what they believed to be their junior year, and then learn they need additional courses to fulfill specific college requirements which were not listed in the core curriculum. For the record, he said, the requirements must be clearly defined to avoid students being required to take five or six years to graduate. Senator Inman's response induced laughter: "Derek, we have an army of advisors. They talk to the students at Pima all the time and are determined to make them understand that if they are coming to the University of Arizona, they have to take this, that and the other. I think we can depend upon them to prepare the students for this."

Senator Neuman suggested that, before we go to the lengths of sending faculty

members to various committees to provide input, someone articulate the needs in a way that the Senate can debate, so that it can decide whether or not it wishes to continue even to look at this problem. Senator Inman summarized the sequence of events to date, as she saw them: the two Presidents got together and decided they needed this program, and committed themselves to it. Someone from the administration indicated it had been approved, and next fall courses will be offered in elementary and secondary education, languages, sciences, and so on. Vice President Fernandez told ICPC's subcommittee not to worry about any of that, that nothing has been decided. She added that the University does seem to be committed to this plan, and the question is going to be how can faculty influence the process so that it will be a really good academic program. She said one member of ICPC suggested this may be an interim step in the plan to have a four-year college in Pima County, or perhaps a way to avoid the enrollment cap. She said it might work to our advantage if some students could go through the PCC campus. She said she did not know how it would finally be worked out, but she did think that the program would go forward.

11. FURTHER DISCUSSION ON THE REPORT OF THE RESEARCH PARK SUBCOMMITTEE: Dr. Zwolinski asked Senator Witte, Chair of the Research Policy Committee, and Mr. Joel Valdez, Senior Vice President for Business Affairs to come to the podium. He reported that Dr. Michael Cusanovich, Vice President for Research, had also been scheduled to speak on the research park topic, but he had been called to Phoenix to attend a legislative meeting. He would, consequently, also be unable to speak on the Mt. Graham topic today.

Senator Witte, noting that discussion had been initiated at the September Senate meeting, said there were a number of items she wished to address today. Mr. Valdez was present to provide information on the financial aspects, revenue neutrality and maintenance details of the acquisition, because little information had been available when the report was written. She said more information on the management plan was also requested. Participation by faculty in articulation of the management plan for the research park is vital because of its effect on faculty in the way it is maintained, on research grants, indirect costs, and other priorities. Secondly, there should be continuing study of some of these issues, and an ongoing report process to the University community as plans develop. Thirdly, philosophical issues must be addressed in a continuing fashion, for example, conflict of interest issues regarding financial, time, and commitment conflicts, and more philosophical issues like changes in the mission of the University. Fourthly, since the research park might also become an educational facility, whether this is an appropriate site, and how it should be developed, and which faculty committee should be involved in a continuing fashion in the plans that are developing. She then called on Mr. Valdez.

Mr. Joel Valdez thanked the Senate for inviting him to speak. He noted that when he accepted Dr. Zwolinski's invitation, he told him it was still somewhat premature, and he could not provide much more information than has already been made public. He said the negotiations between our team and IBM are still ongoing, but he could safely say that the acquisition price will be less than \$100 million. "The debt service, depending on how it is structured, will be more than sufficient to cover the debt, resulting in a revenue neutral arrangement. Concerning the issue of management, Morrison Knudsen Corporation is the manager of the operation. This company maintains the facility and makes sure that it meets all codes. It is a zero discharge facility, meaning it is not tied to either the county or city water systems. It contains many resources within its own confines. It is a state-of-the-art facility, comprised of 2.2 million square feet. To rebuild that facility today, the base cost is estimated somewhere

between \$380 and \$400 million. It includes, on top of the 340 acres that house the buildings today, an additional 1,000 acres of vacant land. Our agreement would be to acquire this facility from IBM, and to lease it right back for a twenty-year period, over which time their yearly payments, as I said, would be more than sufficient to retire annual debt.

"The structure will be whether we do it as the University of Arizona Board of Regents or Board of Regents and private, non-profit corporation, or research technology park. We don't know yet which is the best way to go to ensure revenue neutrality and additional cash flow to the institution. Once that is determined, and it is true that we are still working on it, then I guess much more detailed information would become available. Let me assure you that the Regents and the President have both indicated that we are not to proceed unless revenue neutrality does occur, because we are not going to use any existing resources from the University budget. When IBM moves in, they will occupy about 500,000 or 600,000 square feet. They have entered into a lease agreement, between Hughes and IBM. We do not have the details of that lease. It is not for us to be that concerned about it simply because it is between those two parties. The University would be buying from IBM, and we would honor that lease. Morrison Knudsen, the facilities manager, will continue to be the facilities manager, as dictated by IBM. The cost that they charge to do that is within the rate structure that we would charge occupants, referred to as common area maintenance (CAM) charges. One sticky point that our attorney is working on is what happens in the fifteenth year if the chiller goes out? We feel that the occupants should pay, not the University of Arizona.

"So those are the kinds of dotting i's and crossing t's that are going on right now. It is still positive, and I remain optimistic about it, but I can't give you much more information than that, because that's all I have. We are thinking about events that could occur in twenty years. Dr. Cusanovich and Bruce Wright are in charge of developing a land use plan, looking out 20 years from now and consulting with planners locally and nationally. Given the infrastructure as I see it today, we have been provided an excellent opportunity to obtain something of great value for less than \$100 million, at no cost to us. I've heard there is no free lunch, so it's too good to be true for me. The fact is, after these facilities are leased, we will then have access to the cafeteria. That would be our responsibility. It is now managed by Marriott Corporation, and it was subsidized by IBM. Whether it continues or not, I don't know, but we intend to keep Marriott there. Their contract is good for about two and a half years more. Morrison Knudsen's contract is good through, I think, the end of 1996. You can see that we have some time. As I indicated, IBM has insisted that Morrison Knudsen be the manager of their facility as long as they are there. I am only guessing, but I would assume Hughes would stay with the same kind of a philosophy. Let those people who have been running the facility for quite a few years, and are more familiar with the infrastructure, stay.

"We would have about 240,000 square feet in addition to the cafeteria. In the research park report, there is a diagram of the floor plans of the buildings. Buildings 60 and 61 would become ours. They are not identified as leasable at this moment. However, individuals have been calling us constantly as to the feasibility of moving in. We have not made any overtures to anyone. We have not entertained occupants. We have simply said we are still in negotiations with IBM. Other facilities, such as warehouse and utility buildings, will be part of the University. The cost of operating the facility, as I indicated, is built into the CAM charges, which are negotiated each year. That's the best information I can provide you now. Since I have to worry about the rest of the campus,

I am very particular about draining money from here. This will not be like ASU's research park."

Senator Garcia asked what the current annual charges are for CAM and cafeteria operations. Mr. Valdez said \$9 million total.

Senator E. Williams asked Mr. Valdez why he supposed IBM was willing to enter into this agreement. Mr. Valdez said he believed IBM's primary reasons were financial.

Senator Witte said that one factor may have been the elimination of property taxes for IBM. Mr. Valdez noted that rental fees will take the place of property taxes. Senator Witte asked if those sums were equivalent. Mr. Valdez responded no. Over the course of twenty years, they will have paid \$180 million in rent, and received less than \$100 million from the sale price. He added that all he is worried about is where does the money come from and who handles it.

Senator Parsons asked what would happen if Hughes or IBM declared bankruptcy, and for what period of time were the leases written. Mr. Valdez said that IBM's lease would be written for twenty years, and their bond rating is better (triple A) than the UA's (double A). He said he thought the Hughes contract was written for five years, with options for more. One of the types of issues that are still being worked out is what happens at the end of the fifteenth year if the chiller goes out? He said the University's position has been that all the occupants pay for it, not the UofA.

Senator Young said he owns one of the technology transfer companies referred to in the report. In view of the distance and his University duties, he said, even if he were to be offered space rent free, he did not believe he could afford the time and the separation from his students, classes and the campus to travel all the way out to the IBM site. He said it would require him to be off campus for at least two days a week, and although he thinks the concept of the research park is a good one if it were convenient, he wondered about the impact it would have on faculty responsibilities on campus and if the distance factor would preclude many of the University's technology transfer companies from actually making use of this site. Senator Witte said that was perhaps an issue that should be discussed separately, although it was very much within the purview of the research park topic. Mr. Valdez noted that others have come forward to indicate their willingness to move out there immediately.

Senator Neuman asked about potential environmental risks, and the possible impact on the University. Mr. Valdez responded that all environmental assessments had been cleared by EPA, all of the documentation is in place, and it is a remarkably clean facility. Concerning a previous question related to bankruptcy, he said the bonds are insured. They would be paid, but not by the University.

Senator McElroy asked if this arrangement, which alleviates a tax burden, would have a negative impact on the City of Tucson, or resultant costs for the University. Mr. Valdez said the site is not located within the city limits, but the city is working with Hughes, and anticipates \$100 million in additional payroll, together with a multiplier factor, will be expended in the community. That factor will more than offset whatever the city is doing to assist Hughes. He said he has not heard of any plans that would force units to move out there, but two buildings will be available, and if they were rented out, that income would provide additional cash flow.

Senator Witte, in further response to Senator McElroy, said the property is in the Vail district, and it will impact their tax base. Mr. Valdez added that development in that part of the valley may offset the decrease in the long run.

Senator Garcia asked Mr. Valdez if he believed anyone had any objections to the subcommittee's recommendations, which he considered fairly minimal. Mr. Valdez said he spoke with Dr. Melia to commend those who worked on the report, and he knew that IBM was very much interested in the report as well. Senator Garcia asked if the recommendations would be adopted. Mr. Valdez said he didn't really know, but most of the recommendations have already been considered in the ongoing negotiations.

Senator Myers said he wondered whether the problem is complicated by confusing an industrial park, which is what has been described, with a research park. He added that a research park and a branch campus both have the potential for draining money from the University. "And I think that no matter what you say about covering all the financial aspects, we will end up spending University money on it." Mr. Valdez: "Even if it's additional dollars from the Legislature, for that specific purpose, like they're going to do at ASU?" Senator Myers said that, unfortunately, the Legislature is dealing from a fixed pot, and whatever they spend there will come out of someplace else. Mr. Valdez said he would have to agree with Senator Myers.

Senator Parsons asked where library facilities would be located, to support the research complex. Mr. Valdez said he did not know at this time. The University would have two buildings that it could either lease out or assign some function to. If the latter option was exercised, one of those two buildings could contain library material. Or, it was possible that only one building might be leased. He said he really didn't know what would occur, but he had full appreciation for her concern.

Senator Desai said he supported Senator Myers' comments. In a situation of limited resources at the University, we must ascertain whether this is to be an industrial or a research park. The resources of the University should not be drained to support it in either its beginning or its latter stages. Secondly, as a research park, this facility would probably house many experimental laboratory facilities. But we currently are experiencing tremendous difficulty in maintaining and improving campus laboratory research facilities. He believed that rather than raiding our resources for a research park, we need first to improve the existing laboratory facilities on our campus. Mr. Valdéz said he appreciated that, and that is why IBM insisted that Morrison Knudsen continue to manage the facility, to ensure the UofA will not be responsible.

Dr. Zwolinski thanked Mr. Valdez for sharing his time and his thoughts with the Senate. He said the Senate might wish to call upon him again to provide a further update. Mr. Valdez said he would come if more information develops. Senator Garcia said he hoped the Research Policy Committee and the Subcommittee on Research Park would continue to monitor this issue. Mr. Valdez said he would appreciate that. Senator Witte said the Research Policy Committee will bring the issue of conflict of interest to the Senate, and the issue of where the branch campus should be is one that should not be left by the wayside. She said this topic has been discussed by the Committee of Eleven, and she hoped that a Senate standing committee will be able to bring the Senate up to date on the status of the new education facility and what is being done in that regard.

material will continue to be placed on Senate agendas for the next few meetings until the proper mechanism to review and act on this material has been determined. He said if any Senators have specific questions upon examining the Bulletin prior to a Senate meeting, they should notify the Curriculum Office and express their concerns.

Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 6, Section I was moved (motion 1993/94-24) and seconded. A voice vote indicated approval with one abstention.

13. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:13 p.m.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

14. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 4, 1993:

- 1993/94-20 Election of Dr. Chandra Desai and Dr. Lynn Joens as Senate representatives on the Faculty Budget and Strategic Planning Committee
- 1993/94-21 Approval to remove from the table a motion concerning the Procedure for Selecting Senate Reorganization Review Committees
- 1993/94-22 Approval of the Procedure for Selecting Senate Reorganization Review Committees, as amended
- 1993/94-22A Approval of two-part amendment to the Procedure for Selecting Senate Reorganization Review Committees
- 1993/94-22B Approval of an additional amendment to the Procedure for Selecting Senate Reorganization Review Committees
- 1993/94-23 Approval of motion directing the Chairman of the Faculty and Senator Billie Jo Inman to meet with Vice President Fernandez concerning faculty involvement with the PCC/UA Sequential Degree Program
- 1993/94-24 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 6, Section I

15. DOCUMENTS APPENDED TO THESE MINUTES:

Committee Structure for Reorganizations for Financial Reasons