

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, December 6, 1993  
Room 146, College of Law

1. The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 2:45 p.m. on Monday, December 6, 1993, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Forty-seven members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Malcolm J. Zwolinski presided.

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

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Anderson, Bertram, Coons, Dahlgran, Fajardo, Gruener, Hildebrand, Manke, Pacheco, Ruiz, J. Williams, and W. Williams.

2. OPEN SESSION: Senator Warburton distributed to Senators a draft copy of Guidelines for Developing Values Definitions and Behavioral Objectives. He said he was a member of a CORE team that is trying to establish definitions for the listed values, and the team would appreciate Senators taking time to review the information and provide comments to any of the members, listed on the cover sheet.

Senator Silverman said that, although a Senate subcommittee had prepared a report concerning the purchase of the IBM facility, he was concerned that the negotiations are apparently being carried out in secrecy, without the involvement of faculty or other campus constituencies. He said he hoped the process will become more open and include faculty input, especially as to how the facility would be used, e.g., research park or temporary or permanent campus for the new four-year college. He said a second concern relates to the fact that an apparently potential tenant of the University is a weapons manufacturer. He said he hoped this issue will become more open, and will include the involvement of faculty, students and staff.

Senator Pitt stated that both the community and the campus had taken note of the fact that the search for an Athletic Director was completed very quickly, but the search for a Dean of Students has been ongoing since March, and many academic positions have been placed on hold. Although searches were completed, there have not been hires. She said the message is that athletics is more important than academics.

3. REPORTS

- 3A. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Zwolinski reported that President Pacheco had planned to give his report this afternoon, despite having to leave almost immediately on a trip, but starting the Senate meeting at 2:45 instead of 2:30 made it impossible for him to attend. Dr. Zwolinski added that the President expressed his regrets, and indicated he had wanted to announce the appointment of the new Athletics Director.

- 3B. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY: Senator Garcia said he wanted to update

the Senate on the activities, projections, and timeline of the Planning Subcommittee of the University Budget and Strategic Planning Committee, following Dr. Roger Caldwell's report to the Senate at its November meeting. He noted that Senators Jones and Myers, also members of that subcommittee, might like to provide additional comments in the Question and Answer period.

Senator Garcia reported that the subcommittee is proceeding according to the plans presented by Dr. Caldwell. "All academic units...have been examined according to the criteria and using the measures that we brought to you. Those measures include total student count, productivity in terms of undergraduate and graduate degrees granted by the unit, both total and per FTE faculty, student credit hours, grants and contract dollars, and a variety of other measures of that type." At last report, the subcommittee was struggling with ways to assess quality and to define centrality. "Thus far, only the bean count sort of statistics have been used....PAIP report cards have identified on the order of 25 units for further study. Subcommittees of the planning committee will now examine each of those units in detail, including reports sent forward by those units or the Deans, and any programmatic reviews or other data that might exist. Units will then be identified for further study by Deans if such is warranted. The subcommittees will report back to the committee itself on the units. The committee will determine which of those, if any, should go to the Deans for comment and additional study. Those substudies will be done by the middle of this month. The Deans will be notified at the end of this calendar year. At the beginning of the following year, the Deans will provide recommendations to the committee and the Provost, who in turn will make recommendations to the President. Any action required will then trigger one of the two mechanisms that we now have for reviewing the restructuring of units. When no removal of tenured faculty is involved, the process takes 45 days from the time of appointment of a committee; when plans call for termination of tenured faculty, the process takes much longer--90 days after the formation of the committee, which itself takes some time. I would guess, if that latter course is required, then it will be next fall before any serious action will occur and the Senate becomes involved. The Senate, at some point, will hear a report from a committee of the Senate. That is a summary of what is happening in the Planning Subcommittee. The Planning Subcommittee consists of twenty-one people. Four are from faculty governance, elected by the faculty as members of the Senate or of the University Budget Committee. The remainder are department heads, deans, vice presidents, representatives of the staff, or other constituencies. So it is a University-wide sort of committee."

Senator Garcia then reported on the Continuous Organizational Renewal (CORE) program and its progress. "A quality leadership training series has been conducted this fall, consisting of ten 4-hour classes for two groups of 25 people drawn from the administrative level of deans. The intent is to have every University administrator at the level of department head and up go through this kind of training. The training itself will be assessed after training of the second group has been completed on December 10. I hope to involve the chairs of appropriate Senate committees in that training. Dr. Zwolinski and I are the only two members of the Senate who have been involved so far."

In accord with Senate views, three members were added to the Curriculum Committee of the Sequential Degree Program, and Senator Garcia was appointed as a faculty consultant to the Oversight Committee. No plans exist for the latter committee to meet in the foreseeable future, but the Curriculum Committee has been examining details connected with the structure of a sequential degree program and what programs it might cover, and a report is anticipated soon.

Senator Garcia said he had discussed planning of the new four-year college with Vice President Fernandez, who assured him that when the planning committee for the college gets structured, it will include members of faculty governance. A community advisory group now exists for the four-year college. Senator Garcia said he believes it is the intent of both the University and the Board of Regents that the college not be built at the expense of programs at the University of Arizona. For that reason, he said, it will be important to have full community support, and particularly the recognition that additional financial support is necessary.

He reported that the Senate Executive Committee will soon select some members to serve on a committee to be appointed by the Provost to revise the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. Revision is somewhat overdue, but there was agreement to wait until various changes had occurred.

Senator Garcia said he has asked the Chairman of the Research Park Subcommittee to reconvene the subcommittee in the immediate future, so that when action is consummated, it will be in a position to examine the actual plans, discuss them in detail, and advise the University appropriately. At the time of its last report, there was some associated vagueness because the details were not known.

Senator Garcia reported that he had written to the Provost concerning the change in title of the Director of Extended University to that of Dean. He said that the title of dean is commonly associated, on this campus, with a degree-granting unit and, unless degree-granting status for Extended University is planned for the near future, the change in title may constitute title inflation. He added that if degree-granting status is planned, the Senate should be involved.

Senator Garcia also reported that he had asked the President to examine the administrative structure of the University to determine if we have too many administrators. In view of the fact that staff cuts have been made and the institution is considering the possibility of excising departments, including tenured faculty, "I think all segments of the University ought to be examined in the same light, and I have asked that that occur."

3C. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Sypherd apologized for arriving late, and noted that the Senate meetings overlap Deans' Council meetings.

"Let me respond to Senator Garcia's comment about the Dean of Extended University. I want to make it clear that was a title change. It did not involve an increase in salary. It involves the same tasks that the individual has been doing. I think it's an honest reflection of the way Extended Universities are organized in the PAC-10. I do not believe it represents title inflation; it was an appropriate change to make. Whether that title will continue on forever, I'm not prepared to say, but it was a management decision made by me. The President concurred, and I did not think much consultation was necessary, since that individual was in place and doing those duties.

"The President's Quality Leadership Program (PQLP) is an important program. We think that academics can continue to learn. Those in greatest need of learning, perhaps, are those who become leaders through no fault of their own. They are simply asked one day to become a department head, an assistant dean, or a vice provost, and some training is necessary. Some of the instructors are seasoned administrators who add to the professional expertise of the members of the College of Business and Public Administration. I happen to be one of those instructors, so I can testify to their high quality.

"I am very happy to be able to announce to the Senate something which you already know, and that is the appointment of Eugene Levy as the new Dean of the Faculty of Science. I think we were very fortunate that from within our own ranks we had outstanding candidates. I think Gene Levy brings to that position years of experience as a dynamic academic leader. He is a highly visible scholar in Planetary Sciences, with a record of successful ventures, a man of ideas, and I think there is a lot of excitement in store for us in the Faculty of Science, where I happen to hold my faculty appointment.

"Let me say something about the faculty pay raise. Again, the pay raise issue is not a slam dunk. It is a request, as you all know--the only Decision Package proposal that all three universities made. We believe that there is a very high likelihood that we will receive funding at some level. There is some anxiety, though, that authority will be given to grant a pay raise in excess of what the Legislature funds, and that would create a significant problem for all of us. I am hoping that does not happen. By way of gossip, I can tell you that the word on the street is that the State will project a balance of about a half a billion dollars in the coming year--\$500 million--and that it will be spent in several ways: a significant rebate to taxpayers and, perhaps, the needs of K-12. No one is making grand speeches about the needs of higher education. I'll let that hang there as a pregnant suggestion for each of you who know to whom to write. I continue to be positive about the pay raise issue, however, and we are going ahead with a University-level committee that will set the guidelines and the framework for how such an increase in salary might be administered across the University. That committee is essentially ready to be announced. It involves individuals from the Faculty Senate and some others representing department heads and members of the administration. The idea here will be for that committee to set guidelines to which individual colleges will react with an implementation plan to be submitted back to the University-wide committee for approval. We should then be ready if we are blessed with significant pay raise money.

"We have completed the appointment of the General Education Committee that will continue to examine the UofA's position on general education and how we should be carrying out the process of general education on the campus. That committee was put together from a mixture of people, some recommended by the Chair of the Faculty and some that I added myself.

"Meetings have already been held of the first-year experience team, jointly appointed from among members of the Faculty Senate and others around campus. That committee will be reporting some early findings sometime in the Spring.

"I think all of us have concerns about the report on the performance of our students on the Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Exam. I believe this is a problem that should be taken up immediately and profoundly by the Faculty Senate. This is a faculty issue. It is not something that should be left to the administration to pursue, and I would urge you as a Faculty Senate to figure out the right way to deal with what seems to be a non-stellar performance by students on these writing examinations. If I can be of help to the Senate in how we approach that issue, I'd be happy to, but I really believe it's a Senate issue.

"If I don't see you before the holidays, I'd like to encourage you to enjoy those holidays, use them for some rest and relaxation. I promise we'll have the heat on when you come back."

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

3E. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE: Dr. Zwolinski noted that both he and Senator Reynolds are members of the University Budget Subcommittee. Though some activity was underway, he anticipated much more would be happening during the Spring semester. He and Senator Reynolds will bring reports to the Senate floor then.

Dr. Zwolinski reported that, in connection with President Pacheco's announcement today concerning the appointment of Mr. Jim Livengood as Director of Athletics, both finalists for the position made on-campus visits last week. Several news reports indicated that the candidates met with the Faculty Senate, and he believed a word of explanation was in order. "Knowing that these two individuals were scheduled for campus visits, a request by Chairman of the Faculty Garcia was transmitted to the Search Committee for inclusion of faculty in the interview process. The request was granted, and meetings were scheduled with each candidate. Seven and eight members of the faculty were able to meet with Mr. Bockrath and Mr. Livengood, respectively. The faculty who participated were primarily members of the Senate Executive Committee and Senate standing committee chairpersons. In sum, we support Dr. Pacheco's selection, and look forward to a strong Faculty Senate interaction with Mr. Livengood and the Athletic program."

Dr. Zwolinski called attention to a survey form that had been included in the mailing to Senate members. A team appointed to develop guidelines for a campus-wide information system had asked for input concerning items that should be included in such a system. Senators were asked to complete the questionnaire and return it to the proper address. Dr. Zwolinski noted that an article on the Information System had appeared in the December 6 issue of Lo Que Pasa.

Dr. Zwolinski said that a committee had been appointed to meet with the Registrar and to prepare a report for the Senate regarding the origin of the Preliminary Degree List. Committee membership consists of Senator Shlomo Neuman, who will serve as Chair, and Senators James O'Brien and Claire Parsons, with a student to be appointed by ASUA President Derek Lewis. He said that, due to prior commitments and scheduling problems, the committee was unable to provide information on the list scheduled for action at today's Senate meeting, but will report to the Senate prior to action on the May 1994 list.

Dr. Zwolinski announced that the University's Mission and Objectives Statement had been distributed to the University community for comment. He urged Senators to review the Statement, and if they had any concerns, to bring them to a member of the Senate Executive Committee prior to its meeting on December 20.

Dr. Zwolinski also announced that a Holiday Open House would be held at the Faculty Center on December 15, 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., and he invited all to attend.

3F. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Lewis reported on the well-attended tuition hearing that ASUA had held the previous week. ASUA directors and ASUA members solicited input from participants on what they considered to be critical priorities if students were required to pay higher tuition, i.e., where should some of the additional dollars go.

Senator Lewis said ASUA conducted a delegate assembly a few weeks ago, and representatives from a large number of constituencies came together to discuss issues such as academic advising, safety, tuition and fees, career services, and campus pride. The issues had been identified in a non-scientific survey. He said various departments within ASUA, as a service to their constituents, had been given issues to look into.

Senator Lewis reported that ASUA and members of the Alumni Association have been participating in Legislative coffees, providing an opportunity for students to meet with legislators from districts 9 through 14, and to discuss issues important with respect to higher education in Arizona. He said they were highly productive, and he invited Senators to participate in the informal meetings. Information on date and location can be obtained from ASUA.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Myers asked Dr. Sypherd what criteria were used to determine which campus buildings would be exempt or non-exempt from closure between semesters, because the exempt list appeared to be fairly long. Dr. Sypherd: "The criteria were distributed around campus roughly a month ago, along with a form that one needed to submit, indicating which of the criteria applied. I cannot recall all of the criteria, but they included a contracted service that had to be carried out during that time period, animals or other live material that had to be accounted for, the preservation of certain artifacts where the daily temperature had to be maintained, and essential services, such as the Payroll Office. At last count, I think the number was in excess of 30 buildings." Dr. Cusanovich added that the number was closer to 50 buildings, but in about 20, only one room would be in use, for a special need, and the rest of the building would be shut down. He said he footnoted such instances on the list, which appears much larger than it really is because of the one room situation. In Modern Languages, only KUAT would be functioning, and the rest of the building would be shut down, but it does appear on the exempt list. Dr. Cusanovich said he wanted to clarify that this would not be a shutdown, but rather a heating curtailment. "A large number of people out there think we will actually lock the buildings and put boards across them. It doesn't work that way. The electricity will be on, but the heating will not."

Senator Desai asked Dr. Sypherd why so many searches for department heads are confined to internal searches, while open searches are permitted for higher level administrators. He said he did agree that it is a good idea to look for internal talent, but there appeared to be hardly any mechanism for conducting open department head searches. He asked what are the criteria and under what conditions are open department head searches permitted. Dr. Sypherd responded that he believed an open search for a department head is currently underway in Senator Desai's college. "The criteria I use are based on the sense of urgency that is conveyed to me by the Dean, usually backed up by testimonials from various faculty members. We currently have around 28 open faculty searches ongoing, in marked contrast to the average over the last five years or so of about 125. This is not exactly a freeze, but it represents sharp curtailment. It is a testimony to the fact that we have used the money from faculty lines to accommodate budget reductions to such an extent that we simply don't have the funds to go to the outside." Senator Desai asked whether it was just the sense of urgency or was the availability of enough of the \$23,000 lines to fund a position a factor as well. Which was more important? Dr. Sypherd replied that both aspects had to be considered. "A conviction that there was not sufficient breadth within the department to search only internally for a head, but in addition to that the availability, by putting together some of the \$23,000 lines, of enough funds for the salary for an external department head--or other faculty." He thought there were only three or four searches for department heads among the 28 external searches. The rest were mainly for junior faculty.

Senator Garcia said he agreed with Dr. Sypherd that the Senate should address the issue of the Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Exams, but he wondered whether the funds for graders, previously cut from the budget, could be restored, in view of the current dire shortage of graders.

Senator Barrett addressed a comment to Dr. Sypherd and Senator Garcia. "I think the problem is not just the writing exam--it probably exists campus-wide, in mathematics and many other subjects. You may be familiar with the federal report issued today that indicates a university-level education in the United States today equates to the high school level just a few years ago. Therefore, I think we need to address grade inflation and raising the standards of courses throughout the entire university, not just writing proficiency." Dr. Sypherd: "I think you are absolutely right, and I have heard for nearly eleven months now the awfulness of allowing into our university students who are simply not prepared for University-level work....It is still legal to fail students in their courses if they are not doing college-level work."

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 1993: Dr. Zwolinski reported one correction to the Minutes, which had already been made: Senator Manke was inadvertently listed as absent, but she was present. Senator Neuman suggested a correction on page 80, line 17, to read "impose a tremendous burden on reviewers of large departments." He added that he commended Secretary Roemer for her a very useful detailed description of what transpired. Dr. Zwolinski thanked Senator Neuman, and noted that correction. He also asked all Senators and other speakers, especially those further from the microphone, to either speak loudly or come to the podium, in order to facilitate the recording of the proceedings. The minutes of November 1, 1993, were then approved as amended.
6. CHANGE IN AGENDA ORDER: On a point of order, Dr. Sypherd requested that Vice President Cusanovich's report on Mt. Graham be advanced in the agenda order because of a pressing appointment. It was then moved (motion 1993/94-29), seconded, and approved on a voice vote, to call next for Dr. Cusanovich's report.
7. UPDATE ON THE MT. GRAHAM INTERNATIONAL OBSERVATORY: Dr. Michael Cusanovich, Vice President for Research: "Thank you for moving it up. I appreciate that. I've been asked to provide an update on the Mt. Graham International Observatory. So I'll make some brief comments.

"Two telescopes, the SMT and the Lennon, are up and running. We're going through the usual new house type problems, finding leaks here and there, but that process is almost complete. The final site selection for the Large Binocular Telescope should be done any day or moment now, and that issue resolved. We're looking forward to having that settled. I would have to say, in spite of some of the rhetoric that one hears, that all the sites that we've looked at for the Large Binocular Telescope were excellent, equal to or better than anything in North or South America, and so we're actually quite pleased with any number of sites. The current discussions focus on a site which the Forest Service has asked us to consider because of the lack of influx of squirrels in the last year, as opposed to the conceptual site where the squirrels have moved in in force.

"That leads me to the next point. It was a banner year for squirrels. They multiplied rapidly and extensively, driven by a superb cone crop. One of the beauties of that is that cone crops are good for two years, so there will be another banner year next year. We should top or push, I would guess, 600 squirrels. As has been the pattern from the beginning, the squirrel distribution is principally in the mixed conifer forest, below the spruce/fir where the telescopes are. This is typical of red squirrels in all environments, and the data we have suggest strongly that they migrate in times of expansion into the spruce/fir and kind of contract down to the base population in the mixed conifer. This is not, by the way, inconsistent with red squirrels in any other part of the country where there is a similar zone of trees.

"On the legal front, the only suit currently outstanding is the appeal of the Apache Survival Coalition, in the Ninth Circuit Court, heard in July or August. The appeal is being heard following a ruling in the District Court in favor of the Forest Service and the University. We should hear any time on that appeal. There are multiple-month delays between the time of a hearing and the decision on an appeal.

"As many of you know, the San Carlos Apache tribe has taken a neutral position on the project, and we continue to work closely with the tribe to address those concerns that they may have. I will add that the court filings were quite extensive as part of the administrative record on the Indian issue and, in fact, demonstrated a very large number of contacts between the Forest Service, principally, the University to a smaller extent, and the San Carlos tribe in the 1985-1989 period. That time period was a base of part of the rulings. The November 23rd Wildcat contains an interview with Mrs. Ola Cassadore-Davis of the Apache Survival Coalition. I recommend you read it. It's an interesting document, and it articulates a clash of beliefs which is very difficult to address and illustrates a complex problem. I believe that we need to deal with these kinds of clashes, if you like, as society evolves. They are difficult. And I certainly don't have the answers, but the University should be a place where solutions are developed. I will be glad to answer any questions."

Senator Silverman said he had a comment and a question. As a member of the Senate, he has voiced his concerns about this project over the years, and today he wanted to express another concern, which he said he had discussed previously with Dr. Cusanovich. He said that Dr. Cusanovich, and perhaps the administration, has taken the position that this is a research project like other research projects, and those faculty members who are intimately involved should be making the decision whether the University is involved in this kind of project. He said he recognized the research aspect, but it seemed to him this went beyond a typical research project, involving resources of great magnitude as well as community relations. He said that if we ever embark on a project of this magnitude again, he would hope for campus-wide discussion and faculty involvement. He asked Dr. Cusanovich to estimate what the project has cost the University thus far, and what he estimates it will cost during the next year or two, as well.

Dr. Cusanovich responded that the estimate would depend on definition of the costs. "So far, the principal source of funding has been external. The total expenditures to date are \$12 million, but again, it depends on what you want to count because we've done a lot of work here that hasn't gone on the mountain, about \$20 million. There will be, from the University, probably another \$12 million expended over the next few years. That does not represent total project cost--we only pick up a fraction of that. Most of the money is external. Steward Observatory had a Decision Package for the SMT funded in 1987. The only other University funds that have come into play are indirect cost recovery funds from the indirect cost pool. We normally reinvest those in research projects of all kinds, and we reinvested in this project. Indirect cost expenditures represent \$2 or \$3 million of the \$20 million, at most. The vast majority of the money has been external, and will continue to be so."

Senator Silverman asked if he could provide a breakdown between State and external funding. Dr. Cusanovich responded that the only State funding involved was the Decision Package. Senator Silverman asked if attorney's fees were paid by external funds. Dr. Cusanovich responded "Either external or indirect cost recovery."

8. REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES:

- 8A. REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Atwater reported that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC) is dealing with five critical issues at present. (1) It is finalizing its recommendations for modifications to the Academic Program Review, discussed at the November Senate meeting, and scheduled to be resubmitted to the Senate in January. (2) The committee is revising a document it developed last spring, related to faculty teaching responsibilities. (3) APPC is providing reactions to a policy on access to institutional data that was developed by a CORE committee. (4) APPC has been asked to provide reaction to a new University Handbook for Appointed Personnel policy dealing with externally supported research funds. And (5), on at least two separate occasions this semester, the committee has been asked to give informal reactions and provide discussion on issues that are being dealt with by the Human Resources Committee, chaired by Dr. Martha Gilliland.
- 8B. REPORT OF THE FACULTY BUDGET AND STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE: Senator Reynolds said the committee has met several times this fall. There are no specific issues before the committee at the moment, although he anticipated more activity in the spring. He invited Senators to contact him or one of the committee members if they had issues that they believed the committee should be working on. As a member of the University Budget Subcommittee, he said that committee has been looking at a variety of issues, and he believes some proposals will be coming from that group before too long.
- 8C. REPORT OF THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Inman said she was happy to report that the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC) is making progress toward a report on performance in Undergraduate Education, in terms of enrollment in General Education courses and number of classes offered. She said a comparison of statistics from Fall 1992 and Fall 1993 indicates there has been a significant increase in enrollment and in number of classes. Counting the courses offered by Arts and Sciences and Architecture for General Education, but excluding Agriculture because the figures were not available yet, the total enrollment in General Education courses in the Fall of 1993 was 4,368 greater than in the Fall of 1992; the number of classes taught increased by approximately 42. Another issue before the committee, and which will be discussed at a meeting tomorrow, was a proposal concerning variability in teaching load, which Dr. Sypherd had asked ICPC and APPC to write, for presentation to the Faculty Senate. Thirdly, two members of the ICPC and two other faculty members selected by the committee, as well as Associate Dean of Students Alexis Hernandez, were scheduled to meet with the Registrar this week to discuss improvement of the procedure for dropping a course with a grade of E. Fourthly, a subcommittee is beginning to plan the Provost's Teaching Symposium, which will be held in April 1994. The topic will be Diversity in the Classroom: Do's and Don'ts for Effective Teaching, focusing on students with special sexual orientation, women, physically challenged students, and non-traditional students.
- 8D. REPORT OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Witte said the committee will be focusing for the next several months on the Conflict of Interest document. They expect to provide procedures which will parallel those used for misconduct or improper use of facilities. The committee is focusing on examples of conflict of interest. Senator Witte said she expected the committee will provide the Senate with a list of examples for discussion, perhaps in February. The committee is planning, at the same time, to provide a faculty forum, with a panel of experts on conflict of interest, in conjunction with the Technology Transfer Committee. At a later date, the committee will submit a proposal to the Faculty

Senate defining what is seen as conflicts of interest.

- 8E. REPORT OF THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Wright said the committee had met today expecting to discuss with the Registrar the problems encountered by students with respect to payment of late fees, but because of a conflict, the meeting with the Registrar will have to be rescheduled. Instead, the committee discussed two issues: the new administrative organization under the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and the impact it would have on student life, and also the role of Faculty Fellows serving as liaisons between students and the University, which has the committee's support as a way to improve the interface between faculty, students and the University.
9. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS: Senator J. O'Brien asked Senator Inman if she could provide more information on the faculty load calculation and on the issue of dropping a course with an E. He asked if the committee is proposing to redefine or streamline the procedure. Senator Inman said that on the second issue, the committee had submitted a proposal to the Registrar, but the Registrar indicated that it did not appear to be workable, so the committee has requested further discussion. She said she will report fully on the committee's findings. Concerning the faculty workload issue, she said the committee will be discussing, at the Provost's request, a general statement that workload will be variable, and will include advising, counseling, teaching service and research. She said many departments have followed that policy for a long time.

Senator Myers asked Senator Inman if, concerning the issue of dropping a course with an E, she meant students dropping between the fourth and tenth weeks because they were not doing satisfactory work, or students being administratively dropped, for example, for failure to attend class. Senator Inman indicated the former, where students bring instructors a form, and a W or an E can be awarded. The committee is proposing that the form be turned in to the instructor's department, which in turn will forward it to the Dean, and the Dean's Office will transmit it to the Registrar, rather than have the student return the form as at present.

10. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INTERCOLLEGIATE WRITING COMMITTEE: Dr. Andrew Kirby, Associate Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Chair, Intercollegiate Writing Committee: "This is the first report submitted to the Senate since 1991. The Intercollegiate Writing Committee (IWC) has been in a state of quiescence. We did meet during the Spring of 1993 and this Fall. The report summarizes some of the matters that we have considered this year. Also included in the report are a number of appendices which include statistics, committee membership and various analyses of the numbers and the success rate of those involved in the writing examination. We do not expect to resolve the issues pertaining to writing. We have laid out some of the issues that we believe to be of particular importance. Dr. Tilly Warnock and some of her colleagues from the Composition Board are present. If you have questions that I am unable to answer, I would be happy, with your permission, to pass those along to her and her colleagues.

There are two issues that I particularly want to comment on. The first of these is not so surprising in that it's a request for additional funds. Those of us on the IWC thought that great strides were being made within the program, for example the Writing Center. Such activities are being carried out with temporary funds, stretched to the utmost. More could be done with permanent and increased funding.

"Secondly, we spent a great deal of time discussing the Upper-Division Writing Proficiency Exam (UDWPE) and the statistics on success and failure rates. The exam results were included in the report. We are, I think, less focused upon the exam results, and much more focused on the attention that has been given to the writing process in the upper-division curriculum. We have suggested several ways in which we would like to see writing integrated much more strongly into the upper-division curriculum, and ways in which, perhaps, the UDWPE could be seen as a diagnostic, but part of a much broader based process, with eventual evolution to a more explicit link to departments and colleges. Perhaps the creation of portfolios of writing achievements, with much more emphasis upon writing as it relates explicitly to the upper-division activities of the individual students involved would be more meaningful.

Senator Silverman noted that the performance of 25 percent of students on the writing proficiency examination was unsatisfactory, while another 41 percent fell into the low satisfactory category. He thought the combined total of 66 percent represented an issue of concern, as Provost Sypherd indicated, for the Faculty Senate, which should, perhaps, look into (1) the problems with faculty participation; and (2) the examination itself to determine whether the same type of exam should be continued, or whether a better exam could be developed; and (3) perhaps an even deeper concern for what is being done within departments and colleges for those students who score in the unsatisfactory, or even the low satisfactory, range. He said it was his understanding that within some departments and colleges, significant action occurs when a student fails the exam, whereas in other colleges and departments, not much is required of them. He said he did not know whether the information has been gathered on what each department and college requires of those who fall in the lower two ranges, but he thought the Senate should review such information, and perhaps set some standards to be followed. He added that it didn't make much sense to require that students take the exam, and then have some students who scored in the lower two ranges be required to do much work and others not. The purpose of giving the exam should be to do something positive with the data and to improve writing skills.

Senator Sjong said that, as a student who earned A's in English 101 and 102, as well as in high school English, she questioned the format of the exam. She said the Senate might want to examine the timed, two-hour aspect, because many individuals could be good writers if they were given the opportunity to organize their thoughts and to look over their work without a time constraint. Secondly, if the exam was viewed as a prerequisite to enter upper-division courses, she suggested separate writing proficiency exams for each college, with a topic that was at least of interest to the students.

Senator Inman asked Dr. Kirby if the information Senator Silverman asked about was available. Dr. Kirby said that information was being collected. IWC will work with the data, in the next stage, to determine what individual units are doing, and what successful models there are.

Senator Impey said that he has graded the exams perhaps half a dozen times, and he agreed that a single timed test might be insufficient to judge adequately students' abilities. But, he said, the 41 percent that are minimally satisfactory are just that. "What's being seen is not the inability of a student to respond to the subject that was given, but the inability to form a coherent set of arguments and to logically tie them together. In two hours there's plenty of time to demonstrate that inability. Since the exam results are really the symptom, rather than the disease...what is the range of writing required in the writing emphasis courses, and how many of them are truly satisfactory?"

Dr. Kirby said he thought it would be impossible to answer that question quantitatively because the writing requirement would vary in direct proportion to the number of students in a class in a given semester. Relating the issue to faculty workload, he said it is much harder to oversee a writing emphasis class with 80 students versus 40 students. The difficulties increase geometrically.

Senator DaDeppo said he teaches the writing emphasis course in his department, with approximately 40 students enrolled. He assigns six compositions, spread throughout the term. He said he would appreciate, and he thinks students need, some sort of diagnostic information as to how they're doing. He has seen compositions that were unbelievably poor, with no organization, no real progress, and words misspelled almost beyond belief. If students were given a diagnostic test, and results forwarded to the departments, it would assist him greatly.

Senator Fernandez said that, for future reports, he would appreciate seeing a comparison of the results over several years, to determine if there were any trends. As he reviewed the statistics in this report, he believed unsatisfactory scores in previous years were very similar to those contained in this report. He said he would appreciate clarification on that point.

Dr. Tilly Warnock, Director of English Composition, introduced Dr. Marvin Diogenes and Dr. Ty Bouldin, Co-Coordinator of the University Composition Board. She said the UDWPE was established as a way to identify students whose writing skills needed improvement, and it was set up in such a way that faculty could then work with and advise those students. Many of the issues being discussed today appeared to be related to advising issues--how do the different colleges and departments deal with those who have achieved poor exam results. She said the suggestions concerning actual format of the exam are in the process of being considered. She added that the freshman placement exam, the composition program, the writing emphasis courses, and the UDWPE make this one of the strongest writing programs she was aware of in any school in the country because it continues from the time students enter through their senior year. Dr. Warnock said the composition staff tries to maintain a connection with public and private high school writing programs. She said she believed a proposal for a revised charge to the IWC will be submitted to the Senate. She concluded by indicating that the UDWPE results will probably not change, because the exam was set up to produce these results.

Dr. Bouldin, responding to Senator Fernandez' comments, stated that this year's unsatisfactory rate is about 4.5 or 5 percentage points lower than it was two years ago, the date of the last report, which suggested a slight improvement. He said the combined scores of unsatisfactory and minimally satisfactory, around 65 percent, are very stable.

Senator Hammond said he believes the exam is inappropriate, for two reasons, one of which echoes the point raised about sitting down for two hours. He said he wants his students to write like "little linguists," so he would want an exam that would reflect the kind of writing they would do were they professionals in his field of linguistics. He said he never writes his papers by sitting down with a timer, and he thinks it is inappropriate to test in that way. Secondly, he doesn't sit down and babble on a topic he has just been exposed to--he does some research on the topic, thinks about it, and then he writes. He concluded that the exam seems like the wrong kind of exercise.

Senator E. Williams said he believed Senator Hammond's points were well taken, and suggested to him that perhaps departments ought to be taking a more vigorous

role in the entire examination process. In the first place, they could offer the sort of topics that would be more germane to their students, and interest would lead to a better evaluation process. Students would have the opportunity to demonstrate their particular knowledge in the essay. And finally, faculty could more easily be motivated to take a more active role in the examination process. "We all know that the further the process gets from the departmental level, the less interest we have in it. And if we were dealing with our own students, conjuring up our own questions and proposing our own examination, we might come to some of those grading sessions."

Senator Ewbank said he was a member of the Senate when the mandate was adopted that the test be implemented, and thus felt a degree of responsibility for participating in the grading process. He said he respected Senator E. Williams' comments, and he could understand the concern with 41 percent being only marginally satisfactory. Instructions to graders are if they need remediation, assign a 1; if they can survive and can be admitted into a writing proficiency course in a department, a 2 is appropriate; a 3 is pretty good; he has seen perhaps only a dozen 4's in the last two or three sessions--not many, given the number of essays that he has read. He wondered whether "we are panicking and...pointing our concerns in the wrong direction. I'm not saying a portfolio evaluation might not be a better way of doing it, but I think, given what was set up and how it has been run, we should continue until something more constructive is put together and until there is a commitment on the part of the faculty to help make it run."

Senator Joens said that he teaches a writing emphasis course in Veterinary Science, with an enrollment of about fifteen students. The emphasis is on scientific writing and the critique of papers. In the last three years, he said, he has found that his students have done very well in the class. He wondered if the type of writing that is required on the UDWPE is responsible for the high percentage of unsatisfactory scores. He also wondered why the scoring categories couldn't be simplified to unsatisfactory, satisfactory and excellent.

Senator Atwater said she believed the present exam has many merits, and she supported the concept that students should be able to write proficiently on a topic other than their major coursework, and be able to organize their thoughts and express themselves as they might have to in the future in the community. She said that she has graded several times, and she thought the grading system worked well. "But maybe we should be placing our emphasis on the follow-up procedures in the departments, to find the methods that are successful."

Senator Lewis asked if there is any trend in the data that might suggest a higher failing rate as a function of the major. Dr. Kirby responded that the data are broken down by college. Senator Lewis asked if a comparison, over several years, would indicate a trend.

Dr. Diogenes said the results have been fairly consistent. Currently, the Composition Board is looking at comparative performances of transfer students who have taken their composition coursework at places other than the UofA. Data from about four years ago suggested unsatisfactory performances registered about 10 percent higher for students who had not taken any of their composition work here.

Senator Lewis said he believes much of this is based on student expectations, derived from the kind of writing they are required to do in their majors. He said he believed that the type of training provided to students will to a large extent determine the type of writing they will do, and a grader from the stu-

dent's major department might be more prone to find the writing satisfactory than someone from a different type of unit.

Dr. Zwolinski asked if the Senate wished to take action at this time. Senator Young moved (motion 1993/94-30) that the Senate accept the report of the Intercollegiate Writing Committee, and the motion was seconded. A voice vote indicated approval, although Senator Neuman indicated his opposition because he had not received a copy of the report. He said that if discussion were to continue, he would like to make some comments.

Senator Witte suggested that further discussion be scheduled in perhaps four or five months. She said the Committee of Eleven wrote the original proposal to establish an Intercollegiate Writing Committee, but the program as conceived was more extensive than what is in existence today. She recommended reviewing the Committee of Eleven's original proposal when the topic is rescheduled.

Senator Zukoski moved (motion 1993/94-31) that the Intercollegiate Writing Committee continue with the development of a proposal for Faculty Senate consideration, in conjunction with Senator Witte's comments concerning the Committee of Eleven's original proposal, in an effort to provide some concrete and well thought out suggestions to improve writing proficiency on this campus. That motion was then seconded. Senator Inman said that she hoped the next time this issue comes before the Senate, the report would contain information on what the colleges do to follow up on the results of the exam.

Senator Hammond wondered whether it would prove useful if the exam were to be administered to the Senate, if that hasn't been done, "to see how the people who are supposed to be able to write actually score on a general exam, and then we would know whether the exam is actually a valid thing."

Senator Silverman said he agreed with Senator Zukoski's motion, and today's discussion had highlighted some of the issues, but he wondered whether more specific direction could be given to the committee about concerns the Faculty Senate would like to see addressed. He suggested that perhaps the Senate Executive Committee might be able to provide that assistance. He said this issue is of interest to the Senate, and he thought it desirable that further consideration be given to the matter during the current academic year.

Senator McElroy pointed out that only 2 percent of the faculty graded the exam this semester. Students taking the exam in December may or may not get their exams graded; the October exams were not graded by the end of November. He said it would be helpful if each Faculty Senator graded a test prior to the next discussion, because participation in the grading process would answer many questions.

Senator Sjong said that another important aspect from the student's perspective is the pressure from wanting to graduate in four years. If they don't pass this test, they can't go on to upper-division courses. In comparison, Faculty Senators would have nothing to lose, so the pressure isn't the same.

Senator Neuman said that, while he has neither seen nor graded the exam, he has heard that it is reasonable, and one that every high school graduate should be able to pass. He said he assumed we do not administer the exam to incoming students, and he would like to recommend that it be seriously considered.

Senator Aleamoni said he believed the motion is asking for clarification of the

objectives of the exam, and what it was designed to do. A review of the Committee of Eleven's initial objectives would indicate whether the intent was to launch a general measure screening device to determine a minimal level of competency as opposed to a proficiency in a particular disciplinary area.

A voice vote indicated unanimous approval, with no abstentions. Dr. Zwolinski thanked Dr. Kirby and all who participated.

11. DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE EVENING AND WEEKEND PROGRAM: Senator Inman, Chair of the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC) introduced Senator Hill, presenter and author of the report, Dr. June Dempsey, Dean of Extended University, and Associate Dean Anita McDonald. They and Senator Fernandez were present to respond to questions. She said she would moderate the discussion.

Senator Hill said ICPC's interest in this issue was triggered by a report issued by a task force chaired by Dr. Holly Smith last spring. That report called for implementation of a special Evening and Weekend program. Evening and Weekend students were to be separate from regular University students. Various people saw significant risks associated with that particular proposal, he said, including members of ICPC; nine of those risks were contained in the report being discussed today. Fortunately, he said, that first model was not implemented. Rather, Extended University has been asked to implement an Evening and Weekend Program, the goal of which would be to serve students who, for various reasons, are unable to take part in the regular work-week courses at the University.

ICPC's report contains two recommendations: (1) That the Senate endorse the administration by Extended University of an Evening and Weekend program. Senator Hill said the committee thinks that serving this particular group of students is in the interest of both the students and the University. (2) That the Evening and Weekend Program should not be expanded to serve students who would, in the absence of an enrollment cap, be regular daytime students. Proceeding rapidly with the opening of a new four-year non-research campus in Pima County has far less potential for negative impact on the University of Arizona.

Senator Inman then called for questions.

Senator E. Williams said he was the only faculty member of the Senate to have served on the task force, and it was his opinion that the task force attempted to erase any distinction among students by indicating that the program ought not to be administered through Extended University because such administration would imply that the students involved were not a part of the regular University. Their applications should be processed in exactly the same way as day students. He said the task force's concern was that administration by Extended University would imply second-class status, or at least a different status, and he asked if someone could respond to that concern.

Senator Inman said the University had not been able to fund a whole new administrative system. So Provost Sypherd made a decision to proceed with the program, administered by Extended University, which would charge for courses under the same principles as for Summer Session.

Dr. Dempsey said she would like to clear up one misconception. "Extended University is a facilitating body for the University of Arizona's degree programs and courses. No students are admitted into Extended University. All of the degree programs and all of the courses are University of Arizona courses and programs.

The admission process is exactly the same, and the requirements are exactly the same. It operates much like Summer Session. The colleges or departments decide which courses or degree programs may or may not be offered through Extended University to meet the needs of the students who are unable to attend in the daytime. The faculty are selected by the department heads, and the curriculum that is offered is exactly the same curriculum as is offered in the daytime. As I said, there is no separate admission status. It is the same for all students."

Senator Pitt asked why no teacher evaluations are conducted for courses taught through Extended University or Summer Session. Dr. Dempsey responded that teacher and course evaluations are conducted for all off-campus courses. Copies are sent to the instructor and kept on file. Senator Pitt asked if they are sent to the departments, as well. Dr. Dempsey responded that in some cases they are, and if department heads want them, they can receive them. Senator Pitt asked why evaluations are not done for Summer Session classes, but are for off-campus offerings. Associate Dean McDonald responded that there were no evaluations this past summer, but they generally are conducted and submitted directly to the Summer Session Office.

Senator Inman suggested that, since the details are not set in concrete, the Senate could recommend implementation of an evaluation system similar or identical to that in use for daytime courses, with results transmitted to the departments and the instructors.

Senator Garcia commented that the Enrollment Growth Commission believed the Evening and Weekend Program would service some of the 55,000 additional students anticipated to enroll by 2010. He said that what he was hearing in this discussion was that we cannot afford to service these anticipated students except by increasing the teaching loads of the existing departments. He asked if that conclusion was correct.

Senator Inman responded that what was being suggested here was that the problem would be handled by the new four-year college.

Senator Garcia said that the Enrollment Growth Commission considered Evening and Weekend and the new four-year college as separate pieces: the new four-year college had a 10,000 student load tied to it, and the Evening and Weekend Program had something like a 5,000 student load assigned to it, separate and distinct from the four-year college.

Senator Inman said that ICPC believed it would be more appropriate to address the Evening and Weekend Program to adults who need courses in the evenings and on the weekend, for example people whose employers want them to get advanced degrees. "They find that they can't do it at the University of Arizona. So Extended University wants this to be primarily an adult education program, and our committee liked that idea much more than the idea that we could somehow just use this to extend our present program beyond the 35,000."

Senator E. Williams said he had a couple of observations. At the November Senate meeting, he asked President Pacheco a question along the lines of Senator Garcia's points, i.e., how the Evening and Weekend Program would fit into the larger picture of the new four-year college and the Sequential Degree Program. His response, as recorded in the minutes, was that this was one part of several responses to the enrollment problem. Therefore, the four-year college was not an alternative to the Evening and Weekend Program. He said he wanted to return

to a crucial point: "how students are admitted and how they conceive themselves. I suspect there are infinite nuances in the administrative process that I don't understand, but let me ask Dr. Dempsey this one question. When student X or Y makes application to this institution through Extended University, does he or she receive a reply that says you are admitted to the University of Arizona to pursue degree program X, or are they admitted to the Extended University? If the latter is the case, then I believe we are creating second-class citizens."

Dr. Dempsey: "There is no process to apply for admission to Extended University. Where credit courses and degree programs are offered, the student must be admitted the same as for any other degree program because it is the same. The student may take classes off campus, at night or in the daytime. The degree is still a University of Arizona degree, taught by University of Arizona faculty. There are no separate arrangements; they are not continuing education students. We did away with that many years ago. They are University of Arizona students."

Dr. Sankey confirmed that any distinction between a regular day student and any other student taking classes was eliminated at least twelve years ago. There is only one kind of credit, and that is University credit.

Senator Myers said that, although he did not want to disagree with what had been said, he had the impression that if a student applied for admission to the University, there was an assumption that they would be a daytime student. "We don't really have a good way to cope with the student who wishes to enroll for a degree but who is only going to take evening classes. While departments do have control of the curriculum, it is not true that the evening curriculum is the same as the daytime, because no department is going to be able to offer that number of evening courses. It takes too many students for the classes to run, because they have to be self-supporting. Concerning the question of who teaches those courses, because they constitute an extra load, extra pay is available, but on a different scale. Teaching assignments are not made in the same way that they would be for daytime classes, so there is a difference between the two which I think we've not really come to grips with yet."

Senator Witte asked what percentage of Extended University students are enrolled in credit courses. Dr. Dempsey responded that a little under 50 percent are enrolled in credit courses, including Summer Session. There is no "extension credit," such as the California system has. Excluding Summer Session, around 2,000 students are receiving University credit, out of a total of 50,000. Senator Witte noted that we are talking about only a small percentage, and Dr. McDonald confirmed that the figure was only about 3 percent.

Senator Enos said she was trying to understand the differences, and asked if students admitted to Extended University are required to take placement exams and the UDWPE. Dr. Dempsey responded that there are no differences, and students are not admitted into Extended University. They are admitted into the University of Arizona, and meet all admission requirements. Extended University does not handle admissions. Students may apply for admission to the University as either degree or non-degree seeking students.

Dr. McDonald said that the primary focus of the Evening and Weekend Program is to offer a limited number of degree programs for adult students, programs that have been brought to Extended University's attention by departments and colleges. or by some of the students they were currently serving. In terms of her personal experience, adult students can complete a degree program in less than 16 years and can be provided an opportunity for professional growth. "The main thing is,

we are looking at a limited number of degree offerings on the campus. Many of the students will come with their General Education studies already completed. All of them will go through the regular admissions process. We have been working with the Admissions Office and the Registrar's Office to help clarify how that process would work. They will be University of Arizona students, not students of Extended University."

Senator Garcia: "If it is not our intent to service the 5,000 students that the Board of Regents anticipated were going to be serviced by this means, then we should inform the Board that that isn't going to happen. If this is going to be a small peripheral program servicing a few people who have full-time jobs, then I think the Board is being misled. They have set up a hypothetical situation which we are not prepared to cope with, and they ought to understand that there will be 5,000 unsatisfied students running around somewhere."

Senator Fernandez said that he believes the long-term goal is to serve a larger number of students, in the range of 3,500 to 5,000. A pilot program is needed, and while the Summer Session model exists, "we really don't have the experience with full-blown degree programs in the evenings and weekends. The idea is to begin with something that's manageable. If we can work through the details successfully, then the program would ideally serve that many students."

Senator Jones said he had some concerns related to the issue of support services for this group of students. Faculty will be paid to teach the classes, but he wondered how advising, counseling, and additional library services will be provided for. Senator Inman said it was her understanding that Extended University will have funding to assist departments in hiring more people and for providing such services. She asked Dr. Dempsey if that was correct.

Dr. Dempsey said that an administrative committee comprised of representatives from various support offices on campus has been meeting for almost two years. They have agreed, on an experimental and temporary basis, to schedule one evening per week when these offices and services will be available, and that information will be conveyed to the student population. She said that Extended University does have a faculty advisor, hired through the College of Arts and Sciences but paid for through Extended University. She said there may necessarily be, in the future, some financial arrangements to increase those services. For now, that administrative committee has decided what will be done in the first year through some realigning of their schedules, and some of them are already open one evening a week.

Kenneth Cahall, a Junior in Creative Writing, said he was a peer advisor for the Center for Transfer Students, and was here today to represent the increasing population of new traditional students at the University--people like himself, who at age 25 was working a full-time job. He said when he read about the Evening and Weekend program in the Wildcat, it was a dream come true for him and for many of the advisees that he comes in contact with through the Center for Transfer Students. He said he came to the Senate meeting to lend his support for the program. It was his understanding, from what he had heard today, that there are questions about supporting this program. He said it was clear to him that, through the tuition of students enrolled in this program, funding can be provided. He referred to experiences at Prescott College, which is addressing the concerns and needs of adult students. He said that there can be a lot more integration between faculty and students in devising programs and noted in particular that adult students are much better at voicing their interests and concerns than are the less experienced students in more traditional programs.

He concluded that he thought that the Evening and Weekend Program is a really good idea.

Senator McElroy said he believed that this issue is far too important to be cut off by time. He moved (motion 1993/94-32) that the Senate Executive Committee reschedule this issue for a future meeting, or perhaps for more than one meeting, and that information be provided that would answer some of the many questions raised today. He added that, at the end of this meeting, there were still many concerns that had not been voiced. That motion was seconded, and a voice vote indicated approval.

12. APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Volume 15, No. 8, Section II was moved (motion 1993/94-33), seconded, and approved on a voice vote with one abstention.
13. APPROVAL OF PRELIMINARY DEGREE LIST FOR DECEMBER 1993 COMMENCEMENT: Acceptance of the list was moved (motion 1993/94-34), seconded and approved on a voice vote, with five abstentions.
14. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

---

Elizabeth Roemer  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

15. MOTIONS OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 6, 1993:

- |            |   |
|------------|---|
| 1993/94-29 | Approval to change the order of one agenda item.  |
| 1993/94-30 | Acceptance of Intercollegiate Writing Committee Annual Report.  |
| 1993/94-31 | Approval to request the Intercollegiate Writing Committee to submit a proposal to the Senate, based on the Committee of Eleven's original charge, and providing additional information. |
| 1993/94-32 | Approval of motion to schedule a second discussion, during the Spring 1994 Semester, on Evening and Weekend Programs.   |
| 1993/94-33 | Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 15, No. 8, Section II.  |
| 1993/94-34 | Acceptance of Preliminary List for December 1993 Commencement.  |