

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
December 1, 1997

These minutes may be accessed electronically at:
<http://w3.arizona.edu/~senate/minutes.htm>

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Jeffrey L. Warburton at 3:00 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Atwater, Caldwell, Chen, Clarke, Dahlgran, Davidson, D. Davis, T. Davis, Emrick, Erickson, Erlings, Ervin, Feltham, Fernicola, Garcia, Glittenberg, Heckler, Hogle, Howell, Larson, Likins, Maré, Medine, Miller, Mishra, Mitchell, Myers, O'Brien, Poss, Reeves, Romer, Schiffer, Schooley, Silverman, Spece, Troy, Warburton, Weinand, and Witte. Mikelle Omari served as a non-voting substitute for Senator Pitt. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Carlson, Coons, Dvorak, Dyl, Emrich, Gerber, Gore, Gruener, Hurt, Joens, Levy, Love, McCaslin, Montanaro, Nelson, Pepper, Pitt, Spherd, Szilagyi, and Zwolinski.

2. OPEN SESSION

(Please note that speakers at the Open Session are expressing their personal opinion, which may not reflect the position of the Faculty Senate.)

Senator Feltham suggested that, in order to keep pace with our changing society, the UA should consider "downsizing" itself by (1) not admitting students who do not have the background and preparation to succeed at the UA, and (2) making better use of the physical facilities on campus (e.g., reintroducing Saturday classes and increasing the number of week-end and evening class offerings). He said these changes would be beneficial to students, as well as more cost-effective.

Senator Silverman expressed concern regarding the UA's proposed partnership with the Nike Corporation because of its "poor track record when it comes to treatment of its workers." He said that Nike had closed its last U.S. plant in 1984, moving all of its manufacturing operations to third-world countries, where workers have been denied basic labor and human rights. Even though Nike has taken steps to correct this situation, some abuses apparently still exist, Senator Silverman added. He cautioned against lending the UA's "good name" in exchange for monetary considerations, and he recommended that the institution establish and enforce a code of conduct for such partnerships.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Gilbert Davidson

Highlights of Senator Davidson's remarks: (1) The student referendum to authorize a mandatory \$40-per-student fee each semester to help finance the Student Union/Bookstore renovation/expansion project was overwhelmingly defeated two weeks ago. Senator Davidson ascribed the defeat to several causes: (a) The referendum was a complex issue, about which the student body was not adequately educated; and (b) the *Arizona Daily Wildcat*, after initially supporting the referendum, adopted an editorial stance opposed to it. Senator Davidson said the next steps in the process should include obtaining preliminary architectural plans for the project and presenting them to students, as well as initiating a major fundraising effort through the UA Foundation. This will be a long process that needs to involve the entire campus community, he said. (2) ASUA scholarship applications are due on Dec. 5. ASUA plans to offer two \$1,000 scholarships (one to a graduate student and the other to an undergraduate) and six \$500 scholarships (one to a graduate student and five to undergraduates).

3B. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Jeffrey Warburton

Presiding Officer Warburton's announcements: (1) Prof. Edwin Clausen from the Arizona International Campus has been elected AIC's non-voting representative to the Faculty Senate. (2) Prof. Mikelle Omari will substitute at some Senate meetings for Senator Pitt, who is on sabbatical during 1997-98.

3C. Secretary of the Faculty Rose Gerber

No report, since Secretary Gerber was unable to attend the meeting.

3D. Chair of the Faculty Jerrold Hogle (Attachments)

Chair Hogle discussed several topics: (1) The Arizona Faculties Council (AFC) is scheduled to make another presentation regarding faculty workload at the ABOR meeting on Dec. 4-5. Using overhead transparencies (see copies at end of minutes), Dr. Hogle

reviewed the planned presentation, noting that the AFC had made some progress in developing measures since his last report to the Senate. He explained that the AFC would not be able to present exact data from the universities to the Regents until April, since data collection for the Teaching Incentive Program (TIP) had taken so much time. However, the AFC is approaching agreement on a formula by which total credit hours would be factored in by university aggregates: Each credit hour would be multiplied by 4 to account for 4 items—1 hour of actual class time, 1 hour of preparation, 1 hour for assessment including grading, and 1 hour for the faculty member to keep up with his or her field. For independent studies, the AFC is tending toward the formula used for TIP—a ratio of 7 to 1, so that 21 units of independent study credit hours would equal 3 units of regular class credit; this number would then be multiplied by 3 to account for preparation time. Instruction-related activities, such as curriculum development, advising and mentoring, directing undergraduate or graduate studies, technology development, and student recruitment may be factored in as 25% of faculty time in the aggregate. When these calculations are done for the UA faculty for Fall 1996, the University aggregate is approximately 32 hours a week per FTE faculty member. Chair Hogle said that almost all the Regents think this is acceptable for faculty at a Research I university. He added that if the AFC makes such a presentation, it is unlikely that a state-mandated teaching minimum will be imposed, but faculty may have to account for themselves using a formula similar to the one outlined. He invited faculty input prior to the AFC's presentation to ABOR. (2) With regard to TIP, Chair Hogle reported that representatives from all the campuses had met recently with several legislators and John Lee of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee (JLBC). The group agreed that there would be much more contact between the universities and the Legislature in preparation for the next round of salary awards; work groups involving faculty leaders and others will be set up to facilitate this communication. Thus, Dr. Hogle said, it is unlikely that TIP will happen in the same way again. (3) Progress is being made on shared governance issues, Chair Hogle said. The Task Force on Extending Shared Governance has met several times to explore how staff, appointed personnel, and students can be involved in regular decision-making on campus. The group is drafting proposals which will be ready for Senate review before the end of this academic year. Also, the Shared Governance Review Committee will meet later in December to assess the progress on shared governance and to ensure that it happens at every level of the University. (4) Chair Hogle shared a "lingering concern" regarding the proposed changes to the state whistleblower law. He said that, although he respects the zeal, courage, and convictions of the President of the Arizona State Conference of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), he is concerned that she has taken issues such as the whistleblower amendment directly to the Legislature, bypassing elected faculty governance at all of the state universities. Chair Hogle said he and the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate have asked the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to review the whistleblower law and UA policy regarding whistleblowers in order to make an informational presentation and recommendations to the Senate at the Jan. 26 meeting. The Senate could decide then or at its Feb. 9 meeting what position it would like to take on the whistleblower issue. It is up to the Faculty Senate to decide whether the Arizona AAUP President's position represents the position of the UA faculty, Chair Hogle said.

Chair Hogle and Presiding Officer Warburton presented a plaque to Parliamentarian Sankey to recognize his "extraordinary service to the faculty of the University." Senator Warburton noted that Dr. Sankey is now in his 27th year of continuous service as Senate Parliamentarian. Dr. Sankey expressed his surprise and delight at having received the award. He added that both the role of UA faculty governance and the work related to it have grown substantially since he took office.

3E. Provost Paul Sypherd

No report, since Provost Sypherd was unable to attend the meeting.

3F. President Peter Likins

A summary of comments by President Likins: (1) The defeat of the Student Union referendum was the result of "trying to make very complex decisions in a political process." He said he thought that Senator Davidson and his team had done all they reasonably could in the time they had available to inform their constituents about this issue, adding that he agreed with Senator Davidson regarding the next steps in the process: Students need to be given more information about possible alternatives for renovating the Student Union (e.g., spending \$60-70 million for the full renovation/expansion project or \$10-15 million for minimal improvements to the infrastructure), including preliminary architectural plans and fundraising mechanisms. President Likins noted that ordinarily an architect cannot be hired until the Regents have given conceptual approval to a project, but he would try to persuade them to make an exception in this instance. He also stated that the full project could not be undertaken without a "substantial student fee contribution." (2) UA representatives need to do the necessary political homework in preparation for ABOR meetings, including communication with the Regents prior to votes, in order to create a more comfortable working relationship between the UA and the Regents. President Likins commented that the AFC is playing a very powerful and positive role in communicating the interests of the three universities to the Regents. He added that the AFC functions entirely without the prior approval of university administrators. An important part of shared governance, he noted, is for faculty and administrators to develop sufficient mutual trust so that either group can approach external constituencies with confidence that the other will not feel discomfort. (3) The joint UA/ASU Ph.D. program in the theory and history of art is an excellent example of collaboration between universities. Dr. Likins encouraged faculty to take advantage of any opportunity for other meaningful collaborative efforts. (4) President Likins said he plans to distribute a discussion paper on priorities for the University in the new few weeks. This paper is intended not as a presidential edict, but rather as a stimulus for dialogue in the University community and feedback to him. If the paper is effective in stimulating discussion, similar papers may be issued in the future, he said.

4. **QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD**

Senator Witte asked Chair Hogle how the whistleblower resolution will be presented in the Senate. She commented that an extensive discussion should take place, with all views being presented, so that the Senate can make an informed decision in a deliberate manner, rather than have to vote on "some type of crisis resolution." She suggested that the Arizona AAUP President be invited to participate in the discussion. Chair Hogle responded that the intent was to present as much information to the Senate as possible, but he noted that the Senate would need to act in a timely enough manner so that any resolution could go before the Legislature during this session.

Senator Silverman commented that the Arizona AAUP President has filled a void on campus, because the UA faculty has had very little interaction with the Legislature in the past. However, the AFC may be starting this process in an organized way now, he added.

Senator Spece asked if the Senate would have an opportunity to consider an intermediate proposal, rather than merely being asked to endorse or reject the Arizona AAUP President's proposal regarding the whistleblower amendment. Chair Hogle responded affirmatively.

Senator T. Davis said he agreed with Senator Spece: The Faculty Senate needs more information before it can decide whether to endorse the whistleblower amendment. He added that much of what was discussed at the Oct. 16 hearing organized by the Arizona AAUP President for legislators to hear faculty complaints about inequities is still highly confidential. A number of those situations are currently being processed through faculty governance committees established for that purpose, such as the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT), the Committee on Conciliation, and the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment (UCEC). Dr. Davis added that the faculty needs to better understand the processes in place in order to know whether the cases discussed at the hearing are being properly handled; he also noted that some of the information disseminated regarding those cases was incorrect or taken out of context. On another topic, Senator Davis suggested that Chair Hogle involve a faculty member from the College of Medicine in the work being done on measures of faculty workload. Chair Hogle clarified that, at present, the AFC is trying to arrive at measures that can be applied state-wide, and the UA is the only state institution with a College of Medicine.

With regard to substitutes for Faculty Senators, Senator Myers pointed out that the General Faculty Constitution does not provide for proxy votes. Presiding Officer Warburton clarified that Prof. Omari will be a non-voting substitute for Senator Pitt. Recalling the way building construction was financed in the past, Senator Myers asked President Likins if he had considered requesting that the Legislature appropriate funds to renovate and expand the Student Union. President Likins responded that the Legislature had provided very clear signals that the UA could not expect to receive millions of dollars in single budget allocations. He added that the current practice of issuing bonds which need to be repaid puts enormous pressure on tuition and other operating funds of the University.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOV. 3, 1997**

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting on Nov. 3, 1997, were approved as distributed.

6. **PRESENTATION ON THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT**

Senator T. Davis, UCEC Chair, discussed at some length the role, responsibilities, and procedures of this committee. He noted that he had been asked to make the presentation because there has been some confusion regarding these issues lately. Using overhead transparencies, Senator Davis reviewed relevant sections of the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel*, the *General Policies of the University*, the *Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual*, the *Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty of The University of Arizona*, and Public Health Service regulations regarding grants. Dr. Davis read the charge of UCEC: to "deal with questions of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative endeavor, conflict of interest, and facilities misuse," using the appropriate University policies. "Misconduct" has been defined in policies as "(1) fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other serious deviations from accepted practice in proposing, conducting or disseminating the results of research, scholarship or creative endeavor; (2) material failure to comply with federal and other requirements for protecting researchers, human subjects, and the public or for ensuring the welfare of laboratory animals; and (3) failure to meet other material legal requirements governing research, scholarship and creative endeavors." Allegations may be made by anyone. UCEC operates similarly to a grand jury, conducting inquiries to determine if there is "cause to think" that misconduct has occurred; CAFT conducts investigations. In the past UCEC has been relatively inactive, typically meeting once annually; however, in the last several years both UCEC and CAFT have experienced a greatly increased caseload. Since August 1995, UCEC has conducted 17 inquiries, of which 4 have been referred to CAFT. Dr. Davis briefly reviewed the issues involved in those 17 inquiries. Other highlights of his presentation: The UA is subject to federal regulations regarding misconduct in science, because it receives grant funds from the federal government. Fortunately, the UA had developed guidelines and processes for investigating allegations of research misconduct very similar to those the federal government subsequently adopted. Because the University was ahead of other institutions in this regard, and because many large Research I universities are receiving allegations related to improper laboratory management, the UA and the National Institutes of Health Office of Research Integrity (ORI) are co-sponsoring a conference on the management of biomedical research laboratories, to be held at the UA Oct. 1-3, 1998. Throughout his presentation, Senator Davis stressed the need for the UA to adhere strictly to UA policies and federal regulations in order to "do the job properly," because if the ORI determines that guidelines are not being followed, it will step in and conduct its own investigation. In connection with this, Dr. Davis emphasized

that UA faculty have a responsibility to their colleagues not to discuss publicly the details of pending UCEC and CAFT cases. Disseminating information to the media not only can do a disservice to the accused faculty member, it also can make it more difficult to persuade faculty members to serve on CAFT panels, he said.

Senator Spece asked about the right of the accused to present his or her side of the case. Senator Davis responded that both UCEC and CAFT processes provide ample opportunity for this. Senator Spece also suggested that members of the College of Law be invited to participate in UCEC and CAFT procedures. Senator Davis noted that in the past the College of Law had declined such a request, due to liability concerns.

Senator Witte pointed out that the procedures in UHAP governing the handling of allegations were developed by the Research Policy Committee, of which she was chair. She said the RPC's intent was to assure fair play and objectivity for the accused faculty member, while at the same time providing protection for the whistleblower up to a point. However, if it was determined that the charges had no basis in fact and the whistleblower had brought them with maliciousness, there were provisions for punishment of the whistleblower. Dr. Witte also commented that there have been "egregious breaches" of CAFT processes in the past, such that in one instance, a faculty member was awarded \$1 million in a lawsuit against the UA. She noted that, in developing the procedures, the RPC wanted the faculty to have a completely faculty-controlled process for the initial inquiry. They did not envision CAFT as an investigative body, but rather one to recommend sanctions after the allegations had been proven true.

Senator Silverman asked whether UCEC handles questions of misuse of state funds. Senator Davis responded that it does, if the allegation falls within UCEC's charge. Senator Schiffer inquired whether UCEC ever assumes a mediator role. Senator Davis responded affirmatively, noting that only an occasional case is referred to CAFT.

Senator Garcia pointed out that the UHAP procedures being discussed were originated in the Faculty Senate and modified only slightly by Regents' counsel. Therefore, the Senate can also propose changes in the procedures to the Regents. He also commented that there is a danger in trying to "nuzzle" the University community, and establishing regulations that would do that would be "antithetical to the existence of the First Amendment." Senator Davis clarified that he was not advocating any new regulations, just reminding faculty that they have "an incredible responsibility to each other" not to discuss current UCEC and CAFT cases, especially if they do not have all the facts.

Senator Likins asked what would happen if there was a conflict between the will of the state and the will of the federal government, would there be double jeopardy? Senator Spece responded that federal law would pre-empt and negate state law if there were inconsistencies between the two. Senator Witte commented that it could be considered double protection, or several levels of review, rather than double jeopardy.

7. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FORWARDED FROM INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE** (Attachment)

All seven items on the consent agenda, forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee as seconded motions, were passed. These motions are detailed at the end of these minutes. [Motion 1997/98-14 through Motion 1997/98-20]

8. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ON OTHER ITEMS FORWARDED FROM INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE** (Attachments)

Senator Dahlgran introduced and explained three additional items forwarded from the ICPC as seconded motions:

(a) UA/ASU joint Ph.D. program in the theory and history of art - Senator Dahlgran noted that the unique aspect of this program is that it is collaborative. He said that it would have advantages in student recruitment and placement, but it would require a fair amount of administrative time. He added that the program has the approval of the appropriate departments and councils at both the UA and ASU. Motion 1997/98-21, to approve this program, was carried unanimously.

(b) Change in withdrawal policy to create new grade designations of W/P and W/F - Senator Dahlgran explained that there currently is no real policy for complete withdrawal from the University, so that what happens in each case is somewhat haphazard and inconsistent. The proposed change would enable an instructor to indicate whether the student was passing or failing the course when he or she withdrew, by assigning grades of W/P or W/F, respectively. This grade would not be included in the GPA computation, he said. Senator Silverman expressed the concern that if most students who completely withdraw from the University are in the midst of intense personal crisis, it might be unfair to penalize them by assigning failing grades. Even though such grades are not included in the GPA, they are permanently on the student's transcript and may adversely affect future attempts at re-admission, he said. Senator Schooley gave an example of a student who has abused the withdrawal policy three semesters in a row; he said some students should be penalized with failing grades. Motion 1997/98-22, to change the policy for complete withdrawal from the University to add the grade designations of W/P and W/F, was passed, with a few nays heard.

(c) Academic calendar changes - Senator Dahlgran explained that there is a problem with the academic calendar for 2001-02 because of the need for 14 teaching days between the end of the fall semester and the beginning of the spring semester, in order to accommodate Wintersession. Current calendar guidelines stipulate that the "the last Friday of finals shall be the last Friday falling on or before Dec. 21." Because the spring 2002 semester is scheduled to begin on Jan. 9, there will not be 14 teaching days between semesters unless the guidelines regarding finals are changed. Senator Dahlgran reported that the ICPC recommends that fall semester final examinations end on Friday, Dec. 14, that fall semester commencement be held on Saturday, Dec. 15, and that fall semester classes begin on Monday, Aug. 20, 2001. Senator Garcia questioned the need to move the fall 2001 semester up by a

full week. Noting that he serves on the academic calendar committee, Senator Warburton explained that the University is currently locked into having six days of final exams and a mandatory dead day. Senator Dahlgran said if the semester were moved up only one day, classes would begin on a Friday, but guidelines currently stipulate that fall semesters must begin on Mondays. Senator Atwater asked for confirmation that beginning the fall 2001 semester on Aug. 20 would allow enough time for Summer Session, and Senator Dahlgran replied that it would. **Motion 1997/98-23**, to change the appropriate section of the academic calendar guidelines to read, "The last day of finals shall be the last Friday in December falling on or before Dec. 20," was carried, with 20 votes in favor, 9 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

9. **PRESENTATION OF SECONDED MOTION FROM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY SENATE MINUTES (Attachments)**

Senator Hogle reported that he was presenting this seconded motion [**Motion 1997/98-24**], which was forwarded from the Executive Committee by a vote of 8 to 2, on behalf of Secretary Gerber, who could not attend today's meeting. He explained that this initiative was driven by the increased costs of distributing the minutes and the need to reduce Faculty Center expenses in order to avoid budget overruns. He said the intent was not to limit access to the minutes, but rather to take advantage of technology currently available. Chair Hogle referred Senators to the resolution in their packets as he read portions of it:

Given the rising expenses for printing and mailing 2,600 copies of the Faculty Senate minutes and the relatively low interest among faculty members in reading the minutes word for word (according to our recent survey), the following is moved and seconded for a vote by the Faculty Senate:

1. Starting with the January 1998 Senate meeting, detailed summary minutes will be written as they are now, but the method of distribution will be changed to simultaneously meet the diverse needs of readers and enhance efficiency. All members of the University community will have access to the information either in the traditional printed format or electronically.
2. The UNapproved minutes will be mailed to all Faculty Senate members in the packet for the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting, as they are now.
3. Once the minutes are approved and any corrections are made, the minutes will be placed, within a week after approval, on a Web Site for which all members of the University community will be given the address. All interested people with Web access will be able to find the minutes there.
4. A hard copy of the minutes, with appendices, will be mailed to every academic unit and dean's office in the University. Those who are interested in reading the printed version, or who may not have access to electronic media, can access them in the places where the aforementioned offices make them available, as they will all be asked to do.
5. Those who prefer to read the printed version of the summary minutes may request to receive an individual copy. Each September and January, the Secretary of the Faculty will send a letter to all members of the General Faculty which (a) identifies the Web address at which Senate minutes can be found, (b) notes the presence of hard copies in academic units and deans' offices, and (c) offers each individual the opportunity, using an easy mail-back form, to request a hard copy of the minutes mailed to him or her by the Faculty Center through the remaining portion of the academic year.

It is important that all people who want them have ready access to the information in Faculty Senate minutes. At the same time, there is no good reason to spend many precious dollars to print and mail thousands of copies that are read *in toto* by only some people (who can still get hard copies if they want them).

Chair Hogle noted that of the 250 General Faculty members who responded to the aforementioned survey, which was distributed in October, only 64 indicated they want to continue receiving the detailed summary of the minutes in printed form as they do now; also, there was significant support for placing the full version of the minutes on the Internet. He added that the expense associated with distributing the minutes can be reduced by an estimated two-thirds by implementing this proposal.

Senator Witte spoke against the motion, calling the distribution of the full printed version of the minutes to the entire General Faculty "the most fundamental part of faculty governance." Noting that this year marks the 50th anniversary of the UA Faculty Senate, she said that all faculty have received printed copies of the minutes ever since the Senate was established, even when the Faculty Center had no budget of its own. She stated that it was "implicit if not explicit" in the General Faculty Constitution that the minutes have to be provided to the faculty. She added that there would be no additional efficiency in not providing the faculty with a hard copy of the minutes, because the minutes will still need to be prepared and typed; it is simply a matter of making more copies available. She said the faculty was "giving you a mandate that they want those minutes in full" by their response to the survey regarding the minutes. She questioned exactly how much money would be saved by the proposal, and she asked if costs could be trimmed by measures other than discontinuing the full distribution of the printed minutes. Senator Witte moved [**Motion 1997/98-25**] to table the previous motion; motion was seconded and defeated, with 13 votes in favor and 17 opposed.

Senator Atwater asked what the cost of sending printed minutes to 2,600 faculty is, to which Chair Hogle responded that the typical minutes (6-8 pages in length) cost approximately \$600 to print and distribute per mailing. Senator Atwater also commented, "I don't think the voice of the faculty has been very loud," pointing out that less than 10% of the General Faculty had responded to the minutes survey, and many of those respondents indicated that they did not need the full printed report. She noted that if the motion from the Executive Committee is passed, faculty will have several options to receive the minutes, including continuing to receive the hard copy as they do now. She also noted a concern regarding sending appendices with the minutes to all academic units, because of the additional cost. Chair Hogle said that even if appendices are sent to academic units, it is estimated that each mailing will cost \$200 rather than the current \$600.

Senator Garcia stated he thought the proposal in the motion would provide a quite adequate distribution of the minutes, since no one who wants access would have his or her access diminished by the proposed distribution system. He recommended that the Senate approve the motion.

Senator Schooley asked what the concerns of the two Executive Committee members who opposed the motion were. Senator Aleamoni said he had primarily the same concerns that Senator Witte articulated. He added that the minutes are the main vehicle that the Senate has for communicating with the General Faculty, and that he was not convinced by the results of the survey that there is a relatively low interest in reading the minutes word for word. He also noted concerns regarding lack of Internet access. Senator Medine commented that he had voted against the motion essentially for the same reasons. He also said that he embraced Senator Witte's idea that this is "a senseless plea to co-governance and to democracy," and he said he would wager that the readership of the minutes would be lower with the new distribution system. Senator Schooley said that he would support the motion, because individual faculty members can still receive printed copies of the minutes if they wish.

Senator Silverman expressed a concern that some faculty may read the minutes only once during a semester when an issue that interests them is discussed, but if they have not indicated that they want the printed copy of the minutes, it will not be available to them. Chair Hogle responded that faculty can request a copy of the printed minutes at any time during the semester, either by contacting the Faculty Center or by checking in their department.

Senator Weinaud said he thought the survey indicated a very high interest in the minutes. He added that Senators are the representatives of the academic citizens of the University, and that democracy requires an informed citizenry. He moved [Motion 1997/98-26] that, due to the lateness of the hour, a vote on the main motion be postponed until March 1998; motion was seconded and defeated, with 12 votes in favor and 17 opposed. It was confirmed that there was still a quorum present.

Senator Witte requested that the vote on the main motion be a roll call vote. She asked for seven Senate colleagues to support her in this point of order, and several Senators voiced their agreement.

Senator Warburton conducted the roll call vote on Motion 1997/98-24, to adopt the seconded motion from the Executive Committee regarding distribution of Faculty Senate minutes as detailed above: motion was carried, with 17 votes in favor and 15 opposed. Those voting in favor of the motion: Atwater, Chen, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Emrick, Erickson, Garcia, Glittenberg, Heckler, Hogle, Howell, Larson, Maré, Mitchell, Poss, Schooley, and Warburton. Those voting against the motion: Aleamoni, Caldwell, Clarke, Erlings, Feltham, Medine, Miller, Mishra, Reeves, Romer, Schiffer, Silverman, Spece, Weinaud, and Witte.

10. **PRESENTATION ON THE PROMOTION AND TENURE STATISTICS REPORT and REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS**

Presiding Officer Warburton announced that, due to the lateness of the hour, these two agenda items would have to be postponed until the Jan. 26, 1998, Senate meeting.

11. **RECESS**

The Senate meeting recessed at 5:15 p.m. to go into Executive Session.

Rose M. Gerber, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Copies of overhead transparencies regarding Chair J. Hogle's faculty workload presentation to ABOR.
2. Copies of overhead transparencies from Senator T. Davis' presentation on the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment.
3. Consent agenda dated Dec. 1, 1997.
4. ICPC information sheet regarding the UA/ASU joint Ph.D. program in the theory and history of art, the modification of grading policy to accommodate a student's complete withdrawal from the university, and modification of Faculty Senate calendar guidelines.
5. "Educational Enhancement Through Joining Forces" (additional information regarding the UA/ASU joint Ph.D. program).
6. Seconded Motion from the Executive Committee on the Distribution of Faculty Senate Minutes, dated Dec. 1, 1997.

*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.

Motions of the Meeting of Dec. 1, 1997

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 1997/98-14 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to delete the major in Portuguese; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-15 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to continue the Physical Education major within the College of Education; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-16 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to establish a dual Ph.D. program in Biochemistry/Molecular and Cellular Biology; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-17 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the program name from the Program of Educational Administration to the Program of Educational Leadership; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-18 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the department name from Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation to Department of Special Education, Rehabilitation and School Psychology; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-19 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the B.S. in Geosciences to B.S.; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-20 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the B.S. in Speech and Hearing Sciences to B.S.; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-21 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve a UA/ASU joint Ph.D. program in the theory and history of art; motion carried unanimously. |
| 1997/98-22 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the policy for complete withdrawal from the University to add new grade designations of W/P and W/F; motion carried. |
| 1997/98-23 | Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to change the appropriate section of the academic calendar guidelines to read, "The last day of finals shall be the last Friday in December falling on or before Dec. 20;" motion carried. |
| 1997/98-24 | Seconded motion from the Executive Committee to accept the proposal for distribution of Faculty Senate minutes as detailed in the text of today's minutes; motion carried. |
| 1997/98-25 | Motion to table Motion 1997/98-24; motion defeated. |
| 1997/98-26 | Motion to postpone a vote on Motion 1997/98-24 until March 1998; motion defeated. |