

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
Monday, November 2, 1987 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in regular session at 3:05 p.m. on Monday, November 2, 1987, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Sixty-two members were present. Presiding Officer of the Senate Thomas R. Rehm presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Aleamoni, Andreas, Aquilano, Atwater, Austin, Billo, Bootman, Brown, Butler, Carranza, Cartee, Chase, Chisholm, Consroe, Cosgrove, Cusanovich, Daly, Dickstein, Drake, Epstein, Ewbank, Fahey, Fenstermacher, Figler, Fleming, Goetinck, Hasselmo, Hetrick, Irving, Jones, Koffler, Krutzsch, Larson, Logan, McConnell, McCullough, McGraw, Mishel, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Paplanus, Peterson, Phipps, Reed, Rehm, Ridge, Roemer, Rollins, Ruiz, Sander, Silverman, Smith, Stender, Streitmatter, Swaim, Triffet, Tuchi, Watson, Weiss, Witte, Woodard, and Woolfenden.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Bayless, Beigel, Boynton, Chen, Cunningham, Flint, Ganapol, Horak, Kettel, Marcus, Mautner, Parsons, Patterson, Sharkey, Sigelman, Sobelman, Stedman, Steelink, Tollin, Tomizuka, and Wilkening.

WELCOME EXTENDED TO NEW FACULTY SENATOR: Dr. Rehm welcomed Dr. Paul Consroe, new College of Pharmacy Faculty Senator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 1987, AS CORRECTED: Senator Atwater asked to have page 24, line 7, corrected to accurately reflect the composition of the Committee on Instructional Support Services and Teaching Facilities, as follows: at least one student, five faculty members, two representatives from Physical Resources, and four other administrators. The minutes were then approved as corrected.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PROVOST OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Hasselmo said he had two very brief points. "In collaboration with the Chairman of the Faculty and Chairman of the Senate, we set up a framework for consultation concerning the revised Mission and Scope statement with the Senate. We have had one meeting with that group, which consists of the chairs of various Senate committees, with leadership being provided by Professor Rehm, who is also sitting in on that. We will be looking to that group as providing a major vehicle for consultation on revision of the Mission and Scope statement. The intention is that early in the winter we will have a draft of the Mission and Scope statement available for discussion in the Academic Affairs Council. All three institutions would do that, and those statements will then become part of the strategic planning effort for the University system as a whole.

"Secondly, I have appointed a committee to review teaching evaluation in the University. This means teaching evaluation in all its manifestations including the requirements that are specified in the Promotion and Tenure documents, including the teaching evaluation as it has been conducted in IRAD--the kind of support services that have been provided for teaching evaluation. We hope also, through some kind of sampling, to do a study of teaching evaluation as it

is conducted in various departments in the University. We hope to be able to identify good models for teaching evaluation that are found in certain departments, and to be able to share those models with other departments. I don't know at this point whether the recommendations will be of such nature that they would lead to policy revisions, but that is something that we would have to consider as the report comes forward. I certainly expect that the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines that we normally issue in April will be revised in line with recommendations made by this committee."

CHAIRMAN OF THE FACULTY REPORT: Dr. Rehm reported that Chapters 3 and 4 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel were transmitted to the President, and are being reviewed at the present time.

The Committee on Elections had completed balloting in the College of Medicine, and Dr. Timothy Fagan was elected, and will begin his term at the December meeting. Dr. Rehm called for a motion to ratify Dr. Fagan's election. It was so moved (motion 87/88-18), seconded and unanimously approved.

Dr. Rehm said that one of the committees he serves on deals with public relations and the public's perceptions about the University; he requested members of the Senate who have knowledge of universities in which the university/community relations are of an outstanding nature to communicate them to him after the meeting, or to telephone the names to the Faculty Center.

Dr. Rehm said he had met with the Committee on Conciliation; members are feeling somewhat frustrated in the way they have cases presented to them. Part of the problem, he said, may be that the faculty does not know what that committee is in a position to do: they are there to conciliate. In order to conciliate, he said, it's not possible to work with opinions cast in concrete. Most of the cases the committee has been seeing recently are those where all parties in a case are polarized, and hence must be forwarded to CAFT. It would be more desirable to solve problems before they reached the formal hearing point, and he requested Senators to communicate these ideas to their constituencies to ensure that faculty, department heads and deans are all aware this committee is in place and can work if it's called in to play early enough. When Senators learn of faculty members or others who contemplate problems, he suggested they advise giving the Committee on Conciliation a call; the Chair is Bernice Epstein, or the Faculty Center can be called for telephone referral.

The Committee on Committees is developing its annual survey for distribution to the General Faculty to indicate interest in service on University committees. The effort expended on such committee service is a component of the 3-part duties of teaching, research, and service. He asked Senators to urge members of their constituency to fill out and return the survey.

Dr. Rehm reported that item 12 on today's agenda, proposals from the Research Policy Committee regarding Technology Transfer, has been placed on hold. It will be introduced today, but discussion will occur at a later date, and Senator Witte would discuss that in her report.

Dr. Rehm said that on October 6 he had occasion to meet with the Faculty Chairmen of ASU and NAU; the purpose of that meeting was to investigate methods by which better communications could be established between the faculty and the Board of Regents. A presentation was made to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Regents in Flagstaff to investigate ways of doing this; he said that NAU is

very interested in a Faculty Regent position that would emulate the position established for Student Regent, and ASU is also interested. Dr. Rehm said he has not heard a lot of interest on the part of UA faculty for a Faculty Regent, but he has heard interest expressed in establishing some sort of information exchange between the Regents and the faculty. He said he would report back to the Senate as information becomes available.

Dr. Rehm reported that he had been contacted by an Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness (EEC) Task Force Teaching Subcommittee member, a faculty member from ASU, requesting faculty names that she could use as a reference group from this campus. She requested names of faculty who were both good teachers and good researchers, and he said he was able to provide them.

REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY: No report.

REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT OF ASUA: Senator Carranza said that Arizona Students Association (ASA) presented to the Board of Regents Finance Committee their annual report on tuition and fees, for the tuition and fees policy setting. He said the Council of Presidents had presented a recommendation to the committee in which they proposed the percentage of the cost of education that in-state students pay increase on an incremental basis of 20-25 percent over a five-year period. ASA's position this year was to draft criteria to be put into place before the Council of Presidents moves ahead in increasing the percentage of the cost of education. Criteria that was presented to the Board included monitoring devices for a system in which data can be obtained for the entire University system as a whole on financial aid availability, and the ratio of loans and self-help as compared to grant and gift aid, among others. The Finance Committee moved to adopt the Council of Presidents' recommendation, and the tuition and fees setting policy will be discussed at the December Board of Regents meeting. If any Senators are interested in a copy of the report, he will provide a few copies to the Faculty Center, and he may also be contacted.

Senator Carranza reported that the ASUA Scholarship Program is alive and flourishing, and ASUA hopes to reach its goal of \$50,000 for an endowment fund.

ASUA launched, with its Student Health Advisory Committee and one Student Senator, Project Stay Safe, a concentrated effort on behalf of student government in promoting wellness in our University community, and the project is going extremely well, he reported. The Pima County Department of Health made a major endorsement to the program last weekend, and allocated a large sum of money to continue the effort.

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD: Senator Silverman, noting that Dr. Rehm had indicated NAU is interested in establishing a Faculty Regent, asked what the status of this subject is. He wondered whether the Faculty Senate might want to take a position on this issue. Dr. Rehm responded that, as a result of the meeting of Chairmen of the Faculty, a proposal was submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee about a Faculty Regent, and it was discussed. He was not aware of the outcome. He added that the Senate at NAU was in favor of an individual Faculty Regent, modeled on the rotating Student Regent position. Mr. Silverman asked if Dr. Rehm could find out what happened in that committee discussion. Dr. Rehm said he had talked with a member of that committee the end of last week, and discussion is on hold at the present time.

Senator J. O'Brien asked Senator Carranza why there was a need for ASA since

there is a Student Regent. Senator Carranza said that although the Student Regent represents students, a lobbying body is still necessary. He wondered whether a Faculty Regent could adequately represent faculty without an equivalent to ASA in place for faculty. He said ASA seats the Student Regent as an ex officio member so that ASA can impart a great deal of information to the Student Regent. Dr. Rehm said that the Faculty Regent concept as proposed by NAU would be an individual acting as a representative of all faculty in the University system. Since the concerns of the faculty at the three universities are different, and since it would be a rotating situation, it might be difficult to represent fairly all the interests, thus presenting some drawbacks. He added that faculty at ASU have a lobbying group, structured to do much that ASA does for students, but it is only for ASU faculty. In the past, he said, there has been an Arizona Universities Faculty Council (AUFCC), which is not active at present. He called upon Senator Roemer, who said she acted as Treasurer a few years ago, until her term expired, but there is no one available to replace her.

Senator Ewbank said he wanted to comment on a piece of mail he received last week, a University catalog of courses available in the fall. He said he had already administered mid-term exams when he received this brochure. In light of the concern for good examples of public relations, and in light of the efficiency element of EEC, he urged that if the November publication, since this appeared to be the July publication, doesn't get off the ground soon, the University might want to consider saving the cost of distribution and jettison the publication.

Senator Fleming asked Dr. Rehm if he was soliciting names now for the EEC Task Force Subcommittee on Teaching. Dr. Rehm responded that the request coincided in a timely fashion with a scheduled meeting of the Committee on Committees, and he had already submitted names they had provided. He believed this group might meet twice with the subcommittee.

Senator Fleming asked Dr. Hasselmo if he could indicate the membership on the newly created committee to review teaching evaluation at the University. Dr. Hasselmo said he did not have the list with him, but that it would be chaired by Sarah Dinham, from the College of Education, and does have representation from the Senate leadership as well as from recent winners of the Burlington Northern Teaching Award program, and a faculty member who teaches very large courses effectively, a graduate student, and at least one under-graduate, in order to have broad representation. He said he would be glad to provide the full membership, but did not have it with him.

Senator Goetinck said that he had received this morning a disturbing letter that accompanied a copy of a resolution passed by the Chinese-American Citizens Alliance in which they unanimously decided to boycott the University of Arizona. He did not know what was behind this, and asked for an explanation if it could be provided. Dr. Rehm said he was familiar with this document, and it was the result of a long drawn out process. He said this case had gone through the appropriate channels at the University and Regents levels, and the solution reached at those levels was not satisfactory to an individual concerned, and this boycott is a result of that dissatisfaction. He said there appeared little that can be done because the case had been reviewed appropriately, and would require a change in decision on the part of the Board of Regents to satisfy this individual. Senator Hetrick said he was Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure at the time this case was brought forward, and

confirmed that it did indeed go through all the due process stages, and that this had occurred at least ten years ago.

Senator Woodard said this is the third week of the on-line registration system, and he asked Senator Butler for a brief report. Senator Butler said he was happy to report that, as of today, approximately 13,000 students have accessed the system and registered with a minimum of difficulties or technical problems. He said Saturdays are extremely busy; the hours are Saturday through Thursday, 7 a.m. until 10 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. on Fridays, totaling 100 hours per week. Reports are being provided to department heads regarding current status of classes, and classes are starting to fill up. He said they have received a number of compliments on the new telephone registration system.

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Jones said that the committee is very pleased that, as Dr. Rehm reported, Chapters 3 and 4 of UHAP have been transmitted to the President. He said the committee has met three times since the last Senate meeting, primarily to review the Promotion/Tenure and Promotion/Continuing Status Report, which is being presented to the Senate today.

REPORT FROM THE BUDGET POLICY COMMITTEE: Dr. Rehm said the committee will meet for the first time on November 16, to elect a Chair and to meet with the Senate Executive Committee to review its charge.

REPORT FROM THE INSTRUCTION & CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE: No report.

REPORT FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Witte said that Dr. Lytle's report on the Undergraduate Research Grant Program and her comments later in Item 12 would constitute the Committee's report.

REPORT FROM THE STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE: Senator Mishel said the committee is continuing to work on revising the proposal submitted to the Senate last spring, and is also working on a faculty survey for input on the major items contained in that proposal.

APPROVAL OF CURRICULAR MATERIAL: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 87/88-19) to approve Section I, Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 3.

APPROVAL OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES COMPLETED AUGUST 13, 1987: It was moved, seconded, and unanimously voted (motion 87/88-20) to approve the list of candidates for degrees completed August 13, 1987.

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH GRANT PROGRAM: Dr. Rehm requested and was granted approval for Dr. Clifford Lytle to address the Senate on this subject. Dr. Lytle said the University experienced a delightful surprise last April when the Vice President for Research announced the establishment of this program. There are three component parts to the program, he said: (1) \$14,000 was allocated to provide students with an opportunity to do some research on their own, not associated with any class requirements or work; (2) a faculty mentorship program was established so that each one of these students would have a faculty mentor with whom to work; and (3) a small sum of money was provided so that once each year an Undergraduate Research Forum could be conducted on campus so that these young scholars would be able to present their papers, their research and their findings in a forum not unlike the professional meetings to which many of them, hopefully, will be going on later on in their careers.

"The Undergraduate Research Grant Program is administered by the Honors Program; however, it is open to all students in the University, not simply Honors students. The decisions with reference to which students will receive grants are made by the Undergraduate Research Grant Committee, which is comprised of Marlys Witte, Surgery; Nat de Gennaro, Business; John Garcia, Mexican-American Studies; Charles Sherry, English; Dan Bollerman, student representative; and myself. We had little time to advertise the program; however, the little promotion that we gave it produced 96 student applications. We were able to award grants to 23 of those 96 students, and the average grants ranged from \$500 to \$700, most of which was allocated as summer stipend to support them throughout the course of the summer, though there were small funds allocated for either travel or supplies.

"It was interesting to note that the applications came from all disciplines throughout the University. The Committee, which is not a true reflection of all the component parts of the University but the endeavor was to make it such a reflection, was very concerned to ensure that all aspects of the University were represented. The grants ran the gamut from Arts, Sciences, and Engineering, and included a young student who painted a mural at the Chicanos for Las Casas, a retirement home on the south side. We had a wonderful representation from so many areas within the University.

"We have planned the Undergraduate Research Forum for February 24. It will be an all-day forum on campus, starting at 8:00 a.m. We have divided the 23 students into panels and clustered them together, hoping that most of the research projects within each cluster would be related, and they will have an opportunity to present a written abstract of their work, for those who are interested, and to also present their research over a period of 15 or 20 minutes. During the evening we are going to have a dinner for the scholars and for their mentors, and hopefully have a prestigious faculty member probably from outside the University who will come in and discuss the situation with the group. We want this forum to be open to the University community at large. We want to encourage faculty and students to attend it, we are going to spend money to make sure it is adequately advertised, and we want this to be one of the several rather prominent events that will occur during next year, which is the Year of the Undergraduate.

"We are also pleased to advise you that this program has already been institutionalized. We have taken stock of the various problems that confronted us last spring, and hopefully we have adopted procedures and remedies so that those will not recur. Dr. Wilkening has assured us that we will receive funding in each of the successive years so that it will be an ongoing program. I know that many of us realize that exposing our students to the unknown, to provide them with an opportunity of discovery--this is one of the great joys that we experience as faculty. We have had many comments, not simply from the students involved, but from faculty also, just delighted with the prospects of this program."

Senator Fleming asked when applications will be available for students who are interested in applying. Dr. Lytle said the program will be advertised at the very beginning of the semester, and applications will be due March 1. He said this schedule would remedy the problem with time constraints experienced last year.

Dr. Rehm thanked Dr. Lytle for sharing this information with the Senate.

YEAR TWO OF THE LIBRARY'S SERIALS REVIEW PROJECT: Senator Phipps, Acting University Librarian, said she would elaborate on the October 9 3-D memo, outlining the procedure that will be followed this year, with the goal of continuing cancellation of serials in order to keep up with the expected 15 percent annual increase in prices for serial subscriptions. She said she wanted to talk about some of the change processes from last year.

"Last year, as we began this process, we set a three-year target of canceling at least \$300,000 worth of serial subscriptions. Last year's goal was \$100,000 and we were able, at the end of the year, to cancel \$96,000 worth of serials. Approximately 1/3 of the subjects were covered, and this year, because we are as certain as we were last year, we are in the mode to cancel yet another \$100,000 worth of serial titles, at least. At the beginning of this year, knowing we were faced with this 15 percent increase, and knowing also that our state-funded acquisitions budget received no increase, we did ask the administration for, and received, a \$190,000 supplement from local funds in order for us to continue this process and provide orderly input by the faculty, so that we might meet our financial obligations in the serials area.

"This fall, in the second year of the review, we will be reviewing the subjects of philosophy, psychology, archaeology, biography, geography, economics and finance, political science, music, engineering, drama, linguistics, literature of selected languages, Center for Creative Photography serials, serials from the Central Reference collection, and serials in the oriental studies collection. In order to balance the budget for next year, we will review this year those titles that we might cancel at the end of this year. In order to meet the expected 15 percent rise in serials prices next year, we have set a target that each subject area must cancel at least 15 percent of the total dollar figure expended in that area. This is the only way we can survive next year. Last year, we did not set a specific percentage target. Recommendations by the faculty fell far short of what we needed to cut; we will go back to those subjects that last year fell short of the 15 percent target, and re-review them this year.

She said that the process has been improved this year, because the Library will be able to provide not only the costs of the periodical titles on the lists that will be sent to faculty, but also lists of titles showing increases over the last two or three years so faculty can get an idea of the trend regarding particular titles.

"Faculty input to this process is still crucial to our achieving the targets with the least amount of impact on support for research and teaching. We have restructured the process so that librarians are reviewing the lists in those specific subject areas I mentioned and they are assigning a rank to each title on the list: 1 is a core title in this subject and should not be canceled under any circumstances; 2 is a very important journal in this field and probably should not ever be canceled; 3 means if the 4's on this list do not add up to 15 percent of the dollar figure allocated to this subject, this might be a title to cancel); 4 indicates this title is recommended for cancellation this year. The librarian's review will actually include enough 4's to reach the 15% target. As soon as librarians have completed reviewing their subject area, those lists will start going out to identified faculty in the departments related to that subject. We ask that the lists be back by March 15 so that the committee can examine whether or not we have met our target in those areas. Between March 15 and April 15, a final recommendation will be made by the

Library about cancellations; that list will then be made available to the faculty so that an appeal can be made if necessary. The committee and the administration of the Library are going to act as an appeals board if faculty want to disagree at that point with what we are recommending for cancellation. I can tell you that our bottom line is we must meet 15 percent in the subject area. If something is appealed, we will ask for other recommendations for cancellations. All of the cancellations must be made by June 30 in order for us to achieve these savings in next year's budget.

"This is a very time-consuming process. We feel that it is very important that the faculty take part in this, and that is why we have designed the process this way, and why we asked for extra money in order to allow us to pay these huge subscriptions so we can spend the year reviewing this. We want to do as little damage as possible to the collection in this process, and so I urge you to encourage your colleagues in the departments to take this seriously and to give us what they can. It is very important for us to have faculty input."

Senator McGraw asked which fields reviewed last year would be reopened for review this year. Senator Phipps said art, biological sciences, education, and Latin American history would be reviewed again. Senator Epstein asked what criteria are used to decide which rank to assign. Senator Phipps said librarians have developed a list of criteria to be applied in making these recommendations: criteria of relevance, area of collection intensity, is it supporting an undergraduate or graduate program, type of publication (newsletter or broadside), quality of articles in the publication, retrospective usefulness of the publication, language of the publication, the amount of space it takes up, availability elsewhere on campus, availability in the state and in the interlibrary loan network, accessibility (is it covered in major abstracting and indexing sources), the format, the quality of the paper, availability on microform, if in a foreign language whether it is available in translation, who is the requestor, what is the cost, and what are the Library's holdings in this field.

Senator Hetrick said that, given this necessity, the Library deserves a great deal of commendation for the procedures they are following, and it is much appreciated. He asked if the Library is able to use the citation index in any way to help in this process. Senator Jones responded that in the Science Library librarians are using two pieces of information provided by the citation index, as well as an impact factor provided by the publisher of that index which indicates how many times articles are cited in a given year. Senator Hetrick asked how librarians take into account the fact that some journals will frequently be of use to several departments. Senator Phipps said every effort is being made to identify all individuals to which a journal is relevant; lists will be sent to each department involved. In addition, she said, all lists will be placed on reserve in the Main and Science Libraries; faculty who have more than one field of interest will be invited to review those lists and provide input. Specific lists will be mailed to those requesting them. Senator Hetrick asked President Koffler if this is one of the ways in which the University is surviving the budget cutbacks of recent years. President Koffler responded that examining the Library's holdings each year, to minimize unnecessary holdings, is quite an activity in its own right apart from budget considerations; the serials holdings increase significantly every year by virtue of the fact that more and more is published. Some management of this area must occur. Senator Hetrick said that 15 percent seemed a little high, but the review appears essential because the cost of journals is becoming absurd.

Senator Dickstein said that the review underway at the UA is not unique: every major research university library either began this project years ago or is now starting the review, and UA's 15 percent is not high in comparison. She said that the value of the dollar has had a significant effect on prices due to the fact that many European publishers have taken over some U.S. publishing houses; the European rates are then in effect, even though the journal may have been published in the U.S.

President Koffler said he would like to add that he had made presentations every year to the Board of Regents and the Legislature pointing out the inflationary differentials, especially in non-U.S. materials costs, resulting in lowered value and purchasing power of the dollar. He said the response has been very positive, but the problem with serials price increases goes way beyond that. Senator Phipps agreed that this is both a national and international problem, referred to in the Library world as "the serials crisis." She said she had requested additional time from the Senate in January or February to show a slide-tape presentation that clearly identifies the problem; there are reportedly several international corporations that are cornering the market on scholarly journals, some publishing as many as 550 journals in one field. These publishers set the prices, and because libraries cannot control those prices, the problem is not going to go away. With the fluctuating dollar figure, an even higher inflation factor might be in evidence next year. Some universities are facing as much as 19 or 20 percent annual increase.

REPORT ON PROMOTION/TENURE AND PROMOTION/CONTINUING STATUS: Senator Jones said the report, included with today's meeting call, was provided by the Provost's Office. He thanked the Provost for the detailed breakdown by women and minorities which was included with the report. He said the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC) was not sure how the Senate would like APPC to review this report annually, so APPC developed some comments and observations on the affirmative action aspects. He said the committee would appreciate comments later on whether this is what the Senate is interested in hearing.

In addition to the statistics included in the report, APPC examined a report prepared for the Board of Regents by the Affirmative Action Office entitled "The University of Arizona Demographic Study of Minority Faculty, 1977-86" as well as selected portions of the Annual Affirmative Action Report for 1986-87. Senator Jones said he also spoke with a representative from the Association of Women Faculty about affirmative action issues. Senator Jones noted that President Koffler made several strong statements about affirmative action in his annual address to the faculty, and the subject has been recently reported in the Wildcat and the Tucson Citizen. Senator Jones said he had divided comments today into two sections: one for general observations and the second for a more detailed review of affirmative action aspects of the report. He said the committee had particularly noted changes in the recommendations as they go through the various levels of evaluation, from the departmental committee, the department head, the college committee, dean, university committee, provost, appeals, and then final decisions. One example was the College of Medicine, where the initial recommendations of individuals for promotion began with 16 pro, 0 against; it basically remained that way, with a couple of minor changes, winding up at 16 and 0 on the other side. That happens in a similar fashion for several different departments, he said. Others, however, take a curious nose dive in the middle of this process. The Humanities statistics begin at 7 and 0 and in the middle of the report, at the university committee, there is a 1 and 6 split, finally changed to 3 and 4.

Without more information the committee is at a loss to explain any of these differences.

Senator Witte asked if APPC had information that indicated which of these promotion/tenure committees are elected, as in the College of Medicine, and which are not. Senator Jones: "I do not have that information. We might want to explore that." He said he had asked Provost Hasselmo to share with us today what he views as the role of the University Committee and report briefly on the progress toward developing a university-wide criteria for promotion/tenure and promotion/continuing status.

Dr. Hasselmo: "The goal of the University Committee is that of trying to ensure that the institution maintains some kind of institution-wide standards. We do have an institution that is quite diverse, and it is difficult to impose very detailed criteria and specific statements on that institution because, for example, the evaluation of the creative work of a studio artist as compared with the work of a chemist as compared with the work of an English professor--there are fundamental differences, and one has to use judgment and different types of criteria in order to evaluate that work. What the University Committee does is to review all of the dossiers that come through and try to establish that in terms of the particular discipline a case has been made for promotion and tenure. This is a very important task, and one that rests very heavily on the collective judgment of a group of people who have experience with evaluation of work in various disciplines. That to me is a very important task that this committee performs. In discussing the role of the committee with the committee, I've told the committee that they ought to apply in a straightforward manner the quality criteria in teaching and research as they see them and as they are to some extent formulated in the University-wide policies and with greater specificity, college and departmental policies, which are all available to the committee. If they see special circumstances, then they probably should not act upon those special circumstances--they should draw those to my attention, and as we enter into discussions with Deans about final decisions, if the University Committee's recommendation goes against the recommendation that comes from the college, then I would have an opportunity to review those special circumstances and I will take whatever steps are necessary to review those circumstances. I think in general what you are seeing is a University Committee that is applying the criteria in that kind of straightforward manner, strict and demanding as it should be. Then you see on either side the special circumstances and in making my decisions I always look at some of those special circumstances. We have felt that there is a lack of institution-wide criteria, and last year we convened a group of former Promotion and Tenure Committee chairs and asked them to undertake a review of criteria, such as they are, and to make recommendations concerning the refinement of those criteria. We felt, however, that the first step we should take was to solicit from as many comparable institutions as possible the statements that they have, and we have as of today 25 responses to that inquiry. I think we have 25 versions of University-wide promotion and tenure criteria. I have called another meeting of the P & T Committee Chairs in order now to proceed with the development of a draft of what may become a statement concerning institution-wide promotion and tenure criteria. That is clearly a matter that would have to be considered carefully through the faculty governance system."

Senator Epstein said that for the last year and a half she has chaired the Committee on Conciliation; the major grievances are those related to promotion

and tenure, and they must come before Conciliation before proceeding on to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. One matter of concern, she said, and perhaps this could be addressed while the matter is under review, is that the individual should be informed of the vote of the University Committee, which seems to be a crucial point in the process, "before the position is totally hardened." She said she would make a strong recommendation that even though the University Committee's recommendation is provisional, and the final authority rests with the Provost and the President, that there be some communication to the individual between the University Committee's vote and the next step, with an appeal process implemented at this point, or some kind of intervening action. She believed there would be far fewer problems in the long run than there are currently. She also noted that there are so few or absent or unclear procedures about how the various committees along the way function, that this has also presented a big problem. She said she was tossing it out for discussion or consideration somewhere that this process could be truncated periodically, or at least once, so there is an opportunity for the candidate to have some notion which way it's going.

Senator Hetrick said he would like to second the first point that was made: the candidate who is coming up with an appeal is sometimes at a great disadvantage because the person knows only that the University Committee has recommended either pro or con. He thought it would be important if the votes from that committee were made available to candidates in question, thus saving some grievance procedures. He asked if anyone had a feel for how many universities of this size and stature have such a University-wide committee. He said he knows that not all of them do. Dr. Hasselmo said he didn't know what the proportions might be, but when his decision deviates from the University Committee's decision, it is almost without exception on a split vote in the University Committee. He said he wondered if reference was being made to the fact that in the statistics one doesn't know whether this was a unanimous recommendation by the University Committee or whether it was a 5-4 vote, and therefore becomes important because a severely split committee suggests that there is something that must be looked into with special care. He said that occasionally he has gone back to the P & T Committee to discuss those cases, not to get them to change their vote but to better understand why they saw the case differently; sometimes it's a matter of very different perspective. As far as feedback to the candidate is concerned, he said, that is an issue the Senate has discussed in the UHAP draft, paragraphs 3.17 and 4.18; the language says that upon request, a written summary will be given of the reason for denial of promotion and tenure. He said this is a matter that would require change in the Board of Regents policy, and will be broached by the President with his colleagues to try to establish whether it is feasible to go forward with a request to change that policy. He said that otherwise it put him in the situation of trying to provide informal information to candidates who contact him, and he has to tread a fine line because he cannot reveal everything that he is party to, but at the same time he tries to indicate what the major issues seem to have been.

Senator Jones said he would like to proceed to the affirmative action aspects. As widely reported, basically the University is making little progress in terms of getting more women and minorities tenured on this campus. One of the positive aspects, he said, is that there seem to be at least more women in the tenure-eligible ranks. Since this a long-term process, results of these efforts will not be seen probably for some years. In looking over the variety of statistics and results, APCC had several recommendations. Three of these

are in support of proposals that are already in progress: one involves more appointments of women and minorities with tenure initially; a second is to make joint appointments when that is appropriate. Also, already taking place, the special meetings held on campus for tenure-eligible and continuing-eligible women and minority candidates; these meetings provide them with a good opportunity to hear from others on campus about the requirements and to give additional support for the process. He said APPC also recommended that, for monitoring purposes, there be additional statistics provided on women and minorities at the second- and fourth-year review levels. APPC can examine the final statistics, "but we don't know what's taking place in the middle of the process so it's very difficult to make any conclusions about what's happening there." Also, he said, APPC would like to see additional statistics on the number of tenure-eligible and continuing-eligible appointments; preliminary statistics are available on the number of tenure-eligible women, but not for continuing-eligible or minorities.

Senator Jones thought it would also be useful to have follow-up information from women and minorities who leave this institution to determine why they are leaving: are they getting better jobs elsewhere with better salaries? are the conditions here such that they present problems for them working with us? He said that the University's Affirmative Action Officer is considering looking into this. He said APPC also thinks it would be useful if the Affirmative Action Officer worked with the learned societies to get a better idea of what the available applicants are in an area. It was the committee's understanding that the statistics being used are up to five years or more old. He said many of the societies, such as the American Chemical Society, and others, provide statistics broken down by minorities and women on a much more current basis, and that it might be useful for the Affirmative Action Office to explore the possibility of working more closely with some of those learned societies in order to obtain more up-to-date information.

Senator Dickstein said that a quick look at the statistics does seem to indicate that at the University Committee level a lot of changes occur. She wondered whether this is a unique year, or whether previous reports could be compared to see if this is common. She said she was concerned how the University Committee seemed to reverse those who are closer to the subject areas and closer to knowing about the discipline and the quality of writing and research.

Senator Jones said that in previous reports to the Senate that he could remember, similar spreads were encountered, and there seems to be consistency within some colleges; in other areas it seems to take this dip in the middle level with the Dean and the University Committee. He said he thought the pattern here is not substantially different from what we've seen in previous years. Senator Dickstein asked if college patterns could definitely be noted, and whether APPC could review 50 years statistics and see if the differences occur in the same colleges consistently. Senator Jones said he did not examine each of these areas in relationship to the previous year/years statistics, and that the committee might want to take a look at this.

Senator Fahey said that Senator Jones had commented that there were women in tenure-eligible, but not many in tenured positions. She said her concern with that comment is that it has been made for at least the last ten years, and her feeling, with no data available, is there is a revolving door: women come in with tenure-eligible positions and leave before they achieve tenure. She

wondered if there is any way to examine that. Senator Jones believed there is; he said he had asked for follow-up statistics for women and minority who leave the institution, so some information could be developed from an exit interview. In addition, he said, what happens at the 2- and 4-year reviews would also be useful, particularly if a unit keeps hiring women whom they turn out at their 4th-year review level.

Senator Witte said that some years ago the Committee of Eleven presented an exhaustive report on affirmative action, the result of reviewing stacks of computer printouts at that time. She said she believed that a motion had been passed in the Faculty Senate that there would be an annual report about the progress of affirmative action that would follow a specific format which was provided that would allow the Senate to come to grips with the kinds of questions raised today. To her knowledge, she said, not even one year has this report been presented to the Faculty Senate. She said she was mentioning this as a point of information. [Secretary's Note: A review of the Senate Minutes and Index was undertaken; the report was mentioned in the Chairman of the Faculty's Report of May 1983, but no action was taken by the Senate.]

Dr. Hasselmo said he would be glad to provide that report if the Senate wished, and that there have been some exit interviews with women and minorities who have left the University. So far, he said, it has been on a very casual basis. Dr. Ford has recommended that exit interviews be undertaken in a more systematic fashion; he believes this would be a wise thing to do, and it will be initiated. He said the Affirmative Action Office has also instituted a two-year study of terminations and is going to study a sample of male, female, and minority faculty members. Dr. Hasselmo said the Provost's Office is funding, together with the Association of Women Faculty, a joint study on obstacles to promotion and tenure specifically for women faculty members. He said he hoped that we can diagnose this so we can be in a better position to avoid some of these pitfalls.

Senator Cusanovich said there may be another source of information: NORAs. Statistics must now be available on the fractions of males and females applying for any given job. Dr. Hasselmo said information like that is available, but how complete it is he wasn't sure. "But when women and minorities are known to have reached a certain stage of the search process, that is reported. And one can think of a number of cases where such offers have been made and turned down, and there have been senior women faculty who have turned us down. With regard to target-of-opportunity appointments, we have extended eight to women and minorities in the last three years. Target-of-opportunity appointment has come to be a solid, significant factor in our efforts to recruit women and minorities. We intend to continue to take that approach.

President Koffler said, "Some departments are doing an excellent job pursuing outstanding candidates and are very adept at doing so. To my subjective observation, the same degree of zest and imagination is not used in pursuing specifically minorities and women. I think that can be done... I think you have to go after the candidates with enthusiasm. Some departments do much better than others." Senator Jones said that if he recalled correctly, one of the criteria for evaluation of department heads and deans is affirmative action efforts they make each year. President Koffler agreed, and said he puts it to everybody that they pursue this effort and encourage affirmative action. Essentially, he said, the administration will try to use every vehicle at its disposal to encourage affirmative action.

Dr. Hasselmo said he had asked all deans for recruitment plans for 1988-89, and as part of the discussion and review of those recruitment plans, affirmative action will have a very prominent place.

Senator Epstein said she would like to go back to the promotion and tenure and promotion and continuing status process and move that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee examine this process and some of the data to determine where discrepancies exist--are they the same in all colleges, and do they persist in some more than others--and perhaps consider the opportunity for introduction of conciliation at an earlier stage to prevent disagreements and avoid the legal ramifications. President Koffler said he had to give a personal reaction to this: he believes it is a process that has to take its course. "If you look at the statistics, you will see not only the decision of the University committee but also that of the Provost. Until the Provost is through with a case, I don't know what you can do with it. How do you appeal something that hasn't been finished yet?" He said he believed that when Senator Epstein mentioned "appeals" that she meant, perhaps, arbitration. "I don't think there's arbitration involved...It's a question of judging." He said that if a case had not been persuasively made, the question might arise of missing materials, but that the case had to be referred back to the initial committees; "We can't arbitrate or start looking at new data during the process. So at the moment I cannot quite see how you would initiate any appeals early--I don't think that can be done."

Senator Epstein: "If I may respond, I think it's more a weighting of the material rather than the absence or presence of something. Perhaps those closer to the situation may weight the data in a particular way. If appealing is not the right thing, then perhaps some opportunity may be given to a candidate, especially when there are split decisions on the University Committee, or a hearing of some sort, some kind of intervention because I see that as heading off some more serious problems later on." Senator Epstein said she believes a lot of the grief that the University encounters in the press and the courts from candidates who feel they have not been fairly handled could be averted if there were a better process. She therefore moved that the Academic Personnel Policy Committee at least review this matter to see if there is any possibility for preventive action to be filed.

Senator Witte said she thought that in President Koffler's comments the real issue is whether peer review is a secret process or whether it thrives in an open process. She said a legitimate question is being raised along the way with the promotion and tenure process. She mentioned that there are universities where the whole process is completely open. Senator Paplanus asked Senator Witte if she could name an institution where the promotion/tenure process is completely open. Senator Witte: "I can say there are institutions where there's a lot more open and reasons are provided at every step and you can see your file."

PROPOSALS FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE REGARDING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER:

Senator Witte said four proposed policies had been distributed to the Senate with this meeting call: Research Fraud, Creation of University Committee on Ethics and Commitment, Conflict of Commitment, and Facilities Mis-Use. She said these policies would be reintroduced at perhaps the January meeting because the administration has expressed some concerns.

She said the documents are the result of over a year and a half of work by the

Research Policy Committee. The committee has met with the Technology Transfer Committee a number of times and with the Vice President and Associate Vice President for Research. She said the committee also reviewed various institutional guidelines by universities as well as major research fraud cases. The committee will continue to work on these documents over the next few months and would appreciate input from the faculty. The draft documents will be appended to these Senate Minutes so that they can be reviewed.

NEW BUSINESS: Senator Silverman moved (motion 87/88-21) that the Faculty Senate take a position in support of the Faculty Regent concept; that motion was seconded. Dr. Rehm said that normally when a motion of this nature comes before the Senate, it is scheduled for discussion in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and will appear on the next Senate agenda.

Senator Witte said she would also like to place an item on the agenda for February or March which she will entitle Naming and Renaming of Buildings or Parts Thereof. She said there is an established faculty procedure for honorary degrees. "Just as I would not want something to be called Witte Way or Beigel Towers, I think at some point the faculty has to come to grips with the naming and renaming of buildings." Dr. Rehm noted that there is a standing Building Naming Committee at the University. Senator Witte asked if renaming recommendations come through the Faculty Senate. Dr. Rehm said the committee serves as an advisory group to the President. Senator Witte responded that she would like to see renaming treated as honorary degrees are.

Dr. Rehm reminded everyone this is Homecoming Week, and a number of departments have alumni programs set up for the latter end of this week; he encouraged everyone to attend.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

---

George W. Ridge, Jr., Secretary

MOTIONS PASSED AT THE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 2, 1987

- 87/88-18 Ratification of election of Dr. Paul Consroe, Pharmacy College
- 87/88-19 Approval of Curriculum Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 3, Section I.
- 87/88-20 Approval of candidates for degrees completed August 13, 1987.

MOTIONS SCHEDULED FOR ACTION AT NEXT MEETING

- 87/88-21 Motion to approve Faculty Regent concept.

MATTERS PENDING

- Research Policy Committee: Four draft policies (attached to these Minutes)
- Student Affairs Policy Committee: Proposal for the Recognition of Student/Faculty Interaction as an Integral Component of Effective Teaching

DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THESE MINUTES

- Budget Policy Committee membership roster
- Research Policy Committee drafts: Policy on Fraud in Research, Conflict of Commitment Policy, Facilities Mis-Use Policy, University Committee on Ethics and Commitment