

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
December 3, 2007**

**Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:**

**<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>**

**Visit the faculty governance webpage at:**

**<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/>**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert P. Mitchell at 3:05 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 140.

**Present:** Senators Aleamoni, Bergsma, Christenson, Conway, Cuello, Cusanovich, Dahlgran, O. Davis, DeSorda, Effken, Engel, Foley, Garcia, Green, Gruener, Hildebrand, Howell, Jenkins, Jones, Knutson, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mosher, Neish, Pavao-Zuckerman, Pintozzi, Sander, Schlager, Shelton, Silverman, Slugocki, Smith, Spece, Sterling Ulreich, Weinand, Willerton and Witte. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

**Absent:** Senators Bruce, Burd, Cromwell, D. Davis, Estrada, Joens, McKee, Mountford, Mutchler, Nolan, Ruiz, San Martin, Sarid, Songer, St. John and Strittmatter.

**2. OPEN SESSION**

Senator Silverman displayed an overhead comparing faculty diversity trends from 1996 and 2006. He expressed incredulity that in spite of the Millennium Project and the efforts of a variety of campus diversity organizations over the past ten years, the percentages of minority and female faculty who are tenured or tenure-track have barely risen 1% in ten years. The percentage of non-tenure track minorities has risen only partial percentage points, and the number of females in this category has stayed the same. The Faculty Senate may want to consider these numbers and suggest some action. Presiding Officer Mitchell reminded the Senate that if anyone wishes to suggest some action, s/he may do so during the "new business" agenda item at the end of this meeting.

**3. REPORTS**

**3A. ASUA**

ASUA Representative Jon Engel reported in President Bruce's absence that ASUA has worked hard with GPSC to prepare the students' tuition proposal to ABOR later this week. He thanked President Shelton and the administrative offices for their assistance in this process. ASUA is also reviewing the Teacher-Course Evaluations and has met with R. Kroc, J. Hogle and Chair of the Faculty Howell with the goal of making the TCE a more useful document to both students and faculty.

**3B. GPSC President Catherine Neish**

GPSC President Catherine Neish reported that Vice President for Student Affairs M. Vito is creating an information-gathering group with a goal of writing the Request for Proposals for campus childcare by the end of this year. GPSC is requesting an increase in the minimum half-time F.T.E. Graduate Teaching Assistant's salaries from \$9K to \$12.5K, which is in line with cost-of-living and with the average minimum half-time salaries of our peer institutions.

**3C. Faculty Officers' Report**

Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell alerted Senators to the revised agenda and attachment on Senators' desks today. The January 28 meeting of the Faculty Senate will be in Law 146.

**3D. Provost Eugene Sander**

Provost Eugene Sander said he has received the student- and Senate-endorsed letter about the RFP for a child care facility and has asked Vice President Vito, who has been previously involved with groups trying to establish child care on campus, to take the lead on this item. He hopes the internal search for a Vice President for Instruction will be concluding very soon. Candidates for the Dean of the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture will be interviewing in mid-January, and he hopes to bring in candidates for the Dean of the Mel and Enid Zuckerman College of Public Health shortly after January 16<sup>th</sup>. College of Nursing Dean Marjorie Isenberg has announced her intention to retire on June 30<sup>th</sup>, so the Provost will also be forming a search committee for that deanship.

**3E. President Robert N. Shelton**

President Shelton said that he anticipates the Regents will approve tuition and mandatory fee increases at their meeting later this week. He is proposing increases of \$450 for undergraduate residents and \$2350 for undergraduate non-residents, with similar percentages for graduate students, plus an additional \$40 student fee. He complimented student leaders Bruce and Neish, who worked closely with him throughout the year on the tuition proposals. Their presentations at the recent public tuition hearings were among the best, most cogent and on-target presentations of the evening. President Shelton will also be presenting the UA's Strategic Plan to the Regents. He thanked Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) Chair Miranda Joseph and the other members of SPBAC for sharing their collective wisdom. His presentation to the Regents will focus on themes from his state of the University Address, mainly on people and quality. He will make specific statements about how shared governance empowers him, and how the UA's priorities are consistent with and supportive of the governor's priorities and of the "2020" long-term vision strategic plan of the Regents. He will highlight the UA's commitment to graduate and certify more Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) teachers, the "Arizona Assurance Plan" which places new emphasis on need-based financial aid to make the U of A accessible to all qualified students and will be partially funded by the tuition increase, the UA's plans for growth not only in undergraduate population but also in graduate and professional student enrollments, strategies for retention and graduation rates, and he will emphasize the return on investment when the state provides funding for the UA's research programs. He will forward the text and PowerPoint slides of his ABOR presentation to the Senate.

Turning to the University's state-funded portion of the budget, he explained that multiple groups are working on the question of how to fund Arizona's universities in this day and age: the legislature, the executive branch and the Regents. The legislature's Higher Education Committee leaders Burns and O'Halleran are attempting to move away from the enrollment growth funding model. The governor is also engaged in discussions about funding the university system. The UA had previously submitted a very aggressive budget request which the Regents had endorsed. Collectively, the three universities were requesting about a 20% increase in operating budgets. However, with the state's economic downturn, the governor feels this is an unrealistic request and wants to work together. Governor Napolitano's Strategic Planning and Budgeting Director, James Apperson, has asked for a whole new budget request but the Regents have decided to identify priorities instead. The UA's "continuation" budget was for \$26M and the "strategic investment" budget was for \$47M and then there are added funding requests for building renewal and new construction at the College of Medicine-Phoenix. President Shelton met with SPBAC and decided to continue to focus on people in his budget prioritization and he decided that the UA's top priority is the \$26M base continuation budget, which contains the \$13.7M request for faculty salary increases as well as some funds for operations maintenance at facilities, utilities inflation and some library acquisitions. For the strategic investments budget, he identified three tiered priorities which include increased access for STEM teachers, student access, and workforce development. He also cut back on solar technologies and trimmed about two-thirds of this budget request, to about \$15M. He believes this is consistent with what the governor wants to hear as well as what his priorities are and what SPBAC has endorsed. The state is anticipating an \$800M deficit for this fiscal year, and a \$1.2B deficit for FY09. The Regents' 2020 strategic planning exercise is being led by Sandra Woodley. He met with her and Executive Director Joel Sideman who explained how they had come up with a funding algorithm for the three universities which is very complex because of the differentiated missions. The Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) model calls for 50% funding toward instruction and 50% toward research but the ABOR team preferred to differentiate and weight the typical funding levels for a research-intensive university like UA versus an instruction-intensive university like NAU. The difference, however, turned out to be quite small. President Shelton determined that the Regents' consultant had selected a group of research-intensive public universities like Arkansas, Idaho and Hawaii, for comparison, but these actually had no relation to UA. President Shelton suggested institutions that are actually UA competitors such as the California schools and Chapel Hill. He said he believes this weighted approach can work, but the UA has to be matched with the right peers and he still has a long way to go to convince the Regents of the quality of the research that goes on at the UA. The Regents' challenge, then, will be to come up with one approach that fairly and properly addresses three such different universities.

**4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3**

Senator Ulreich asked President Shelton whether he will speak to ABOR about the quality of the UA's teaching as well as the research. Senator Ulreich believes that the attention and focus on UA's research leaves the qualitative issue of UA's instructional mission and the success rates of UA's students in the market out of the equation. President Shelton responded that it is more difficult to evaluate teaching. He needs more quantitative or even semi quantitative measures to show how UA's instruction is superior. So far the instructional component of the base budget has been accepted by all three universities but UA needs a differential for the research.

Senator Witte commented that perhaps the terms, "mentoring" and "developing students," which the UA does very well, might be a better way to describe and factor in UA's instructional mission.

Senator Silverman asked President Shelton whether the legislature might give the Regents funds and authority to allocate higher education appropriations. President Shelton responded that he has heard rumors about this proposal but he does not believe there is any significant support for it. There is a small precedent with the Proposition 301 Technology and Research Initiative Fund (TRIF), which the Regents decided to assign in a 2:2:1 (ASU:UA:NAU) ratio, which may not be the most rational or equitable method of distribution.

Senator Jones asked President Shelton how the state's projected \$800M shortfall might impact the University. As of last week, President Shelton said, the governor and her legislative liaisons said they intend to protect higher education from cuts this year, but this may prove to be a very difficult task. UA's state-allocated funds total about \$400M and President Shelton believes that if the UA must take cuts this year, the institution might be able to handle no more than ½% one-time cuts, and these should not be taken from the base budget.

Senator Howell asked President Shelton about the funds to bring a resolution to the UMC/UPH radiologists' threatened mass resignation. President Shelton explained that negotiations for their salaries and support for their residents had been ongoing for six months. The radiologists' enterprise realizes about \$17M per year, of which they were receiving less than half. With the December 1 deadline at hand, President Shelton, Dean Joiner and UMC President and CEO Greg Pivrotto reached an agreement to bring the radiologists' salaries up to the midpoint and those funds to come from the hospital and the UHP practice plan.

Referring to Senator Silverman's open session remarks, President Shelton commented that he shares the concern about UA's distribution of minority faculty. He has found one prevalent, common perception among minority faculty regarding this issue; that minority hiring at the department level is not being taken seriously. He believes it is important to work together to attract more talented minority faculty members to the UA.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 5, 2007**

The minutes of November 5, 2007 were approved with one abstention.

6. **ICPC NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEM: NAME CHANGE OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND ACADEMIC OUTREACH TO ARIZONA OUTREACH COLLEGE (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell advised the Senate that this non-consent agenda item does not come as a seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC). ICPC Chair Conway introduced guests David Cox and Michael Proctor who are present to answer questions. Chair Conway explained that were the name change—from Continuing Education and Academic Outreach (CEAO) to Arizona Outreach College—to be approved, this unit would continue to be a non-academic, administrative office. Arguments for the name change are that it would: 1) help CEAO to be more recognized, 2) enhance its credibility / status / visibility, 3) make CEAO more attractive to a larger audience, and 4) eliminate any perceptions that CEAO is restricted to southern Arizona. The proposal calls for the unit to receive a seat on the Academic Deans Council and to have more interaction with true academic colleges, similar to the precedent of the Honors College. Arguments against this proposal include: 1) The word "college" in the name is objectionable to some faculty members because it is not truly a college. 2) Some departments have distanced themselves from the unit and manage their own distance courses because the CEAO has not offered adequate support. 3) This unit needs more than a name change; it has a history of problems and needs to be reinvented. 4) Why not just call it University of Arizona Outreach? The proposal is coming forward to the Senate even though it did not receive strong support among the various committees. The Undergraduate Council's sixteen-person vote was split 6-5-3 with two absent; the Graduate Council had only eight of its thirty-one members present at the meeting to discuss this proposal and an electronic vote yielded 18-0-0 with 13 not registering a vote. ICPC's eight-member vote was split 1-4-1 with 2 not registering a vote.

D. Cox explained that when Dean Sander assumed the title of Vice President for Outreach, Extended University was reorganized into the office of Continuing Education and Academic Outreach (CEAO). The proposal for a name change of CEAO to Arizona Outreach College has been vetted in a number of groups and the split votes indicate that nothing is clear. CEAO was originally targeted for elimination under "focused excellence;" however, CEAO is one way that the University can grow its enrollment without bringing more students physically onto the campus. While CEAO has had a history of some lack of follow-through and of operating some programs that did not break even, the staff has eliminated those non-credit/revenue negative activities and programs over the last two years. There were inconsistencies in the way programs operated and in the way departments/faculty/colleges were supported by CEAO. The restructuring is intended to provide consistent quality and support for all. Restructuring CEAO has resulted in 29 staff, 1.7 of which is supported with appropriated funds specific to the five majors available on the Nights/Weekends Campus. The rest of the staff is supported by the enrollment-generated revenue with some of those monies flowing back into the departments and colleges. This name change would provide stability and promote visibility to academic outreach, not only with clients who are primarily located off-campus, but also to the on-campus community. The primary mission of this proposed college is to support the departments and colleges in offering credit and some non-credit courses (depending on demand/need/costs) to off campus constituencies throughout Arizona.

Senators' comments and questions included: 1) Are there any concrete benefits beyond visibility and marketing that students, faculty and departments would gain from this name change? Dr. Cox emphasized that CEAO does not have any faculty or programs. Existing UA campus-based departments and colleges offer all the courses, programs and degrees. The primary benefit is the flexibility to offer courses or programs to off-campus clients through CEAO where revenue can follow enrollments. The CEAO enrollment counts as the University's FTE count, but CEAO students' tuition is split between the CEAO operations with about 70% flowing back to the colleges. Advantages to students include flexible payment plans and class schedules, which can run on an eight-week or even shorter cycle or an extended cycle. Although CEAO courses must be registered by the 21<sup>st</sup> day to be included in the FTE count, students and faculty together may decide to accelerate or extend a course as needed. 2) Provost Sander spoke about the analogous organization on campus called the Honors College, which has no faculty or students, but it promotes

every college on this campus by giving Honors degrees. This unit is led a dean and an associate dean. Provost Sander believes that one of the futures of this University will be to serve students and other people at a distance to the Tucson location. UA desperately needs an organization to facilitate offering such courses and degrees. Under the direction of Mike Proctor, the CEAO has implemented a uniform billing policy and quality controls to eliminate rogue programs. The name change and visibility will help students in rural or remote areas to receive a quality education and to believe they are getting their money's worth when they enroll, and to receive support from an Outreach College just as on-campus students receive support from their colleges. 3) Does the taxonomy of the term "college" suggest a substantive change in terms of rights and privileges? Does a college belong to a different category within the University and do the Regents regard a college differently? D. Cox responded that the primary responsibility of this unit's place on the Deans Council would be visibility and the opportunity to alert the deans to advise their department heads and faculty that there is a support system in place for academic outreach. 4) The name change of the Honors Program to be the Honors College was related to the academic mission. The proposed name change of CEAO has the academic mission in the background, but the predominant motivation is political. "Outreach" is a much broader enterprise than the proposed "Outreach" college would suggest. Many colleges and units are already providing outreach and have received grants for outreach activities. Will the centralization of outreach lead to fees or interference with the outreach activities? D. Cox responded that this unit is not intended to replace all of the outreach that is currently taking place within the University. This proposal is to simply provide a vehicle to enable all of the academic colleges to provide credit-generating coursework and degrees to new clients all across the state and particularly in southern Arizona. M. Proctor described that the Master's in Optical Science is not a classical approach in that it is a combination of residence- and electronic-based instruction. Departments utilizing CEAO for a broader academic outreach have expressed that something to provide central organization would help to reach more students. Senator Christenson moved to approve the proposal to rename the Continuing Education and Academic Outreach unit to be the Arizona Outreach College [Motion 2007/08-16]. Motion was seconded. Senator Jenkins moved [Motion 2007/08-17] to table the discussion until January. Motion passed 23-10. Any requests for additional information or clarification should be directed to the Faculty Center.

7. **FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF POLICY FOR MANAGEMENT OF PERSONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell introduced the Policy for Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest, which comes as a seconded motion [Motion 2007/08-21] from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee. The policy, he said, is returning to the Senate as a first reading because it has been over a year since it came before the Senate. APPC Chair Aleamoni indicated one modification on page 3 that was suggested at a previous Senate meeting that adds: "If the immediate supervisor deems the plan unsatisfactory, then the supervisory employee may submit the plan to the next administrative level for review and acceptance or rejection." Senator Aleamoni moved [Motion 2007/08-22] to add the words "romantic or sexual" to the third sentence in .3 on page 2 to read, "When an employee is involved in romantic or sexual relationship with another employee or student . . ." Motion was seconded. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) What do we have in place right now? There is an interim policy that has been in place for years and will remain in force if the Senate doesn't approve this one. Presiding Officer Mitchell indicated that, although this policy may not be perfect, it is better than the interim in place now, and it is the best we could negotiate with the Office of the General Council. 2) If this policy is for romantic or sexual relationships, and there are other policies for other contexts like friends or kinships, shouldn't #3 on page two be struck? 3) This policy is originally broader than just romantic or sexual. 4) What about children of faculty? There is another policy for that. 5) If this policy is for romantic or sexual relationships, the document talks about romantic, sexual or other personal relationships throughout. 6) What is an "other" personal relationship and maybe that should be left out completely? "Conflict of Interest" in the Definitions on Page 1 describes the other types of relationships and the responsibilities that apply in a supervisory-subordinate relationship where the University's primary interest is in securing objective performance. 7) What are the other types of relationships? A business relationship could be another type of relationship. The Question was called [Motion 2007/08-23] and passed. Motion 2007/08-22 carried 19-5-0. Motion 2007/08-21 to approve the Policy for Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest carried 21-5-3.

8. **FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST/CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT POLICY (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell reminded the Senate that the approval of the University of Arizona Interim Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment Policy Version 08/06 comes as a seconded motion [Motion 2007/08-18]. Research Policy Committee Chair Cusanovich explained that the RPC has worked for about a year on this policy on Conflict of Interest/Commitment relative to research and business transactions. Senator Cusanovich said the RPC has not noted any substantive changes in this document and remarked that historically, this has not been an area of great difficulty for the University. The policy is being revised to bring it up to date and into compliance with federal and state laws. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) If a professor sold a rental home, would s/he have to report this to a department head? Senator Cusanovich answered no, the only business transactions that are required to be reported are those involving the University or a relative and the University. 2) Since the sanctions include dismissal, Senator Spece moved [Motion 2007/08-19] to add this language: "A particular sanction should be proportionate to the offense and dismissal should be reserved for intentional and serious conflict." Motion was seconded. 3) Any revisions to the document should make it fairer and bring faculty closer to an evenly and appropriately applied due process. 4) Does a faculty member who personally earns more than \$10K acting as a consultant on another academic grant have to report that earning? Yes, but the principle is to meet sure that the consulting duties do not interfere with University duties. Consulting money has to be reported to the department head annually. Consulting funds

that do not come to an individual but rather to another unit within the University would come under a contract. 5) The appeal process on page 16 states that an appeal must be lodged within ten business days with complete documentation. A faculty member may not have a sufficient amount of time to assemble a case. The number of days should be increased to 15 days. 6) What are the major changes from the original? Major changes include a broader definition of relatives and relationships, and added detail and language to formalize the process we already had in place, primarily to be in compliance. Senator Pavao-Zuckerman offered a friendly amendment to Senator Spece's motion by specifying that it be placed on page 20 under Article VIII, D, 1, j, which was accepted. Motion 2007/08-19 to amend the policy passed. The Question was called [Motion 2007/08-20] and passed. Motion 2007/08-18 to approve the University of Arizona Interim Individual Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy Version 08/06 passed.

9. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM THE SENATE TASK FORCE ON GENERAL EDUCATION (attachment)**

Senator and Senate Task Force on General Education Chair Dahlgran informed the Senate that the group was originally charged with reporting at the December meeting but the final report is not yet ready. This Task Force has met every other week throughout the fall and has searched extensively for information, documents and data related to general education and members are processing that data and are compiling a report. Chair Dahlgran hopes that the Task Force will finish its work and produce a final report in February. Chair Dahlgran invited any questions to be emailed to him or to a committee member at the email addresses included on the roster in Senators' packets.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM THE SENATE TASK FORCE FOR STUDENT RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell advised the Senate that Senator Strittmatter is out of town but the faculty officers are aware that the Senate Task Force for Student Retention and Advancement has met twice and has identified its goals and data to be gathered. Chair Strittmatter will be invited to give a report at the earliest possible time in the next semester.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM: UA FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN 2009-2013 (attachment)**

Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) Chair Miranda Joseph explained that she is prepared to talk about the first part of the University's Strategic Plan, not the Information Technology Strategic Plan that was added as an appendix. SPBAC has worked on the substance of the plan for more than a year and Dr. Joseph told Senators that SPBAC leads the process of crafting the strategic plan. SPBAC is an extraordinary committee in terms of its shared governance representation with both elected and appointed faculty, as well as representatives from student government, staff and appointed professionals, administrators and members of the Cabinet which bring a diversity of perspectives to the process. In addition to the members, however, SPBAC also reached out during the process and interviewed another 88 stakeholders both internal and external to the University, and worked closely with President Shelton and the Cabinet. Every state agency has to submit a five-year strategic plan to the state of Arizona every year. Previous plans have been a fairly bureaucratic and routine process. This year the Committee started from scratch to create a meaningful plan for UA, primarily because the University has a new President and this exercise provided a good opportunity to help him elaborate his vision and provide him with advice, as is the charge to SPBAC. The audiences for the Strategic Plan are diverse and complicated so SPBAC took ABOR's priorities into consideration immediately, along with President Shelton's priorities as stated in his inaugural address. The Committee will adjust the plan as the Regents' 2020 Plan, the governor's priorities and the legislature's priorities become known. SPBAC conducted an environmental scan to look at trends and demographics that impact the University. The greatest impact is coming from the tremendous population growth in the state and the nature of that growth.

The Committee also looked at the UA's strengths and what needs to be strengthened. Four main areas emerged for strategic directions: the first is preparing students and enabling them to attend the UA by physically growing the campus, providing financial aid, and reaching out to junior high and high school students. The second focuses on the education that the University will provide to those students while they are here. The third deals with research and developing our strengths, particularly in the interdisciplinary areas. The last direction is service and outreach activities enriching and improving life for people in the state of Arizona from offering cultural activities to providing medical care.

President Shelton expressed gratitude for the multiple interactions with SPBAC and that he appreciated SPBAC taking to heart his messages in both his inaugural address and his State of the University address. The overarching criterion from which all of this flowed, he said, is the fact that UA is a major Research I university in a growing state, and there is a need to demonstrate the value to Arizona residents of a UA educational experience and how the UA's research activities improve the human condition beyond its borders. Those features emerged strongly in the four strategic directions. Taking place parallel to the UA's process, ABOR began conducting its own strategic 2020 plan, which failed to capture the full dimension of a Research I institution because the Regents have been focused primarily on enrollment growth. SPBAC's process has allowed the UA to speak forcefully in the Regents' 2020 discussions and planning. President Shelton has indicated that the strategic plan will guide resource allocation at the UA, so it is a meaningful document. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) Provost Sander commended Dr. Joseph for her leadership of SPBAC and this process. 2) Congratulations to Dr. Joseph and to everyone involved in the planning process. This is the first time many faculty can remember being invited to be involved.

Dr. Joseph credited President Shelton who gave the signal a year ago that he was open to a substantive strategic planning process. President Shelton added that he did what he is supposed to do, which is to take advantage of smart people. 3) Does the plan address faculty diversity? Dr. Joseph responded that there is a line about diversity and there are measures, which in some ways is the most important part of the plan. 4) The plan has a good focus and highlights the teaching component, which is extremely important to the Regents. If we can provide objective measures for instruction that are comparable to scholarly productivity, and demonstrate how we can deliver the instructional mission along with the research, that would resonate with the Regents and the legislature. Dr. Joseph said the Regents are focused on sheer quantity of degrees versus research, and what is lost is the quality. The plan cites the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) as one instrument for measuring quality of instruction. UA's plan understates the growth component but given the pressures from the state, the UA will be challenged to try to grow larger and faster but still keep the quality. 5) Thank you for the inclusiveness of the process that has led to a plan that people feel invested in, and that lends strength to it. 6) Thank you for creating a lucid plan that should be received by its multiple audiences with understanding. 7) We have measures and goals for diversity for faculty, but we don't have any measures for our goals in becoming a Hispanic-serving institution or for increasing students' diversity overall. Dr. Joseph said the negotiation over what measures would be included in the final plan was complex; some long-time administrators were hesitant to include accountability measures because of possible legal concerns with projecting ethnic enrollments by 2013, which could be read as a target. Dr. Joseph and quite a number of SPBAC members believe that those measures should be in the plan, partially to hold ourselves accountable. If the Senate feels strongly about the issue as a policy matter, she'll step out on it. Senator Howell asked President Shelton whether the student diversity accountability measures could be included. President Shelton responded that the accountability measures are in the plan but they are not graphed; nevertheless, the University keeps track of those numbers very carefully and knows what progress is being made. The distinction is whether the information is presented in text and graph or just text. Senator Howell expressed sadness that the projected diversity goals for students are not displayed. President Shelton said he will invite the University's general counsel to explain the legal argument. Dr. Joseph added that there is no question that the UA needs to do more in terms of reaching out to Hispanic students in particular, ensuring their preparation and serving them well while they are here. She would prefer to see commitments of resources and values toward making that happen, rather than projected ethnicity percentage goals. A possible ballot initiative could make lives more difficult. President Shelton agreed and that his staff has begun planning for this, but our admission criterion does not include race/ethnicity. It is important to get our message out that if this proposition passes, it will have no impact on our commitment to recruit and serve all Arizona students. Enrollment Management is attracting more talented and qualified students from all groups, including minorities. Presiding Officer Mitchell observed that today's discussion reflects positively on the quality of the SPBAC Strategic Plan and thanked Dr. Joseph for her leadership and for presenting it to the Senate today.

12. **NEW BUSINESS**

Senator Mitchneck asked whether the Senate officers want to engage in a conversation about concrete actions that the Senate might take to achieve the diversity goals in the Strategic Plan. Presiding Officer Mitchell agreed to take that up with the Senate Executive Committee.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Jennifer L. Jenkins, Secretary of the Faculty  
Pamela S. Bridgmon, Recording Secretary

**Appendix\***

1. Overhead: "The University of Arizona Diversity Profile of Faculty: 1996 & 2006"
2. Revised Faculty Senate agenda for December 3, 2007
3. Policy for Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest for the University of Arizona. Revised version 9-20-06
4. Faculty Senate General Education Task Force Roster 2007-08
5. Senate Task Force for Student Retention and Advancement
6. Memorandum from Provost Sander dated November 2, 2007 re: Instructional accountability and responsibility
7. Memorandum from David F Cox dated May 2, 2007 re: Renaming of Existing Organization Unit (Continuing Education and Academic Outreach)
8. The University of Arizona Five Year Strategic Plan 2009-2013
9. The University of Arizona Interim Individual Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy Version 08/06

**Motions of the Meeting of December 3, 2007**

**Motion 2007/08-16** Motion to approve the proposal to rename the Continuing Education and Academic Outreach unit to be the Arizona Outreach College. Motion not acted upon.

**Motion 2007/08-17** Motion to table discussion on renaming the office of Continuing Education and Academic Outreach to be the Arizona Outreach College. Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-18** Seconded motion from the Research Policy Committee to approve the University of Arizona Interim Individual Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy Version 08/06. Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-19** Motion amend University of Arizona Interim Individual Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment Policy Version 08/06 by adding this sentence to Section VIII D, 1, j: "A particular sanction should be proportionate to the offense and dismissal should be reserved for intentional and serious conflict." Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-20** Motion to cut off debate on Motion 2007/08-18. Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-21** Seconded motion from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to approve the Policy for Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest for the University of Arizona. Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-22** Motion to amend Motion 2007/08-21 to add the words "romantic or sexual" to the third sentence in .3 on page 2 to read, "When an employee is involved in romantic or sexual relationship with another employee or student . . ." Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-23** Motion to cut off debate on Motion 2007/08-22. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER  
1400 E. Mabel  
PO BOX 210473