

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
November 3, 2008**

**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 3:06 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 164.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Antin, Barton, Bergsma, Bieda, Bruce, Burd, Christenson, Connally, Conway, Cusanovich, A. Davis, O. Davis, Effken, Foley, Garcia, Green, Gruener, Guertin, Hay, Howell, Hyne, Jones, Joseph, Jull, Kovach, McKean, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mutchler, Nolan, Nystedt, Ogden, Ozkan, Pintozzi, Plante, Renger, Sarid, Schlager, Silverman, Slugocki, M. Smith, S.M. Smith, Songer, St. John, Sterling, Tabor, Willerton and Witte. L. Evers substituted for J. Ulreich. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Cuello, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Estrada, Fregosi, Gehrels, Hildebrand, Ruiz, San Martin, Shelton, Spece, Strittmatter, Talenfeld, Ulreich and Zedeno.

**2. OPEN SESSION**

Senator Sarid presented justifications for the UA Transformation process to refrain from unnecessary reorganization and allow the structure of College of Optical Sciences to remain as a stand-alone college.

**3. REPORTS**

**3A. ASUA President Tommy Bruce**

On behalf of all students, ASUA President Bruce delivered an eloquent plea to faculty to maintain a positive mindset during this time of enormous uncertainty. He asked administrators to allow students to be as empowered and as involved as possible in the UA Transformation process. He reminded faculty that students implicitly trust faculty and that it is a privilege to teach students. Working together and building positivism into the process will provide inspiration to the students and strengthen the institution.

**3B. GPSC President Stephen Bieda**

GPSC President Stephen Bieda reported that his office is receiving multiple calls with concerns about some of the frightening prospects facing graduate students and graduate teaching assistants (GTAs) in particular, regarding the UA Transformation. President Bieda echoed President Bruce's request for faculty to refrain from frightening students with threats of program closures and to maintain a positive stance throughout the Transformation process. On October 27<sup>th</sup>, GPSC submitted a memo to President Shelton, Provost Hay, and Chair of the Faculty Senate and SPBAC for consideration. In an effort to assuage graduate students' concerns about the transformation process, President Bieda has invited President Shelton to a GPSC general meeting on Wednesday, November 5 at 6:00 p.m. in Law 164. On November 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup>, GPSC will hold a roundtable discussion for GTAs to discuss concerns about increasing class sizes and quality of education. GPSC hosted the "Student Showcase" exhibit of over 70 undergraduate and graduate student research projects on the mall during Homecoming weekend. President Bieda thanked the faculty who participated as judges for the event. The winners will be invited to present their displays this winter at "UA Wildcat Pride Night," an event in Phoenix designed to demonstrate to the state legislature the amount of scholarship and excellence that is conducted at UA. In another effort to help the UA, GPSC will meet with outgoing Chair of the state House of Representatives Education Committee, Jennifer Burns, on November 14<sup>th</sup>, to discuss the state budget and higher education.

**3C. Faculty Officers' Report**

Presiding Officer Robert Mitchell announced that the online election to approve the recent revisions to the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws ended on October 28<sup>th</sup> and all of the changes passed. He welcomed three more newly-elected senators, Senators-at-Large Jennifer Barton, Elena Plante, and Mark Smith, and College of Science representative George Gehrels and ex-officio Senator and SPBAC Chair Miranda Joseph. Finally, Chair Mitchell welcomed Arizona Board of Regents President Fred Boice, Regent Fred DuVal, and Student Regent David Martinez who are here to present information about the "Solutions through Higher Education" public awareness campaign.

**3D. Provost Meredith Hay**

Provost Hay announced that the timeline for the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee's feedback on the UA Transformation white papers was met, and that those recommendations should be posted to the website by Wednesday. She is pleased with the outcome and thanked the SPBAC and its subcommittee for their efforts. About twenty proposals were recommended for the next step. A large number of more complicated and overlapping proposals were recommended for further development. These proposals could be important to the UA for decades; however, so finding common ground to move forward is essential so those will have an extended timeline. She will be sending a campus-wide email regarding the next steps and a timeline. Regarding the UA Transformation process, Provost Hay remarked that she is absolutely committed to as much transparency and inclusiveness as possible and urged the Senate to stay positive and remain focused on the future.

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

Senator Silverman asked if the Constitution and Bylaws changes are being properly forwarded to the next level for implementation. Presiding Officer Mitchell said the revised documents are being sent to President Shelton and the University's counsel for approval.

Senator McKean asked about the difference between UA's Transformation due to budget cuts versus Transformation that is a result of the white paper plans. Provost Hay responded that the Transformation process planning began in August. Unfortunately, in September and October, the extraordinary global economic crisis converged on the Transformation efforts. Where the original Transformation included a focus on budget and savings, the real focus was on becoming a better University. The budget now is co-mingled with the Transformation plan, but rather than setting aside Transformation and looking at a "recession plan," the administration will be looking closely at these proposals to determine whether the plan will help to cover budget shortfalls. The governor is trying to protect higher education, but is possible that a budget rescission of 5, 10, or 15% will be imposed. Provost Hay urged all units to behave responsibly and to be fiscally conservative. It may be that a FY09 mid-year rescission can be rolled over into FY10.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2008**

The minutes of October 6, 2008 were approved with two abstentions.

**6. INFORMATION ITEM: SOLUTIONS THROUGH HIGHER EDUCATION**

Arizona Board of Regents President Fred Boice reassured Senators that universities are able to transcend revolutions, downturns, and recessions. The United States of America is at a critical juncture, however, and much of its future depends on higher education. He showed a brief video that describes the quiet crisis threatening the United States' economic prosperity and the critical role that higher education plays in producing enough highly skilled workers to compete in global markets. Referring to the book, *Rising Above The Gathering Storm*, Regent Boice listed a number of scientific developments, applications of engineering solutions, and continual technological innovations and breakthroughs that are not occurring in the U.S., but rather are taking place in nations such as Saudi Arabia, China, India, Russia, Australia, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Regent DuVal explained that the aspirational goal of the "Solutions Through Higher Education" campaign is making human development (K-12 and beyond) the principal cultural and social organizing priority of this country. Pragmatically, it is to make the connection between higher education and economic growth real for all people, and at its core, the campaign aspires to stabilize and grow the public's commitment to higher education. Regent DuVal described a three-step progression to social change: 1) convince people of the need for change in a compelling enough way to actually change their individual behaviors; 2) make it culturally and socially acceptable to express that behavioral change to other people; and 3) when a critical mass is reached, there is an environment of public opinion and cultural expectation that the political system responds to. This progression has been successful with litter, teenage pregnancy, designated drivers, and is currently addressing sustainability. Social change is the only way to address the fact that the U.S.' standards in education are declining and degree production is down while it is rising in other countries. Furthermore, the only ways to grow in the world, economically, are 1) cost; 2) size; 3) be a petrol exporter, or 4) innovation. The U.S. cannot compete with nations such as China or India in cost or size, and exporting petrol is not available to the U.S., either. Many nations can compete on all four levels, but the U.S. can only compete with innovation: i.e. discoveries, creations, inventions, knowledge, ideas, and new products.

What is unique about this dynamic is that it's a public policy choice that can only be fixed by public policy response driven by public opinion, and this choice is available to all nations. As such, many nations are choosing to increase their investment in education. Regent DuVal described the vicious cycle/virtuous cycle. In a vicious cycle, if the nation doesn't invest in human capital -> skill sets decline -> the nation can't compete in the international marketplace -> tax revenues decline -> declining tax revenues create pressures to cut expenditures and the largest discretionary part of the budget is education. In the virtuous cycle, nations invest in human capital -> skill sets increase -> wage values increase -> public policy response is to increase investment in higher education and to make targeted tax cuts around outputs and other economic stimuli. The Arizona Board of Regents members are convinced that the only way to win this fight is to invest in higher education, which is why they are traveling

throughout the state to present this “inconvenient truth” about higher education wherever people are gathered, to build the critical mass of public support for policy change to occur. One success the Regents can claim is passage of the Stimulus Plan for Economic and Education Development (SPEED). This plan was conceived as an opportunity to leverage the decline of the state’s construction/real estate industry. In what was admittedly a bad budget year, thousands of individuals expressed the importance of the SPEED plan to lawmakers, who then allocated a \$1B capital package to construct new buildings and refurbish existing ones on the three state university campuses. The state has additional challenges: to increase degree productivity and to better align with K-12, the P-20 Council and community colleges. The next big target is to increase financial aid because Arizona is one of the few states without a publicly-supported financial aid package. The University currently sets aside 15% of tuition for financial aid, which is a huge strain on the administration. A student demographic breakdown indicating the relationship between economic strata and academic capacity shows that students from wealthy families are three times more likely to attend college than their poorer counterparts with the same academic ability. Income, not talent, is now the single biggest driver for success in higher education. The Regents are promoting investment in tuition financial aid to business communities all over the state as the best return on investment in today’s economy, because college-educated citizens earn and invest more, and will pay back to society the cost of that education four or five times over, to say nothing of the multiple cultural and societal benefits. A predictable, stable, growing revenue source for higher education is needed to solve this quiet crisis in Arizona.

Regent DuVal invited senators and their colleagues to join the Coalition for Solutions Through Higher Education and to encourage our political system to make this a principal policy objective. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) What does it mean to join the Coalition? Regent Boice explained that members will receive periodic information relative to actions in the legislature and in higher education, to help people become involved and informed about education. 2) Some people are suggesting cutting student financial aid to save money for the University. Regent Boice explained that about seven years ago, Arizona had the lowest tuition among public universities in the country but ranked 49<sup>th</sup> in affordability because of no financial aid. Since that time, tuition has increased 162% but affordability has increased to 23<sup>rd</sup>. The most our state legislature has ever contributed to financial aid is \$10M, as opposed to Colorado, which contributed \$55M, and Indiana with \$285M. The state has an obligation to make a college education available to every student. 3) It is heartening to see our Regents so impassioned about working to make this huge social change. 4) What is the likelihood of passing another educational funding proposition like Prop 301? Regent DuVal noted that Proposition 301 was successful because it was perceived as facilitating the success of the entire educational enterprise. Tech Transfer failed, however, because it was perceived as padding higher education. The future of higher education, in both real and political terms, is tied to K-12 education because as fewer and fewer Arizona students go to college, fewer and fewer parents care about higher education. 5) This initiative seems a little too narrow and leaves out a large segment of the population who perhaps would want to become car mechanics, electricians or plumbers. Could this initiative incorporate the idea of technical schools? Regent DuVal acknowledged this suggestion is a vital one which they are aware of. He explained that the funders for the Solutions Campaign are the university foundations, so they are limited by their missions to help the objectives of higher education. The Regents are also working with a group of foundations to quickly ramp up a companion exercise with a broader message to merge with the “Solutions” Campaign, because “Solutions” won’t succeed without it. Regent Boice added that engineering recruiting begins in the eighth grade now, because students need to take the math classes to qualify.

7. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM THE DEAN OF LIBRARIES AND CENTER FOR CREATIVE PHOTOGRAPHY (attachments)**

Dean of Libraries and the Center for Creative Photography Carla Stoffle provided handouts of her overheads to accompany her report. She shared that in the 2007 rankings for research libraries, UA’s library is ranked 27<sup>th</sup> overall, and 19<sup>th</sup> among the 100, an improvement of six places over the 2006 ranking. The reason that the library improved in its ranking is that over the past eight years, the library has escaped having its Information Access (IA) budget cut, plus the implementation of a student library fee has helped greatly. However, current budget restraints and inflation are seriously impacting library expenditures by reducing purchasing power for print collections, books and journals, felt most heavily in the humanities and social sciences. Meanwhile, a flat IA state budget, declining donations and endowment returns, reduced collections for lost materials and inflation will continue to drive the library to make more reductions. Dean Stoffle assured the Senate that, as always, reductions in journal subscriptions, overlapping electronic databases, other cancellations of lesser-used materials, or leasing of materials will be made in consultation with faculty, researchers, graduate students and other key stakeholders to minimize negative impacts. Cancellations could begin as early as March 2009. Dean Stoffle plans to solicit feedback from faculty and to share information about cuts and cancellations widely. She will provide a report on the cancellations in September, 2009. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) Will all members of a department be contacted to provide feedback? Dean Stoffle said she will work with department heads to identify faculty to provide feedback but she will share information broadly. 2) What percentage of the library’s budget is comprised of the student fees? Dean Stoffle responded that last year, the student fees provided about \$900K and half of that was spent on library materials, as well as service such as extended hours and express delivery of scanned articles to a desktop. The library provides quarterly reports to the students, solicits feedback and is accountable to the students both before and after the expenditures. 3) The library anticipates putting up a web-based list of proposed cuts so the information is available to everyone by January 2009. 4) What are the mechanisms to communicate with graduate students? Dean Stoffle said some departments are better than others in sharing information with graduate students, but the library will share with ASUA and GPSC leadership. 5) With the elimination of electronic packages, will individual faculty be asked to pay for electronic articles? Dean Stoffle noted that some databases overlap core content so the library will be implementing WorldCat Local which will allow a user to search the national

database for materials. It is likely that the library will decrease its use of Interlibrary Loan which takes 24 hours for article and four days for book deliveries.

8. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: CLARIFYING THE "GUIDELINES FOR REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA" (attachments)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell advised the Senate that the revised Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals in today's packets comes as a seconded motion [Motion 2008/09-7] from the Senate Executive Committee. Chair of the Faculty Howell explained that the proposed revisions were necessitated after questions arose concerning proposals that don't involve transfer of faculty, but rather the mergers of units. SPBAC Chair M. Joseph noted that these Guidelines need to be effective for all types of proposals, so the proposed revisions expand the scope of the document for the kinds of proposals that are at the center of the UA Transformation. Revisions also clarified the quantifiable measures on page 2. The revised language indicates that if fewer than a majority (50%+1) of the combined, affected faculty agrees with a proposal, that merger or transfer will not be implemented. Senators' comments and questions included the following: 1) The words, "at least" in I, a, on page 2, seem to imply that a unit could have more than one member on the advisory committee. Senator Silverman moved [Motion 2008/09-8] to delete "At least" from the section I, a, to read "At least one member from every academic unit involved in the proposed transfer or merger, elected by the faculties in the respective units." Motion was not seconded. Senators discussed that the language "at least" is an attempt to continue the sense of the original language that provides for no fewer than three faculty members with at least one member from every affected academic unit. The phrase, "at least" provides necessary flexibility for the Chair of the Faculty if more than three units are involved. Furthermore, the paragraph above stipulates that the Chair of the Faculty will ensure that the members of the committee collectively have the necessary knowledge bases to assess the proposal, so again, some flexibility is necessary. Senator Silverman withdrew his motion.

2) The strikethrough language from the second bullet on page 1 used to read "Unilateral decisions to move faculty members from one group to another will be avoided." The replacement bullet is very different and reads "This procedure is intended to prevent unilateral decisions regarding faculty transfers of the merger of units." Senator Silverman moved [Motion 2008/09-9] to amend the replacement bulleted language on page 1 of the proposed revisions to the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" to read, "~~This procedure is intended to prevent~~ Unilateral decisions regarding faculty transfers or the mergers of units **will be avoided.**" Motion was seconded. Senators discussed that "prevented" is stronger than "avoided." Language referring to a unilateral decision may not be necessary, since the process is to reach a decision by a committee, which is by definition, not unilateral. The concern about a unilateral decision does not refer to the committee's actions, but rather to a higher administrative power. Why not use a simple statement: "There will be no unilateral decisions." Motion failed. The third bulleted sentence on page 1 isn't needed at all because this document describes a procedure to prevent unilateral administrative decisions from happening at all. 3) Senator Pintozzi moved [Motion 2008/09-10] to delete the third bullet on page 1 which reads: "This procedure is intended to prevent unilateral decisions regarding faculty transfers or the merger of units." Motion was seconded. Senators discussed that it is important to keep the language in the third bullet because it clearly states what it prevents. Presiding Officer Mitchell called for a show of hands vote. Motion failed 9-23.

4) Clarity of language is needed to define specifically what "optimal" means in the last sentence of the new second bullet on page 1, which reads, "The proposal will provide for an optimal degree of mutual agreement among all those affected." SPBAC Chair Joseph interprets this word as the intent is to get people to agree, and noted that the quantifiable percentages are described on page 2. If 75% of the combined total of the affected faculty agree plus 50%+1 of the affected faculty of each unit agree, the proposal can go forward without this committee procedure. If fewer than those percentages of faculty agree, the proposal goes into the committee process described in this document. With unevenly-sized units, however, it may be possible to reach a majority of the combined units without a single affirmative vote from a smaller unit, so the intent is to allow a dissenting unit a chance to slow down a reorganization by throwing it into the committee process which provides a measure of protection. This version strengthens the position of a smaller unit. 5) What is not specifically articulated in the document is that if there is not 50%+1 support from the combined affected faculty, the process does not even go forward to a committee. Senator Joseph moved [Motion 2008/09-11] to add a sentence to read: "If a proposed reorganization does not have support from a majority (50%+1) of the combined affected faculty, the proposal will no longer be considered." This sentence is to be added to the middle of the paragraph on page 2 that begins with "If 75% of the combined..." Motion was seconded. Senator Jones suggested formatting this paragraph into three bullets. Motion carried with two nays.

6) The Guidelines do not address a situation in which a unit is being dissolved and tenured faculty are being scattered among five departments; such a reorganization could be sabotaged by one unit refusing to take one person and the committee would have to be constituted with members from each of the five departments. 7) The Guidelines also call for three Faculty Senators to sit on each advisory committee, which could become a problem with only 64 senators facing twenty proposals coming forward from the UA transformation. Senator Joseph anticipates that most of these proposals will not need a committee, and on a practical level, surely the proposer(s) will complete most of the consensus-building and placements for individual faculty members prior to submitting a proposal. 8) On page 2, section I, a, the Senate should retain the original language to include a representative of the faculty members who are being transferred on the committee. Senators discussed whether the term "sending unit" implies those being transferred, and hypothetical cases which might involve only one faculty member being transferred. Senators also

discussed that individual faculty transfers are commonplace and are a personnel matter, not a reorganization. This revised language of the Guidelines is more general and is intended to address group transfers and mergers. The procedure makes sense for organizational structure decisions, but the advisory committee would be unwieldy for individual personnel issues. Senator Green moved [Motion 2008/09-12] "If this proposal involves the transfer of a unit, then at least one member whose transfer is being proposed should be appointed to the committee." Motion was seconded. Motion was not acted upon. Senator Joseph moved [Motion 2008/09-13] to reinstate the original language of Section 1, a, of the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona." Motion was seconded. Motion carried.

9) Clarity and consistency of language is also needed where the document refers to departments versus units. Presiding Officer Mitchell noted that the word "department" appears only once in the document and is used appropriately. 10) What is an "academic unit," exactly? Does the Senate all agree about the definition of academic unit? 11) Does this document apply to mergers of colleges as well as departments? Chair Howell affirmed that the document does apply to colleges. Does the Senate want this procedure to apply to colleges, because on the college level, this procedure may not be that helpful? It would be disturbing if the Guidelines did *not* apply to colleges. The document might be strengthened by adding a definition or a list of what qualifies as an academic unit. There is no official definition of "unit" in the ABOR policy manual. Perhaps an academic unit could be described as something (school, program, center, department . . .) with faculty and a budget. Senator Mitchneck added that the Guidelines document also applies to eliminations. Presiding Officer Mitchell said he would entertain a motion to define or list what is meant by "unit." Senator Pintozzi called for the question [Motion 2008/09-14]. Motion carried. Motion 2008/09-14 to approve the revised "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" *as amended* today carried 34-3-1.

### ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

J.C. Mutchler, Secretary of the Faculty  
Pamela S. Bridgmon, Recording Secretary

### Appendix\*

1. Faculty Senate Roster 2008-09
2. "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" approved 4-7-08 with proposed revisions
3. "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" approved 4-7-08 with proposed revisions inserted (clean copy)
4. Overheads from the Dean of Libraries and Center for Creative Photography showing impacts of inflation and the state's financial crisis on the Information Access budget
5. The University of Arizona Libraries and Center for Creative Photography Strategic Plan 2009-2013

*\*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 November 3, 2008

**Motion 2008/09-7** Seconded motion to approve the revised "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" *as amended* (See motions 2008/09-11 and 2008/09-13, below). Motion carried.

**Motion 2008/09-8** Motion to delete the words "At least" from Section I, a, on page 2 of the proposed revisions to the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" to read, "At least one member from every academic unit involved in the proposed transfer or merger, elected by the faculties in the respective units." Motion was not seconded and was withdrawn.

**Motion 2008/09-9** Seconded motion to amend the replacement bulleted language on page 1 of the proposed revisions to the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" to read, "~~This procedure is intended to prevent~~ Unilateral decisions regarding faculty transfers or the mergers of units **will be avoided.**" Motion failed.

**Motion 2008/09-10** Seconded motion to delete the third bullet on page 1 of the proposed revisions to the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" which reads: "This procedure is intended to prevent unilateral decisions regarding faculty transfers or the merger of units." Motion failed.

**Motion 2008/09-11** Seconded motion to add a sentence to the middle of the paragraph on page 2 of the proposed revisions to the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona" that begins with "If 75% of the combined..." to read: "If

a proposed reorganization does not have support from a majority (50%+1) of the combined affected faculty, the proposal will no longer be considered.” Motion passed.

**Motion 2008/09-12** Seconded motion to add a sentence to Section 1, a of the “Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona” to read: “If this proposal involves the transfer of a unit, then at least one member whose transfer is being proposed should be appointed to the committee.” Motion was not acted upon.

**Motion 2008/09-13** Seconded motion to reinstate the original language of Section 1, a of the “Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona,” to read “No fewer than three faculty members, to include one member elected by the faculty in the sending unit(s), one member elected by the faculty in the receiving unit(s), and one member elected by those whose transfer is proposed. At least one member from every academic unit involved in the proposed transfer or merger, elected by the faculties in the respective units. The Chair of the faculty will conduct nomination meetings with each affected academic unit and will arrange for mail ballots to select the members.” Motion carried.

**Motion 2008/09-14** Seconded motion to add end debate on Motion 2008/09-7. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER  
1400 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210473