

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
November 7, 2005**

**Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>
Visit the faculty governance webpage at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/>**

CORRECTED

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Mitchell at 3:02 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Asia, Baca, Burd, Christenson, Conway, Cromwell, Cuello, Cusanovich, D. Davis, G. Davis, Garcia, Green, Gruener, Hammann, Hildebrand, Howell, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, Marchalonis, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mutchler, Nolan, Pintozi, Primeau, Record, Ruiz, Sarid, Silverman, Smith, Songer, Sterling, Tatman, Thorn, Ulrich, Willerton, and Witte. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Bernsen, Carrell, Chandler, Dahlgran, deWinter, Estrada, Jackson, Joens, Likins, Mountford, San Martin, Spece, St. John, Strittmatter, Weinand, Wheeland, and Zizza.

2. OPEN SESSION

Greg Hodgins, Vice Chairman of the Appointed Professional Advisory Council (APAC, formerly APOC) reported on the Changing UA Employee Population, using data from the Integrated Information Warehouse. He reported on diversity and salary trends and showed that non-faculty appointed personnel have increased by 66% since 1993. Dr. Hodgins explained that the majority of appointed personnel are on year-to-year contracts and that they are the most vulnerable and dynamic employee group. This year's APAC goals are to increase awareness of this employee group, to support co-workers, and to provide service to the University Administration and to the community. With a change in the presidency coming, the group hopes to become more active in shared governance, to address the lack of a formal grievance procedure for this group, and to encourage the University to implement 3-year contracts, which the Arizona Board of Regents voted to allow in August 2005.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA Director of Academic Affairs Keith Primeau

Director Primeau reported in President Bernsen's absence that ASUA raised \$2000 from visiting alumni during Homecoming for the solar energy project for the new UA Visitor Center. Drew Record is working with Arizona Students Association teams on two campaigns: the "Stop the Raid on Student Aid," which is to combat the legislature from taking away student aid, and the textbook price campaign to try to reduce the cost of textbooks.

3B. GPSC President Elaine Ulrich

GPSC President Ulrich reported that the Student Showcase at Homecoming had an excellent showing with 112 participants and \$12,000 in awards given to students in eleven different categories including BIO5 and Women's Studies and an award for Outreach. She thanked the faculty and departments who contributed judges and funding for this effort and commended GPSC's Administrative Director Amanda Brobbel for her leadership on this project. GPSC has conducted three interviews for a replacement for the ASU Student Regent who resigned from the Board of Regents. President Ulrich attended Dean of Students Melissa Vito's childcare workgroup, which has recommended hiring an outside consulting company to conduct a survey to determine all campus groups' (students, faculty and staff) childcare needs. It also recommends that next spring a professional consultant be hired to do a feasibility study and help implement a plan. President Ulrich and Dorian Voorhees of the Graduate College are assembling a workgroup to consider issues of inequity among graduate students, such as TA's 10-month contract versus 9-month work rule, tuition remission, supplemental compensation, FICA taxes and graduate students' summer exemptions.

3C. Secretary of the Faculty Jennifer Jenkins

Secretary Jenkins reported that UA faculty teams are in the process of evaluating the Learner-Centered Education grants. The report will go to Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) for funding in December.

3D. Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Vice Chair Mitchell announced that the ABOR meeting will be at UA on Dec 1-2. ABOR meetings are open to the public and will be held in the North Ballroom of the Student Union. As Chair of the Arizona Faculties Council, Vice Chair Mitchell was appointed to sit on an ABOR Tuition Study Workgroup, which is currently defining and differentiating among program fees, course fees, and differential tuition and which will report to the Board in December.

3E. Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell

Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell distributed a list of the vision-characteristics for the presidential search. She acknowledged Professor Emeritus Roger Caldwell for assisting her in creating this starter list. She hopes to elicit faculty responses to create a faculty vision to promote to the Presidential Search Committee. She asked Faculty Senators to contact their constituents about this topic and to report back to the Senate in December, when she will lead an extended discussion. Chair Howell also asked for Senators' interest in conducting a Faculty Forum panel discussion with faculty members, the President and Provost, to dialogue about faculty compensation. This idea grew out of a SPBAC meeting last week. The Senate overwhelmingly approved of this idea, so Chair Howell will attempt to schedule such a forum before the semester ends.

3F. Provost George Davis

At the request of Chair Howell, Provost Davis distributed his essay, "The University of Arizona, An Archipelago of Innovation" which he wrote at the request of the deans to be given to presidential candidates. With a theme of "maximum evolutionary potential," his essay attempts to capture the essence of the UA, what makes it so uniquely innovative, and also to indicate certain valuable dimensions of the UA that ought not to be changed. This document has been distributed to the deans, the Presidential Search Committee, presidential candidates and now to the UA Foundation's presidential search committee. In addition to his narrative, there are specific, offset quotations from the UA's strategic plan running throughout the document and highlighted measures of achievement at UA. Provost Davis chose to emphasize innovation after attending an AAU provosts' meeting where President Nils Hasselmo emphasized how to enhance universities' capacity for innovation. Innovation in research, scholarship and creative endeavor can create corridors for turning ideas into important outreach, advancing knowledge and applications for society. UA's emphasis on graduate interdisciplinary programs (GIDPs) is an important part of these efforts. Provost Davis recently visited Australia with AAU President Nils Hasselmo and a group of AAU provosts to meet with representatives from the Group of Eight (Go8) eight research universities in Australia. The group also looked to build relationships and partnerships above and beyond study abroad, student exchange and faculty partnerships. The delegation visited the universities of Queensland, New South Wales, Sydney, Australia National University, Melbourne, Western Australia, Adelaide and Monash University. One outcome of this trip is a recommendation that the presidents of the 62 AAU universities in the U.S. and Canada should set aside money for top undergraduate scholars and for emerging top doctoral students to connect with researchers at these universities in Australia in order to have a truly international experience centered on their research interests. Provost Davis was impressed with the Australian federal and local governments' acknowledgment of the importance of and investment in research institutions for the good of the country. Australia's research universities are engaged in large multi-university projects and consortia for which there are both competition and collaboration, as well as in strategic international thinking and partnerships. Provost Davis reminded the Senate that former national poet laureate Robert Pinsky will speak tomorrow at 4PM in the North Ballroom on "Sadness and Exultation."

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3

Senator Gruener requested and Chair Howell agreed to send the presidential vision statement to Senators electronically.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 3, 2005

The minutes of October 3, 2005 were approved.

6. FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORIZATION FOR A NEW ACADEMIC PROGRAM, THE BACHELOR OF ARTS DEGREE, AFRICANA STUDIES MAJOR, FROM THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)

Vice Chair Mitchell invited ICPC Chair Willerton, Africana Studies (AFAS) Director Julian Kunnie, College of Humanities (COH) Dean Chuck Tatum and College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) Dean Edward Donnerstein to the podium. Senator Willerton advised the Senate that the ICPC reviewed this new degree program in two full meetings and met with both deans and Director Kunnie. He explained that the ICPC overall had a positive reaction in terms of the desirability and breadth of this program, but had reservations about several issues that arose in discussion about which the committee could not reach agreement. ICPC therefore voted unanimously to forward this to the Senate as a First Reading, rather than on consent agenda. Chair Willerton prepared three general areas of concern for the Senate about the proposal and also emailed them in advance to the deans and Director Kunnie: 1) "What is compelling the University to add this degree? Do the state and the community need

this program?" 2) "Should there be concerns that this is not a traditional program that is self-contained in one college; that is to say that the program will be housed in COH but the bulk of the teaching resources are located in SBS?" 3) Is the focus of this program as currently proposed too broad, especially in light of rather limited resources?" The proposal offers three distinct study areas and the committee was concerned that the eight promised faculty lines might not be enough. Some members felt that Study Area III was the strongest given the resources, but in the end the committee was not comfortable micromanaging the proposal and wanted the full Senate's consideration. Director Kunnie has prepared a written response to these questions, which is on Senators' desks today. Director Kunnie explained that this program represents a process that began in 1991 under President Henry Koffler. In 2002 the program received planning authorization from ABOR. He believes that this totally interdisciplinary structure of the major will be historic for AFAS, COH and SBS. Following an AFAS Academic Program Review in 2001, the three study paths were conceived as the most important aspect of this degree; that is, to assure that its students will have practical applications following graduation. Dr. Kunnie's long-term vision of the degree is a Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies, similar to American Indian Studies, Mexican-American Studies, East Asian Studies and Latin-American Studies. Dean Tatum explained that the Africana Studies program began in SBS as Black Studies, was later called African-American Studies, and came into COH by unanimous petition in 1994. UA's COH is larger than the traditional model of Humanities, which is language and literature. East Asian Studies came to COH about 15 years ago and is highly interdisciplinary with joint-appointed historians and anthropologists contributing to the program. The Africana Studies program is similar to the East Asian Studies program, but there isn't a mechanism at the undergraduate level for interdisciplinary studies like the GIDPs, which is one of UA's signature programs. Africana Studies will share faculty from Political Science, History, Religious Studies, Literature and Anthropology, and several other areas yet to be identified with the full consent of the dean and department heads in those areas. Most of the courses will be taught in Africana Studies but cross-listed with courses from SBS and the College of Fine Arts (CFA), paralleling the GIDPs. Dean Donnerstein spoke of the excellent working relationship he shares with Dean Tatum and of his strong support for this program. The cross-listed courses will benefit SBS students tremendously and he is interested in a graduate level for this program. Dean Donnerstein also spoke about a retention report that shows UA has more difficulty retaining African-American students than any other group. His experience at two other institutions has shown that having a Black Studies or African-American Studies department helps black students, even non-Black Studies majors, to feel at home and to know that there are faculty of color who are interested in the same issues.

Vice Chair Mitchell asked for a motion and Senator Ulreich moved [Motion 2005/06-17] to approve the implementation authorization for the new academic program, Bachelor of Arts degree in Africana Studies. Senator Willerton commented that, although listed on today's agenda as a "first reading," the committee advanced this item for discussion and possible action today. Motion was seconded. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) The ICPC is to be commended for bringing this item to the Senate in full, rather than on consent agenda, because it finally gives the Senate some say in new curricular activities of the University. 2) The working relationship of the deans and the interdisciplinary nature of the proposed program are also to be commended. 3) This program may become a model for undergraduate interdisciplinary programs. 4) Although not mentioned in the curriculum, the program should be urged to expand its involvement between Africana Studies and Arid Lands Studies noted on page 15 of the proposal, and particularly with Africa. 5) Could the ICPC members who are present speak to the issue of focused excellence in terms of scholarship and course offerings within this program and also to the issue of compelling interest in light of focused excellence and financial restraints? Senator and ICPC member Conway responded that his concerns were that the program was drawn up by a very small number of people, maybe two or three, and that the program needed an Academic Program Review (APR) by outside experts in the field. He later learned that the program was reviewed in 2003 by some outside experts, but that information was not initially provided to the Committee. Senator and ICPC member Pintozzi responded that she did request and receive a copy of this APR report. After carefully reading that report, she said that although the program has experienced some personnel difficulties in the past, she is confident that this proposal is following the APR's recommendations and the strategic plan that was envisioned. Speaking as an ICPC member, Senator Willerton said that he was most concerned with the resource issue. Speaking as the ICPC Chair, Senator Willerton reported that, after Senator Pintozzi's efforts to obtain the APR, the entire committee did receive it and some responded by email that they were more comfortable with the proposal after reading it. If the committee had been given this material prior to its last meeting, he believes the committee would have brought a stronger recommendation to the Senate. Dean Tatum responded that he believes this proposal *is* an example of focused excellence, that resources are critical at this juncture, and that this proposal will take advantage of considerable strength in two or perhaps three colleges, pulling together an interdisciplinary program that is resource-conscious and not duplicative. In addition to the APR, Director Kunnie also assembled a group of courtesy faculty drawn from several areas that have functioned as an advisory board to him, so that this proposal wasn't written in isolation. Provost Davis described that President Koffler promised a Black Studies program in the late 1980's but through a series of recruitments and losses, the program has struggled to demonstrate critical interest and potential critical mass in the program. The APR made specific suggestions to improve the program and faculty recruiting has been taking place.

Senators' questions and comments continued: 6) Being interdisciplinary and cooperative is one thing, but what does it mean to have a program reside in one college while the bulk of the resources resides in another? Dean Tatum responded that the resources aren't in SBS; they are in Africana Studies, which is a highly interdisciplinary entity with faculty whose degrees are in African, Caribbean and African-American literature, religious studies, political science and theatre arts. The hope is to hire additional faculty with degrees in history and anthropology. The Africana Studies courses are cross-listed in COH, CFA and SBS. ICPC Chair Willerton explained that some Committee members were concerned that many of the courses listed in the program are

taught by SBS faculty; some members wondered what might happen in 10-15 years when different deans are in place. The deans attended an ICPC meeting where they enthusiastically explained their working relationship for the interdisciplinary nature of the program. Senator and SBS Associate Dean Mitchneck advised the Senate that SBS' History and Political Science courses are not overloaded and that cross-listing will actually help out some SBS courses. 7) Does Africana Studies contain enough resources within the program to cover the courses in the major without cross-listing with SBS or CFA? Director Kunnie affirmed that at least five courses have been added over the past year and the program is on the verge of recruiting two strong faculty candidates this year which should increase the offerings. The SBS courses would then become reinforcement rather than courses upon which the program would permanently depend. 8) To what extent is the financially-stressed College of Fine Arts actually committed to this program and how does this program differ from ASU? Dean Tatum responded that ASU's program is in African-American Studies and draws upon faculty from other departments to coordinate a major with the director of African-American Studies. Dean Tatum said the UA program has not asked for any resources or financial commitment from CFA. Africana Studies has recently hired a faculty member with a degree in theatre arts whose courses will probably be embraced by CFA's Theatre Arts department. Director Kunnie reiterated that his program has actively collaborated with students and faculty in theatre, music and dance and will continue. ASU's degree is in African-American Studies, whereas UA's program is more global, encompassing African-Continental, African-American and Caribbean experiences. Director Kunnie noted that in comparison to most Research I aspirational peer universities with African-American Studies programs, the UA's program will have a distinctive edge with its global curriculum. The program's faculty hires reflect a diversity of geographical, political and cultural terrains and Director Kunnie is collaborating on active exchanges with five universities in Africa. Senator Howell called for the question [Motion 2005-06-18]. Vice Chair Mitchell explained that a call for the question is a motion to cease debate on this issue. Motion was seconded. Motion to cease debate passed 28-6-0. Vice Chair Mitchell called for the vote on [Motion 2005/06-17] to approve the implementation authorization for the new academic program, Bachelor of Arts degree in Africana Studies. Motion carried with one opposed and two abstentions.

7. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVAL OF EXCLUSIONARY ORDER POLICY FROM THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (attachment)**

Vice Chair Mitchell asked the Senate for permission to defer item 7, "discussion and possible action on the Exclusionary Order Policy," to the next meeting, in order to accommodate today's guest speakers. He explained that this item came to the Senate last month as a consent agenda item from the Senate Executive Committee. A Senator at that meeting requested to remove this item from consent agenda so it is now returning as a regular agenda item. The policy is currently in force as an interim policy so there isn't a pressing need to approve it today. Parliamentarian Sankey ruled that a two-thirds vote is necessary to defer this item to the next meeting. Vice Chair Mitchell asked for a vote and stated that two thirds of the Senate approved of this action. Senator Silverman asked that this item be located early on the next meeting's agenda.

8. **GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW COMMITTEE'S REPORT (attachment)**

Vice Provost for Instruction Jerry Hogle referred Senators to the "Report and Recommendations of The University of Arizona *General Education Review Committee* of 2004-05." In addition to the committee composed predominantly of members of the general faculty, some members of it conducted focus group research with faculty and students; that research can be seen online at <http://teachingteams.arizona.edu.gerc>. The review committee did not recommend any structural changes to Tier I and II, but did recommend some internal changes to be executed by the University-wide General Education Committee (UWGEC). The most important recommended changes are as follows: 1) Relating to course objectives, "Ask field groups of faculty experts to reconsider, and/or recommend clarifications of, the expected learning outcomes of each Tier I and Tier II strand." This would actively involve faculty in reasserting the curricular aims of each General Education (Gen. Ed.) strand. 2) Relating to Program Implementation, the review committee recommends that "better communications be designed to improve the *understanding* of what Gen. Ed. is for all constituents: students, faculty, advisors, administrators, department heads and members of the wider community." 3) The committee noted a lot of confusion about appropriate substitutions for courses and recommends "that the UWGEC review and clarify the guidelines for appropriate substitutions for Gen. Ed. Courses to ensure a balance between students attaining the outcomes of Gen. Ed. sought by the General Faculty and students being able to meet their individual educational needs." 4) The committee recommends "that the UWGEC, in consultation with the Honors College, the Undergraduate Council, and appropriate other groups – in other words, with broad faculty involvement – work out a clearly demarcated 'Honors Track' in General Education so that our most academically-advanced and best-prepared students can have an enriched educational experience." Vice Provost Hogle noted that the student-based focus group evidence shows that the Honors College is the location of the student group that reported Gen. Ed. is the least valuable and least challenging. This recommendation might represent a policy change, which would then come through the Faculty Senate for approval. 5) Relating to Program Operations, Vice Provost Hogle will be setting up a task force "to examine and make recommendations about the adequacy and accessibility of academic support services for faculty and students involved in Gen. Ed.," partly to help make greater use of educational technology in Gen. Ed. courses. 6) Relating to Quality Control, the committee recommends "that the UWGEC create a periodic review process for Tier I and Tier II courses as fulfilling established Gen. Ed. requirements," once the objectives for each strand have been clarified by these faculty groups and passed by the UWGEC. Vice Provost Hogle said the review committee feels that the Gen. Ed. program, if consistently well done with consistent objectives, can compare strongly with the best general education programs in the country. Right now, however, Gen. Ed. courses are uneven and wildly variable in

quality, even within the same strand. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) The review committee should consider eliminating the blatant politicization of our curriculum (line 399 on Page 8) which is not needed any longer, particularly the addition "sexual orientation." It's time to delete this. Vice Provost Hogle responded that it was an almost unanimous decision by the committee that this language was desired. 2) It is a great disappointment that this study deferred looking at the academic rigor of Gen. Ed. courses, because the major concern among both faculty colleagues and Honors student-advises is the same: why is rigor deferred? Vice Provost Hogle answered that long-term assurance of rigor is a task charged by the Senate to the UWGEC. 3) The other concern this study dodged is the overabundance of "boutique courses," rather than substantive courses within the disciplines. The College of Science wants its students to have a much more rigorous and broader understanding of fields such as psychology or sociology. Vice Provost Hogle noted that criteria are needed in order to determine academic rigor-for each area, so that is why the report asks for faculty to reassess what those criteria should be. 4) What about "assessment?" It was understood that the General Education Committee commissioned an assessment of how well the program was delivering the material to the students and how well they were retaining, and that we use a national assessment. What happened to that report? Do we have any statistics on that assessment? Vice Provost Hogle responded that no statistics exist because the committee feels there has yet to be a satisfactory mechanism set up for assessment. Assessment requires very clear outcomes, which is why the report recommends clarifying outcomes for Gen. Ed. Without a basis for comparison, there is no way to compare to Gen. Ed. other institutions' Gen. Ed. programs. 5) Fifty-two Gen. Ed. units are required, which is more than most majors, but we don't require any academic program review (APR). Shouldn't Gen. Ed. be held to the same rigorous academic standards as a major? Vice Provost Hogle responded that this report essentially *is* an APR, but without the outside reviewers. Budget concerns may have influenced the committee's decision not to invite outside reviewers. The Senate could commission that, however. 6) There should be liberal substitutions allowed for Honors students, with decisions made by an outside panel rather than the "pro-Tier I" Gen. Ed. Committee. Vice Provost Hogle thought this a reasonable suggestion and will ask the UWGEC if they would mind having that extra help, but the decision rests with the Committee. 7) Although this is a detailed report, it appears to have overlooked the especially expensive cost of running the program with full professors teaching and requiring sections. The review committee could have looked more deeply into cost-saving measures, increased efficiency in delivery, and how "the spending of net tuition dollars follows student demand. . ." Vice Provost Hogle commented that this whole area was extensively examined, and the committee reached conclusions after considering many questions and data, and referred the Senators to Appendices D and C. Appendix D shows the Provost has been allocating more funds for Gen. Ed. and reallocating monies following the budget cuts and the tuition increases. The net revenue tuition model in Appendix C, which breaks out that portion of each student's tuition as applicable to Gen. Ed., shows that in 2004 Gen. Ed. brought in \$45.5M but the program is only spending about \$20M. One way to cut costs is to cut the number of required units, but Gen. Ed. is the least expensive form of instruction that the University offers. Furthermore, much of the support for graduate students comes from Gen. Ed. And finally, if the number of units is reduced, where would the students go to obtain the required 120 units? Larger classes might cut expenses, but the committee didn't recommend that. 8) Allowing "double dipping" for Gen. Ed. courses to also count as majors/minors as suggested in Appendix B is a good idea where those courses provide a link. Vice Provost Hogle responded that quite a few Tier II courses already do allow that. 9) The best thing that Gen. Ed. ever did was to allow transferability of Gen. Ed. courses between colleges and this should continue even if liberal substitutions have been allowed, but a college should be able to require a specific Gen. Ed. course. Vice Provost Hogle found this an interesting proposal for the UWGEC to consider. 10) How sacred is the name of "Gen. Ed.," which is somewhat underwhelming. Vice Provost Hogle responded that the name is not sacred, and the committee asked the UWGEC to consider renaming the program as a possibility.

9. **FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVISED MANAGEMENT OF PERSONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST POLICY FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

Vice Chair Mitchell announced that this revised policy is returning to the Senate and acknowledged Senator and former APPC Chair Kiefer's work on this policy several years ago. Vice Chair Mitchell was a member of the APPC at that time and the committee's concern then was to clarify the second paragraph on page three so that persons with a conflict of interest could have assistance in working out a plan to eliminate the conflict. Vice Chair Mitchell welcomed current APPC Chair Aleamoni to the podium. Chair Aleamoni said that when the APPC reviewed this revised policy, members were concerned about the lack of an "escape clause" for the unusual but not impossible circumstance of a student-child who wishes to enroll in a parent-professor's course, where the parent is the only person teaching that course. APPC invited the Office of the General Counsel and the Vice President for Campus Life to a meeting where attorney Vicki Gotkin expressed an opinion that the last sentence of the first definition statement covers this situation. The committee asked to change the word "a" to "any," to read, "when an employee is involved in *any* relationship..." and then voted unanimously to forward the policy to the Faculty Senate as a seconded motion [Motion 2005/06-19]. Senator Kiefer noted that there is nothing more complicated than a personal relationship. He advised the Senate that a fair policy, at the very least, should include an avenue of appeal. This policy grants authority to a colleague's immediate supervisor to review plans to eliminate personal conflicts and to fire either or both employees if the plan is not acceptable to that supervisor. This grants extraordinary power to a supervisor and the policy still does not contain any avenue for appeal. This creates tremendous potential for unfairness and mischief. A fair-minded committee would be better entrusted with reviewing such a plan. Presiding Officer Mitchell recognized Vice President Sandra Taylor in the gallery, who explained that no mischief is intended and that any disciplinary action would be subject to appeal, but that appeal process lies outside of this policy. From Human Resources' point of view, an immediate supervisor really is the person who is the most responsible for working with the two conflicted individuals to resolve a situation. Senator Kiefer countered that most administrators would view such an

explanation as “administrative convenience,” but faculty are more interested in fairness. Vice Chair Mitchell noted that this policy applies to other University stakeholders such as staff, teaching and research assistants and students and that these people could also be potential victims affected by a conflict of interest. A fair process would place the process in the hands of individuals who are not directly involved. Another senator commented that Senator Kiefer’s point is well-taken. A supervisor may not be interested in students or might deny something that under normal circumstances would be granted. These are not theoretical issues. Back in 1969-70 there was nepotism and a lot of unfairness among employees here at UA. One situation actually went to court. Senator Ulreich moved [**Motion 2005/06-20**] to refer the policy back to committee for consideration of what he regards as grave procedural concerns. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with two opposed.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

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

Appendix*

1. The Changing University of Arizona Employee Population
2. Visionary presidential characteristics (“The faculty of the University of Arizona believe. . .”)
3. The University of Arizona: An Archipelago of Innovation, Reflections by George H. Davis
4. Request for Offering New Academic Degree Program (Major), The University of Arizona
5. Summary of Africana Studies Major Proposal: November 7, 2005
6. Exclusionary Order Policy
7. Report and Recommendations of The University of Arizona *General Education Review Committee* of 2004-05
8. Policy of Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest for the University of Arizona, FINAL VERSION 10/19/05

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

Motions of the Meeting of November 7, 2005

Motion 2005/06-17 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the implementation authorization for the new academic program, Bachelor of Arts degree in Africana Studies. Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-18 Seconded motion to end debate on **Motion 2005/06-17**, the motion to approve the implementation authorization for the new academic program, Bachelor of Arts degree in Africana Studies. Motion carried.

Motion 2005/06-19 Seconded motion from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to approve the revised Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest Policy. Motion not acted upon.

Motion 2005/06-20 Seconded motion to refer the revised Management of Personal Conflicts of Interest Policy back to committee. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473