

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
April 2, 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 3:02 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 140.

Present: Senators, Bergsma, Burd, Christenson, Conway, Cusanovich, Dahlgran, D. Davis, G. Davis, O. Davis, Estrada, Green, Gruener, Hertzog, Hildebrand, Howell, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mountford, Murdaugh, Mutchler, Nolan, Pavao-Zuckerman, Pintozzi, Ranger-Moore, Rodl, Salazar, San Martin, Schlager, Shelton, Songer, Sterling, Strittmatter, Thorn, Ulreich, Willerton and Witte. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian. L. Aleamoni substituted for S. M. Smith

Absent: Senators Bruce, Chandler, Corcoran, Cromwell, Cuello, Joens, Marchalonis, McKee, Ruiz, Sarid, Sebesta, Silverman, Smith, Spece, St. John, Tabor, Tatman, Weinand and Zizza

2. OPEN SESSION

Senator Murdaugh informed the Senate about a GPSC-sponsored Red Cross Blood Drive on Campus the week of April 9th. She also invited the Senate to attend a humorous talk entitled "The Power of Procrastination" by Jorge Cham, author of PhD Comics, on April 25, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. in the Modern Languages Auditorium.

3. REPORTS

A. ASUA President Erin Hertzog

ASUA President Hertzog brought invitations for Senators to the gala event, "An Evening of Enrichment" on Friday, April 27th at the Courtyard Marriott to raise funds for textbook scholarships. The Arizona Students Association is sponsoring "Saddle Up for Financial Aid" day with 600 students from the three universities along with pep bands and mascots in Phoenix on Wednesday, April 4 in order to lobby the legislators to increase the Arizona Financial Aid Trust and other financial aid bills to demonstrate the importance of the student life initiative and what attending a University has to offer. Faculty Senate member Tommy Bruce was elected to be the new President of ASUA beginning May 1. Relating to Proposition 300, E. Hertzog said ASUA is helping to create some awareness that even if students are documented, they do have to go to the Registrar's Office to be checked and that they have an appeal process. President Hertzog introduced David Martinez, the newly-appointed Student Regent from the UA.

3B. GPSC President Paul Thorn

GPSC President Paul Thorn described last week's Graduate and Professional Student Appreciation Week. Reaching out to some more specific groups, GPSC sponsored events including a family barbeque, breakfast at the Arizona Health Sciences Center for health sciences graduate and professional students, and LGBT speed-dating. GPSC also held elections last week and Catherine Neish, a graduate student in planetary sciences, was elected to be the next GPSC president effective May 1. Kathleen Corcoran, a Faculty Senate member, was elected vice president. GPSC began the workload survey of graduate teaching and research assistants today and hopes to gather comparative data about the type and amounts of work that graduate assistants are doing across campus.

3C. Faculty Officers' Report

Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell announced that the results of the General Faculty General (run off) Election which ended March 30 is on Senators' desks today. He thanked everyone for participating by running, voting, or encouraging colleagues to vote. The next Faculty Senate meeting on May 7 is, at this moment, scheduled to meet in Law 146. Due to the Law College's renovation plan, it is uncertain where the Senate will actually meet next year so he advised continuing Senators to watch their packets for the location. He reminded the Senate that at the May 7 meeting the elections will take place for the Committee on Conciliation, the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment, the University Hearing Board, as well as for the Senate's representative to the Senate Executive Committee, the Shared Governance Review Committee, and the Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning. Senators interested in running for the last three committees are invited to submit a brief biostatement to the Faculty Center by April 15, 2007. On behalf of the Faculty Officers, he thanked Senators Chandler,

Kiefer, Sebesta, Tabor, Tatman and Zizza, and ASUA President Hertzog and GPSC President Thorn for their service to the Senate. Presiding Officer Mitchell observed that some Senators may need to leave the Senate early to begin the Passover Holiday today.

3D. Provost's Report

Provost Davis reported that the Interim Dean of the Mel and Erid Zuckerman College of Public Health will be Dr. Iman Hakim, professor and director of the Division of Health Promotional Sciences. Dr. Hakim holds M.D., Ph.D. and MPH degrees. She holds joint appointments across campus with the Cancer Center, Community Medicine, and Nutritional Sciences. Provost Davis described the selection process in which the Provost Leadership Team interviewed the pool of six candidates, narrowed it to three finalists who then presented in open forums to the MEZCOPH faculty, staff, administrators and professionals. Those attending the forums also had an opportunity to provide feedback on each of the candidates. Provost Davis then interviewed the three finalists and feels that he had a strong, informed basis for the decisions and that the early announcement allows for a good transition. Provost Davis described the very deliberative process for making recommendations to President Shelton regarding unit-by-unit budget reductions and reallocations to be applied across campus. He began by consulting with SPBAC, Academic Council, Finance Committee and SPBAC again. The process design took into close consideration SPBAC's guiding principles and strategic priorities. He solicited materials from the colleges that relate to nine strategic directions including strategic vision; assessment of instructional quality and productivity; a sense of the optimum employment of personnel to manage instruction; advancement of diversity; revenue generation through research; programs and activities related to vital public outreach; interdisciplinary dimensions; projected budget impacts from cuts of 1.5% to 3%; and suggestions for incentive concepts in the future. From the academic support units he requested strategic vision: a sense of their productivity, quality, flexibility, and responsiveness; perceived strengths and limitations; the value-added dimension to UA's financial position; the value-added dimension to UA's reputation; diversity goals; vital public outreach; and the projected budget impact from cuts of 1.5% to 3%. Provost Davis held 34 budget hearings with all of the colleges and academic support units with assistance from J. Mok and Ed Frisch, and with input from the Provost's Leadership Team (PLT) which includes Gene Sander, the Vice President for Outreach; Leslie Tolbert, the Vice President for Research, etc., etc.; Andrew Conrue, Dean of the Graduate College; Jacqueline Mok, Vice Provost for Programs; Jerry Hogle, Vice Provost for Instruction and Juan Garcia, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Provost Davis' analysis began with a default assumption of 3% across-the-board, but with an understanding of potential for relief for where cuts to contributions to the overall strategic University mission or cuts would impair the University's strength. He identified five areas for relief: institutional revenue and mission capacities related to instruction; institutional revenue and mission capacities related to research; advancement of gender and ethnic diversity; expectations for vital public service; and tactical considerations related to local circumstances. Provost Davis explained that he worked from several premises: one premise is that relatively small, fractional percentages of budget cuts in colleges delivering large quantities of student credit hours can create high risk in institutional capacity to deliver classes and seats, and to generate tuition-based and enrollment-based revenues. In particular, he looked at colleges that are providing in excess of 50,000 total student credit hours. A second premise is to be wary of undermining efficiencies where student credit hours are generated quite economically or inexpensively: the administration should not underestimate that for units generating student credit hours quite economically, small fractional percentage budget cuts can have a magnified impact on classes and sections and instructors. For sponsored project research, the premise is that AAU peer rankings are disproportionately billed on the magnitude of sponsored project research. This category catapulted the UA to AAU status in spite of other disadvantageous metrics that still persist. Attracting federal dollars is now more competitive than ever; for the first time, UA's total sponsored projects research revenues not only flattened, but decreased to some degree. Again, a small fractional percentage reduction can have significant impact on a unit's capacity to generate external funding. The premise with respect to diversity is that the competitiveness of our Research I University in recruiting and retaining outstanding ranked faculty is increasingly impacted by how well the institution is doing in creating a diverse, hospitable and fair place to work. Fractional percentage reductions impact colleges' ability to recruit and retain quality diverse faculty and harm the overall institutional diversity goals. The premise for vital public service is that, for some colleges, the vital public service component must be tightly organized, judiciously and effectively administered, and invested in heavily. Furthermore, University leadership requirements in these areas are very challenging politically because societal expectations are so high and often so unrealistic. Small, fractional percentage reductions in these areas can be not only harmful but also can, through under-investment, result in loss of support from vital public constituencies. For tactical local considerations, Provost Davis explained that the deans' searches in Public Health and Architecture will most certainly require some University investment. Another area to be considered is departments where faculty salary averages are woefully beneath the median relative to peer institutions. In this way, he hopes the cuts and reallocations will be made as strategically as possible.

3E. President Robert N. Shelton

President Shelton complimented Provost Davis and his colleagues on the very thorough and inclusive budget process, and SPBAC for setting the overarching tone of the criteria to be considered. President Shelton sent letters to the deans and vice presidents last Tuesday identifying the specific dollar amounts of the cuts. He remains confident that this action will strengthen the UA in the years ahead, but not without a lot of pain. He continues to spend time in Phoenix and remarked that the southern Arizona legislators really understand the importance of higher education to the state. Support for the Arizona Financial Aid Trust is softening so President Shelton is pleased that ASA and ASUA will lobby the legislature for increasing and retaining the proposed level of funding and he may join forces with the students at some point. The new Vice President for External Relations, Stephen MacCarthy, was here for a week-long visit last week and has received very strong positive reviews from people who met

him, including some of the Regents. He comes to UA from Penn State and will begin April 30. President Shelton has begun the first regular five-year personnel reviews of senior personnel. He said these reviews need to be thorough, substantive, and timely or they lose their impact. Vice President Ota will be the first to be reviewed and Dean Tatum has agreed to chair the review committee. The process is expected to take no more than 4-6 weeks and President Shelton invited anyone in the University community with insights into enrollment management to provide input to the review committee. Tucson's City Council has agreed to allow the UA to develop a bioscience park at 36th and Kino. UA's involvement in the Rio Nuevo project is currently on hold.

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

Senator Witte asked Presiding Officer Mitchell to address the faculty election voter turnout which abruptly dropped from 700-800 down to 200-300 with the advent of online elections. Furthermore, many College of Medicine faculty are disenfranchised because they are so busy that if they don't vote immediately, they won't go back and do it later, whereas they will check off a paper ballot. Presiding Officer Mitchell said he believes that in this 21st century, people need to use computers and if anyone is disenfranchised, it's a personal choice.

Senator Witte told Provost Davis that faculty input regarding budget cutting was not solicited from her department or from anyone she knows and she believes there is a serious communication problem between the College of Medicine administration and faculty. Provost Davis explained that the information coming to his office was deeply vetted in the colleges and he strongly encouraged the deans and department heads and faculty leadership to be as inclusive as possible. President Shelton said Senator Witte's comment goes to the heart of shared governance. He knows how much effort Provost Davis expended in encouraging the deans to solicit faculty input and how widely those results varied. He said the problem needs to be worked from both ends; it requires persistence and insistence from faculty leadership in the colleges to ensure that department heads are telling the deans that their faculty needs this information; there may also be some campus culture/habits that need to be changed.

Senator Mountford asked President Shelton when the Senate will receive a printout of the unit budget cuts and what will budget cuts look like for next year? Regarding distributing the announcement of unit budget cuts, President Shelton would like to wait until the middle of April to allow the deans to respond to the letters and be certain nothing critical was overlooked. He said the Senate is the proper venue in which to release this information. Next year's (FY08) cuts will be the third year of the four-year budget stabilization plan and he feels optimistic about FY09, which he expects to be about \$5M. There is potential for reducing that \$5M amount based on the state legislature's actions next year.

Senator Howell asked the President when he would be announcing his choice for the interim provost. President Shelton will announce this information at the end of this week, when he also expects to announce the members of the Provost Search Committee.

Senator Mitchneck asked President Shelton to share the elements of his optimism for UA's financial situation in FY09, other than the legislature's potential action. President Shelton said his wary optimism is based the legislature's consideration of new ways to fund this University other than by enrollment. Furthermore, he believes UA's enrollment has stabilized so the University won't be losing \$1M+ each year due to declining enrollment. He does not expect another 2-3% cut in FY09.

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

The minutes of March 5, 2007 were approved with one correction.

6. **THIRD READING AND ACTION: REVISED UHAP 2.13.09, POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR INVESTIGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT IN SCHOLARLY, CREATIVE AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA (attachment)**

Research Policy Committee Chair Cusanovich reminded the Senate that this item still comes as a seconded motion from the RPC [Motion 2006/07-22]. For this reading, Chair Cusanovich said he received a fair number of grammatical suggestions from Senator Ulreich which are included in this version. Chair Cusanovich did not receive any other written suggestions from the Senate, so he added a specific mention of the identities of human subjects and made no further changes. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) Has the issue of anonymity been changed from the original version? Chair Cusanovich said the committee did not feel it is appropriate to make any change to that section. He pointed out the criteria on page five regarding credibility of anonymous complaints; he believes these criteria provide adequate protection for the Research Integrity Officer to make an appropriate decision. 2) The added language relating to human subjects does not speak specifically to the RIO's agreement to strip all personal identifiers from all of the files before the review committee receives them for an inquiry or investigation. Chair Cusanovich responded that HIPAA rules require following all federal policies, procedures and laws. Several Senators assured the Senate that such files are already coded and stripped and separated according to the Human Subjects policies and procedures. Chair Cusanovich believes that the language of the policy protects the identities of human subjects in any investigation. 3) One senator respectfully disagreed, citing that an investigator's file containing the stripped and separated identities could still be subpoenaed. 4) All of the Senate's conversations regarding confidentiality and anonymity have been effectively disregarded. 5) What does the phrase "attributable allegations" mean?

Senator Ulreich and Chair Cusanovich interpret that phrase to mean that the RIO would encourage any individual coming forth with allegations to allow them to be attributed, but if the individual declines, it remains up to the RIO to decide whether to investigate. 6) There is nothing in the *Federal Register* that mandates investigating anonymous complaints. The confidentiality versus anonymity issue is not addressed in this policy. Senator Ulreich believes that if the University doesn't undertake to investigate anonymous allegations, the federal agencies will, and such an action could affect all research at the UA. Chair Cusanovich reminded the Senate that there are constraints on the RIO to establish that anonymous allegations meet the criteria spelled out to determine credibility. Senator Jones called for the question [Motion 2006/07-31]. The Senate voted 32-1-1 to end debate on [Motion 2006/07-22], the revisions to UHAP 2.13.09, the *Policy And Procedures For Investigations Of Misconduct In Scholarly, Creative And Research Activities At The University Of Arizona*. The Senate voted 31-3-1 to approve. Senator Howell asked Chair Cusanovich and Provost Davis about whether they were consulted about the appointment of a new Research Integrity Officer. President Shelton authorized Leslie Tolbert to fill this position following the retirement of the previous RIO. Senator Howell expressed concern that this appointment might have been made without informing or involving faculty leaders. President Shelton said he will review the process.

7. **SENATE DISCUSSION OF CRITICAL ISSUES: UA UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT ADMISSION AND RECRUITMENT ISSUES (attachments)**

Senator Howell called the Senate's attention to two sets of handouts from Rick Kroc which provide demographics about which of our students graduate and which are retained after the first year. The first tables include five different freshmen cohorts analyzed according to race/ethnicity, Academic Index (AI), SAT/ACT scores, GPA and their first term academic standing. The four- and six-year graduation rates are analyzed in the same way. The Academic Index, he said, appears to be the best predictor of success at UA. Paul Kohn, Director of Admissions said that applicants with low AI undergo a lot more scrutiny by evaluation teams and these students are admitted if his office really believes they will be successful. This data indicates that about 60% of these low AI students are retained. Senators' comments and concerns include: 1) Is the UA's four year graduation rate really only 32%? Yes, and that is almost double the 17% of 15 years ago. 2) Is the Office of Admissions extracting and tracking those other factors that appear to determine success? In conducting the extensive, comprehensive, holistic reviews, the reviewers meet monthly to be certain that they are all performing the reviews authentically, and that a single variable such as overcoming a serious obstacle is not overly influencing any one reviewer. 3) Is there a limit on the number of students with deficiencies each year? ABOR requires that the UA accept anyone in the top 25% of their graduating class with no deficiencies, but it also has an obligation to accept 10% of students across the spectrum of abilities, to ensure access. A byproduct of accepting students with deficiencies is that some students may not have been ready to succeed when they came here. The holistic admissions review allows Kohn's office to select those students who show potential to succeed. 4) Is it true that the 10% low AI students use the majority of the resources for retention? L. Trousdal, Assistant Vice President for Student Retention, acknowledged this truth and her office has learned that preparedness by institution and by the students is crucial. 5) Our graduation rates show that fewer than one third of our students graduate in 4 years, and fewer than 60% graduate in 6 years. How does that compare with our peers? R. Kroc responded that UA ranks at the bottom among the AAU peers; among publics with similar admission standards, the rates are similar. 6) Fewer than 50% of students with SAT scores of 1400 and above are graduating in four years. Why is such a low percentage of these seemingly very-well prepared students graduating in four years? Vice President Ota responded that many of those are Honors College students and have chosen a longer path with double or even triple majors. P. Kohn added that some of the opportunities created for these high AI students may deter graduation, such as studying abroad for a year, or a teaching preceptorship. Unfortunately, the University does not always award full credit for these experiences. R. Kroc added that UA is losing some of these students as well, not as drop outs, but as transfers. They are not flunking when they transfer. L. Trousdal has just begun to gather exit data on non-returning students. She noted that 48% say they are transferring to another institution and approximately a third are flunking out. 7) Anecdotally, some non-returning merit students have said they are transferring out because of the lack of merit-based aid and resource-based weaknesses in the Honors College. 8) UA has a huge diversity of student abilities and also a huge variety of teaching styles coupled with a very tough curriculum. 9) What does the data show about retention rates for non-resident versus residents? L. Trousdal responded that retention among residents is higher than for non-residents. Senator Burd disagreed, stating that the difference in the persistence rate for out-of-state versus in-state is only 1%. R. Kroc noted that for the past 10 years, the out-of-state persistence rates have increased right along with the increase in admission standards for non-residents.

In response to Chair Howell's inquiry at the March Senate meeting, P. Kohn referred Senators to another handout at their desks listing the benefits of and costs of increasing National Merit Scholars (NMS) enrollment. He advised the Senate that improving the quality of the student body by doubling the number of NMS recruited to UA is just not fiscally responsible or possible. Since most of these students attend the Honors College, it is essential to deliver the educational experience that high caliber students are looking for. The cost of recruiting these students and delivering that quality experience would cost millions of dollars. Not to do so would mean risking undermining their enrollment because they will simply transfer. The primary value is a move up in the national rankings. UA's "National Scholars' Visitation Program" is going to have to add in a layer for the sophomore level just to remain competitive enough to bring in the 100 NMS per year that UA currently averages. Doubling the scholarship award for NMS would not make any difference if that high quality educational experience isn't delivered. Increasing recruiting efforts with more active direct and personal travel-based recruiting is just not financially or temporally feasible. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) What about the availability of Honors Classes? Many Gen Ed Honors Classes are closed to everyone except incoming freshmen. Many more small, quality TRADS classes are needed. P. Ota agreed that course availability is a major concern and that there are not even enough Honors Classes to meet the needs of current students due to a resource issues.

In fact, Honors College Dean MacCorquodale is looking to reduce the number of freshmen and transfer students or increase the admission standards to the Honors College for next year. 2) If we believe our peers are the AAU institutions, then UA is second to the bottom. 3) If UA wants to improve the graduation rate, we absolutely must increase the SAT or AI of incoming freshmen. 4) We also must improve the quality of our offerings for the graduate students. 5) Perhaps the NMS recruiting visits could be more student-focused to engage the students in campus life as opposed to so much emphasis on the academic orientation. Provost Davis observed that there is a moral dilemma here: our recruitment of top scholars is very well done, but when they get here, we are struggling to provide the kind of programs and courses that should be part of an Honors experience. Our faculty are willing to provide the Honors experience, but the challenge to provide fundamental class accessibility and availability in units like Political Science and History that have experienced significant budget and faculty losses creates a serious dilemma. We are an AAU institution in spite of some metrics and we have worked very hard to retain outstanding faculty, but because the fundamental state base support hasn't kept pace with the market, we have had to cannibalize lines to meet the greater and greater challenge to serve undergraduate and Honors students. 6) We should change the focus of our admissions policies to provide resources to higher functioning students and restrict access to the lower AI student. 7) Offering quality courses will require reallocation of resources. 8) It seems that the UA restricts Honors students to an artificial number. 9) We should avoid making students repeat what they have learned in high school so they get so bored that they transfer. Senator Gruener asked for a straw vote about whether the UA should focus on fundamentally changing the admissions policy and the composition of the student body to become smaller and more highly academically elite while maintaining diversity, like the University of North Carolina, or maintain the current fairly open access and diversity? 10) The most important thing is to improve graduation rates without limiting access to the most academically-prepared students. 11) There is money hidden in the pockets of the University to improve the quality of education and mentoring for all students. 12) Predictors, curves and correlations are self-fulfilling prophecies. 13) We need to foster an academic environment here because this campus isn't particularly academically oriented. 14) Our disconnect isn't in admissions; it's between who we admit and what we provide. We also need to be able to accommodate all of the rich diversity of students and faculty. Among the other states in the PAC-10, students have a wider variety of universities to choose from; in Arizona, UA isn't good enough for high end students and yet is responsible for accepting the low end. 15) As enrollment increases, there will have to be more four-year institutions in Tucson. 16) If every class is providing a challenging education, we won't need to worry about Honors classes and NMS. 17) Are we doing students a favor by admitting them here when we can't support them and then they fail? 18) What we do with and for the students once they are admitted is far more important than their GPA, test scores and AI. We should focus on what we can do to improve education and teaching and increasing our expectations for those students with our admittedly way-too-scarce resources. President Shelton commented that the faculty needs to be realistic about the state we are in, the state's support for public institutions. He hopes to strike the right balance with no extremes such as admitting everyone or freezing enrollments. The most precious resource we have is faculty time, and the question is how to use it. He is wary of shifting significant funds from need-based to merit-based aid and he believes we have a responsibility to educate a broader array of students. He doesn't support the nationwide trend to "buy" students. Senator Howell informed the Senate that President Shelton rejected the Regents' offer of incentivizing compensation.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Senator Burd suggested that the Senate Executive Committee consider changing the Academic Calendar to accommodate college commencement ceremonies without being in conflict with the final exams.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

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

Appendix*

1. "Spring 2007 Faculty General Election Results" press release dated April 2, 2007
2. UHAP Policy 2.13.09 showing latest revisions in highlighting
3. "National Merits Scholar (NMS) Recruitment" dated 3/30/07
4. Profile of persisting and non-persisting first-time full-time freshmen entering Fall 2000-Fall 2005
5. Profile of seniors entering as first-time full-time freshmen entering Fall 2000-Fall 2002 Graduating in four years or less
6. Profile of students entering as first-time full-time freshmen entering Fall 1998-Fall 2000 Graduating in up to six years

**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 April 2, 2007

Motion 2006/07-31 Motion to end debate on Motion 2006/07-22, the revisions to UHAP 2.13.09, the *Policy And Procedures For Investigations Of Misconduct In Scholarly, Creative And Research Activities At The University Of Arizona*. Motion carried, 32-1-1.

Motion 2006/07-22 Seconded motion (carried over from January 22, 2007 meeting) from the Research Policy Committee to approve revisions to the *University Handbook for Appointed Personnel* 2.13.09, "Policy and Policy and Procedures for Investigations of Misconduct in Scholarly, Creative and Research Activities at the University of Arizona." Motion carried 33-3-1

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473