

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
September 9, 2002**

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>

AMENDED

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair and Presiding Officer Wanda Howell at 3:05 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Bales, Bixby, Borden, Burd, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Farney, Garcia, Hancock, Hartz, Holmes, Howell, Impey, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, Likins, Miesfeld, Mishra, Mitchell, Morris, O'Brien, Oxnam, Pintozzi, Radebaugh, Rimsza, Schlager, Silverman, Songer, Spece, Sweazea, Tatman, Vierling, Warburton, Warnock, Weinand, Willerton, Witte, E. Wright, S. Wright, Wysocki, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Arabyan, Caldwell, Chandler, G. Davis, Erickson, Esparza, Heinrich, Joens, Larson, Lynch, Powell, Swanson, Szilagy, and Timmermann.

2. OPEN SESSION

(Please note that speakers at the Open Session are expressing their personal opinion, which may not reflect the position of the Faculty Senate. Written statements submitted during Open Session are available in full at the Faculty Center.)

There were no speakers for the Open Session.

3. REPORTS

ASUA President Doug Hartz

President Hartz reported that ASUA emphasized voter registration and campus community as a part of this year's welcoming activities, along with a successful CATFest. This year's ASUA goals include starting up new programs including freshman class council and working closely with ABOR to develop action plans. ASUA hopes to hold a series of forums with parents and the student body to determine students' needs and to develop a vision.

3B. GPSC President Pete Morris

President Morris shared his opinion from his perspective of having lived and studied abroad in Australia, the United Kingdom, Europe, and the South Pacific, that UA enjoys an extremely positive relationship among the student body organizations, the faculty and the administration. He also acknowledged the commitment from each of these groups to providing a high quality education and an admission from each of them of the importance of graduate students in that mission, particularly while facing the difficult situation of the current budget. Real problems facing GPSC included the drop in relative stipends from the 58th to the 38th percentile nationwide, the graduate student attrition rates (20% Masters, 35% Ph.D.) which has been closely linked to stipend rates, and the cut in TA positions which directly affects TA workload. He also reported that every elected position in GPSC was contested and is filled, and all the colleges are represented. The GPSC organization is committed to improving graduate students' retention, quality of life, and education.

3C. Vice Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell

Vice Chair Howell welcomed the following new senators, Dean's Representative Marie Swanson, Vice President's Representative Dick Powell, and GPSC representatives Jani Radebaugh and Karen Sweazea. The Student Affairs Policy Committee still needs two Senators to complete its roster. The Senate Executive Committee has reserved the Decision Lab for the purpose of an electronic brainstorming dialogue on making the Senate and the Shared Governance process more effective. The two dates will be October 14 and 28, from 3-5pm and Senators are asked to respond with their availability and willingness to attend. Referring to agenda item 9 on the May 6, 2002 Senate agenda, the Medine Resolution which reads, "That the Faculty Senate empanel a five-member ad hoc committee to determine the dollar amount necessary to bring teaching and research faculty salaries to within 5% of current American Association of Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) levels; and to recommend to the Senate for discussion a plan to reach those levels within a three-year period," Vice Chair Howell noted that the motion was not acted upon because of lack of information. The Senate Executive Committee has contacted Dr. Medine, who is currently on sabbatical, for his clarification and will return this item to the Senate floor at a later date.

Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

No report.

3E. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock

Chair Hancock thanked Dr. Robert Sankey for agreeing to return as Parliamentarian for this year, as his schedule permits. Chair Hancock also noted that this year's student leadership is particularly strong. The theme of the Arizona Board of Regents' (ABOR) annual retreat in August was "Changing Directions." Their intention is to explore the notion that the three universities in the state have coordinated but differentiated missions. President Likins' position of promoting "focused excellence" is in keeping with the principles developed last year by the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC). SPBAC is composed of 21 voting members, eleven of whom are faculty members, six elected, four appointed, plus the Chair of the Faculty. ASU President Mike Crowe's vision of change includes a rapid growth path and an enterprise model with greater entrepreneurial efforts on the part of faculty. NAU hopes to become a stronger liberal arts institution, rather than attempting to anchor a research agenda like UA and ASU.

3F. President Peter Likins

President Likins welcomed the new student leaders to the Senate, and noted that not many university senates in America include a member of the National Academy of Sciences, Vicki Chandler, as well as the Fiesta Bowl Queen, Jenny Rimsza. He has invited D. Hartz to attend the Finance Committee meetings this year. The opportunity for redirection in this time of austerity may allow the Regents' to consider relaxing some of the restraints that bind the universities to mitigate some of the financial pressures. Both the Regents and the State have treated the three universities identically, and the governing policies such as admissions, tuition, and rules and regulations have been driven by the same mission. Differentiation of missions among the three universities is a rational approach for optimal service to the people in times of limited resources. The three presidents' perspectives for change are remarkably compatible. UA's focus on excellence could be accomplished through managed growth and more selective admission criteria, while maintaining, advancing, and increasing the diversity of both the student population as well as the faculty and staff. Possible ways to relax restraints might be to allow the cap on non-residents to be applied to the system as a whole, rather than to each individual institution, or to allow differential tuition. The State's 22:1 funding formula maximizes enrollment, but does not promote focused excellence. Allowing the institution to focus on academic programs with a criteria of excellence will shape the investment strategies. The three presidents will present their strategies publicly at the November ABOR meeting. President Likins will issue an ABC Bulletin inviting members of the campus community to share ideas and opinions about this topic.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Impey asked whether the graduate student attrition rate, in part, might be linked to the difficult climate for women wishing to combine families with graduate careers. The UA provides little opportunity to delay the time to graduation, similar to delaying the tenure clock, for women in academia. GPSC President Morris agreed and acknowledged that this year's focus on quality of life issues include healthcare and childcare issues. President Likins clarified that two conflicting strategies for childcare have been in existence at UA for the past five years; a voucher system and an Office of Childcare that has been studying the question for five years. The Office of Childcare was recently discontinued which will allow some funds to be shifted to the voucher system.

Senator Silverman asked whether the Regents would simply be discussing proposals or taking action at the November meeting. President Likins doesn't anticipate actions, but the Regents may encourage or discourage some strategies through resolutions.

Senator Jones commented that the mission differentiation is a welcome concept, because trying to be all things to all people is a challenge, but that implementing such a strategy may require some fortitude. He asked President Likins what he expects in terms of the budget for the coming months. President Likins remarked that the current projections suggest a shortfall for this year of \$400M and of \$1B for the '04 budget. He believes the State may yet require further rescissions this year. Currently, though, the deans and department heads are struggling with transforming temporary cuts to permanent cuts.

Senator Impey observed that the Deans are already being faced with the strategic decisions as to where the focused excellence decisions should be made, so that debate may have to crystallize very quickly. President Likins believes that the University will benefit greatly in the future if the selective excellence cuts are made now.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 6, 2002

The minutes of May 6, 2002 were approved with the following corrections to item 8: first line should read "... Professor Joni Anderson," and line 15 should read "... but are a *discrete* faculty."

INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) Director Jim Livengood emphasized to the Senate that UA's ICA exists only because the University allows it to exist. He acknowledged that while Intercollegiate Athletics are not without controversy, not much of it exists at UA. His department

focuses on their key issues: 1) Trust, in issues both academic and financial, 2) Credibility, 3) Recruiting, 4) Marketing and Promotions, and 5) Development/Fundraising. He dismissed the idea that Athletics is a cash cow, but noted that UA's Athletics program has never run red ink in his nine years and is almost self-supporting, receiving only about 4% of its budget from State funds. The Athletics budget is about \$32M and the department has been giving \$.5M/year to the Student Union and supports 19 teams as well as the Marching Band. UA Athletics does not violate PAC10 or NCA rules and attempts to recruit the best possible student-athletes who can achieve academically, socially, and athletically. Nationally televised games provide great visibility for UA. Athletics development and fundraising works closely with the University and the Foundation to ensure that they do not overlap efforts. ABOR's exhaustive study on ICA shows improvement in academics and graduate rates. He displayed two booklets, "Myths and Facts of Intercollegiate Athletics at UA" and the "Annual Report of Intercollegiate Athletics" which shows the academic rates and money flow. Both are available on the Web or by request. Senators' questions and Director Livengood's responses included the following: 1) What is the relationship between ICA and "club" teams? There is no relationship between ICA and the 32 club teams other than sharing facilities. 2) Does UA participate in random drug testing? UA does test randomly because the NCA has mandated drug tests in all sports for student-athletes. UA's drug testing is part of a very workable drug education program whereby if a student-athlete tests positive, he or she is counseled and educated, but is not suspended or expelled. If this same student tests positive at an NCA event, expulsion and loss of scholarship would follow, so UA's drug testing protects the student-athletes. Over the years, only a couple athletes have been lost due to positive testing at NCA events. 3) To whom should a professor direct inquiries regarding student-athletes in his or her class? Please contact Dick Bartsch, Associate Director for Student Services or Mr. Livengood, directly regarding students needing assistance. 4) What about the national reform movement? Dudley Woodard, the UA faculty representative to the NCA will attend a national conference in Indianapolis this coming week which will strengthen not only student-athletes' admission standards but also continuing eligibility standards to increase student-athletes' academic accountability.

7. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) Chair Jerry Hogle presented the Annual Report including the latest version of the Environmental Scan and the Strategic Plan 2001-2006, as mandated by the Shared Governance agreement. Directing the Senate's attention to Appendix E, Dr. Hogle described the letter from SPBAC to the Cabinet and Finance Committee dated March 27, 2002, which includes the criterion for excellence described in the plan. SPBAC makes recommendations on the overall University budget as well as the overall Strategic Plan, and is also charged with determining how to decide which programs to strengthen or not. The six attributes of quality which SPBAC believes should be used to evaluate units and make decisions about reallocation, reduction, reorganization, or elimination are: 1) Educational Excellence, 2) Research and Creative Excellence, 3) Student Demand, 4) Vital Public Impact, 5) Revenue Generation, and 6) Interdisciplinary Need. SPBAC suggests that programs that don't meet even one of these criteria might be the first place to begin looking for reorganization. The top two criteria are educational excellence and research and creative excellence. Senators' questions and Dr. Hogle's responses included the following: 1) What is the timeline for decisions about reorganizations? The Senate will be discussing the Procedures for Reorganization today, and when those procedures are in place, then proposals for reorganization will come forward, probably within the course of this academic year. 2) Mission differentiation within the University may also surface and could help to optimize resources. Certainly not all units can meet the ideal of outstanding research, teaching and outreach. The plan assumes continuation of the constraints already imposed by the Regents, such as minimizing the need for remedial education classes as the student population grows. 3) How is the Strategic Plan actually used? ABOR requires the University to present a strategic plan at five-year intervals. When President Likins presented the Regents with his vision for the University, it was entirely consistent with this plan. This plan was created in an extensively consultative, collaborative process involving not only the Senate but also the college councils, an effort that served to generate synergy around the University's vision. Dr. Hogle also alerts the Cabinet or Finance Committee when proposals are deviating from the Strategic Plan. In addition, the Strategic Plan is also implemented and reported in annual reports at the college and departmental levels, as in the most recent example of diversity. 4) How will each unit be evaluated? Not every unit may be evaluated. As proposals come forward from departments and deans, committees will be chosen to evaluate the proposals. The process is advisory only. Dr. Hogle invited Senators to send additional questions to him at hogle@u.arizona.edu.

8. **CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND ACTION: PROPOSED REVISIONS TO "REORGANIZATION PROCEDURES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA" (attachment)**

Secretary Mitchell described the "Policy for Reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona," which was passed by the Faculty Senate in 1983 and modified in 1992 and 1993. That document was written prior to the Shared Governance Agreement and also refers to committees that no longer exist. It describes the process by which faculty may be transferred from one department or college to another. A team led by former Chair of the Faculty Jerry Hogle and current Chair Jory Hancock drafted revisions to this document to reconcile the differences. The draft was then reviewed by SPBAC, the Dean's Council, and the Senate Executive Committee, and the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC). APPC brought the April 24, 2002 version to the Senate on May 6, 2002 as a seconded motion [Motion 2002/03-4]. That motion is still on the floor today as the discussion resumes. Secretary Mitchell opened the floor to questions, comments and amendments. Senators' questions included the following: 1) Are the faculty tenured to a department, a college or the University? There was a consensus of the discussion that the tenure is to the University. 2) In Phase III, why do ASUA and GPSC have the opportunity to make recommendations, but not a faculty group such as the Faculty Senate? 3) Since the previous version had copies of the recommendations going to a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate, Senator Garcia moved [Motion 2002/03-9] to add the phrase "and the Faculty Senate" to the end of the sentence in Phase IV, so it reads, "with copies going to affected faculty members and the Faculty Senate." Motion was seconded. 4) The best time for the Senate to provide feedback to the President is in Phase II, section 5, simply because the Senate cannot provide feedback within 15 days, as stated in Phase III. 5) The eleven faculty members of SPBAC could meet separately as a pure faculty group to evaluate and make recommendations from a faculty point of view. President Likins said he supports this suggestion because they are, in some sense, a derivative of the Senate Budget and Strategic

Planning Committee and they would be the most well informed group of faculty. 6) It is appropriate to add the Faculty Senate to both Phase III and Phase IV. 7) When this procedure was used before, the Senate did meet and debate the issues, so it is possible, but not in 15 days. 8) Page 2 of the SPBAC Annual Report distributed today describes the provision for the six elected general faculty members to meet separately from SPBAC if they wish. 9) If the creation of a new department is important enough to need the Senate's approval, then so should the potential dissolution of any department. 10) There is no opportunity for post-doctoral fellows to provide input. Post-doctoral fellows are considered as staff members. 11) What is the definition difference of a unit versus a department? The thinking behind this is to avoid anything that is a subset of a department. Senator Witte moved [Motion 2002/03-10] to add the phrase "the Faculty Senate" to Phase III to read, "... the Faculty Senate, ASUA, and GPSC should review ...;" to change the number of days from "15 days" to "30 days" in Phase III to read "Within 30 days of the publication of the Advisory Committee's report, ..." to change the number of days from "15 days" to "30 days" in Phase IV, and to add "the Faculty Senate" to Phase IV following the phrase "of the issuance of the recommendations by. . ." to read "Within 30 days of the issuance of the recommendations by the Faculty Senate, ASUA, and GPSC, ..." and also following the phrase "with copies going to affected faculty members," to read, ""with copies going to the affected faculty members and the Faculty Senate." Senator Garcia withdrew his motion. Motion was seconded. Senator Hartz offered a friendly amendment to Senator Witte's motion, to add "and ASUA and GPSC" to Phase IV, to read, "with copies going to affected faculty members, the Faculty Senate, ASUA and GPSC." Motion passed unanimously. Senator Likins moved [Motion 2002/03-11] to add this sentence to the end of Phase IV; "The faculty members of SPBAC shall present a report augmenting that of SPBAC as a whole." Motion was seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Motion 2002/03-4 passed as amended with one abstention.

9. **APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA ITEM FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION FROM INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

The consent agenda items detailed at the end of these minutes were approved [Motions 2002/03-12, 2002/03-13].

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Robert L. Mitchell, Secretary

Appendix*

1. 2002-03 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule
2. 2002-2003 Faculty Senate Roster.
3. 2002-2003 Faculty Senate Standing Committee roster.
4. 2002-2003 General Faculty Standing Committee roster.
5. Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
6. SPBAC 2001-02 Annual Report to Faculty Senate from Jerry Hogle, Chair of SPBAC dated August 29, 2002.
7. The University of Arizona 2001-06 Strategic Plan.
8. April 24, 2002 memo from APPC to Faculty Senate re: "Reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona."
9. September 9, 2002 questionnaire re: Senators' availability for Decision Lab brainstorming sessions.

*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 September 9, 2002

Motion 2002/03-4 Seconded Motion from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee to approve the April 24, 2002 draft policy revisions to "Reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona." Motion passed as amended with one abstention.

Motion 2002/03-9 Motion to amend Phase IV of the April 24, 2002 draft policy revisions to "Reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona" by adding the phrase "and the Faculty Senate" to the end of the sentence in Phase IV, so it reads, "with copies going to affected faculty members and the Faculty Senate." Motion withdrawn.

Motion 2002/03-10 Motion to amend Phase III and Phase IV of the April 24, 2002 draft policy revisions to “Reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona” by adding the phrase “the Faculty Senate’ to Phase III to read, “. . . the Faculty Senate, ASUA, and GPSC should review . . .;” to change the number of days from “15 days” to “30 days” in Phase III to read “Within 30 days of the publication of the Advisory Committee’s report, . . .;” to change the number of days from “15 days” to “30 days” in Phase IV, and to add “the Faculty Senate” to Phase IV following the phrase “of the issuance of the recommendations by. . .;” to read “Within 30 days of the issuance of the recommendations by the Faculty Senate, ASUA, and GPSC, . . .;” and to add “the Faculty Senate, ASUA, and GPSC” following the phrase “with copies going to affected faculty members,” to read, “with copies going to the affected faculty members and the Faculty Senate, ASUA and GPSC.” Motion passed unanimously.

Motion 2002/03-11 Motion to amend Phase IV the April 24, 2002 draft policy revisions to “Reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona,” to add this sentence to the end of Phase IV, “The faculty members of SPBAC shall present a report augmenting that of SPBAC as a whole.” Motion passed unanimously.

Motion 2002/03-12 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the request from the College of Humanities and the Department of Russian and Slavic Languages to change the name of the department to Russian and Slavic Studies. Motion passed.

Motion 2002/03-13 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the request from the College of Science and the Department of Atmospheric Sciences to disestablish the undergraduate minor in atmospheric sciences and the BS with a major in atmospheric sciences. Motion passed.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473