

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
March 3, 2003**

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 and Presiding Officer Wanda Howell at 3:03 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146. She noted a change in the order of agenda items to complete the discussion and action on the Policy on Ethics in Scholarly, Creative, And Research Activities and Procedures for Investigations of Misconduct.

Present: Senators Arabyan, Borden, Burd, Caldwell, Chandler, Dahlgran, D. Davis, Erickson, Farney, Garcia, Hancock, Hartz, Heinrich, Howell, Impey, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, Likins, Lynch, Mitchell, Morris, O'Brien, Oxnam, Pintozzi, Powell, Schlager, Silverman, Songer, Spece, Swanson, Szilagyi, Tatman, Timmermann, Vierling, Warburton, Warnock, Willerton, E. Wright, and Zwolinski. Nick Green substituted for Marci Holmes. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Bales, Bixby, G. Davis, Esparza, Flores, Holmes, Joens, Larson, Miesfeld, Mishra, Rainer, Sweazea, Weinand, Witte, S. Wright, and Wysocki.

2. OPEN SESSION

Ms. Rachel Wilson – Ms. Wilson, of Students Against Sweatshops, spoke about SAS' campaign against using students' tuition money for construction, and against the University's relationship with Lehman Brothers, an international bond-underwriting firm which is also one of the leading bond-underwriters for the private prison industry. Ms. Wilson concluded by asking President Likins to sever that relationship.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Doug Hartz

President Doug Hartz reported that ASUA shuttled 75 students to advocate with legislators in Phoenix last Tuesday, but the state's budget projections remain discouraging. For the tuition increase, ASUA is proposing a \$900 increase in undergraduate resident tuition and \$1450 for out-of-state. Dr. Andrew Weil spoke to UA students last week about managing their health and nutrition and school-related stresses. ASUA's online primary elections are underway and general elections will take place next week.

3B. GPSC President Peter Morris

GPSC President Peter Morris reported that GPSC cannot support the central administration's current proposal for tuition increases for graduate students. According to GPSC's recent survey of 500 graduate students, 11% of UA's 8,000 graduate students are considering dropping out if tuition is raised and a number of research assistants said they will drop their number of semester units from 9 to 6. Furthermore, the current proposal is causing many research assistants to consider teaching assistantships, which could jeopardize some research projects. A GPSC proposal asks the administration to hold all graduate students unharmed, for \$700,000 to cover the costs of need-based aid, an amount Morris believes will completely protect those who may need to drop out, for a commitment from the administration to explore providing 75-100% tuition remission for graduate assistants, and to set aside 10% of graduate student tuition for permanent graduate need-based aid, which is a necessity, not a luxury. These measures would bring UA closer to the graduate student compensation levels of our peer institutions, and would benefit the UA as a whole.

3C. Vice Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell

Vice Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell announced that online voting in the General Faculty Primary will end at 5:00 PM on March 7, 2003. Results will be posted on Monday, March 10. Petitions for the remaining vacancies on Committee on Committees, Committee of Eleven, and the Senate are available now and are due March 7, 2003. That election will take place from March 24 through April 4.

3D. Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Secretary Mitchell advised the Senate that neither the faculty officers nor the Faculty Center knew of Pr. Marv Waterstone's intent to use the allfaculty listserv as a forum for opinions. The faculty officers notified CCIT, which determined that this was a violation of rules, quickly shut that listserv down, and have taken steps to ensure that this cannot happen again.

3E. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock

Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock thanked Greg Fahey's office as well as the students for their advocacy with the legislature, and commended President Likins for the strong and courageous position he took in his speech to the legislature on University budgets and the future of higher education in the state. Indications for this year's budget are more encouraging than the long term. Chair Hancock is setting up the advisory review committees with volunteer representatives from ASUA, GPSC, UAS, SPBAC and the Faculty Senate, to consider the merger and reorganization proposals that are coming forward. If the affected faculty members agree with the proposal, no advisory committee review is necessary. With about 14 proposals expected, Chair Hancock called for the Senate to schedule extra sessions on April 14 and 28 to handle these proposals in a timely fashion.

3F. President Peter Likins

President Likins said the news of no more budget cuts for FY03 is encouraging, but that the legislature still needs to take action to adopt that budget in a special session. President Likins took the risk of making a firm public statement to the state appropriations chairs, since they had not yet endorsed this budget and the timing was appropriate. He also acknowledged that ASUA's and GPSC's feedback and counter-proposals on tuition increases have been helpful and constructive, and that the student-administration relationship is much healthier this year. President Likins proposed permanently ending the annual tuition-setting debates in ABOR by following the UA medical school model, which involves adjusting the upcoming year's annual tuition rate by simply matching the 33rd percentile of peer institutions for the present year. The admissions policy proposal that will be heard at the March and April ABOR meetings will involve delegating substantial authority to the universities for managing growth in ways that will increase diversity and quality. President Likins said the reorganization proposals are now entering the review process by the Provost's office and the Senate's advisory review committees. President Likins said Chair Hancock had asked the Cabinet to consider the processes that lead to University policy development. University policies are developed from many points of origin, and when the faculty initiates a policy, the faculty group should seek appropriate administrative input. When a policy is being developed in an administrative office, members of the appropriate Senate standing committees should be brought into the process very early on. President Likins reminded the Senate that he speaks and acts from the Senate floor as a senator, but that when a policy comes to him in his role as President, he may not be able to endorse the policy in its current form, and he may return it to the Senate Executive Committee for revision. For the administration, the Cabinet is the final venue. Since Chair Hancock sits on both the Cabinet and the Senate, President Likins has asked him to take responsibility for alerting the appropriate administrative offices of any conflicts.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Silverman suggested that the mechanism for communication is needed at both ends of policy development process, because rarely is the Senate informed when a Senate-approved policy is approved and implemented as University policy. Senator Silverman also noted that under the shared governance agreement, President Likins should return to the Senate to consult and work out the differences or explain why the differences can't be worked out. President Likins agreed his office needs to improve feedback after the Senate passes a resolution, and may talk with the Executive Committee to resolve conflicts or explain to the Senate what conflicts may not be able to be resolved. Senator Silverman also commented that the Senate does not appear to be taking any proactive positions in the changes that are being presented from the ABOR or the administration. President Likins said it is fair and appropriate for the Senate to take a position on any of the actions that come down from the Board of Regents or other authorities, but warned that it sometimes takes several meetings to gain a full understanding of a complex subject.

Presiding Officer Howell, who chairs the Arizona Faculties Council and represents the universities' faculties to the Board of Regents, explained that ABOR's agendas and materials simply aren't available early enough to permit the Senate time for discourse and dialogue, but she hopes the next few ABOR meetings will require multiple readings of a issue, which would allow the Senate time to discuss and offer resolutions.

Senator Garcia suggested that the Senate consider opening up its procedures by preempting the Senate's agenda-setting mechanism, in order to allow items of import to be brought to the Senate floor for discussion in a more timely manner.

Senator Hancock described how the timing of the multiple policies developed for threatening and disruptive behavior created a conflict for the Vice President for Campus Life's office. These policies came out within days of the UGC's policy being presented to the Senate Executive Committee, and the Faculty Senate passed the UGC's policy on February 3, 2003. Vice President Taylor, however, views the UGC's policy as being in conflict with the interim policies implemented for threatening and disruptive behavior. Senator Hancock suggested that if a policy, such as the grievance policy, is passed by the Faculty Senate, and is later found to be in conflict or in error, the Senate needs to be willing to consider the necessary change. Senator Silverman affirmed Senator Hancock's suggestion to return to a policy that needs amending to the Senate, noting that this step is necessary to honor the shared governance agreement.

President Likins clarified that if a policy is needed to be in compliance with the federal funding agencies or to protect the University, he will enact an interim policy until the Senate can act.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF February 3, 2003

The minutes of February 3, 2003 were approved with the following correction: replace "one" with "any" in the following sentence under item 3G, to read: "The universities hope that the Regents will adopt an admissions policy that begins with a broad, overarching statement that a certain population (roughly the top 25%) will be assured admission to any of the three state universities (although not to a specific program)." Minutes were approved as corrected.

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

The consent agenda item detailed at the end of these minutes was unanimously approved [Motions 2002/03-28].

7. **INFORMATION ITEM: "PAYING FOR FOCUSED EXCELLENCE: A NEW PARADIGM FOR FUNDING SALARIES" (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Howell introduced this proposal to establish a new way to fund salaries for faculty, staff and appointed personnel and indicated that it is applicable to the Medine Resolution that came to the Senate last spring. Senator Jones, the Senate representative to the University Compensation Advisory Team (UCAT) presented the proposal, "Paying for Focused Excellence: A New Paradigm for Funding Salaries," which was drafted by E. Ervin, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel. The initial pages provide an historical context and summary of the university's current situation with respect to state funding and the constitution. The proposal begins on page three and provides a number of suggestions including 1) the University will produce funds equal to at least 2% state-funded personnel salary base each year for faculty, staff and appointed personnel salaries, 2) UCAT will develop a plan to allocate these funds, 3) the University will continue to allocate \$250K to the Provost for recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty, 4) the University will allocate \$250K on a one-time basis to address salary equity cases, and 5) funds identified will be derived from tuition revenues, indirect costs recovery, vacancy savings and all funds sources. This internally generated, permanent, salary pool will be augmented by merit increases from the state. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) Taking control of our salary management is a positive, proactive step to take, since no one else is going to do this for the University. 2) Taking the majority of the money for salary increases from tuition revenues may set up a situation in which salary increases are too closely tied to tuition increases. 3) The introduction of the draft proposal fails to mention the 2000+ appointed personnel employees, describes faculty as being the best and brightest, and describes staff as dedicated and skillful. 4) What happens if the state awards a 3% across-the board salary increase: will the increase truly be distributed across the board? 5) What if the state is inclined to award merit money: will it then withdraw such merit funds because UA has a plan and is already addressing merit? 6) The fundamental problem is that Arizona is one of the few remaining states in which university funding is tied to other state agencies. 7) Will equity be interpreted only around the issues of the Millennium Report, or will it be broader than that? E. Ervin responded that the equity issue will have to be determined and that it will require a lot of input. 8) Since the only University-controlled funds are the tuition moneys, this may be the only mechanism available to de-couple the University's salary funds from the state agencies. 9) Does the language "the UA will produce funds . . ." mean that the University will *withhold* funds, and that this will be given first priority over possible program elimination? 10) The language, "The plan will be founded upon merit" is unclear: does it mean that the colleges shall be ranked upon merit, or the faculty within the colleges? 11) The \$250K amount needed for equity seems too small to address the enormous salary inequity cases that exist on this campus. E. Ervin responded that this amount is primarily being used to address retentions that help the UA's diversity profile, and that \$10-12M is spent annually for ad hoc salary adjustments, most of which are primarily for retention. John Wilson, of the Office of Decision Planning and Support, is completing an equity study that indicates \$250K is needed for *internal* equity, whereas \$57M would be needed for mean equity for all employees among our peer institutions. 12) How will UA be able to sustain generating a 2% (roughly \$6M) salary pool annually? President Likins responded that the Provost, in his capacity as Chair of the Finance Committee, is concerned with all of the various priorities, tradeoffs, resources, vacant lines, available funds, and even cuts for the purpose of creating this permanent salary pool. President Likins said he and the Provost would welcome a set of Senate recommendations describing goals, values, and parties to be engaged in the process, to provide guidance for the administration, but that the Senate should not necessarily expect commitment from the administration. E. Ervin emphasized that the 2% is a goal to strive toward, that the important principle here is to undo the traditional method of funding salaries because our people are just too important to deal with on an ad hoc basis, and that most other universities do not operate this way. President Likins added that this year, at ASU, the administration set aside \$1.2M to increase the salaries of only the top 10% of the faculty. Additional feedback should be addressed to Libbie Ervin, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, or to Senator Jones.

8. **FIRST READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: "MODEL FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW P&T CS REVIEW PROCESS" (attachment)**

Senator Hancock asked the Faculty Senate for feedback on a proposal for a model for implementation of the new Promotion and Tenure/Continuing Service review process, which would combine the second and fourth year reviews into a single, third year review. He said the proposal has already been vetted in other venues and that a survey of all faculty showed 64% approval. Furthermore, 19 out of our 25 peer institutions already use this model. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) This model provides new faculty with enough time to start making it here at UA, whereas the current 4 years is too late. 2) This model is superior, but there is a potential to double-load the P&T committee, which is not the case with the 4th year review. 3) This model could potentially provide less mentoring, so there should be more aggressive and consistent mentoring of junior faculty. 4) This model would help the agriculture extension faculty who are often hired outside of the teaching schedule and are sometimes facing reviews in as little as 11 months. 5) Some departments have junior faculty sitting on annual performance review committees and it would not be appropriate for those faculty to provide feedback on a candidate's promotion/tenure progress, as is required in this model. E. Ervin reported that the administration hopes to implement this model by next fall, 2003. Many of the details will be worked out at the college level. Additional feedback should be addressed to Libbie Ervin, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, or to Senator Hancock.

9. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: ASUA RESOLUTION REGARDING FALL BREAK (attachment)**

Senators Hartz and Farney presented a proposal for a fall break, which would close the University from the Sunday before Thanksgiving until the Monday after the holiday, allowing students adequate travel time to visit their families and celebrate the holiday, as well as provide relief from the stress of a semester without any significant breaks. A review of peer institutions revealed that the average number of class days is 71.5, well below the UA's standard of 75 in the fall, and 73 in the spring. The fall break proposal would bring UA's class days down to 72 in the fall. UA's average number of student contact hours is 47, which would fall to 45,

which is still more than ASU or NAU. Over half of UA's peer institutions and over 20 non-peers have a fall break. An ASUA survey of 800 students indicated that students overwhelmingly supported the fall break idea, and were even willing to begin classes three days earlier in the fall to accommodate the break, if necessary. GPSC, Residence Life, and several other campus communities also support the proposal. An ASUA survey of MTW classes that week indicated that only 56% of students attended classes those days, 29% of those classes were canceled, and on Wednesday, over 56% of classes were cancelled, with a 26% attendance rate in the classes that were not cancelled. Furthermore, a shutdown of the University's non-essential buildings could potentially save \$600-800K in utilities savings. Implementation is proposed for 2005-06. Human Resources may be affected by staff compensatory issues for a shutdown. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) Staff may have to use vacation time for the University's closure. L. Wakefield, of the Staff Advisory Council, said staff opinions are split: some would rather have a University closure during spring break, some are concerned about having vacation times dictated by the University's closure, some departments don't allow employees to earn compensatory time, and new employees or hourly employees who don't have an opportunity to earn compensatory time would definitely be hurt by a closure. 2) Currently, many students request to take exams a day or two before or after the weeklong spring break in order to travel on those days and extend their break. Extending the Thanksgiving Break an extra three days would probably result in the same phenomenon. 3) The Office of Curriculum and Registration is most concerned about jamming the University Calendar, which is very tightly packed with winter session, pre-session, and two summer sessions, or moving commencements off of Saturdays. 4) While ASUA's presentation of the information about this proposal is appreciated, it is regrettable that students would propose such a thing, since students are the losers, shortchanging themselves by three days of education which will most probably not be made up. 5) To contour the University's program around a few students who want to get to a home 1500 miles away is troubling. 6) Most students choosing to attend a distant school understand and have factored in the distance involved for holiday travel. 7) Many of the faculty are already canceling those three days of classes anyway. 8) The timing of a break in the educational process just one week prior to final exams would disturb the academic process. 9) Faculty value the days in their curriculum and are concerned about losing any contact hours. 10) ASUA's statistics about class cancellations and class attendance drop-offs do not reflect the whole of the campus. Upper division and graduate students attend classes during that week and do not usually leave prior to Wednesday evening, although this may not hold true for freshmen survey classes. 11) How do UA's student contact hours compare with ASU and NAU? Senator Hartz explained that ASU's classes meet for 45 MWF and 47 TTH; NAU meets for 44 MWF and 46 TTH, and UA meets for 46 MWF and 47 TTH. 12) Did ASUA survey any of the same classes for attendance and cancellations in October as a control statistic? No. 13) How many students actually signed the proposal? The petition was circulated for 2 hours a day for a couple of weeks, gathering about 800 signatures, and in that time, only one student refused to sign the petition. 14) The fall calendar is packed so tightly that it is just not possible to alter the days and still allow for commencement. 15) A professor teaching the same class in the fall and spring terms would have to alter the content and lectures to match the schedule. 16) The Veteran's Day holiday falls in November, and it is possible that this could fall on a Monday, followed by 4 days of classes and then the Fall Break of a full week could follow, setting up a possible two week break. 17) Despite the objections or potential problems voiced here today, the student body, by the unanimous approval from GPSC, as well as the overwhelming approval from ASUA and students signing the petition, is sending a very clear message, and one which deserves additional study and serious attempts to work out the proposal. Presiding Officer Howell asked Senator Hartz to funnel the fall break proposal through the appropriate channels of the Undergraduate Council and the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee, and then the Faculty Senate.

10. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Senate recessed at 4:52 to go into Executive Session.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Robert P. Mitchell, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
2. "Final Draft *Paying for Focused Excellence: A New Paradigm for Funding Salaries*."
3. "Final Draft 2/20/03 Model for Implementation of Streamlined P&T/CS Review Process"
4. ASUA Fall Break Proposal and Resolution S.R. 02169, 2/12/03.

*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 March 3, 2003

Motion 2002/03-28 Seconded Motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the transfer of the Epidemiology Graduate Interdisciplinary program to the Mel and Enid Zuckerman Arizona College of Public Health with a name change to the Epidemiology Graduate Program. Motion passed.