

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
May 5, 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 Secretary Robert Mitchell, presiding in Vice Chair Howell's absence, at 3:06 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Benedict, Borden, Burd, Conway, Dahlgran, D. Davis, G. Davis, Erickson, Esparza, Garrett, Hancock, Jenkins, Kiefer, Likins, Mitchell, Morris, Pitt, Rainer, Schlager, Silverman, Swanson, Tatman, Timmermann, Tomanek, Warburton, Willerton, Witte, Zizza, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Bales, Bixby, Chandler, Christenson, Cusanovich, Farney, Flores, Green, Gruener, Hildebrand, Howell, Impey, Joens, Jones, Larson, Lynch, Miesfeld, Pintozzi, Powell, Songer, Spece, Strittmatter, Sweazea, Vierling, Weinand, Wright, and Wysocki.

2. OPEN SESSION

Dr. Jennifer Jenkins – Dr. Jenkins encouraged Senators to participate as commencement marshals to lead students into and out of Commencement Exercises. A walk-through will take place on the afternoon of May 16, and commencement ceremonies take place in both the morning and afternoon of May 17, 2003.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President J.P. Benedict

ASUA President J. P. Benedict introduced himself and said he looks forward to working with the Faculty Senate.

3B. GPSC President Peter Morris

GPSC President Peter Morris introduced president-elect Jani Radebaugh, who has served on the Senate's Research Policy Committee for two years and the GPSC for three years. Senator Morris emphasized his total confidence in and endorsement of Jani and the incoming GPSC council and officers. J. Radebaugh described the strength of the internally restructured GPSC and its relationship with ASUA. She looks forward to the opportunities created by fiscal difficulties and expressed appreciation to the administration for help in obtaining the 50% in-state tuition remission for all half-time TA's and RA's. GPSC will continue to pursue 100% tuition remission for graduate assistants, as well as addressing GA workload issues.

3C. Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell welcomed the new student leaders, ASUA President J.P. Benedict, and GPSC President Jani Radebaugh, as well as the new and returning senators. He called Senators' attention to the General Faculty and Senate standing committees' reports and requested feedback to whhowell@ag.arizona.edu on a draft document included in the annual report from the Shared Governance Review Committee, describing implementing shared governance and best practices. Chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, Jerry Hogle, directed Senators' attention to the Main Campus and AHSC Five-year Strategic Plans, and the Update Summary of Requirements and Suggestions. Dr. Hogle explained that even though the current strategic plan was accepted by the Board of Regents last year, both the Board and the legislature recently asked for changes in the format and these plans are in the process of being revised. The update outlines the changes and estimates that have been requested. Dr. Hogle will address the Faculty Senate again in September, after the state budgeting process is complete.

3D. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock

Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock advised the Senate that the "Policy and Procedures for Investigations of Misconduct in Scholarly, Creative, and Research Activities" passed by the Senate, has been approved by the president, is now in effect, and will be posted to the online version of UHAP soon. With respect to a resolution passed by the Senate in April, the Arizona Faculties

Council (AFC) did not disagree with the Faculty Senate's request to petition the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) to change the ABOR grievance policy standard of proof from "a preponderance of the evidence" to "clear and convincing," for the most serious cases involving sanctions of dismissal or suspension without pay. However, the AFC requested substantive evidence and examples of an emerging national trend for this higher standard of evidence in civil cases. Faculty leadership will request assistance from Senators Spece and Silverman to cite cases, especially in Arizona, where the higher standard has been employed. Chair Hancock has consulted with the Committee of Eleven and the Senate Executive Committee about the timing of the triggers for the proposed elimination of the Humanities Program and the proposed merger of German Studies and Russian and Slavic Languages. The summer break is generally considered a less advantageous time for a Senate advisory committee review to take place. Chair Hancock has consulted with faculty members in the Humanities Program who prefer that the review be postponed until fall; he will meet with faculty members from German Studies and Russian and Slavic Languages to determine their preferences. The Provost has expressed that, until negotiations secure a place for every faculty member or an advisory committee review takes place, no mergers or program eliminations will be implemented. Chair Hancock acknowledged Parliamentarian Sankey for his invaluable continuing support of the Faculty Senate and the Senate Executive Committee. Chair Hancock also acknowledged Faculty Center staff for a year of hard work and flexible scheduling.

3E. Provost George Davis

Provost Davis acknowledged the April 25, 2003 *Chronicle of Higher Education*, which featured him with President Likins in its cover story about partnerships among upper administrators in higher education. He remarked that he deeply values his partnerships with the Senate Executive Committee, the Shared Governance Review Committee, and with the ASUA and GPSC student leadership. In meetings with SPBAC and the Senate Executive Committee, he has the opportunity to deeply consider issues and potential solutions to problems. Provost Davis is presently involved with Academic Program Reviews. The quality of the self-studies is impressive, and the visiting committees are also impressed with the composition of the APR committees, which typically include faculty from affiliated departments, an alum, and a community member. Provost Davis said the promotion and tenure reviews have been taking longer this year, and that he is also involved in the Annual Performance Review evaluations of deans and vice presidents. He has been reading the College Annual Reports and the deans' annual summaries of activities and accomplishments, with respect to four dimensions of leadership: management leadership, academic leadership, diversity leadership and University-wide leadership. Members at the recent Cabinet retreat considered the penultimate draft of the Diversity Action Plan, which is now complete, has identified 85 action steps, assigned responsibility for implementation and oversight, as well as a Search Guide for all levels with 50 specific steps that are reminders and checklists to assist in recruiting efforts that will result in more frequent short lists and outcomes that are marked by diversity. The state legislature is continuing its budget deliberations and may not finish until June. Several challenging and disturbing proposals include a 2.5% or an \$8M cut, or a requirement for the universities to fund the employer's portion of health and retirement benefits (about \$10.1M or more). Additionally, although the 22:1 funding formula is never fully funded, the recommendation at this time is for zero funding, which is another \$3.5M. Working with the Finance Committee and the VP for Business Affairs, President Likins and Provost Davis are determining needs and priorities, as well as finding creative measures to minimize the impact of potential cuts on the departments, divisions, and colleges. Douglas R. Nickel, from the Museum of Modern Art in San Francisco, has been appointed Director of the Center for Creative Photography following a national, two-year search.

3F. President Peter Likins

President Likins expressed his appreciation to the Faculty Senate, the student leaders, and to the entire general faculty, as he reflected on the past year as a time of remarkable civility and discourse amid tremendous magnitude of change. The difficulties and challenges imposed by the severity of the budget constraints have nevertheless created more opportunities this year than the previous two. President Likins remains optimistic about the long-term future of the University, because of changes in the attitudes and values of the Board of Regents that give the universities greater freedom of action to cope with adversity, because of the commitment of the state government to try to help UA build a research facility, and because of the new governor who is very supportive of higher education. He expressed special appreciation to the members of the University Cabinet who were committed to work with him through an extremely challenging year to accomplish important missions for the University despite conflicting interests, making this year the best of his six years at UA.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

Senator Silverman suggested the Senate be provided with an end-of-semester summary twice a year listing Senate issues and actions and the status of such items. He also asked Chair Hancock to notify Senators immediately if there is any change to the current plan to wait until fall to implement an advisory review process. Chair Hancock reminded the Senate that any review committee process beginning now would require calling a special session of the Senate in August. President Likins added that it is worth taking the time to help the faculty most affected to accept the changes and to adjust to the realities.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 7, 2003

The minutes of April 7, 2003 were approved.

6. **DISCUSSION (SECONDED MOTION FROM SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO ENDORSE) AND POSSIBLE ACTION: "INTERIM POLICY ADVISING AGAINST TRAVEL TO SARS AFFECTED AREAS" (attachment)**

Secretary Mitchell introduced the seconded motion [Motion 2003/04-1] from the Senate Executive Committee to endorse the Provost's "Interim Policy Advising Against Travel to SARS Affected Areas," and urged faculty, staff, and students to take it seriously and to follow its guidelines. Provost Davis acknowledged Dean Marie Swanson of the Zuckerman Arizona College of Public Health, Vice President for Campus Life Saunie Taylor, and Human Resources Executive Director Allison Vaillancourt for their assistance with this policy. Senator Morris reported that GPSC has already endorsed the policy. Motion passed unanimously.

7. **ELECTIONS FOR COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT, UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD, SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AND SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE SHARED GOVERNANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE (attachment)**

The Senate conducted its annual election. Votes were cast using written ballots. Parliamentarian Sankey and Senator Warburton served as tellers. In accordance with the General Faculty Bylaws, those elected were:

Committee on Conciliation

Keith McElroy
Michael Polakowski
Timothy J. Vance

University Committee on Ethics and Commitment

Saumya K. Debray
Patricia F. First
Deborah R. Mathieu
Xubin Zeng

University Hearing Board

Judith A. Berg
Thomas R. Ervin
Clare P. Rowe
Susan E. Wilson-Sanders

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Representative

Malcolm J. Zwolinski

Faculty Senate Shared Governance Review Committee Representative

Raffi P. Gruener

8. **SECOND READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: "INTERIM POLICY ON THREATENING BEHAVIOR BY STUDENTS" (attachment)**

Senator Jenkins and Vice President Taylor led a discussion on the Interim policy on Threatening Behavior by Students marked "4-3-03 Draft." Taylor acknowledged the presence of some of the members of the Threat Assessment Committee: Jody Glittenberg of the College of Nursing, Jim Clark from Political Science, Steve Adamczyk from UAO, Veda Kowalski from the Dean of Students Office, and Cathy Nichols of Human Resources. Two other faculty members, Catherine Shisslak from Family and Community Medicine, and Judith Becker from Psychology also participated in this effort. Taylor explained that several issues continue to separate the Faculty Senate's Policy on Administrative Drop with Prejudice, which passed on February 3, 2003, and this interim policy. Addressing the first issue, using the Student Information System (SIS) to track students' threatening behaviors, the Threat Assessment Committee has concluded that SIS really was not designed for the purpose of tracking threats or suspensions for threatening behaviors by students, and would prefer to implement a proposed tracking system that would be monitored by the Dean of Students Office. Steve Adamczyk explained a proposal for a central tracking system administered by the Dean of Students Office, which would provide a history of threatening student behavior. Access to this information would be provided to faculty and those individuals with a legitimate need to know, which would better protect students' privacy and preserve the student information that is held private in the SIS system. Using the SIS system for tracking would essentially be taking information from a central tracking system and broadcasting it around the university. The SIS is a passive, record-keeping system, not a warning system, so no signals would be generated to alert faculty of students with a history of threatening behavior. Adamczyk emphasized that a faculty member observing threatening behavior should report this to the UAPD and the Dean of Students Office, regardless of what is in SIS. Adding a record of past threatening behavior to a student's SIS record, which would follow him/her from year to year, has the potential to harm that student's reputation and might be used unconsciously as a bias against the student, even if the student was sanctioned and has worked to overcome and reverse the earlier behavior. This type of harm to reputation is exactly what the federal student privacy laws were created to prevent. FERPA gives students an opportunity to appeal to the Registrar's office to remove a statement in a record. Using SIS to track threatening behavior would create another level of appeal, even after the Dean of Students Office has completed due process and found the student responsible. Adamczyk recommended not broadcasting sensitive information over a passive record-keeping system, but rather that faculty should talk with the Dean of Students Office about concerns, and also to report any incidents of threatening behavior to the police and the Dean of Students Office. Veda Kowalski is currently

researching other university campuses to determine how they handle monitoring and information flow and Taylor assured the Senate that she is committed to finding the necessary funds to implement the proposed tracking system by Fall 2003. The second variation in the Faculty Senate's policy involves language substituting "shall be expelled" in place of "may be expelled," for any student with two documented suspensions for threatening behavior with opportunity for appeal. Taylor explained that the committee believes that, rather than mandatory expulsion, there needs to be some discretion in the process with the Dean of Students and the Behavioral Assessment Committee, and that "may" is also in keeping with ABOR Policy 5-401 *et seq.* Senators' questions and comments included: 1) Retaining "may" is preferable to mandatory sentencing in any form. 2) Would the tracking systems be flushed as soon as the student graduates? Kowalski responded that behaviors resulting in suspension or expulsion are retained indefinitely; other records are kept for five years or until graduation, whichever occurs first. 3) A minimum sanction of dropping a student from a class should be added and stated in the policy. Taylor responded that this is appropriate at times, that the discretion for this action would reside in the Dean of Students Office, and that precedents already exist. 4) How are faculty members' privacy and safety protected against retaliation by students? Taylor responded that with the Dean of Students Office and the police involvement, faculty can be protected, and this would be handled on a case by case basis. Kowalski added that there is no privacy for the complainant, but that the Dean of Students will work with police and Human Resources to provide support for faculty and staff and to protect the community. The last issue concerns a suggestion from Vice Chair Howell and Senator Jenkins to include a representative of the Senate's Student Affairs Policy Committee on the Student Behavior Assessment Committee. The language of the interim policy reads, "may include" whereas the Faculty Senate policy reads "shall include...." Taylor explained that timing discretion may be necessary in forming this committee and that discretion will reside with the Dean of Students Office. This Committee may not always include representatives of all the groups listed in the policy, and may not always include a member of the Faculty Senate or the SAPC, but will always include a faculty member. Senators' questions and comments continued: 5) One passage in the interim policy reads, "The Student Disciplinary Procedures shall govern all proceedings involving such complaints," while a second passage reads, "The Dean of Students Office may utilize a student behavior assessment committee to assist in determining whether the student should remain on campus or whether other appropriate actions should be taken." 6) Can this student behavior assessment committee override a decision of the Student Disciplinary Procedure? 7) Does "assist in determining" mean the student behavior assessment committee advises the Dean of Students and the Dean of Students then makes the decision about sanctions or does the committee have authority to determine sanctions? 8) What does "other appropriate disciplinary action" mean? 9) If the Dean of Students Office has authority to appoint the student behavior assessment committee and to impose sanctions, this could be likened to having a prosecutor appoint the judge. 10) Why is this student behavior assessment committee needed at all, since we already have the Student Disciplinary Procedures? Kowalski responded that faculty wanted a body made up of faculty, staff, and professionals in various areas such as police, that will review and talk specifically about student threatening behavior on campus, and advise the Dean of Students Office about issues of level of threat and risk and impact on community, and advise Kowalski. 11) The interim policy's description of the committee does not address these functions. 12) If this committee is advisory only, shouldn't the term "advisory" be added to the committee's title? As time ran out, Presiding Officer Mitchell requested that Vice President Taylor and Senator Jenkins continue to work on the policy and return it to the Senate in the fall. Additional questions or feedback may be directed to jenkinsj@u.arizona.edu.

9. **DISCUSSION (SECONDED MOTION FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON HONORARY DEGREES) AND POSSIBLE ACTION: "HONORARY DEGREES CRITERIA" (attachment)**

Secretary Mitchell, who chairs the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees, explained that this revised policy comes to the Senate as a seconded motion [Motion 2003/04-2] from the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees to approve revisions to the policy and criteria for approving nominations for honorary degrees as delineated in the attachment. Secretary Mitchell explained that there are two unwritten, unpublicized traditions that the committee has routinely applied to nominations: 1) requiring a local connection and 2) disallowing current faculty from receiving honorary degrees. He presented the complete policy with proposed revisions, to clear up language and procedures that are both antiquated and inaccurate in several places, in addition to clarifying the actual criteria. The first correction removes the phrase, "as well as earned" from the last sentence of the third paragraph under "Policy," to read "Approval by the Faculty Senate is required for honorary ~~as well as earned~~ degrees." Not only has this not been practiced for many years, but even if it were, the committee believes this statement does not belong in the policy on honorary degrees. A passage to be added after the fourth paragraph under "Policy" to clarify the criteria for a local connection reads: "Normally, candidates for honorary degrees from the University of Arizona will have some connection to the University, the Tucson community, or the State of Arizona, but exceptions to this general rule may be made if the case is compelling." Another passage to be added immediately following involves the tradition of not awarding honorary UA degrees to former or current faculty members. UA records indicate that this tradition has been breached at least 15-20 times and the committee offers this compromise language; "Honorary degrees from the University of Arizona will not be awarded to current University of Arizona faculty members, but may, in exceptional cases, be awarded to emeritus or retired U of A faculty." Senator Silverman moved [Motion 2003/04-3] to amend this passage by striking "faculty members" and substituting "employees," and by striking "emeritus or retired U of A faculty" and substituting "former U of A employees." This change allows for the possibility of retired administrators, employees, and faculty members to receive honorary degrees. Motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Minor edits involve adding the phrase "or his/her designee" following "the President" in three passages. The next change involves striking some language in the passage located in the fourth paragraph under "Procedures" to comply with the current practice of not distributing bio-sketches, due to serious confidentiality issues, until the Senate has gone into Executive Session . . . " to read: "The biographical sketch will be made available to Faculty Senate members at ~~least five days~~

prior to the March Faculty Senate meeting” The next change removes one charge to the committee as stated in the section titled, “The Advisory Committee,” to read: “The Committee is charged with the following responsibilities: ~~Identifying qualified candidates and recommending them to the President, so that the President might consider suggesting them to academic units for consideration as nominees.~~” The committee has not been following this procedure in practice and believes it is not appropriate for the approving committee to also be the nominating body. Senators’ questions and comments included: 1) What does the Committee do, in reviewing a nomination? 2) Do you conduct background checks? Secretary Mitchell explained that the Committee reads and summarizes the documentation provided by the nominating unit and asks for additional information about a candidate if the Committee has questions. 3) Does this review occur before or after the college vote? The timeline calls for the review to occur before the college vote. 4) It is often the case that questions arise as a result of the college vote, so it may be appropriate for the Advisory Committee to alter the order of approvals. Provost Davis assured the Senate that his office would assert due diligence in the process. 5) Do all colleges have a voting procedure in place? Secretary Mitchell was uncertain but noted that the Shared Governance Review Committee could explore this issue. 6) If a college votes down a candidate, does that kill the nomination? Yes. The final revision to the section titled “Schedule” corrects the timeline to be more accurate with current practice. Senators’ continued questions included: 7) Is the schedule different for Winter Commencement? No, honorary degrees are approved as a pool and when they are awarded is subject to the recipient’s availability. 8) Is it possible for the Senate to receive, in addition to the bio-sketches, the outcomes of the college votes? Secretary Mitchell will request this information to be included. 8) If the Senate doesn’t see the nominees’ names or bio-sketches until the day of the Senate meeting, does that reduce the Senate to a rubber stamp? 9) There have been heated discussions in the Senate over honorary degree nominees in the past, so the process seems to work pretty well. 10) One problem might be that the Executive Session is always scheduled at the end of the Senate meeting, reducing both the opportunity for discussion and the quorum. Why not reverse the order of that meeting, to begin with the Executive Session? This would also be a courtesy to the guests who attend the Senate meeting in order to present the nominees and answer questions about them. Secretary Mitchell will ask the Senate Executive Committee to consider this suggestion. Secretary Mitchell then called for the vote on the seconded motion [**Motion 2003/04-2**] from Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees to approve the proposed revisions to the policy and procedures for approving nominations for honorary degrees as modified by the amendment approved by the Senate today. Motion passed unanimously.

10. **ICPC CONSENT AGENDA (attachment)**

The consent agenda item detailed at the end of these minutes was unanimously approved [**Motion 2003/04-4**].

11. **SECONDED MOTION FROM ICPC FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: POLICY REVISION: FINAL EXAM POLICY AND REGULATIONS (attachment)**

Senator Jenkins said the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee chose to forward this item as a seconded motion [**Motion 2003/04-5**] rather than consent agenda, to allow for Senate discussion. The first proposed revision to the final exam policy and regulations would permit a summative assessment such as a portfolio or a term project acceptable in place of a final exam. This summative assessment is more logical for disciplines such as Fine Arts or Public Health. The second proposed revision would give candidates for graduation who have final examinations scheduled during their college commencement recognition ceremonies an option for rescheduling that exam. Senators’ questions and comments included: 1) How does one deal with an exam scheduled for a class in which everyone is probably going to attend the college commencement ceremony? Faculty members in this situation should consult with the department head or dean’s office and the scheduling office. Senator G. Davis called for the question [**Motion 2003/04-6**]. Motion was seconded and passed. Original motion to approve revisions to the Final Exam Policy and Regulations carried.

12. **SECONDED MOTION FROM ICPC FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: POLICY CLARIFICATION: -- EXCEPTION TO POLICY ON GRADUATE CREDIT FOR SENIORS FOR STUDENTS COMPLETING PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS IN DENTISTRY AND VETERINARY SCIENCE (attachment)**

Senator Jenkins said the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee forwards this item as a seconded motion [**Motion 2003/04-7**] rather than consent agenda, to allow for Senate discussion. The motion is to approve an exception to the policy on graduate credit for seniors for a very small number of students who are recruited into professional programs in Dentistry and Veterinary Science before completing their undergraduate degree at UA. The exception would allow such students to apply up to 30 credit hours from the graduate professional program toward their UA undergraduate degree. Senators’ questions and comments included: This exception violates two UA academic policies against “double-dipping” courses to satisfy the requirements for two different degrees, and the requirement that eighteen of the last 30 credits for a degree must be UA credits. 2) The typical student will take his/her most advanced courses in the major and minor subject areas during the last year of coursework. 3) The reason this proposal has come forward is because the Petitions Committee, in attempting to uphold the academic integrity of the institution, has been unwilling to approve this exception for lack of a clear academic reason to support this policy change. 4) If this exception is only for exceptional students, shouldn’t all exceptional students be afforded a similar opportunity? 5) If this exception is approved, it will be precedent setting and might afford some students the opportunity to earn both the bachelors and masters degrees in just five years. Dr. Bonnie Barber from the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences explained that the exception applies to a total of about 3-5 students per year. Very competitive professional programs in dentistry

and veterinary science at places like Cornell or UC-Davis, in an attempt to capture our students as quickly as possible, may offer such students admission to their program after only three years of undergraduate work, and award them both the undergraduate and graduate degrees from their institutions, despite the 90 credits completed at UA. Losing such students as alumni by not awarding them a UA diploma to hang in their professional offices diminishes their influence as UA ambassadors in the community as well as affecting potential alumni financial support. These students have been shaped by three years of UA experience in their general education, pre-major and major classes. The requested exception is in line with what other WICHE institutions such as Cornell, Davis, University of Washington, Oregon State, and Colorado State are already doing. 6) Academic Council voted unanimously to support this exception which seems to be common practice for these few exceptional students. 7) This is really a jump, to use 30 units for both the graduate and undergraduate degrees, compared with our own policy in which students are only allowed to apply a maximum of 12 graduate credits toward an undergraduate degree, double-dipping is not allowed, these units must be taken in the last semester, and they must be taken at UA. Motion passed with 14 approving, 4 opposed, and 6 abstentions.

13. SECONDED MOTION FROM ICPC FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: UA SOUTH BACHELOR OF APPLIED SCIENCES DEGREE PROGRAM (attachment)

Senator Jenkins said the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee forwards this item as a seconded motion [Motion 2003/04-8] rather than consent agenda, to allow for Senate discussion. The motion is to approve the UA South (UAS) Bachelor of Applied Sciences (BAS) Degree Program. Dean Randy Groth of UA South was recognized and provided answers to Senators' questions and comments which included: 1) Is this a separate degree program or will this degree be a UA degree? This is a separate degree program unique to UAS and will not be offered at UA Main. It is similar to those offered by ASU East and West. The diploma will be unique to UAS and will say UA South. 2) If these degrees are unique, why do they carry identical course numbers to those at UA Main? Faculty looked at BAS programs offered both in Arizona and around the country and at the combinations of courses for a particular subject area such as Computer Information Systems, and then used existing courses to comprise the gen ed and core classes across several themes. The additional units for this degree will be in the subject area of concentration, which will change over time as we develop new programs. 3) For example, does POL 480 transfer fully between UAS and UA Main? It is the same course, and the UAS class is offered with the same rigor as UA Main, by tenure track faculty at UAS. 4) A number of these degree programs mimic degrees offered at the Eller College of Business and Public Administration. Students might expect to take a number of identical-numbered courses at UAS and then transfer to the Eller College, and the Eller College would be required to accept these courses. What ties exist between UAS and the Eller College? All ties between UAS and Eller College have been severed. Students coming into the BAS program are cohort-based students, which means we accept a certain number of students from each cohort, for example in the UAS Elementary Education program, we accept the students at the junior level and they take their classes from UAS, they do not transfer back and forth with Main Campus. It's a clean cohort-based kind of program. 5) Are all of the classes taught at UAS? No, all the general education classes can be offered anywhere, but the BAS is only available at UAS. 6) Is a specific degree program's classes offered only at UAS or also at UA Main? UAS faculty don't teach classes on Main campus, but those classes are offered at Pima Community College East, at Cochise Community College, at UAS in Sierra Vista, in Santa Cruz County, and in Nogales. Motion passed with 18 approving, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

14. INFORMATION ITEM: GPSC FINAL REPORT: GRADUATE STUDENT DEPENDENT AND CHILDCARE SURVEY (attachment)

GPSC President Peter Morris presented the Senate with the GPSC Final Report on the Graduate Student Dependent and Child Care Survey. He noted the problem warrants a great deal more attention and funding and requested that it be placed on the next Senate agenda.

15. NEW BUSINESS

Chair Jory Hancock informed the Senate that the UAS faculty have been conducting some preliminary discussions that may lead to UAS's greater curricular autonomy to fulfill its differing mission to serve a population that is largely composed of more geographically dispersed working adults who are more diverse and more place-bound. If UAS were to generate courses, it would be with consultation from UA Main affiliate faculty, and eventually the UAS diploma may read UA South, rather than University of Arizona. Senator Jenkins has polled Undergraduate Council and ICPC faculty members about this issue and received responses from Social and Behavioral Sciences, Fine Arts, Engineering, Education, Nursing, CAPLA, University College, and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Faculty were generally supportive of UAS' curricular autonomy and their concerns included: separate diplomas and separate transcripts, budget concerns, although UAS has its own budget, course articulation and using different prefixes for UAS courses, and how or if this issue fits under focused excellence. The Office of Curriculum and Registration, since they will be administering the changes, is adamant about being involved in this issue. Provost Davis expressed gratitude for the Senate's approval of the BAS degree program, which he believes is very sensitive to how the UAS upper division courses articulate with the community colleges and he is persuaded that a very strong advisory system is in place, so that students who move into this program do so with a complete understanding of the difference between the BAS and a BA or BS degree. He is hopeful that the Senate will embrace the concept of establishing a group of UA affiliate faculty committed to work

closely with UAS faculty to objectively describe whether or not the programs being developed meet the requirements and expectations of this faculty. Senator Jenkins suggested Provost Davis constitute and charge such a group. Chair Hancock concluded that this issue will continue to be explored and will be of interest to the Arizona Board of Regents.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Robert P. Mitchell, Secretary

Appendix*

1. "Interim Policy Advising Against Travel to SARS Affected Areas"
2. BioStatements and draft ballot for Faculty Senate Election
3. Draft "Interim Policy on Threatening Behavior by Students 4-3-03"
4. April 24, 2003 Memorandum to Faculty Senate from Robert Mitchell re: Revisions to "Honorary Degrees: Policy and Procedures"
5. Consent Agenda item forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
6. Proposed Revision: Final Exam Policy and Regulations (3/25/03)
7. February 19, 2003 Memorandum from Celeste Pardee to Provost Davis and the Provost's Management Group re: Policy Clarification: Graduate Credit for Seniors Exception to Policy on Graduate Credit for Seniors for Students Completing Professional Programs in Dentistry & Veterinary Science
8. April 10, 2003 Memorandum and packet of materials from Provost Davis to ICPC re: UA South's Bachelor of Applied Sciences Degree Program
9. "Final Report Graduate Student Dependent And Child Care Survey (2003)"
10. Committee of Eleven Annual Report 2002-03
11. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Annual Report 2002-03
12. Committee on Conciliation Annual Report 2002-03
13. University Committee on Ethics and Commitment Annual Report 2002-03
14. Academic Personnel Policy Committee Annual Report 2002-03
15. Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee Annual Report 2002-03
16. Research Policy Committee Annual Report 2002-03
17. Student Affairs Policy Committee Annual Report 2002-03
18. Shared Governance Review Committee Annual Report 2002-03 and draft document on "Implementing Shared Governance at the University of Arizona"
19. Senate Task Force for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues Annual Report 2002-03
20. University Committee on Corporate Relations Annual Report 2002-03
21. General Faculty Standing Committee 2003-04
22. Faculty Senate Standing Committees 2003-04
23. Faculty Senate Roster 2003-04
24. Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee Meeting Schedule 2003-04
25. January 1, 2003 The University of Arizona Main Campus Five-Year Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008
26. January 1, 2003 The University of Arizona Health Sciences Center Five-Year Strategic Plan FY 2004-2008
27. April 8, 2003 Five-Year Strategic Plan Update Summary of Requirements and Suggestions prepared by IPASS

*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 May 5, 2003

Motion 2003/04-1 Seconded Motion from the Senate Executive Committee to endorse the Provost's "Interim Policy Advising against Travel to SARS Affected Areas," and urging faculty, staff, and students to take it seriously and to follow its guidelines. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-2 Seconded Motion from the Advisory Committee on Honorary Degrees to approve the proposed revision to the policy and procedures for approving nominations for honorary degrees as delineated in the attachment labeled "April 24, 2003 Memorandum to Faculty Senate from Robert Mitchell re: Revisions to 'Honorary Degrees: Policy and Procedures.'" Motion carried as modified by approved amendment described in motion 2003/04-3.

Motion 2003/04-3 Motion to amend the Revisions to “Honorary Degrees: Policy and Procedures” in the fifth and sixth paragraphs by striking “faculty members” and substituting “employees,” and by striking “emeritus or retired U of A faculty” and substituting “U of A former employees.” Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-4 Seconded Motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the request from the Graduate College to establish a board-eligible MS in Genetic Counseling. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-5 Seconded Motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve two revisions to the Final Exam Policy and Regulations. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-6 Motion to close debate and call for the question on the Revisions to the Final Exam Policy and Regulations. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-7 Seconded Motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve an exception to a policy on graduate credit for seniors for students completing professional programs in Dentistry and Veterinary Science. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-8 Seconded Motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the UA South Bachelor of Applied Sciences Degree Program. Motion carried.

Sermin/2002/03/ 5-5-03sermin

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473