

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
October 4, 2004**

These minutes may be accessed electronically at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>
Visit the faculty governance webpage at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/>

1. CALL TO ORDER

Secretary Robert Mitchell, presiding in Vice Chair Wanda Howell's absence, called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146. He announced that agenda item 8 would be moved to 10, and that the Committee of Eleven agenda items 9 and 10 would be moved up to 8 and 9.

Present: Senators Baca, Bixby, Brobbel, Bui, Burd, Chandler, Conway, Cromwell, Cusanovich, D. Davis, G. Davis, Eddy, Garcia, Garrett, Gruener, Hancock, Hildebrand, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, Kinney, Larson, Likins, Marchalonis, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mountford, Patterson, Pintozzi, San Martin, Silverman, Spece, St. Jolu, Sterling, Strittmatter, Tatman, Tomanek, Ulreich, Willerton, Witte, Worle, and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Chapman, Christenson, Dahlgran, Howell, Joens, Pitt, Powell, Smith, Songer, Swanson, Timmermann, Vierling, Weinand, and Zizza.

2. OPEN SESSION

Senator Ulreich of the College of Humanities expressed concern on behalf of the College of Humanities about the most recent budget rescissions which provoked a crippling, demoralizing effect that has led professors in his college to believe that their work is not valued by the central administration.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Alistair Chapman

Senator Ryan Patterson reported on behalf of President Chapman who is absent due to class. ASUA has adopted a theme of "civic engagement" which involves multiple approaches. ASUA student volunteers' voter registration efforts will end tonight at midnight and included a "Rock the Vote" concert this past weekend with over 1800 registered voters attending. Voter education involves a speakers series with a broad range of political speakers including libertarian Presidential candidate Michael Badnarik, Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano, David Hardy, author of Michael Moore is a Big, Fat, Stupid White Man, Michael Moore, director of *Fahrenheit 9/11*, Arizona Congressman Jim Kolbe and Arizona Senator John McCain. Students viewing the first presidential candidates' debate last week were able to participate in a discussion immediately following with two faculty members who presented opposing viewpoints. The ASUA Office in the Student Union has just been designated an early polling site, so registered students, faculty and staff will be allowed to vote early the week of October 25-29. The Arizona Students Association is considering creating a student lobbying video. A student stakeholder meeting regarding restructuring of higher education in Arizona was held in conjunction with the ABOR meeting last week. ASUA is beginning to discuss mandatory meal plans for freshmen. ASUA's efforts to increase advisor accountability has made real progress this past year and with the COSMOS tracking system, advisors will be able to post notes and students will be able to check them for discrepancies or questions. A pilot program is expected to be ready next semester. Through the efforts of ASUA President Alistair Chapman working with President Likins, the December Commencement ceremony has been reinstated and students will work with the Commencement Committee to eliminate some of the past problems and to make this the decorous ceremony that it deserves to be. In November, ASUA will host a President's Breakfast for students to meet with President Likins and learn about how the University operates. ASUA is also beginning to consider the high cost of printing pages via Internet e-reserves.

3B. GPSC President Amanda Brobbel

GPSC President Amanda Brobbel introduced Senators James Eddy, GPSC's external affairs vice president, and Thomas Kinney, GPSC's internal affairs vice president. She expressed gratitude that the Board of Regents approved the plan for UA to purchase La Aldea housing complex for graduate students. Student Showcase deadline has been extended to October 14 and faculty are asked to encourage their best students to apply. GPSC plans to focus on ways to improve conditions for graduate and professional students and hopes to increase the graduate student travel grants, which are currently funded at only \$20K/year, compared to ASU, which is at \$70K/year. GPSC is working with "BabyCats II," a graduate student club that was begun several years ago to determine what are the childcare needs of graduate student parents.

3C. Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Secretary Mitchell welcomed the new ASUA and GPSC senators, Kim Bui, Ryan Patterson, and Evan Worle, James Eddy, and Thomas Kinney. Secretary Mitchell thanked the Senators who participated in the electronic vote on the ICPC Consent Agenda item [Motion 2004/05-9] regarding the name change of the Program in Judaic Studies to a Center for Judaic Studies. Motion carried with a quorum of 29 Senators voting, twenty-eight in favor and one opposed. Next month the Senate will be visited by ASU West's Fran Bernat, Chair of the Arizona Faculties Council and the Faculty Stakeholders Group regarding proposed changes to the structure of higher education in Arizona. Secretary Mitchell called Senators' attention to two items in the Senate packets, the Senate and General Faculty Standing Committees lists, and the Research Policy Committee's Annual Report.

3D. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock

Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock acknowledged the ASUA's efforts in attempting to balance the speakers brought to campus for the speaker series. Chair Hancock is the only faculty member named to the higher education restructuring workgroup. His subcommittee is considering what criteria to use for evaluating the fifteen proposals that have already come forward. He expects the evaluation process to take 12-18 months and cautioned that if a proposal is predicated upon student demand, in which case, those projections for student demand need to be very accurate. This process is very transparent and these meetings are all open. The Student Union is underwriting the Redington Room's "faculty club" on W-Th-F from 3-6PM, but the low turnout has been discouraging. Chair Hancock inquired whether Senators might like to visit the Redington Room as a group some afternoon.

3E. Provost George Davis

Provost Davis distributed a description of a proposed restructuring of the finance committee. He has presented the concept to the Senate Executive Committee, SPBAC, and the Focused Excellence Task Force of Regents' Professors. The budget and finance challenges involve working hard to analyze issues and recognize opportunities. When state funding was adequate, the finance committee functioned as an all-funds budget committee, but these times require a different kind of structure. A cabinet-level Core Finance Committee chaired by President Likins would recommend allocating and reallocating funds, and would direct and receive information from the six following workgroups: Financial Practices, Revenue Projection, Enrollment Revenues Planning, Academic Investments and Priorities, Infrastructure and Support Services, and Compensation and Benefits. The chairs of each of these workgroups would sit on the core finance committee. Membership of the workgroups will include several deans and at least one faculty voice. It is hoped that the chairs of the workgroups will consider expertise and inclusiveness when determining membership and staff support. Provost Davis explained that the intent of this restructure is to ensure that the work of the finance committee never becomes insular and that the deans will ensure faculty dialogue from cabinet to academic council to department heads, directors and others. Regarding the state funds for the July salary packages for faculty and the key personnel decision package funds, Provost Davis said that the administration is about to conclude that deployment of the state's July salary package as related to faculty will not be made until January 1, 2005, but will be retroactive to July 1, 2004. Feedback and input received from SPBAC, Academic Council, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee suggest that the Provost retain 10% of the July salary package for reallocation centrally. The remainder would be deployed to the colleges in proportion to the state personnel budgets, and the deans, working with department heads, shared governance committees, and MROC committees, will develop policies and guidelines for distribution. Provost Davis said this conversation is ongoing and welcomes feedback. Regarding the key personnel decision package funds, Provost Davis described key personnel as those individuals within a university whose contributions are critical to a unit's ability to achieve excellence in fundamental mission and signature areas. Managing these funds as a separate pool should enable the University to be pre-emptive and pro-active in identifying and retaining such significant individuals. Furthermore, women and minority faculty commonly carry extraordinary service loads in addition to research and teaching and this should be factored into the criteria. The Provost proposed retaining 20% of these funds for reallocation across colleges but 5% would be given for non-faculty key personnel. The remainder would be deployed to the deans who would bring plans and criteria for distribution that have been vetted in the colleges to the Provost. The timeline for these key personnel funds will also be January 1, 2005.

3F. President Peter Likins

President Likins referred to the turbulent times that the University has been encountering and expressed respect for the ASUA's decision to bring the controversial film director Michael Moore to campus, even though it has flooded his mailbox with some angry criticisms. His response has been that this is a process whereby we trust and respect our student leaders to do the best they can to bring to campus a spectrum of speakers to address this topic of civic engagement. He believes the student leaders have been most conscientious in trying to meet their responsibilities and he does not believe that they are trying to distort values. He has defended their right to invite these speakers. President Likins expressed gratitude for the students' responsible behavior and constructive responses in reacting to the announcement of the cancellation of the University-wide Commencement ceremony. Enrollment figures are improving as designed, getting better instead of bigger, with increasing diversity, higher academic profiles, slightly greater retention of freshmen to sophomores (79%), and slightly higher graduation rates (57%), although those measures are not yet acceptable. The state promises receptivity to the notion that as the University improves, it should receive additional funding in annual allocations. ABOR approved the UA's submittal of a \$32M request for annual and recurring dollars to the state legislature for proper funding for strategic improvements: \$20M to foundations underlying the health sciences, \$10M

for research, instruction and outreach as it relates to water and the water crisis in Arizona; and \$2M to enable the College of Education to work with other colleges to invest in teacher preparation. Other recent media attention has focused on the agreement between ASU, UA and the President of the Board of Regents that ensures that the future of medical education for Arizona will be a University of Arizona franchise. As UA already provides third and fourth year medical schooling in Phoenix, it will now expand those offerings to include first and second year medical education in Phoenix as well. Some confusion has arisen in the media about the Arizona Biomedical Collaborative, which will create a Phoenix Biomedical Campus to house some UA-ASU joint research facilities, TGEN and the UA College of Medicine. ASU's College of Nursing may also move to this location. UA may decide to offer joint appointments to the ASU and UA faculty, but the curriculum, faculty and medical degrees will be the UA's College of Medicine. Since the very disruptive announcement of the budget cuts last June, the President, Provost and others have spent a great deal of time meeting with multiple constituents attempting to explain what internal resource reallocations have been accomplished and what is still needed to advance the agenda and invest strategically in focused excellence. Restructuring the way the upper administration consults on budgeting will involve more deans on the cabinet and in the working groups. The University Council is being eliminated and the President will meet with the Provost and Academic Council instead. The UA recently celebrated "Diversity Day" which was intended to make a statement about the UA's belief in increasing the diversity of its students, staff and faculty and in preparing ourselves for an increasingly diverse America in a global society.

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

Senator Silverman asked why the draft memberships of the restructured financial working groups include only one faculty member and asked how the faculty members would be selected. Provost Davis said he expects the workgroups to invite other faculty and informed staff s to consult and give input on a topic-by-topic basis.

Senator Silverman asked how the restructured financial committee relates to SPBAC. Provost Davis responded that SPBAC's charge is to develop the five-year plan and to be in close dialogue with central administration and the finance group with proposals for year-by-year investing that will help fulfill the five-year plan. SPBAC remains a fundamental shared governance group to provide feedback because it is uniquely composed of individuals who have been elected or appointed by individual employee groups.

Senator Witte asked Senator Hancock to set aside time in a future Faculty Senate meeting to fully discuss Arizona university restructuring, and not to cancel any more Senate meetings when such a discussion could take place. Senator Hancock said the Senate would certainly be able to have a discussion about the restructuring of higher education in Arizona. He also said that any discussions dealing with budget or restructuring would not have as much value in the absence of the President and Provost, who were, both unable to attend the September Senate meeting, which was subsequently canceled. Senator Witte responded that Faculty Senators are certainly able to have a discussion, particularly about philosophical matters such as restructuring, without the upper administration present. Senator Hancock agreed and suggested that such a discussion could even take place in the Redington Room. Secretary Mitchell added that, in the spirit of shared governance, it is better to have these discussions with the administration in attendance.

Senator Witte asked Senator Hancock what he intends to do about the dismal turnout in faculty elections due the change from paper ballots to electronic voting. Senator Hancock responded that the increase in ASUA's voter turnout when it changed to online voting was a strong motivating factor in the decision to try this. The \$3000 cost savings was also motivating. Senator Hancock is willing to discuss whether to return to paper ballots.

Senator Brobbel inquired whether faculty's electronic voting is via an Internet link. Senator Mitchell responded that this is the procedure and that faculty have to log in to vote using Net ID's and passwords, which may be the obstruction.

Senator Witte asked whether the faculty at UA would receive a \$1000 across-the-board salary increase. Provost Davis responded that most of the deans are in favor of that distribution.

Senator Witte expressed concern about the decision-making process regarding the decision to offer College of Medicine degrees in Phoenix. She asked why this agreement between the ABOR President and the ASU and UA presidents was not discussed publicly, openly and fully, why it was made without involving faculty in the discussions, and was the ABOR President representing the entire Board of Regents in this decision? President Likins responded that the entire Board unanimously and openly endorsed this action in retrospect.

Senator Mitchneck thanked Provost Davis for the responsiveness in restructuring the finance committee and asked about the process for selecting the faculty representatives for the working groups. Provost Davis responded that this will be discussed on Wednesday and that he is soliciting suggestions of names of knowledgeable individuals from the deans and the chairs of the working groups. Senator Silverman asked Provost Davis to please consider that the faculty representatives to the restructured finance committees should at least be nominated and perhaps even selected by faculty, not deans and administrators.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF May 3, 2004**

The minutes of May 3, 2004 were approved.

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

The consent agenda items detailed at the end of these minutes [Motions 2004/05-10 to 2004/05-14] were approved.

7. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION: INSTITUTE FOR GLOBAL PHARMACEUTICAL DEVELOPMENT**

Arizona Health Sciences Vice President Ray Woosley and Associate Vice President for Economic Development Bruce Wright distributed and discussed information about an extraordinary opportunity to create an Institute for Global Pharmaceutical Development (IGPD), a freestanding, independent, not for profit partnership between the University of Arizona, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Stanford Research Institute International. The high cost and long time presently needed to bring new drugs to patients has created a serious problem in our nation and globally, and is threatening our health-care system due to rapidly raising costs, and the pharmaceutical industry because of the reduced time that patents are in force. The mission of the proposed institute will be to examine ways to and elaborate policies that would accelerate drug development, to reduce costs associated with bringing new drugs to market and to provide unique educational and training experiences to professionals in this area. Currently, industry figures show that it takes 12-15 years and \$800M to \$1.7B to bring a new drug to market. The patent life on a new drug is about 15-17 years, so the pharmaceutical industry only has 2-5 years to recoup costs and turn a profit on that investment. This situation has resulted in fewer new drugs being taken through this arduous process despite the fact that basic research has been providing new leads for drugs that have the potential of becoming highly effective in the treatment of diseases. The consequence is that the public has diminishing access to new treatment for life-debilitating and threatening diseases. Bruce Wright stated that the creation of the IGPD in Tucson is likely to become a significant anchor for new biotechnology companies and associated enterprises to Tucson and that this activity is likely to translate into vigorous economic development for our community. The IGPD is an opportunity for Tucson and the UA to become an international leader in biosciences and particularly in the area of drug development. The Institute would establish a federal research center in the State and is consistent with the State's efforts to build a biotechnology corridor that runs from Flagstaff through Phoenix to Tucson in accord with the Battelle roadmap for Arizona. The plan is to form the Institute through a memorandum of understanding with the three partners, which would lead to developing a business plan, a financial plan, a governance/management structure, and a set of program areas that would be the central focus for the first five years. The Institute will be a non-profit entity and would be governed by a board of directors with members from three partners as well as from industry and the community. The IGPD would begin with a five-year annual operating budget of \$4M with federal funding eventually supporting the research activities, educational opportunities and programs. Faculty from Eller, Medicine, and Pharmacy colleges are discussing the concept and the hope is to begin activities in January 2005. The reason for fast-tracking the IGPD is that we, in Tucson, have a unique opportunity (by partnering with the FDA and the SRI) before the FDA will open the concept up to national competition. Funding from a variety of public and private sources, tuition, foundation grants and research contract fees would be involved. One of the criteria posed by FDA and SRI was to challenge the community to step forward to participate in establishing the Institute in Tucson. To date, the institute has received a commitment of \$1.5M for operating expenses for the first five years from public and private sources in Tucson, which will cover basic operating expenses for the Institute. The rest of the annual expenses for operating the institution the first five years will be provided by the founding partners, primarily as in-kind services such as temporary facilities, faculty support, and research grant and contract dollars. This is an extraordinary response from the community (including the City of Tucson which, since this discussion took place, has approved funding for the project.). Bruce Wright said he hopes to secure state funding to build a facility to house the Institute in 2006-07. The Institute has the potential to establish Tucson as an international center for drug discovery and development, it compliments the efforts of TGEN and the Arizona Biosciences Roadmap, it would draw a variety of world-class researchers to Tucson and to UA to participate both in research and educational enterprises of the Institute and would potentially attract major pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies to the region. Economically, the Institute would also attract contract research organizations that would want to be close to the Institute to learn how to do accelerated drug development including receiving approval from the FDA. The Institute would likely serve as a strong stimulus to encourage the creation of faculty spin-offs in the life sciences and in interdisciplinary enterprises that will bring together talents from engineering, business and the life sciences. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) Will this request to the legislature for capital compete with the UA's biomedical decisions packages? Bruce Wright replied that funding requests for the Institute are not part of the University's request for funds, but rather more like a long term loan request from the State, of about \$25-30M to build the Institute, which would include not only the Institute but would draw research organizations. 2) What are the downsides and risks of this proposal? The risks are that the community invests in this and then the FDA does not get appropriations. Our backup plan is to downsize the Institute and offer educational programs that would generate tuition and draw NIH other new grants. The investment from the community in this scenario would take a lot longer to pay off, if ever. Another risk is that, given this extraordinary national opportunity, if we don't take advantage of this opportunity, it would say a great deal about Tucson and the UA to not respond and this could have a devastating effect on our subsequent efforts to become a high technology community. 3) What do you want from us? We want the faculty to understand what an opportunity this is and we believe that a lot of faculty will want to be a part of this. We also feel that there are local and national foundations that want help in developing drugs, like the Ara Parseghian Medical Research Foundation searching for a cure or prevention for Niemann-Pick

Type C Disease or the Muscular Dystrophy Association, which would like to accelerate study of an implementation of therapeutics for neuromuscular diseases. Some of these “orphan” diseases will get the attention required because of the high costs of drug development discussed about. This is good for the UA and Tucson and good for the country. The University needs to embrace this and try to align the work, research and educational programming in the various colleges to be supportive of this unique venture. There are also enormous opportunities for collaborative leverage between the Institute and Bio5, the University’s Institute for Biotechnology. It is hoped that the faculty will support the concept of the proposed Institute and will want to be involved. 4) Is it true that no financial commitment from the UA is necessary at this time? That is correct. It is possible, however, that depending on what will be going on in the future, the Institute might come to the University to ask if it might be willing to invest. 5) The Faculty Senate can’t possibly endorse this concept after such a brief presentation. This is an informational presentation to the Faculty Senate, but it is hoped that ultimately the Senate will endorse it. Presentations and meetings with SRI have been made to the Colleges of Pharmacy and Medicine and dialogue is now going on in those areas. 6) This has been discussed extensively in the public media, especially the newspapers. 7) Will new educational programs be offered in January? No, but we would like for the current educational programs to be emphasized in this Institute. One academic aspect is that the UA could become the home for the brightest academics in pharmacy, just as MIT is to the brightest engineers. 8) What is the guarantee that this will lower the costs of pharmaceutical drugs? There is no question in anyone’s mind that something has to change or we will have price controls. Social and policy changes will define this. The majority of drug development is in small biotechnology companies, but they are unable to remain financially viable because they are unable to hang on for the 12 years to secure FDA approval. Big Pharma cherry-picks the best of those companies and profits immensely from them. Streamlining development and reducing the time to market will increase competition, distribute the wealth more evenly, and link the enterprise more closely to the research. 9) Will the Institute always retain a link to the UA. Could it potentially draw faculty away from the UA? The governing body will always include members of the three partners, and the attraction for faculty and new faculty will not be as an academic competition, but rather as a problem-solving oriented environment in which they can contribute or participate, and then return to the academy. The IGPD would be separate from the University and will be a freestanding, independent, not-for profit, 501-C3 that will probably require ABOR approval for the University to sign the MOU, but it is analogous to TGEN. 10) What is the timeline for the approval? The goal is to try to have the details of the institute completed by January 1. Dr. Ray Woosley and Bruce Wright are willing to conduct a series of more extensive and thoughtful faculty discussions to the broader campus community, beyond the Colleges of Medicine and Pharmacy. Secretary Mitchell announced that the Senate Executive Committee will bring this issue back to the Senate.

8. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION: COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN PROPOSAL ON THE REVIEW OF SERVICE UNITS (attachment)

Committee of Eleven Chair Garcia distributed a revised version of the Proposal On The Review Of Service Units at the University of Arizona. The C11 has been discussing the issue of service unit reviews for some time and has heard from a number of faculty who believe that a review of service units, similar to that of departments, is desirable. This proposal calls for a questionnaire and a review committee formed with representatives from the users: the administration, faculty, staff, students, and one external expert, perhaps from a peer institution with a similar unit. Recommendations for improvements would closely follow the model of academic program reviews. The C11 met with a committee that has been appointed to review Financial Services. Leslie Tolbert heads this committee and the discussion yielded the two revisions to the proposal which is actually reviewing a cluster of units, all of which serve the financial needs of the University and how they work together to further the mission of the University. Both kinds of reviews need to go on, but the C11 proposal is directed toward more specific service unit reviews. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) Maybe the external expert should be from the business or economics community. 2) L. Tolbert’s committee’s cluster review is actually a functional review. Isolated organizational units have to function in an interconnected way in order to serve, so it may be more important to define a function such as, “the allocation, construction and remodeling of space.” Reviewing individual units is less useful than reviewing functions and performance. 3) Are you proposing regular periodic reviews for units beyond what they already do? Not if the unit already has a review process in place that satisfies these criteria. 4) Who would oversee these reviews? The vice president for each unit seems like the appropriate official. 5) As a member of L. Tolbert’s review committee, it has been very helpful to look at functions and helpful in gathering information too. Senator Silverman moved [Motion 2004/05-15] that the Faculty Senate endorse the concept that service units at the University of Arizona should be reviewed on a periodic basis. Motion was seconded. Senators’ discussion included the following points: 1) We should encourage some consulting with the units to be reviewed. Neither the Senate nor the Committee of Eleven is in a position to implement these reviews. 2) There is a major difference between service unit and function reviews. President Likins offered a friendly amendment to the motion, to replace “service units” with “support services.” Senator Silverman and the seconder accepted the amendment. Motion passed. Secretary Mitchell agreed to defer the last two items to be first on the agenda after the reports for the November meeting.

9. EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate recessed at 5:06 to go into Executive Session.

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Robert L. Mitchell, Secretary

Appendix*

1. *DRAFT* "Proposed Restructured Finance Committee and Workgroups."
2. Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
3. "Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding" revised, dated 4/7/04.
4. "Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding" revised, clean copy, dated 9-15-04.
5. Committee of Eleven Proposal on the Review of Service Units at the University of Arizona.
6. *REVISED* Committee of Eleven Proposal on the Review of Service Units at the University of Arizona.
7. Committee of Eleven "Concerns Resolution," dated July 2004.
8. Research Policy Committee Annual Report 2003-04.
9. Shared Governance Review Committee Annual Report 2003-04.
10. Faculty Senate General Faculty Standing Committees' rosters.
11. *DRAFT* The Institute for Global Pharmaceutical Development, dated 9/27/04.
12. Powerpoint slides titled "Innovations in Pharmaceutical Development – An opportunity in Arizona."
13. "Crisis and Opportunity on the Critical Path to New Medical Products" HHS - FDA March 2004.

**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 October 4, 2004

Motion 2004/05-9 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the name change of the Program in Judaic Studies to the Arizona Center for Judaic Studies. Motion carried.

Motion 2004/05-10 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the disestablishment of the School of Health Professions. Motion carried.

Motion 2004/05-11 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the disestablishment of the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences with a major in Medical Technology as well as the related courses. Motion carried.

Motion 2004/05-12 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the transfer the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences with a major in Physiological Sciences from the School of Health Professions to the Department of Physiology in the College of Medicine. Motion carried.

Motion 2004/05-13 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the name change of the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences with a major in Physiological Sciences to the Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences with a major in Physiology as it is transferred to the College of Medicine, Department of Physiology. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-14 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the revision to the policy for students with the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) who seek Academic Renewal. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-15 Seconded motion that the Faculty Senate endorse the concept that support services at the University of Arizona should be reviewed on a periodic basis. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473