

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
October 1, 2007**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:  
<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>  
Visit the faculty governance webpage at:  
<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/>

**CORRECTED**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert P. Mitchell at 3:05 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 139.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Bergsma, Bruce, Christenson, Conway, Cuello, Cusanovich, D. Davis, O. Davis, DeSorda, Effken, Engel, Estrada, Foley, Garcia, Green, Jenkins, Joens, Jones, McKee, Mitchell, Mutchler, Neish, Nolan, Pavao-Zuckerman, Sander, Sarid, Schlager, Shelton, Silverman, Slugocki, Smith, Sterling, Ulreich, and Willerton. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Burd, Cromwell, Dahlgran, Gruener, Hildebrand, Howell, Knutson, Mitchneck, Mosher, Mountford, Pintozzi, Ranger-Moore, Ruiz, San Martin, Songer, Spece, St. John, Strittmatter, Weinand and Witte.

**2. OPEN SESSION**

There were no speakers for the Open Session.

**3. REPORTS**

**3A. ASUA President Tommy Bruce**

ASUA President Tommy Bruce announced that ASUA will sponsor a free concert tomorrow night in Centennial Hall. ASUA and GPSC are co-sponsoring a tuition survey of students with an educational piece incorporated into it. On Wednesday ASUA will co-sponsor with KUAT, Cox Communications and the League of Women Voters a City Council Forum in the North Ballroom at 7:00. Next week ASUA will host "Coming Out Week" and on October 9<sup>th</sup>, the Women's Resource Center will host a breast cancer awareness night.

**3B. GPSC President Catherine Neish**

GPSC President Catherine Neish asked for faculty judges for the Student Showcase which will take place in front of the Main Library on November 2-3 which is Homecoming Weekend. Along with "Coming Out Week," GPSC will host a LGBT speed-dating event.

**3C. Faculty Officers' Report**

Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell announced that no nominations were received for the special elections for replacement College Representative Senators from either Fine Arts or the College of Medicine, so those two seats will remain vacant until January. If the vacated term is for one semester or less, the Faculty Bylaws allow a replacement to be appointed to serve to the end of the current semester. The Senate standing Committees are still recruiting members: the Academic Personnel Policy Committee still needs one more general faculty member and the Student Affairs Policy Committee still needs one more Faculty Senator and one more general faculty member. Although they did not make the September 30 deadline, the faculty officers are making progress in appointing members to the Senate Task Force on Student Retention.

**3D. Provost's Report**

Provost Eugene Sander said he has been in this position for about four months and he has initiated some changes that they believe will allow the Office of the Provost to serve the faculty and the colleges better. He has initiated a new communication tool called the Provost's Bulletin, which is a list of announcements that go to the Deans, department heads, the Cabinet and the Senate. He also conducted the first of a series of "Team Provost" dialogues, in the Student Union Kiva last Wednesday. Provost Sander distributed the Main and AHSC budget requests that were approved by the Board of Regents. Provost Sander turned to a change that could make a huge difference in how the Provost's Office allocates "temporary teaching money." The temporary teaching fund has grown to almost \$14M, distributed annually for hiring teaching assistants and temporary instructors to meet course and seat demand. The problem is that this money contributes only to the teaching mission with nothing for research or outreach. The budget re-normalization exercise from last Spring illuminated that a significant number of faculty are not contributing to the

teaching mission as much as they need to be. Provost Sander has been working with SPBAC Chair Miranda Joseph and Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell to create a document that deals with the issue of accountability. He will be asking each department head to certify that every faculty member is fully engaged in the teaching, research and service missions, recognizing that these descriptions will vary across the particular colleges. This effort is right in line with the new era of accountability for universities that is coming from the Spellings Commission, the legislature, and the public. With the colleges' accountability described, Provost Sander will know how much of the temporary teaching money can be permanently allocated to the colleges for recruiting new faculty. Other changes in the Office of Academic Affairs revolve around the concept that the President is responsible for more of the external affairs and the Provost has responsibility for more of the internal affairs. Provost Sander will put in place three Vice Presidents to oversee the three main missions of Instruction, Research and Outreach. The Office of Enrollment Management will be headed by a Vice Provost; an internal search is ongoing. The position of Vice President for Instruction/Dean of University College has also been posted and an internal search is being mounted. 1647

**3E. President Robert N. Shelton**

President Shelton referred to the double-sided FY2008-2009 Legislative Budget Request for Main and the Health Sciences campuses which was approved by the Board of Regents last week. The Regents' approval gives the President authority to initiate discussions with the governor and legislators, which he has begun. President Shelton noted that this budget request is tied to the UA's Strategic Plan, which he will present in December. The number one priority is a faculty salary adjustment request of \$13.7M, which would bring UA to the mean of its peer institutions. The second priority is the 22:1 enrollment growth funding. The strategic investments category is what has traditionally been called decision packages. These strategic investment suggestions allowed for a great deal of faculty input in which 46 individual proposals were aggregated and clustered for synergies and then referenced to our internal strategic plan as well as the Regents' 2020 Strategic Plan and the governor's and higher education committees' priorities. The total state request in permanent or recurring funds is \$73M, which if funded, would mean a very aggressive 18% increase. Turning to the two internal recruitments, President Shelton asked the Senate to recommend faculty colleagues who would be strong candidates for the Vice President for Instruction/Dean of University College to search committee chair Melissa Vito, and for the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management position to Andrew Comrie, who is chairing that search committee.

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

Senator Foley asked about the strategic investments category of Health Promotion to Address Health Disparities and Integrating Imaging and Therapeutics for Improved Cancer Treatments, which appears on both sides of the Budget Request. President Shelton and Provost Sander replied that this is a hybrid proposal that will span both sides of Speedway, including the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the Cooperative Extensions, the Cancer Center and the College of Public Health and will involve a great deal of outreach in disparities of health care to the reservations and rural areas.

Senator O. Davis asked whether the Provost would make the decisions regarding the "permanentization" of \$13.9M based on annual performance evaluations, since there is a fair amount of disparity in how those are handled. Provost Sander explained that he will rely on the deans and department heads, using some form of faculty shared governance input, for each college to arrive at and describe what is a fair and equitable "full teaching load" for that unit. Another key aspect of this proposal is for the funding to start tracking to student credit hours. The Deans are on board with this concept and he hopes to implement within a month. Presiding Officer Mitchell thanked Provost Sander for involving the two faculty shared governance leaders Howell and Joseph early on in this discussion.

Senator Cuello asked where the \$13.9M comes from. Provost Sander explained that this is money that is part of the UA's permanent money that has been controlled by the Provost's Office. After fourteen budget cuts in sixteen years, there is simply no elasticity left in the departments' or colleges' budgets, so the Provost traditionally provided this money to colleges on an as-needed, annual basis for teaching.

Senator Cusanovich asked why a \$24.8M debt service charge for the Phoenix Biomedical Facilities appears on the Main Campus side of the budget request instead of the Health Sciences side. He also asked how to avoid trading off funding that benefits Phoenix but hurts UA, given the legislature's tendency to fund to a number, and knowing that this would be wildly popular in Phoenix. President Shelton responded that he hadn't noticed that line was on the side with the Main Campus budget, as it clearly should be on the AHSC side, but no matter where it rests, it would be charged against the UA budget. The more critical question, he believes, is how he can ensure that the UA's overall priorities are honored when this budget request goes through the governor's and legislature's reviews. Some very important people have a lot of interest in the Phoenix Biomedical Campus, and politicians love to get credit for funding high visibility programs.

Senator Silverman asked what the difference is between the "Critical Faculty Salary Adjustments" and the ABOR "Competitive Salary Request." President Shelton explained that the universities are required to report to the legislature each year the system wide shortfall salaries for faculty, staff, appointed professionals. This figure is so large, (\$50M for UA this year), that it is frequently is ignored, so this year, President Shelton explained that he wanted to highlight the highest priority faculty portion of this number so the \$13.8M is a component of the total \$50M that appears under the ABOR heading.

Senator Ulreich asked whether “critical” modifies “faculty salary adjustments” or “faculty.” President Shelton responded that if funds are allocated for critical faculty salary adjustments, the adjustment will be used to address acute shortfalls, most of which are at the full professor level, based on merit/market adjustments as recommended by deans and department heads.

Senator Foley asked whether there is any way to gauge the Regents’ reactions to the decision packages. President Shelton explained that this is a process of refining. Provost Sander further explained that they did their homework and pitched these packages to some key appropriations people to get feedback on which items are the most attractive. The governor’s office is most interested in STEM and teacher initiatives and workforce development. All of the initiatives that went forward have some reasonable amount of support for them, somewhere in the state. President Shelton also said he and Provost Sander gave feedback to those faculty who provided proposals to the decision packages.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2007**

The minutes of September 10, 2007 were approved with one correction.

6. **INFORMATION ITEM: ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS OPTIONAL RETIREMENT PLAN – VOLUNTARY PHASED RETIREMENT PROGRAM (attachment)**

Associate Vice President for Human Resources Allison Vaillancourt distributed a two-sided handout describing the Arizona Board of Regents Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) – Voluntary Phased Retirement Program. The impetus for this proposal is to support better institutional planning in terms of retirement, to enable the University to retain faculty who are eligible to retire, who might otherwise leave and to create additional flexibility. At age 62 or over, an individual can tell the department head that he or she intends to retire in one, two, or three years, negotiate a reduced load depending on the needs of the unit, and have immediate access to all his/her retirement funds. At the end of the three years, that person could relinquish tenure and retire, or, if the department wants to hire him or her back, they could do so. The Arizona State Retirement System (ASRS) has a plan for a retiree to return to work at .49 for the first year, and then full time after that. The plan is also available to year-to-year appointed professionals, on a year-to-year contract. The Board of Regents has seen this plan and wants to hear faculty feedback from all three campuses. It will come to ABOR for a first reading in December, with a second reading and action in January, and implementation in February 2008. Ms. Vaillancourt is aware that some high-profile faculty members have left UA, cashed out their retirement, and gone to work elsewhere. ORP enrollees have access to TIAA-CREF, Fidelity and AIG VALIC retirement services, and ABOR has worked with all three of those companies to be certain that they can support this. ABOR also called in outside consultants/experts to review the plan and it appears that Arizona is one of the first systems in the country to develop such a plan. The experts also declared that the IRS would be fine with this plan. One distinction is that the ASRS has a health insurance subsidy built in, whereas the ORP does not. Senator Ulreich moved [Motion 2007/08-10] that the Faculty Senate enthusiastically endorse the Arizona Board of Regents Optional Retirement Plan – Voluntary Phased Retirement Program proposal to create parity between the ORP and ASRS participants. Motion was seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

7. **CONTINUED DISCUSSION: RECONFIGURING UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA, A WHITE PAPER (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell led the continued discussion on reconfiguring undergraduate education. The faculty officers are working to complete appointing the Senate Task Force on Student Retention, as created by the Senate’s resolution at its September 2007 meeting. He asked whether there were any more questions or comments regarding the topics of academic preparedness, enrollment, accessibility or tuition. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) UA has lost some out-of-state athletes to ASU because of admission requirements. Are UA’s requirements different from ASU’s, and why? President Shelton noted that there are seven athletes currently playing for UC-Berkeley that UA would not admit academically. Regental policy requires that UA and ASU automatically admit Arizona high school graduates with all sixteen required courses in the top 25% of their graduating class; admissions beyond that level or from out-of-state are discretionary, but ASU traditionally goes deeper into the pool of remaining applicants. UA looks at student-athletes in the same way as all students, to ascertain that the student-athletes can do the work to graduate, and they take into account what special talents they may possess. 2) About 10% of borderline applicants receive a special review but there is a limit on how many special admissions the University can admit. 3) The University must be doing something right by raising its standards because 80% of the freshman class was retained. President Shelton added that the question has many dimensions; overall, it is easier to gain admission to ASU than the UA. ASU feels that its mission is to serve the state by enrolling all students who meet the minimum standards. The Athletic department can and does make special requests to the Office of Admissions, but the overarching consideration is can they do the work. Student-athletes have a tremendous time-commitment on the field so extra counseling or tutoring is provided. 4) UA should be proud that there are athletes we didn’t accept. 5) Senator Silverman remarked that the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics is attempting to better equalize the admission process for athletes versus non-athletes. Some people feel athletics don’t contribute to the academic mission of the University and it is of great concern to them that the institution gives special considerations to athletes that are not available to other students. 6) There is the perception in the state that the UA is very difficult to get into. President Shelton said he isn’t sure how that perception was started, perhaps by rumors of enrollment capping at UA, or the UA’s essay requirement on the admissions application, but he believes that the efforts by Enrollment Management have begun to address that perception; applications were up 28% this past year. Enrollment Management has been explaining to prospective students that the top 25% isn’t really that rigorous a standard and that ensures automatic admission. 7) This perception actually increases the value of

admission to UA; we want students to perceive the UA as something that is difficult to get into but worth getting into, and that students will want to get into and to stay, particularly if they are Arizona residents. 8) The anxiety about being selective is misplaced. The UA can barely serve the students who are already here. The physical plant is overstretched and the surrounding neighborhoods are negatively affected. Selectivity is good; being right-sized is good. We need to address the issues that are causing our really good students to transfer after two years to schools like Columbia, NYU or Berkeley. 9) Vice Provost Garcia told the Senate that he sits on the NCAA's Academic Integrity Subcommittee and he said that UA's admission requirements for student-athletes are the same as for any student. He added that Berkeley allows student-athletes to take a certain number of Gen Ed courses as Pass/Fail.

Presiding Officer Mitchell announced that next month's topic will be the faculty role in student retention, when Chair Howell is here to lead the discussion. Turning to the topic of the Quality of the Undergraduate Experience, Presiding Officer Mitchell invited discussion about the subtopics of infrastructure, advising and mentoring to ensure student success, out of classroom experiences with faculty, and bridging programs to enhance student success. Senators' observations and questions included: 1) Where does class size fit into all of this? Class size is relevant to the quality of the experience and belongs in infrastructure. 2) Do we have any figures relating to how many students leave UA because the quality of our program is too minimal or too high? Senator Cusanovich answered that the Committee of Eleven had looked at these retention figures based on the academic Index and found that probabilities for student success rates at the low end can be predicted with reasonably high accuracy. Predicting the high end is more difficult; much of the evidence is anecdotal that we are losing top students to more challenging experiences, but it is fewer than 100 students, although they are some of the very best students. The Committee of Eleven's proposal is designed to enhance the probability of graduation at the bottom, and to stop the loss of some of the very best students. 3) We should also look at the in-classroom experience with faculty too, to know whether the teaching ability of the faculty is taking into account all of the latest technology and whether the material is current and challenging enough. Senator Ulreich responded that most faculty who have been teaching for a while know what works best in their courses. He remarked that faculty sometimes don't expect enough from the students. Students will meet the faculty's expectations if faculty make classes challenging and commensurate with University-level work. 4) Would it be of any value to look at the "best practices" of schools that are succeeding in retention and are demographically close to UA? Interim Vice President for Instruction and Dean of University College Jerry Hogle responded that there are relatively few flagship Research I institutions with comparative admissions standards. The University of Florida is a close match in terms of admission standards and its retention rate is about the same as UA's. 5) The issue of classroom experience raises the issue of ranked faculty in the classroom. While many of the UA's adjuncts are very fine instructors, they are under some pressure to get good student evaluations so they will be rehired. 6) Sometimes faculty try innovative, non-traditional practices in the classroom, but some students don't do well or don't want to do well with non-traditional methods and then give the instructor a poor evaluation. We have a system that doesn't provide much motivation for faculty to work toward implementing new, improved and nontraditional teaching methods that might improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. 7) Faculty typically aren't informed about standards that should be set at UA. We assume that they know what standards are expected. It is obvious that if we desire to increase retention of students in the lower group, we lower our standards (grades). Is that our desire, or do we want to improve the quality of the student body? Senator Cusanovich commented that it is somewhat criminal to admit students who have little chance of success. We should try to bring them up to speed so they can compete with the broader group. 8) We should endorse the out-of classroom experience with faculty; it is one of the keys to retention. We should restore funding for optional field trips, because student-participants who attend one of those trips come to class more and perform better following this more personal experience with the faculty member. 9) The out-of-classroom experiences for undergraduates include being part of the University community and knowing what is available in terms of services, assistance and socialization opportunities. 10) The National Assessment of Student Engagement is a tool that we discuss. Interim Vice President for Instruction Hogle responded that UA did participate in this very broad-based survey in 2006, which addresses many classroom quality issues; he will make that data available to the Senate's Retention Task Force. 11) Is there any statistical evidence that membership in a fraternity or sorority contributes to students' academic standing? Senator Bruce responded that Greek membership increases retention, but he isn't so sure about GPAs. Senator Neish added that students who are a part of Residence Life or students who are employed on campus also have higher rates of retention. Extracurricular activities at the University can also provide a sense of community for students. Presiding Officer Mitchell commented that it would be interesting to know whether place of residence is a predictor of success. 12) If it is almost criminal to admit students who have a low probability of success, why aren't we requiring them to take remedial courses and have a mentor? Senator Cusanovich commented that we need alternative paths for such students and the issue is further complicated by the huge percentage of entering freshmen who are undeclared majors. If 40% of incoming freshmen fail to graduate in six years, do we know where they go? Do they go to ASU or NAU and do any of them eventually graduate? We don't track how many students who began at UA succeed at ASU or NAU. The Regents only look at whether they finished where they started. 13) It could be helpful to know the demographics and subgroup data on the top 10% of the higher-performing students. 14) Requiring students to declare a major early can help with retention; even if students change majors, they have an identity and a home in a smaller academic community. We do not serve undeclared students as well. Historically, when failure notices were distributed in the early part of the term, they included a category for "inadequate preparation" which was then identified early. Senator Willerton responded that his impression of University College is having success with a number of courses that it is providing to help students find a major and learn time management and study skills. Interim Vice President for Instruction Hogle added that some students are admitted with a deficiency and we do provide some remedial courses. The most common and difficult is the math deficiency, but Pima College classes are now offered on UA's campus for this deficiency. 15) The average student is somewhat neglected because the low- and high-end students receive a lot of attention. 16) Finding a major is not necessarily the key to achieving a sense of community. Changing majors is costly and time-consuming. Students need to generalize at the beginning of

their careers. We should concentrate on making the freshman experience better and strengthening the University College experience. 17) Changing majors is costly and time-consuming because we do not have a universal Gen Ed. 18) Students with learning disabilities are admitted to the SALT program but they pay for this service. Students who fall between the low- and high-ends of the Academic Index they don't get as much attention but they also sometimes require more support or tutoring. 19) How are undeclared students advised? Interim Dean of University College Hogle responded that undeclared majors are assigned an advisor/mentor in University College and they take a course in major selection. The professional advisors in University College also have an anchor advisor in each of the colleges. 20) Class size is a key component of both quality and retention. Five hundred students in a class is not a quality experience. 21) Senator Conway, who chairs the University Petitions Committee, informed the Senate that many petitions come forward because of advising errors. One student told him the advisors in University College each have 600 students. Interim Dean Hogle answered that this statistic is not supposed to be true any more. Many more advisors have been hired so the ratio is more like 400:1. The online "advising notes" system provides documentation of advising sessions so students can go back and look at what the commitment was. 22) Senator Willerton commented that his department is home to 1200 majors and two advisors. He said that faculty in this department often act as career advisors. He personally wrote 80 letters for students going on to jobs or graduate school last year. This is quite a challenge in terms of access to faculty.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

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

**Appendix\***

1. University of Arizona Main and ASHC FY 2008-2009 Legislative Budget Request
2. Draft #10 Arizona Board Of Regents Optional Retirement Plan – Voluntary Phased Retirement Program
3. Reconfiguring Undergraduate Education At The University Of Arizona, A White Paper (e-attachment)
4. Student Retention Considerations

**Motions of the Meeting of October 1, 2007**

**Motion 2007/08-10** Seconded motion that the Faculty Senate enthusiastically endorse the Arizona Board of Regents Optional Retirement Plan – Voluntary Phased Retirement Program proposal to create parity between the ORP and ASRS participants.

FACULTY CENTER  
1400 E. Mabel  
PO BOX 210473