

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
January 28, 2008**

**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/>**

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 146.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Bruce, Christenson, Conway, Cuello, Dahlgran, A. Davis, D. Davis, O. Davis, Effken, Engel, Estrada, Foley, Garcia, Howell, Jones, Knutson, McKee, Miller, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mountford, Mutchler, Neish, Nolan, Pintozzi, Sander, San Martin, Sarid, Schlager, Shelton, Silverman, Slugocki, St. John, Sterling, Strittmatter, Ulreich and Witte. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Bergsma, Burd, Cusanovich, Green, Gruener, Hildebrand, Jenkins, Joens, Mosher, Pavao-Zuckerman, Ruiz, Smith, Songer, Spece, Weinand and Willerton.

2. OPEN SESSION

Senator Silverman provided an update on the resolution that the Senate passed at its September 2007 Senate meeting to endorse in principle the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics' (COIA) latest report and recommendations entitled "Framing the Future – Reform of Intercollegiate Athletics." The Senate asked President Shelton and Senator Silverman to convene a group of individuals to review COIA's report and recommendations and report back to the Senate. The process has gone rather slowly, in part because last fall the Athletics Department was undergoing its ten-year NCAA Accreditation Review. Today, however, a very productive meeting took place in the President's office with Senator Don Davis, Senator Sylvan Green, Jory Hancock (UA's Faculty Athletics Representative), and Jim Livengood to discuss the COIA proposals and address "next steps." The Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (ICAC) will now review the COIA proposals and then report to the President and Senator Silverman, who will convene a small group of individuals to review the ICAC's report and the COIA recommendations and report to the Senate in April.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Tommy Bruce

ASUA President Tommy Bruce distributed a memo, a draft of a proposed textbook legislation, and a Senate resolution related to the Arizona Students' Association's efforts to convince the state legislature to pass legislation that would help hold down the cost of textbooks by requiring full price disclosure and eliminating bundling of textbooks. This legislation has been referred to both the house and senate higher education committees. President Bruce said that the students hope to publicize and gain support for the issue of reining in textbook prices and he asked Faculty Senators to review the draft bill and resolution and to direct any questions to him before he brings this resolution back for a vote at the next Senate meeting on February 4, 2008.

3B. GPSC President Catherine Neish

GPSC President Catherine Neish advised the Senate that a Child Care Committee of about ten individuals including faculty, staff and students plus individuals from the purchasing, budget, and facilities management offices has been formed. Vice Chair Mitchell is representing the Senate on this committee. The first meeting will be on February 5th and will meet throughout the Spring semester. GPSC will be taking the Student Showcase winners to Arizona Pride Night in Phoenix later this week to emphasize to legislators the importance of research in education.

3C. Faculty Officers' Report

Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell alerted Senators to the notice of the General Faculty Primary Election for 29 College Representative Senate seats. He asked that any college Representative Senators who are not planning to run for re-election to please notify the Faculty Center or one of the faculty officers and to help recruit a replacement. Other positions that are up for election include Vice Chair of the Faculty, Secretary of the Faculty, five seats on the Committee of Eleven, two seats on the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee and two seats on Committee on Committees. Petitions are due February 11, 2008 and the online election will begin at 8:00 a.m. on February 20 and end at 5:00 p.m. on March 5. Vice Chair Mitchell invited faculty members to circulate petitions during the Senate meeting. Faculty Senators are invited to attend the interviews for the Provost candidates tomorrow, Thursday, and next Monday at 1:00 p.m. in the UA Foundation Annex at 1125 N Vine, Room 104.

Vice Chair Mitchell noted that there is an item of old business today so he will be diligent in following the agenda's allotted time limits today.

3D. Provost Eugene Sander

Provost Sander announced that Dean Tatum of the College of Humanities (COH) will retire at the end of August. Considering this senior position vacancy, Provost Sander and President Shelton have asked a small group of faculty led by Honors College Dean Patricia MacCorquodale to look at the division of labor between the COH and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) to determine whether there are any associations to be made that might help these two colleges be more efficient, particularly directed toward the quality of programs in those two colleges. Provost Sander noted that, as the University is now in the recruiting mode of the Provost Search process, Faculty Senators are invited to help convince one of these outstanding candidates to join the UA.

3E. President Robert N. Shelton

President Shelton complimented the Provost Search Advisory Committee for an extraordinary job of building up the pool of high-level candidates. Dr. Shelton has been spending much of his time with the governor and the legislature discussing the state's budget shortfall. Appropriations Committee Chairs Pearce and Burns have put forth 10% across-the-board cuts which would be \$40-45M which is simply untenable. It would be impossible to have a mid-year rescission because classes are already in session. The governor shares the philosophy that spending for higher education is an investment for the state's future, not an expense, and has said she intends to hold higher education harmless through a variety of strategies including bonding for schools and tapping rainy day fund. Many of our legislators do understand the value and importance of higher education to the state.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3

Senator Estrada asked Provost Sander whether he expects the committee appointed to look at COH and SBS to be recommending merges, consolidations or eliminating programs. Provost Sander responded that he doesn't have any specific expectations; he just wants to see whether there might be some opportunities to be taken advantage of. He believes that the best time to consider such opportunities is when there is a vacancy in a senior administrator's position. Any recommendations this committee brings forward would have to be vetted by the administrators from both colleges and the Office of the Provost.

Senator Howell asked the Provost and President for an update about the position of Vice President for Instruction/Dean of the University College. President Shelton wanted to meet one-on-one with the three candidates before taking his final selection to the Board of Regents. He expects to make a decision this week.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 3, 2007

The minutes of December 3, 2007 were approved.

6. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION BY THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)

The consent agenda items forwarded by the ICPC and detailed at the end of these minutes [Motion 2007/08-24 and 2007/08-25] were approved unanimously.

7. ICPC NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION BY THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)

ICPC Chair W. Conway informed the Senate that the first item, approval of "Creation of a Catalog page outlining current policy on Multiple Majors" [Motion 2007/08-26] replaces a page which was always contained in the General Catalog up until 1998 when it was inadvertently omitted from subsequent versions of the catalog. This item is not on Consent Agenda because it is a policy change. Motion passed unanimously. The second item, approval of "Policies and Guidelines for Individual Studies Courses" [Motion 2007/08-27] is in response to a summer school situation in Classics concerning individual studies (IS) courses. At that time, Vice Provost for Instruction Jerry Hogle called for a task force to look into individual studies and to make recommendations to the graduate and undergraduate councils. The major changes are to the grading system. The other concern is to make someone responsible for ensuring that the 45 hours of course work is completed for the each credit awarded. The policy calls for the deans and department heads to manage the Individual Studies policies and guidelines. The guidelines also move "directed research" into the IS domain. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) The IS grading system is very close to Pass/Fail and in some cases no credit is awarded for P/F. Dr. Hogle responded that the task force as well as the other vetting bodies approved this grading system for all individual studies courses. 2) Were the upper-level course numbers that are used for practicums for training TAs considered? Dr. Hogle responded that this was considered and the task force didn't recommend the change for graduate courses. ICPC Chair Conway noted the Graduate Council did vet and approve these guidelines. 3) Will dissertation courses be Pass/Fail? Curriculum Associate Celeste Pardee advised the Senate that a working group from the graduate and undergraduate councils agreed to this compromise. The departments accept this as the grade system of record and

that it meets the needs of graduate students. 4) Is a “D” a “Pass?” Yes, but whether “d” work is passing would be up to the discretion of the instructor. For graduate courses, “B-level” work is necessary. Senator Mountford moved [Motion 2007/08-28] to postpone the vote on this item until she can check with her department about possible detrimental issues. Motion to postpone was seconded and carried.

8. **ICPC INFORMATION ITEM: CLARIFICATION OF GRADUATION AVERAGE POLICY AGENDA (attachment)**

ICPC Chair W. Conway advised the Senate that this clarifies the graduation grade point average policy because degrees can be awarded with an Incomplete on the transcript as long as that course is not required for the degree. Students who graduate and then complete an Incomplete expect both their cumulative and their graduation grade point averages to change, which is not the case.

9. **INFORMATION ITEM: PARKING AND TRANSPORTATION (attachment)**

Patrick Kass, Director of Parking and Transportation Services (PTS), thanked the Senate for inviting him to talk about the PTS programs and services. He distributed financial information about PTS and explained that PTS is an auxiliary unit receiving most of its funding from permits, citations and visitor fees. PTS employs about 150 people. The department has the responsibility to manage about 13K parking spaces, a 1:4 ratio between parking spaces and people as well as access to campus for pedestrians, golf carts, skateboards and bicyclists. The department also coordinates with Tucson and Pima County to try to mitigate air quality concerns by reducing the number of single-occupancy vehicles. PTS operates the CATTRAN Shuttle service and the daytime disability cart service and pays debt service on the parking garages and provides alternative transportation programs. PTS sets its permit prices based on its operational costs. UA’s parking permits cost less ASU and fall in the lower third of our peers. To have interchangeable permits would mean fewer permits could be sold and the prices would increase. PTS has received a grant to examine its services and to better position itself for the future. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) How full are the garages? All are sold out, but some have more capacity for visitors than others. 2) The construction of three new residence halls means 1200 more students living on campus, and PTS is looking at constructing another garage and increasing capacity in that area. 3) Other universities seem to have more spaces for small cars. Why don’t we? Compact car spaces are very difficult to manage. The University of Washington is the leader in alternative transportation and would be worth looking at. 4) Could PTS make a specific lot or area that is more user-friendly for visitors? When donors or potential donors come to campus and receive a ticket, this isn’t very welcoming. Most visitor parking is in the garages and parking reservations can be made. 5) The permit rates vary significantly by location. Why not offer mixed-used garages? PTS is looking into this. 6) Are there any bicycle lockers in the garages? Yes—all bike lockers and cages must be reserved. 7) Parking here is the biggest grievance for new faculty. PTS allows “department holds” for new employees and make every effort to get that employee a parking permit.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM: VOLUNTARY SYSTEM OF ACCOUNTABILITY (attachment)**

Interim Vice President for Instruction Jerry Hogle asked the Faculty Senate for advice about becoming a part of the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) has invited UA to participate in the VSA, which would publicly represent facts about students, costs, student activities and opportunities for student engagement and how we assess outcomes. The pressure for this system came out of the Spellings Commission. The data for the VSA would be in the control of the universities. The UA would have to agree to generate the “college portrait” and provide a VSA link on the UA homepage report and report common data on enrollment, graduation and retention rates, expenses, textbooks, learning outcomes and senior exit surveys. None of the data is a violation of FERPA. The VSA would also require using a nationally-normed tool such as the Collegiate Learning Assessment tool which is used by many of our peers, at a cost of about \$7K/year. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1) Will you vet this with SPBAC? Yes. 2) Does the North Central Accrediting Association approve of this instrument? Yes. 3) Will the surveys be mandated or will they be representative? This could be a conflict of interest for agencies that provide such assessment services for fees. The surveys are currently linked to graduation but voluntary. 4) When do you need the Senate’s response? In about two weeks, but the University needs to decide in April. President Shelton offered that some sort of accountability system has been coming for quite some time; the University wants ease of data-gathering, relevant data, and to maintain maximum control over its data. This is the most well-developed and thoughtful system. Dr. Hogle asked for Senate responses to come to hogle@email.arizona.edu.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM THE SENATE TASK FORCE ON STUDENT RETENTION AND ADVANCEMENT**

Senator Strittmatter noted that UA has the lowest graduation rate among its peers. The Committee of Eleven reviewed and revised a White Paper that was originally put together by a group of faculty and brought it to the Senate which voted to establish a Task Force on Student Retention and Advancement. The Task Force has been examining data, learning about the boundary conditions and setting its goals of 1) improving the graduation rate; 2) improving our academic standing; 3) increasing total enrollment; 4) gaining and retaining exceptional students; and 5) enhancing educational opportunities for all students. Chair Strittmatter provided a sampling of the boundary conditions such as the state’s growing demographics, cost containments, market and competition, funding algorithms, and physical limitations. He envisions a system that allows students to proceed at their actual level of accomplishment as well as a number of multi-disciplinary majors, matching students’ interests to what is offered, matching students with employers’ needs, and growth of off-campus programs. Dr. Strittmatter’s personal view is that a

substantial amount of how we do business will have to change in order to reach the goals, and that will not be rapid. The task force won't be able to make detailed recommendations; the most this task force can do is provide directional recommendations that are consistent with the boundary conditions in order to avoid a "ping-pong" effect with the external reality.

12. **INFORMATION ITEM: INSTRUCTIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY PROCESS (attachment)**

Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee Chair Miranda Joseph recounted her early deep ambivalence about being assigned the task of writing a document describing an instructional accountability and responsibility process, and how she became convinced of the need for such a procedure. The amount of temporary teaching funds has increased dramatically to \$14M over the past few years and the Provost is interested in managing the teaching dollars in a better way. Decentralizing these funds with some sort of contractual guarantee for providing teaching is optimal. She added that a larger ideology/set of pressures for accountability may be coming and this procedure will allow the UA to be prepared for an external demand for accountability. Finally, she noted that former Provost Davis requested a report on faculty-generated student credit hours which showed that a large percentage of UA faculty are not doing much teaching, despite some very good reasons in that year. In designing the process, Dr. Joseph wanted to hold harmless the majority of hard-working faculty with full teaching loads and to create a peer-pressure method to influence the small percentage of faculty who may not be pulling their weight. One of her key issues was to allow the dynamism of the faculty contributions to the mission of the University: faculty do not teach the same amount every year, depending on reasons such as grants, fellowships, sabbaticals or temporary administrative duties and so faculty workload assignments must be flexible enough to shift as needed. However, that unit's teaching responsibility must still be covered and has to be tied to resources. Dr. Joseph also didn't want to increase the existing reporting burden by adding another layer of reporting and reviewing of faculty performance. Another key point was that the decisions about what is an adequate teaching responsibility and how a department's teaching responsibilities will be met should be made through shared governance processes. One of Dr. Joseph's principles that didn't make it into the written process is to match the accountability with reward for teaching.

Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell asked whether Faculty Senators have participated via some shared governance process in their colleges to help define the 100% teaching responsibility. The colleges' responses are due in the Provost's office on February 4. Senators' responses were overwhelmingly negative so Chair Howell urged the Provost to determine whether the faculty had a voice in defining the 100% teaching load. Senator Christenson indicated that most department heads are aware of the requirement for describing a 100% teaching load in their departments. Senator Aleamoni noted that in his department, faculty members' annual performance reviews allow for a 100% teaching load to be described as part of each individual's workload assignment. Chair Howell explained that the first piece of the instructional accountability process is to describe the 100% teaching responsibility. A second piece of the process calls for the colleges to describe their responsibility for the University's teaching mission and then the deans are called upon to work with each individual department head to define that unit's responsibility toward each college's teaching mission. The departments have to own the curriculum and the discussion surrounding assigning responsibility at the unit level has to occur at the department level, with faculty shared governance participation. Then, department heads need to meet with each individual faculty member to determine faculty workloads. Chair Howell urged faculty Senators to be extra vigilant in their colleges to ensure that shared governance participation in this process is happening, since faculty buy-in is at stake. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) Faculty governance is a fundamental problem: very few "faculty governance" committees are *elected*, as the Faculty Governance statute specifies. Rather they are "appointed." Also, some faculty committees that are elected are not being used for faculty governance. Chair Howell responded that the faculty has to make this work. 2) A collegial, "pitch in" attitude to help cover workloads for colleagues on research fellowships or sabbaticals is not common at all, and department heads would be reluctant to put an additional teaching load onto maxed-out faculty members and instead would probably ask the dean for \$5K to teach a course, and if that were not available, cancel the class. Those are the realities. Dr. Joseph responded that administrators need to anticipate and account for the flow of things which trigger a change in resources (like sabbatical leaves), which the department head can then allocate for the hiring of adjuncts. 3) Sometimes faculty sabbatical leaves are not known far enough in advance to plan. Dr. Hogle indicated that not all departments are maxed-out and that the colleges where the students are likely to go can be somewhat predicted. A college's capacity just needs to be determined, from the faculty up, rather than from the top down. Chair Howell advised the Senate that she will provide an update on this project at the March 3, 2008 Senate meeting.

13. **OLD BUSINESS**

Senator Mutchler moved [Motion 2007/08-29] to remove from the table the motion [Motion 2007/08-16] to approve the proposal to rename the Continuing Education and Academic Outreach (CEAO) unit to be the Arizona Outreach College. Motion was seconded and this non-debatable motion carried 15-11-0. Vice Chair Mitchell recognized Vice President, Outreach Mike Proctor to speak. Dr. Proctor described how individual faculty have been conducting a variety of outreach programs throughout the state with inconsistent or minimal support from the institution. Historically, continuing education/outreach at UA has never really had a clear mission. These proposed changes will increase access, exposure and recognition for our faculty's programs. Dr. Proctor explained that this proposal was initially cast as a name change, but the name change really reflects a structural cultural and organizational change to reflect the new mission-theme of a life cycle of learning, to make UA's academic content available to a broader population of people beginning with youth programs through Arizona Youth University, followed by exposure to

correspondence opportunities and credit outreach at the UA, distance learning, evening weekend campus, professional development, and finally, senior programs such as Elderhostel. The CEAO is not an auxiliary unit but serves faculty as a pipeline for delivering content outside the campus. Like the Honors College, this unit would not grant degrees, retain faculty or generate content independently. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) Did the faculty committees review and approve this proposal? The Undergraduate Council's vote was split slightly in support of the proposal; the Graduate Council did not have a quorum but those who voted did support the proposal; the ICPC did not support the proposal. 2) Why does this unit have to be structured and named as a college rather than a resource office? This is a specific shift away from providing content similar to community college offerings, and will allow the unit to take advantage of joint marketing and reducing the costs of distance education in improving technical support. The college structure expresses academic centrality which is more than just a name change or a marketing tool. 3) How is this unit different from a resource unit such as University Information Technology Services in terms of providing resources to faculty to help facilitate instructional endeavors and delivery? Those services don't really merit a "college" title. Dr. Proctor responded that through the life cycle of learning theme, the unit will provide an identity and a connection with state residents that will hopefully develop into a lifelong relationship beginning with the Youth University. The college title will convey a very strong academic core enterprise. Like the Honors College, this is very special unit to facilitate access and flexibility of delivery. Provost Sander described how this outreach college will provide a way to interact with potential new students (customers) in remote or rural locations. An outreach college will create a UA experience for students who are place-bound or time-bound and cannot access the campus easily, while providing access to traditional students, too. The college structure will also build and strengthen the internal link among UA's own faculty. Dr. Proctor added that there will only be one dean position and none of the typical administrative hierarchy that larger colleges employ. Vice Chair Mitchell announced that he would like to put this proposal to a vote by 5:30 p.m. Senator Witte inquired and Vice Chair Mitchell affirmed that a quorum is present. 4) The idea of creating a mechanism for the state's residents to establish connections to the University and to see those connections as part of a lifelong experience is a valuable experiment worth trying. 5) The name, "Arizona Outreach College" doesn't specifically connect to the UA brand and may confuse people. 6) Have focus groups/marketing studies been conducted to help with the name selection? Dr. Proctor agreed the name is critical and indicated that he's only had time to convene a few small discussion groups. 7) This enterprise could significantly help the projected enrollment growth demographics. Couldn't the Senate just vote to endorse the concept and not the name? 8) Outreach is going to become more and more critical in the digital age. 9) What are the implications of withholding a vote? Dr. Proctor indicated that this unit has been reorganized four times and the staff is ready to pull together in a coherent way to reframe peoples' perceptions of the UA, and he'd prefer not to wait. Senator Christenson called the question [Motion 2007/08-30]. Motion was seconded and passed 17-3. Motion 2007/08-16 to approve the proposal to rename the Continuing Education and Academic Outreach unit to be the Arizona Outreach College passed 20-7.

1. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Pamela S. Bridgmon, Recording Secretary

Appendix*

1. ICPC Consent Agenda
2. ICPC Non-Consent Agenda: Approval of Creation of a Catalog page outlining current policy on Multiple Majors and Approval of policies and guidelines for Individual Studies Courses
3. ICPC Information Item: Clarification of the Graduation Average Policy
4. Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) Executive Summary
5. Memorandum re: Instructional accountability and responsibility process dated Nov 2, 2007 (revised 1/8/08) to Deans, Vice Deans and Associate Deans for Instruction Senate Task Force for Student Retention and Advancement
6. Printed copies of Parking and Transportation Budget Information PowerPoint slides
7. Provost's plan for a New UA Management Process – "Better Organizing Priorities Management: How to do More High-Quality Teaching, Research, and Service Given a Shrinking Percentage of Discretionary Dollars" approved February 2007
8. A New Model for Continuing Education and Academic Outreach: The Arizona Outreach College
9. Memorandum to The University of Arizona Faculty Senate from Tommy Bruce, ASUA President dated Jan 28, 2008
10. Rough Draft of Senate Bill on College Textbooks dated Dec 21, 2007 Folder 981, Drafter Todd Bayne
11. (ASUA) Faculty Senate Resolution on College Textbooks
12. Notice of General Faculty Primary Election, Spring 2008 dated Jan 11, 2008

**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 January 28, 2008

Motion 2007/08-24 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the graduate certificate in Orthopaedic Science. Motion carried.

Motion 2007/08-25 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the graduate certificate in Early Modern Studies. Motion carried.

Motion 2007/08-26 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve "Creation of a Catalog page outlining current policy on Multiple Majors." Motion carried.

Motion 2007/08-27 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve "Policies and Guidelines for Individual Studies courses." Motion postponed.

Motion 2007/08-28 Seconded motion to postpone the vote on Motion 2007/08-27. Motion carried.

Motion 2007/08-29 Seconded motion to remove from the table the motion [Motion 2007/08-16] to approve the proposal to rename the Continuing Education and Academic Outreach unit to be the Arizona Outreach College. Motion carried

Motion 2007/08-30 Seconded motion to end debate on Motion 2007/08-16. Motion carried.

Motion 2007/08-16 Seconded motion carried over from the December 3, 2007 meeting to approve the proposal to rename the Continuing Education and Academic Outreach unit to be the Arizona Outreach College. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473