

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA<sup>a,b</sup>  
December 4, 2006**

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Mitchell at 3:03 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Bergsma, Brnce, Burd, Christenson, Conway, Corcoran, Cuello, Cusanovich, D. Davis, G. Davis, O. Davis, Estrada, Green, Gruener, Hertzog, Hildebrand, Howell, Jenkins, Jones, Kiefer, McKee, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mountford, Mirdaugh, Mutchler, Pavao-Zuckerman, Pintozzi, Ranger-Moore, Ruiz, Salazar, Sarid, Schlager, Shelton, Silverman, Smith, Spece, St. John, Thorn, Ulreich, Weinand, Willerton, Witte and Zizza. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Boepple, Chandler, Cromwell, Dahlgran, Jackson, Joens, Marchalonis, Nolan, San Martin, Sebesta, Songer, Sterling, Strittmatter, Tabor and Tatman.

**2. OPEN SESSION**

There were no speakers for the Open Session.

**3. REPORTS**

**3A. ASUA President Erin Hertzog**

ASUA President Hertzog announced that 4397 students responded to the tuition survey, the largest optional campus-wide survey response ever. One of the more interesting statistics revealed is that the majority of students are self-paying. Students were also asked to rank their priorities and the highest priority was class availability, followed by financial aid, tuition remission, increased options for majors, technological enhancement, faculty salaries, quality faculty and smaller class sizes. Only 13.1% were not aware that tuition increases annually, and only 2.2% felt it is not very important to know where their tuition dollars go. The Textbook Task Force has completed its research and will be reporting on how faculty can help keep the high cost of textbooks down after the winter break.

**3B. GPSC President Paul Thorn**

GPSC President Thorn reported that the Board of Regents passed a tuition increase of 6.5% for non-resident students. GPSC will work with ASUA and the Arizona Students' Association (ASA) to lobby the legislature for an increase in appropriations from the state General Fund for the universities. ASA is hiring a new director, which will help with the lobbying efforts. The request for proposals for the student health insurance plan will be sent out in the next few weeks. GPSC hopes to receive professional help in preparing a survey and report on graduate teaching and research assistants' workload on the UA campus.

**3C. Faculty Officers' Report**

Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert Mitchell informed senators that the Arizona Faculties' Council (AFC) discussed the "academic bill of rights" at its meeting on Dec 1 and will stay on top of this issue. Vice Chair Mitchell thanked APPC Chair Larry Aleamoni and Vice Provost Garcia for negotiating the release of the 2005-06 Promotion and Tenure report as well as five-year P&T/CS statistics, which is in Senators' packets today. Secretary Jenkins asked for a faculty senator to volunteer to serve on a Task Force to reconcile discrepancies regarding sabbatical leaves between the Arizona Board of Regents' Policy Manual and the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel. She anticipates this committee will only need about five meetings to complete its work.

**3D. Provost's Report**

Provost Davis reported that ABOR did approve program fees and differential tuition for Law, the executive MBA program and School of Information Resources and Library Science, and the doctoral program in Public Health (DPH) (pending its approval in January). The Board deferred until January its consideration of the required fees for the three universities, which includes UA's

proposed additional \$65 information technology and library fee. The Board also approved the proposed concept for setting College of Medicine tuition, which will be at the top of the bottom one-third of large public universities with medical schools with future adjustments based on the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI). The Regents also conducted a study session on strategic planning last week with all three universities' strategic plans delivered in draft form. UA presented its strategic plan with the intent of providing context for the Board of Regents to understand how UA's strategic issues are implemented and how UA's commitments are met. The Regents' summary response was that UA's plan was "long on vision" and limited on specifics and metrics. Provost Davis feels that it is important for UA's strategic plan to be long on vision at this time of the arrival of our new President, but when the final plan is delivered to the legislature in early January, the specifics and metrics will be included. Provost Davis said he was asked at a recent Senate Executive Committee about the status of twenty-eight recommendations that were made by an Employment Policy Review Committee co-chaired by Allison Vaillancourt from Human Resources and Mike Cusanovich from Arizona Research Laboratories. These recommendations described how certain employment policy changes could make the University more effective, specifically for those faculty and staff engaged in the sponsored projects research enterprise. The Provost's Leadership Team has embraced almost every one of these recommendations and is now reviewing how many of these particular recommendations have been implemented and how many will still need to pass through the institution's Policy on Policy Generation process.

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

President Shelton thanked the GPSC and ASUA student leaders for helping him understand our students' priorities on the tuition-setting process. The Regents did accept the Presidents' recommendation of 6.5% increase for non-residents, but lowered the tuition increase for residents to 5%. This decrease in tuition revenue from in-state students amounts to about \$2M for UA. President Shelton will work with the students and with the Governor's office to increase the amount of funding that the legislature adds to the Arizona Financial Aid Trust (AFAT). President Shelton said that the Provost's Office suggested including more data, charts and graphs in the ninety-minute session on strategic planning that he and SPBAC Chair Tony Estrada presented to the Regents. It was his decision to focus the presentation on vision rather than metrics. However, President Shelton affirmed that he will deliver this data in a form that will be clear and understandable. Turning to the report by the Lumina Foundation which focuses access at the flagship universities in each state, President Shelton reported that UA received an "F" for minority access along with 26 other states. States that received an "A" include Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Minnesota and Alaska. The method used to arrive at these grades is to look at the ratio of the percentage of minorities graduating from high school in the spring, and the percentage of minorities enrolling that fall. If non-resident students are removed from the fall enrollment numbers, our grade goes up to a "C," and if high school graduates who are not ABOR-eligible (i.e., students who haven't taken the required high school courses to be admitted to an Arizona university) are removed from the data, the UA receives an "A." President Shelton said he intends to pursue correcting this report, particularly among legislators, because he believes the statistics used to arrive at these grades are misleading. The BIO5 building was dedicated on December 1 with a wonderful ceremony. Turning to the Senate legislature, President Shelton noted that the state senate leadership is now in the hands of southern Arizona Senator Tim Bee and that the house and senate higher education committees are chaired by Jennifer Burns and Tom O'Halleran, respectively. He has had extensive conversations with two of these leaders and his sense is that they have a genuine interest in promoting higher education.

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

Senator Silverman asked for clarification that the 1.5% difference in the Presidents' requested tuition increase that we did not receive from the Regents is about \$6.3M, statewide. The Presidents and Regents hope to convince the state to put that amount into AFAT. Senator Silverman finds this an unusual request and believes that legislators would not consider it a priority. President Shelton explained that, of the tuition dollars that UA receives, about 60 cents on the dollar goes into financial aid, so the argument is a consistent one—that the universities place a high priority on financial aid and would like the legislature to match this commitment. Provost Davis added that Arizona is 50<sup>th</sup> among the states in the amount of financial aid given to students.

Senator Estrada thanked Vice Provost Garcia for providing the promotion and tenure statistics in senators' packets today, but would like greater detail on the minority numbers because he believes this data obfuscates the UA's record of recruiting and retaining minorities. Vice Provost Garcia responded that the numbers are so small that any further breakdown would violate confidentiality.

Senator Hildebrand asked whether the ASUA's survey about class availability has asked students whether they would be willing to take classes outside of the optimal hours of the day that they prefer. Senator Hertzog responded that the survey was pretty basic and did not poll for this specific question and agreed it would be a valuable factor for students' class availability.

Regarding promotion and tenure data, Senator Mountford asked whether the Provost's Office has conducted any exit interviews among faculty who leave before achieving tenure. The retention rate for women and minority faculty in the Department of English is abysmal and it would be interesting to know why. Vice Provost Garcia responded that such interviews used to be conducted sometimes, but they haven't been done recently. He would like to develop a systematic process for conducting such interviews. Provost Davis added that he would like to share our capacity to retain women and minority faculty who have been approached by other universities. In 1999-2000, UA was only able to retain 20% of minority faculty and 25-30% of women

faculty who were receiving outside offers. In 2005, those data moved up to 45% for minority and 49-50%. Most alarming is the cohorts, particularly women, that came in 1997-98 and 1998-99, because UA did not retain many of these faculty. Provost Davis said he has been meeting with several tenure-track faculty members each week and is gathering anecdotal information about their experiences as tenure-track faculty at UA. Presiding Officer Mitchell suggested adding this topic to a future Senate agenda.

Senator Jones inquired whether and how the recently-passed minimum wage increase will impact the University. President Shelton said one question is whether this applies to non-career employees such as student or part-time employees. The Office of the General Counsel is trying to determine whether this increase would apply to student workers. Senator Ulreich offered and Senator Silverman agreed that it may not be in the best interest for the University to take the position of being exempt from the law. Senator Silverman said that while the proposition specified that the state of Arizona is exempt from this increase, the University should set a moral tone by attempting to implement it. If the increase cannot be implemented all at once, perhaps it could be done in stages for all of our employees. Provost Davis said A. Vaillancourt has been running the numbers and the increase would amount to about \$1M, with a heavy impact on student affairs, auxiliaries and grants.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 2006**

The minutes of November 6, 2006 were approved.

6. **APPROVAL OF 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 [**Motions 2006/07-11, 2006/07-12, 2006/07-13, Motion 2006/07-14 and Motion 2006/07-15**] were approved unanimously.

7. **APPROVAL OF NEW DEGREE, PH.D. IN BIostatISTICS, MEL AND ENID ZUCKERMAN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH, FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION BY THE INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell introduced the new degree, a Ph.D. in Biostatistics from the College of Public Health which comes as a seconded motion [**Motion 2006/07-16**] from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee (ICPC). ICPC Chair and Senator W. Conway told Senators about the ICPC's three concerns: 1) Should the Ph.D. in Biostatistics be housed in Public Health, and if so, should it be called the Doctor of Public Health in Biostatistics, or should it be housed under the Graduate Interdisciplinary Studies Statistics Program with Biostatistics as an option? 2) Are there sufficient differences in the curriculum to distinguish the three degrees; epidemiology, biostatistics and statistics? 3) And finally, is the math requirement sufficient for entrance into this program? The entrance requirement is one year of math, but some of the elective courses require two years or beyond. Dr. Conway introduced Senator James Ranger-Moore, Associate Professor and Division Director of Epidemiology and Biostatistics in the College of Public Health. Dr. Ranger-Moore described that epidemiology is a more substantive field: the study of how diseases are distributed, caused and how to determine distributions how happen. Biostatistics is working with numerical data and in particular has an applied focus in the biological and health sciences. An epidemiologist may have a strong research focus on one disease, such as colon cancer and its prevention. This individual may be first author on research publications and write R1 grants for this research focus. A biostatistician works to develop new statistical methods to analyze data with an emphasis in the biological and health sciences. This individual may work as an analyst, consultant or design person on the colon cancer grant, but would tend not to be the Principle Investigator on the grant. A biostatistician would typically have experience with clinical trials and the health sciences, whereas statisticians are more focused on depth of theory. The national level profile for accredited schools of public health with epidemiology and biostatistics programs all have distinct degrees in epidemiology and biostatistics, and nearly all of them also have separate statistics Ph.D. programs housed on the same campus, usually in a college of arts and sciences, so this proposal follows the common national model. Dr. Ranger-Moore introduced Drs. Denise Roe and Duane Sherrill of Biostatistics in Public Health and Dr. Bruce Walsh, head of the GDP in Statistics. Turning to the curriculum, Dr. Ranger-Moore pointed out that there are only three courses that overlap between the epidemiology, biostatistics and statistics programs. Some courses may look similar but vary in the level of depth of theory versus the extent of application that is being taught so they are not interchangeable. Dr. Ranger-Moore said the program's planners agreed that the ICPC's concern about the light math entrance requirement was reasonable so the prerequisites are being changed to bring it more in line with the level of rigor that exists in the statistics Ph.D. Senators' questions and comments included the following: 1) The UA previously had a Statistics Department which was abolished. The Faculty Senate expressed its concern at the time but ultimately approved the dissolution of the department. 2) Are all the Schools of Public Health represented in the overhead? Dr. Ranger-Moore responded that his overhead only showed the schools with degrees in epidemiology and biostatistics. An alternative, the Doctor of Public Health, (DrPH), exists in some schools, but these schools will have to change soon because the new accrediting requirements include a minimum of three Ph.D. degrees. UA's College of Public Health is also advancing the DrPH, which is an academic degree, in today's ICPC consent agenda for its third doctoral degree. 3) How will this program be funded in contrast with the GDP in statistics? Will these degree programs draw funding away from any other areas? Dr. Ranger-Moore explained that these degree programs are part of the regular programs in the College of Public Health programs and will be funded with some state dollars as well as other funding sources that apply to COPH offerings. These programs will not draw any resources away from the GDP or any other programs. Dr. Duane Sherrill said that the faculty are coordinating their teaching efforts between these two programs and are excited about the considerable collaboration developing between the GDP and COPH

faculty. 4) Why not run the biostatistics degree as a track in the statistics GDP? Dr. Ranger-Moore said the main reason is marketability. A biostatistics degree has certain market opportunities that carry a different impact for market opportunities, in the pharmaceutical industry, for example. A Ph.D. in Biostatistics contains certain practical applied methods and experience in them that are ideal for biomedical research. Dr. Bruce Walsh explained that we need degrees in both statistics and biostatistics because the two degrees offer theory and methods versus application of those methods. The Ph.D. in statistics will do real analysis so the math and theory will be emphasized, whereas the biostatistics degree will emphasize significantly more applications. Faculty from the GDP and COPH are working hard to maximize their teaching efforts where there are overlapping courses to be cooperative and synergistic rather than competitive. 5) What is the difference between a DrPH degree with an emphasis in biostatistics versus the Ph.D. in biostatistics? The DrPH is very focused on practice, like a third tier of Dr. Walsh's model. The DrPH will be even more applied than the Ph.D. in biostatistics. Individuals seeking this degree are established professionals in the Public Health workforce who are returning to gain additional knowledge and credentials. The Ph.D. in biostatistics candidates will more likely be students coming straight through. Motion passed unanimously.

8. **SECOND READING AND ACTION: FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS REVISIONS (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell introduced the second reading of the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws Revisions as a seconded motion [Motion 2006/07-17] from the Committee on UHAP, Constitution and Bylaws. Secretary Jennifer Jenkins reminded the Senators that most of these changes are housekeeping and that the charges to the various committees are contained in the constitution and the bylaws contain the operating construction. This iteration contains the grievance policy change that passed the Senate several years ago. If the Senate approves these changes today, it will go to a vote of the general faculty as soon as possible, hopefully in January. Presiding Officer Mitchell remarked that the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) has been extremely helpful in this process with constructive suggestions that improved the document. He offered two final changes suggested by the OGC just this morning. In the Constitution, Article V, the revision simplifies the last sentence by removing the phrase "mechanism by which," which is true but awkward. The second change from OGC is in the Bylaws, Article VI, Section 8, regarding the University Committee on Corporate Relations (UCCR). The portion of the text that is being deleted describes in detail the composition of this committee. One problematic portion says that Students against Sweatshops (SAS) can appoint a representative to the committee, but the UA currently does not have an active SAS Chapter on campus. The revised text described only the faculty membership of the committee, giving the UCCR the flexibility to determine its non-faculty membership according to its bylaws. Senator Murdaugh suggested that a similar problem exists in the description of the membership of the Shared Governance Review Committee in the Bylaws, Article VI, Section 1. She moved [Motion 2006/07-18] to change the last sentence to read "**These members serve two year staggered terms; and in addition there shall be one representative each from Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC), Staff Advisory Council (SAC), Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA) and Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC), who will be appointed in the terms determined as these organizational bodies see fit.**" Motion was seconded and passed. Senator Weinand remarked that the Constitution Article II, Section 1, e disenfranchises emeritus faculty after five years. Presiding Officer Mitchell explained that retired faculty often remain active for the first five years after retirement, but then gradually become inactive or move away. They remain on our roles forever, however, unless we are advised of their demise or relocation to another state and their units continue to receive mass mailings in their name. This change would eliminate the essential "spamming" of departments with mail for emeritus faculty who have long since drifted away. Senators comments included: This change would further marginalize emeritus faculty and is insulting. 2) It's difficult to remember to ask for the emeritus status to be extended after five years have passed. 3) It might be logistically more difficult to notify people to discard mail for persons who are no longer here. 4) If the outer envelopes of the ballots from emeritus faculty contain a name and if no ballot is received from that faculty member for a period of five years, one could assume that faculty member is no longer active in faculty governance at the University. 5) The University has done a poor job of contacting and treating emeritus faculty as the valuable resource that they are. The Committee of Eleven has discussed recruiting emeritus faculty to serve as advisors and volunteers. Senator Witte moved to strike Article II, Section 1, e of the Constitution [Motion 2006/07-19]. Motion was seconded. Senator Weinand suggested that if Article II, Section 1, e is struck, there should be clarification that emeritus faculty are members of the General Faculty. Presiding Officer Mitchell offered a friendly amendment to change Article II, Section 1, e, to read, "**Such persons in categories (a), (b), (c) and (d) who hold emeritus status.**" This amendment was accepted. Motion passed as amended with 29 in favor, 7 opposed and 2 abstentions. Motion to approve the revised Faculty Constitution and Bylaws as amended today and forward to the General Faculty for a vote passed unanimously. Presiding Officer Mitchell advised the Senate that the Office of the General Counsel will need to review today's two minor amendments from the floor.

9. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FROM STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

Strategic Planning And Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) Chair and Senator Estrada told the Senate that at the end of President Likins' term, most people on the finance committee believed that the University was about \$2M short of balancing the 2006-07 fiscal year budget, but the total deficit was far greater because so many continuing projects had been financed with one-time funds. Incoming President Shelton reviewed the budget with input from many constituencies including SPBAC and made very difficult immediate cuts totaling \$10.2M to bring the budget into balance. President Shelton also met throughout the summer with Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell and with SPBAC to examine and prioritize the twenty-eight decision packages that have been proposed. SPBAC felt it did not have enough information to be able to prioritize the packages. Ultimately SPBAC left the final decisions to the administration but provided the following guidance: 1) All decision packages must show clear benefits to

the state. 2) All decision packages must be linked to the needs of the state, "real solutions to real problems." 3) All decision packages must be linked to the UA Strategic Plan; 4) both undergraduate and graduate students must be a high priority; 5) there needs to be a focus on faculty and academic professionals salaries; 6) All decision packages must be clearly stated in easy-to-understand language for the lay person; 7) All decision packages should be more specific in terms of numbers and objectives; 8) All decision packages should reflect external constituencies' needs and issues. SPBAC also helped with the wording of the final six decision packages that were forwarded to ABOR and may be involved in developing contingency plans if those packages are not funded. This semester, SPBAC invited the following key University administrators to speak about their vision and strategic priorities for the future: Vice President for Enrollment Patti Ota; Vice President for Research Leslie Tolbert; Senior Vice President for Academic Outreach Gene Sander; Associate Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate College, Andrew Conrrie; the new President of the UA Foundation, James Moore; as well as Provost Davis and President Shelton.

SPBAC is currently revising the five-year UA Strategic Plan which is available on line at <http://spbac.web.arizona.edu/JLMMRDec15changesStrategicPlanRevision08to12FinalDec21.pdf>. An important component of a strategic plan is the identification of measures and metrics for each strategic priority to be sure it meets ABOR's requirements for content and is fully vetted with key constituencies both inside and outside the University community. The strategic plan's commitments are: 1) to extend the frontiers of knowledge, discovery, and creativity; 2) to prepare and inspire students for their future roles in the world as thinkers, learners, leaders, and responsible citizens; and 3) to serve as a model for linking scholarship and creative expression to our land-grant mandate to serve our communities. The fundamental strategic issues that will help the University to achieve its commitments are: 1) to build a World-Class and Diverse Academic Community at the Forefront of Discovery; 2) to increase Student Engagement, Achievement, Retention, Diversity and Graduation Rates; 3) to extend the concept of a Land-Grant University, and 4) to achieve a Strong Financial Foundation. It will be necessary to increase indirect cost revenue, net tuition revenue and gifts and endowments to achieve a strong financial foundation. The other three elements will be necessary to reach President Shelton's vision of being a top-ten research university in the United States. SPBAC will be actively involved in the all-funds budgeting process this year, both as it is being developed and in the finalized. Senator Estrada reminded Senators that we are in the second year of a four-year budget stabilization process which calls for a 1% reduction from each college for each of the next two years. SPBAC will continue to function in an advisory role to the President and Provost to ensure consistency with our mission and goals.

Senators' questions included: 1) Has SPBAC looked at alternatives to increasing revenues, that is, decreasing expenditures? Senator Estrada said that will be part of the contingency plan if the resources are not forthcoming. UA's decision packages amount to \$36M and the institution has never received 100% of its decision package requests in the past. SPBAC has not yet had a full discussion about what programs might be eliminated if insufficient funding occurs. President Shelton added that the Cabinet Finance Committee is launching a new process in January to carefully examine each year whether we are following our own priorities as times are changing or simply grandfathering programs year after year. He will be relying heavily on the deans and faculty advisory groups to provide him with the level of detail to make those decisions about how to dig out of the hole. 2) Would we be better off to take one big cut and get it over with rather than string it out over multiple years? SPBAC has not had a full discussion on this idea, and money of such cuts could not be sustainable over years. Differential cuts may have to be considered because not all colleges can sustain the same level of cuts. President Shelton commented that one cut would amount to about 4% cut which is a huge and extremely painful cut to sustain. Differential cuts will need to be considered at the University, college and departmental levels. 3) What about faculty input into the budget reduction decisions at the college and department levels? Not all colleges have similar faculty governance mechanisms, and some have no mechanism at all. President Shelton said he believes there needs to be a faculty governance mechanism for input at each college and he and Provost Davis will convey that message to the colleges. 4) One frustration with trying to write a strategic plan is that when the committee tries to accommodate everyone's concerns, the plan ends up too generic and not helpful in making meaningful strategic decisions. 5) One critical and continuing issue that SPBAC is considering is: how does the University offer General Education? Senator Estrada suggests the Senate and SPBAC form a joint committee to take a look at this issue since it involves both finances and faculty workload. Presiding Officer Mitchell said he will bring this suggestion to the Senate Executive Committee.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM: COLLABORATIVE ON ACADEMIC CAREERS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (COACHE) SURVEY**

Presiding Officer Mitchell invited Vice Provost Juan Garcia to the podium to speak about the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) Survey, a joint initiative to improve the quality of faculty work life. Vice Provost Garcia said that the UA participated in a 2002-03 pilot study of twelve institutions of the level of career satisfaction among junior faculty run out of Harvard. In 2005 UA was invited to participate in the completed survey, along with 34 public and seventeen private universities. The 30-minute online survey was designed by and for junior faculty to develop an actionable policy response to questions regarding their experiences with promotion and tenure, the nature of their work, policies and practices that impact upon their work, and the general climate, culture and level of collegiality on their campuses. For many junior faculty, "climate, culture and collegiality" were more important in their early careers than compensation, workload, tenure clarity or policy effectiveness. Vice Provost Garcia displayed some slides to indicate the participating institutions and the criteria for survey participants as well as an overview of UA's strengths and challenges. UA received results totaling 300 pages of data in early August 2006 and the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation (OIRE) is presently analyzing the data and some preliminary analysis is now available on the OIRE website. Preliminary results indicate that faculty at UA enjoy their teaching assignments, research focus, high standards for scholarly productivity, and fairness in evaluations. UA ranked higher than the average in the number of faculty

who, if they had it to do over again, would choose to accept their current position. Challenges for UA's junior faculty include 1) difficulty balancing personal lives, raising children and the professional demands on their time; 2) lack of formal mentoring at the departmental level, particularly among women and minorities; and 3) lack of financial assistance with housing. There are also concerns among UA junior faculty that they are not being given the inside story of what is necessary to achieve promotion and tenure on this campus. In the spring of 2007, Vice Provost Garcia intends to further assess the outcomes of the survey and is scheduling campus conversations with the faculty who participated in the survey to determine how to help them thrive. His office will be working with Human Resources and the ADVANCE Grant group because retention is a genuine concern for his office. He will also be disseminating the complete results and conducting workshops and focus groups and reexamining current policies and directions to see what can be done to address some of the issues addressed by the faculty. The COACHE survey recommends doing this survey every three years and he intends to follow through. Presiding Officer Mitchell said the Senate may want to hear more from Provost Garcia after he's had some of those conversations and focus groups. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) the duality of the strong research mission and the strong access mission at UA creates amazing demands on faculty compared to some of the peer institutions with higher entrance requirements. What kind of challenges/stress does that place on faculty? 2) It would be helpful to have greater specificity of data across gender and ethnicity, particularly in the research area. Vice Provost expects that data to become available. He reported, however, that geographic location, collegiality and the quality of interaction with the community all ranked very high among women and ethnic faculty. 3) Where did the UA rank in formal mentoring? Vice Provost Garcia responded that UA ranked very low, 2.3 out of a possible 5 in relationship to the other institutions. 4) It would be helpful to gather data from faculty members who have already departed. Vice Provost Garcia responded that he wants to establish a systematic way to gather "pulse surveys" as well as doing exit interviews. A. Vaillancourt said that Human Resources has contracted with the Work Institute out of Vanderbilt University to conduct faculty exit surveys and exit interviews as well as for a subset of classified staff and professionals. 5) Did the survey include continuing-eligible faculty? Yes.

**11. DISCUSSION OF SENATOR GRUENER'S FACULTY SENATE REFORM MANIFESTO PROPOSAL – VICE CHAIR MITCHELL. (attachments)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell thanked Senator Gruener for putting his thoughts for Faculty Senate reforms down on paper. He said many of the Senator Gruener's concerns have frustrated him as well as other Senators. He opened the floor for discussion. Senators' comments included: 1) Time in the Senate should not be spent quietly in lecture format. We should try to recapture vigorous and lively debate on substantive matters such as Promotion and Tenure, General Education, writing and undergraduate education. 2) The Senate is mainly reactive to things proposed by the administration and is rarely proactive about proposing issues for new business. 3) The Senate intended to set aside a significant amount of time (30 minutes) at the December 4 meeting to discuss these issues, and of course those minutes have been reduced to five minutes by earlier business. 4) The fact that the Faculty Senate positions are often undersubscribed whereas the Committee of Eleven and the SPBAC position are usually oversubscribed in the annual faculty elections may be indicative of those committees' greater discussion and action. 5) Perhaps the Senate could congregate for either a half hour before the meeting to exchange ideas, or the Open Session could be opened up for questions and real discussion about ideas presented there. 6) The Senate should be a place for vital discussion and debate over significant issues. Too often these items are pushed to the end of the agenda when time has run out or when Senators have left or are too exhausted to debate or properly deliberate. We are failing to do that and this may be why the Senate as a body does not enjoy more respect among our campus colleagues and constituents. 7) The reports from the administration and students are appreciated and can probably continue to be handled in the amount of time currently allotted to it. The Senate, however, spends an inordinate amount of time editing or wordsmithing material that could be handled in subcommittees or electronically. An hour devoted to significant discussion of critical issues by a subcommittee of senators who have prepared to present the issue and lead the discussion could be much more productive. 8) One thing that makes SPBAC meetings so valuable is that this committee meets every week. By the time the Senate meets, much of the information is old news. Perhaps the Senate should meet more frequently. 9) Perhaps the reports could be disseminated electronically, on a weekly basis. 10) The Senate's time today could have been used to discuss the general education requirements. 11) The amount of time given over to routine reports at the beginning of the meeting, when Senators' attention spans and energy levels are at their highest is inordinate. The format of the meeting should be revised to maximize time for discussion and debate. 12) The student leaders and the faculty officers agreed that they would be willing to submit their reports in writing electronically or otherwise. Provost Davis reminded the Senate that he and the President are giving reports by invitation and that part of the value of this format is the Question and Answer period that allows for conversation on those reports. 13) Are there any concrete models of the kind of deliberative body that you would like this Senate to become? 14) The reports at the beginning of Senate meetings from our top administrators and our faculty and student leaders are not the problem. The problem is that the Senate has to endure a lot of reports from other people that take up far too much time. 15) The other problem is that when a committee brings an issue forward, very few Senators ever seem to question it or offer any discussion. It is not clear whether Senators haven't read the material, simply don't care about the issue, or feel the committee has done a good job of preparing the material. 16) There is information and there is information. Many of the lengthy reports from other people, while interesting, are not imperative for the Senate to know about. We should be more selective about what we allow on the agenda. 17) The ASUA Senate considers action items first, then discussion items and information items. Information items are presented prior to coming forward for action. Reports are given at the end of the meetings. 18) Provost Davis said his time with the Senate Executive Committee is some of the most productive as well as enjoyable time he experiences and he looks to that committee for guidance. 19) Much of the discussion that the Senate is seeking does take place in the Senate Executive Committee because that committee is smaller and able to conduct such discussion. Berkeley's Senate meets twice a month. When are we going to have time to discuss textbook prices or undergraduate education?

20) In the interest of efficiency, many items that come from the Senate Executive Committee are "pre-digested" by the time they come to the Senate. 21) It is important that there is a substantive faculty review of curricular matters. The Senate has obligations to approve curriculum and not everything is fascinating. Senator Ranger-Moore's presentation of the Ph.D. in Biostatistics today was excellent and very convincing.

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

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

### Appendix\*

1. Consent Agenda forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
2. *NON*-consent Agenda forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee
3. *Non*-consent Agenda Item Additional Information
4. University of Arizona FIVE-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN FY 2008-2012 draft, dated 10/27/06
5. Summary of Proposed Changes to the Constitution and the Bylaws
6. Proposed Changes to the Constitution, revised 12/4/06
7. Proposed Changes to the Bylaws, revised 12/4/06
8. Memorandum to Larry Aleamoni, Chair APPC from Vice Provost Juan Garcia dated 11/8/2006 with Promotion and Tenure data attached
9. Report to Faculty Senate Fall 2005 Promotion and Tenure statistics
10. "Gen Eds too much not enough" article from the *Wildcat* by Courtney Smith posted 11/29/06
11. Memo to Faculty Senators from Robert Mitchell re: Senator Gruener's Manifesto, dated 10/25/06
12. Faculty Senate Reform Manifesto: proposal by Senator-at-Large Raphael Gruener, dated (rev) 9/11/06

*\*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 December 4, 2006

**Motion 2006/07-11** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the post-baccalaureate certificate in Digital Information Management. Motion carried.

**Motion 2006/07-12** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the post-Master's certificate in Acute Care Nurse Practitioner. Motion carried.

**Motion 2006/07-13** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the post-baccalaureate certificate in Aquaculture. Motion carried.

**Motion 2006/07-14** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the post-baccalaureate certificate in College Science Teaching and Learning (CSTL). Motion carried.

**Motion 2006/07-15** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the implementation of the Doctor of Public Health with a major in Public Health. Motion carried.

**Motion 2006/07-16** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the implementation of the Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Biostatistics. Motion carried.

**Motion 2006/07-17** Seconded motion from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to approve the revised Constitution and Bylaws. Motion passed as amended in motions 2006/07-18 and 2006/07-19 (below) today.

**Motion 2006/07-18** Seconded motion to change the last sentence of Bylaws, Article VI, Section 1 to read "**These members serve two year staggered terms; and in addition there shall be one representative each from Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC), Staff Advisory Council (SAC), Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA) and Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC), who will be appointed in the terms determined as these organizational bodies see fit.**" Motion carried

**Motion 2006/07-19** Seconded motion to change Article II, Section 1, e to read, "**Such persons in categories (a), (b), (c) and (d) who hold emeritus status.**" Motion carried.