

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
September 14, 2009**

**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 Chair of the Faculty Wanda H. Howell at 3:03 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 168. She asked Senators to observe a moment of silence in remembrance of a College of Medicine colleague, Dr. Charles F. Zukowski, who performed the UA's first kidney transplant. Dr. Zukowski tragically died in an automobile accident in August.

Present: Senators Carnie, Cuello, Dahlgran, A. Davis, O. Davis, Delic, Duran, Effken, Fregosi, Gehrels, Goldberg, Guertin, Higgins, Hildebrand, Holmes, Howell, Jones, Jull, Kovach, Marmorstein, McKean, Mitchneck, Nadel, Nagata, Ozkan, Pintozzi, Plante, Reynolds, Rhee, Secomb, Shelton, Silverman, S.M. Smith, Spece, Sterling, Sundareshan, Tabor, Talenfeld, Ulreich, Vaillancourt, Willerton, Witte, Zedeno and Ziccarelli. T. Tong substituted for P. Nolan. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Aleamoni, Antin, Christenson, Conway, Cusanovich, Foley, Hay, Johnson, Mitchell, Mutchler, Nolan, Ogden, Renger, Sarid, Songer, St. John, Strittmatter and Wilson-Sanders.

2. OPEN SESSION

Mr. David Martinez III, UA's outgoing Student Regent, distributed Student Regent nomination forms and asked Senators to help in recommending UA students who are uniquely qualified to serve on the Arizona Board of Regents.

Professor John Warnock from the Department of English in the College of Humanities, expressed concern with the administration's decision to cut some colleges based on their inability to generate external grants.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Chris Nagata

ASUA President Chris Nagata said he hopes to create great working relationships within the Faculty Senate this year. ASUA student government is enjoying increased numbers of students participating in ASUA this year. President Nagata introduced Gabrielle Ziccarelli, ASUA Administrative Vice President, and two Arizona Students Association directors, Billy Holmes and Elma Delic. ASUA has identified priorities for this year including managing an open and accessible organization serving students. ASUA will also be advocating and lobbying for student financial aid at the state legislature, and has selected the Diamond Children's Medical Center as its philanthropy project for this year. Another priority is to extend a hand to campus community and local community partnerships. ASUA is involved with the interviews for directors for the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Questioning Individuals' Center and the Women's Resource Center.

3B. GPSC President David Talenfeld

GPSC President David Talenfeld announced that GPSC has a new Latin motto which means, "We are here to serve those who work to expand knowledge for the benefit of all people." GPSC views its work as a public service and wants to do everything it can to help the faculty fulfill its mission as educators. He asked that faculty make graduate students aware that GPSC aims to sponsor 70% of all graduate student travel requests.

3C. Faculty Officers' Report

Chair of the Faculty Howell offered a heartfelt welcome to all of the new and returning Senators, and Andrew Carnie, Chair of the Graduate Council, whose *ex officio* Senate status is addressed in the Bylaws revisions. She reminded everyone that the Senate schedule for this Academic Year is in Senators' packets. The Senate will meet in Law 168 for all Faculty Senate meetings this 2009-2010 Academic Year. Chair Howell also noted the lists of standing committees that are still in need of some members. Chair Howell turned her attention to the Faculty Forum held last Wednesday in the Student Union Kiva. One of the recommendations coming out of that forum was to hold a faculty poll. Faculty leaders, working with the Senate Executive Committee and the Committee of Eleven, hope to mount such a poll within a very short time. Chair Howell asked Senators to

offer specific questions or items that should be asked on the poll. Another recommendation coming from the forum is to create a mechanism to enable faculty dialogue, such as an interactive, opt-out faculty listserv. Faculty leaders hope to hold at least two or three more faculty forums this semester, at varying times.

3D. President Robert Shelton

President Shelton remarked briefly on the Transformation Plan and budget decisions. He reminded Senators that the transformation process began in spring 2008 after receiving some cautionary notes about the state of the state's budget and the potential impacts it would have on the universities. The administration began some studies in the summer of 2008 including the Tuition Funds Flow Task Force, the idea for white papers, and a significant budget decision to reduce the generating colleges' indirect costs allocations by about 16%. In fall 2008, hundreds of faculty, staff and students were involved in generating and reviewing white papers. SPBAC helped immensely in vetting the white papers. In spring 2009, the Faculty Senate became involved in the implementation phase of the white paper transformation proposals, and at the same time, the Arizona Board of Regents passed a one-time tuition surcharge to help meet the financial emergency. Administrative leaders met with the Regents' Professors, SPBAC, and the Committee of Eleven throughout this time period as well. Now, following the summer of 2009, the administration made decisions about handing out differential cuts and how to deal with an as-yet-unknown state budget. The one-time federal stimulus dollars for FY09-10 and FY10-11 are being factored in. The differential cut numbers are being given to deans and vice presidents, and passed on down to the heads. Faculty are reacting with frustration and angst, not only about the numbers, but also for their interpretation of what the numbers mean about their programs. President Shelton acknowledged the difficulty in dealing with the permanent cuts of over \$100M in state funding, which will be mitigated in part by the federal stimulus funds this year and next, and in anticipating FY2012, when there will be no more stimulus money. He welcomes the opportunity to engage in discussions with faculty and department heads.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3

Senator Silverman asked about the criteria and process that President Shelton and Provost Hay used to make the differential cut decisions. President Shelton explained that they looked at criteria set up in the UA's Strategic Plan, including the capacity to generate external funds, the impact of outreach in the state and the potential for job creation and economic growth in the state. Parallel with those considerations is the Tuition Funds Flow Task Force which he hopes will provide financial incentives for teaching. He also acknowledged the persistent message for differential cuts.

Senator Ulreich expressed concern with the conspicuous absence of academic criteria and a discussion of the UA's core values in the budget-cutting decision process. Referring to a recent memo from the President and Provost, Senator Ulreich questioned the administration's timing and decision regarding differential cuts that appear to have been made, surplus to the absolute need to do so, and allowing a decision to reallocate resources at a time when some units are seriously suffering. President Shelton spoke to the issue of academic criteria and fiscal decisions, and he believes that priority is one of the reasons that the process began eighteen months ago, to understand what programs the UA can afford to let go of, and where to make investments. Academic program reviews also helped to inform the process. President Shelton said that management prefers that those fundamental issues to be decided as close to the unit level as possible, with the Provost, deans and department heads engaged in discussions with faculty. Academic criteria at this level will help in deciding where new hires will and won't be happening over the next four years. President Shelton referred to the \$19M permanent cuts for this year's state reductions, and explained that the state isn't done cutting yet, so the administration opted to make deeper cuts in order to provide \$600K for the arts, humanities and social sciences, \$1M for environmental sciences policy, and \$1M for translational medicine. This decision was based on the need for some positive investments in certain areas.

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2009

The minutes of May 4, 2009 were approved.

6. APPROVAL OF THE NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FORWARDED BY THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (attachment)

Senator Gehrels introduced two seconded motions from the Undergraduate Council (UGC), [Motion 2009/10-1] to approve amending the Time to Declare a Major Policy, and [Motion 2009/10-2] to approve an exception to the Individual Studies Course Grading System. These changes will better serve students, he said. Both motions passed unanimously.

7. INFORMATION ITEM: PROFESSIONAL PEER EVALUATION TOOL SETS (PETS) (attachment)

Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell and Graduate Council Chair Andrew Carnie introduced the Professional Evaluation Tool Sets (PETS) as an online mechanism for faculty to prepare annual reports. The program provides consistency for reporting annual performance activities and the ability for each unit to customize the tools they deem most desirable for annual performance reviews. This tool was introduced several years ago to SBS and Fine Arts colleges. Over one-third of faculty are using some form of on-line reporting systems. The recommendation for an online method of reporting came out of the Millennium Review Oversight Committee in SBS in which female and ethnic/gender faculty reported hidden workloads that were not reported on

traditional peer evaluation review formats. SBS implemented the system with a core set of questions to encourage and consider reporting more activities than had been allowed for in the traditional format. SBS piloted this system in two units with a simple-to-use interface. The system was accompanied by a certain amount of resistance and concerns about how the information would be used, but faculty concerns were answered and the system was implemented for all SBS units in 2007. The chairs of peer evaluation committees, deans and faculty agree the system is fairer and increases the visibility of faculty outreach and service, and makes year-to-year reporting much easier. Having the faculty activity information readily available is also invaluable in writing Academic Program Reviews.

Associate Provost Tom Miller spoke of his desire to get to an integrated, consistent platform for annual performance reviews, post-tenure reviews, and promotion and tenure reviews. The P&T process, in particular, he said, is quite antiquated and paper-driven. This new reporting/recording platform will be a resource and a benefit for faculty, departments, colleges and the University. Although the service and publications data takes time to enter the first two years, after that it will be in automatically-updated fields that now exist for teaching, TCE's and grants. Implementing the system will not be rushed. A. Carnie added that it is critical that faculty need to take ownership and to be involved in creating the peer evaluation sets for their units and colleges, to be certain that peer evaluation is exactly that, peer evaluation. Associate Provost Miller hopes the system will be implemented across all colleges within two years.

Senators' questions and comments included: 1) Does the system support weighted, quantitative values assigned to various faculty activities or will this double the workload for reporting? A. Carnie emphasized that this is a reporting tool, not a mechanism for reporting evaluation back to the faculty members. Dr. Miller added that this kind of question and issue is precisely what his office will be attending to in talks with a steering committee composed of faculty representatives from each college. He then expects to present the system to each college. B. Atkinson of SBS added that the system is not designed to accommodate weighted values. Senator Mitchneck of SBS explained that each department's evaluations are unique, so the system is used just for collecting and managing the data and forwarding it to the peer evaluation committees. 2) Is there a sample that Senators can view? T. Miller will provide a mock-up site when he presents at the college-level meetings. 3) It isn't clear that this will make the reporting process better for faculty, although it is clear that it will make it better for administrators who are trying to compile data. This is part of a long history of central administration telling the faculty what it must do. Faculty are not voting on this nor do they have any say in this. Since accountability is a good thing, let's have an evaluation of our top administrators! 4) Why do we have to change, when we have a system in CALS that works well? Dr. Miller said the systems used in CALS and MEZCOPH are older and do not aggregate the data quite as well, so he wants to move slowly so as to protect those colleges' longitudinal data. 5) No evaluation measures from either the dean or the peer evaluation committees are entered on PETS. It is just the raw data of what the faculty enters. It isn't an evaluation tool. 6) Could a presentation be made at the next Senate meeting? Dr. Miller said he could, but that the next level of conversations will be with faculty and department heads at the college levels. He can provide a set of common items, but he wants to ensure a rich, variegated set of items to captures the variety of activities in individual colleges. He expects gathering that information may take all semester.

8. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION: REVISIONS TO THE CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS (attachments)**

Constitution and Bylaws Committee Chair J.C. Mutchler is unable to be at today's Senate meeting due to an accident. Senator Douglas Jones, who sits on that Committee, presented the proposed revisions to Constitution and Bylaws, which come as a seconded motion [Motion 2009/10-3] from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and the Senate Executive Committee. Senator Jones observed that the majority of these changes are not substantive; many are housekeeping or clarification reflecting changes in department names or administrative titles. The committee also tried to clarify the voting status for various committee members. He called Senators' attention to the few substantive changes which involve changes to the University-wide General Education Committee's composition; changes to the Graduate Council's composition to reflect the Graduate Council's Bylaws changes; codifying the *ex officio* voting status of the Chairs of Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council on both the Senate Executive Committee and the Faculty Senate; and eliminating ICPC from the Senate Standing Committees. A fifth substantive issue involves the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee's (GCC) process but that proposed revision has not yet been approved by the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), so that revision may come forward during the Spring 2010 Faculty Elections. If the Senate approves these changes, they will then go to a vote of the general faculty. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) If the OGC doesn't approve the change to the GCC process, does that mean that this change not come forward? D. Jones responded affirmatively. Chair of the Faculty Howell said the changes are in the OGC's office and she assumes they will be approved. If the Senate approves these revisions today, the full faculty vote will be held up until the OGC approves them. Motion passed unanimously.

9. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM (attachment)**

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) Chair Patricia Hoyer presented a definition of academic freedom for the Senate's adoption. The item comes as a seconded motion [Motion 2009/10-4] from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee and the Senate Executive Committee. She explained that all of our peer institutions have a formalized definition of academic freedom, and that an institution of the UA's stature should have one, too. Beyond that, it will be beneficial to have something in writing when grievances come forward to the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee (GCC) and CAFT, since many faculty

grievances allege violation of academic freedom, but the committees have no definition to turn to. In May 2007, CAFT recommended that a definition be adopted. CAFT formed a drafting subcommittee, which, along with Senator Spece, reviewed peer institutions' definitions and drafted this proposed definition to take to the Senate Executive Committee in August, 2008. The Senate Executive Committee asked that the President, Provost, and OGC vet the definition before moving it forward to the Senate. CAFT presented the definition to President Shelton in August 2008. This August 2009, the Academic Personnel Policy Committee also vetted the definition, and, along with the Senate Executive Committee, recommended moving it forward to the full Senate. Dr. Hoyer also mentioned that Senator and SPBAC Chair Lynn Nadel has reinstated the term "academic freedom" into the UA's Strategic Plan, and thanked him. Academic freedom is referred to, but never defined in the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual or the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP). It is therefore assumed throughout these policy manuals that such a definition exists and that faculty adhere to it. This definition isn't meant to be a legal document, but as a safeguard of the University's and professional integrity.

Senators' questions and comments included: It is ironic that this item comes to the Senate today, when the *Daily Wildcat* today is reporting on a story that students are calling for publishing political science professors' political ties. Pressures on such faculty members had been tremendous during the Vietnam conflict as well as during the more recent Middle Eastern wars. The effort of CAFT to bring this item should be strongly endorsed, and the University should take a strong stand, as well. 2) Senator Spece said the drafting subcommittee was a diverse group and were unanimous in the belief that it is part of faculty's role to criticize social norms. 3) Where does this document go from here? Dr. Hoyer responded that CAFT would like to see the definition incorporated into the UHAP definitions section, and made available on our faculty governance website. Chair Howell added that the definition will be sent over the allfaculty listserv, as well. 4) The last sentence of the first paragraph is troubling in that it is too open-ended and seems to eviscerate the purpose. Dr. Hoyer said the OGC also mentioned this point, but is willing to have the Senate move it forward. 5) From a faculty perspective, the statement seems to mean "it is *at least* this..., rather than *at most* this..." 6) Senator Spece pointed out that attorneys like to fit things precisely into the language of the law or policy, so the drafting subcommittee set out to specifically avoid that possibility. 7) Perhaps eliminating the last sentence or putting a period after "generous interpretation." 8) This document lacks the students' perspective. Could language be added about academic freedom being extended to students? Senator Jones pointed out that students are addressed and included in the first paragraph. 9) It is important to have a broad and open definition of academic freedom on this campus. Dr. Hoyer noted that CAFT has been operating under the 1940 AAUP's Statement on Academic Freedom, which hasn't worked very well. CAFT has latitude to make recommendations based on what is logical and reasonable in determining whether a faculty member has been treated fairly or unfairly. Senator Witte called for the Question [Motion 2009/10-5]. Motion was not seconded or acted upon. Senator Secomb moved [Motion 2009/10-6] to amend the last sentence of the first paragraph to read: "Academic Freedom shall be understood to include, but not be limited to the following:" Motion 2009/10-6 was seconded and passed 26-9-1. Motion 2009/10-4 passed unanimously. Senator Cuello suggested that this definition be shared formally with ABOR and ASUA. President Shelton said he is ready to move forward with this definition. Chair Howell asked CAFT to recommend a distribution plan to the Senate, and asked to look into how to change UHAP.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM; MOSAIC PROJECT HR "GO LIVE" UPDATE (attachment)**

University Information Technology Services Chief Information Officer Michele Norin, and MOSAIC project director Hank Childers provided a report on the timeline and countdown of a major milestone in the institutional effort to replace the aging administrative applications. The entire replacement timeline will take 3-5 years. The first system to be replaced is the Human Resources Payroll System. The team has been offering trainings and attempting to get information out as quickly as possible to as many users as possible. The last time UA's payroll will run under the old system will be Tuesday, September 22. Employee Link will become "read only" after the data is converted into the new system. Faculty Senators asked about the exception-based reporting for payroll time sheets, which M. Norin explained will remain the same as it is now.

11. **NEW BUSINESS (attachment)**

Chair of the Faculty Howell informed the Faculty Senate about a recently enacted law, A.R.S. § 12-781, which means that the universities, among many other entities and employers, can NO LONGER exclude guns from campus if they are lawfully locked in a person's vehicle. ABOR has no choice but to adjust the current ABOR policy excluding guns from campus. Chair Howell said that while the faculty leaders understand ABOR's need to comply with State Statute A.R.S. § 12-781, they feel the need to register great concern, particularly in light of the UA College of Nursing shootings of 2002, and urge both the Board and the legislature to reconsider the safety of the over 200,000 faculty, staff and students across the state as they make these policy and statutory changes. Therefore, she said, the Faculty Officers would like to offer the following resolution as a seconded motion [Motion 2009/10-7], to be presented to the Board of Regents at its meeting in Flagstaff next week:

RESOLVED: *The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona would like to express its grave concern for not only the safety of faculty, but our students and staff with the Revisions to Arizona Board of Regents Policies 5-303 "Prohibited Conduct" and 5-308 "Student Code of Conduct to allow guns on campus in locked vehicles or in locked containers on motorcycles.* Motion passed with one abstention.

Regarding student concerns about influenza, President Shelton informed the Faculty Senate about that the UA's official recommendation is for students with flu-like symptoms to isolate themselves for 24 hours. Due to the limited number of absences allowed per class, and the requirement for doctors' excuses, President Shelton urged the faculty to be understanding if students' illnesses appear to be legitimate.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

J.C. Mutchler, Secretary of the Faculty
Pamela S. Bridgmon, Recording Secretary

Appendix*

1. Faculty Senate meeting schedule for 2009-2010
2. 2009-2010 Faculty Senate roster
3. 2008-09 Committee on Conciliation Annual Report.
4. List of Faculty Senate, general faculty, and other University-wide standing committees
5. Undergraduate Council's Non-Consent Agenda Items
6. Peer Evaluation Tool Sets - Frequently Asked Questions
7. Proposed revisions to the Constitution of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona dated August 25, 2009
8. Proposed revisions to the Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona dated August 25, 2009
9. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure's definition of "Academic Freedom at the University of Arizona"
10. Mosaic HR Go-Live Briefing Powerpoint dated 9-2-09
11. Resolution for the UA Faculty Senate to express concern about the revisions to the ABOR Student Code of Conduct to allow guns on campus in locked vehicles or locked containers on motorcycles

**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 September 14, 2009

Motion 2009/10-1 Seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council [**Motion 2009/10-1**] to approve amending the Time to Declare a Major Policy. Motion carried.

Motion 2009/10-2 Seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council to approve an exception to the Individual Studies Course Grading System. Motion carried.

Motion 2009/10-3 Seconded motion from the Senate Executive Committee to approve the proposed revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona dated August 25, 2009. Motion carried

Motion 2009/10-4 Seconded motion from the APPC and from the Senate Executive Committee to approve the definition of Academic Freedom. Motion carried.

Motion 2009/10-5 Motion to stop debate on Motion 2009/10-4. Motion not seconded or acted upon.

Motion 2009/10-6 Motion to amend the last sentence of the first paragraph of the definition of academic freedom to read: "Academic Freedom shall be understood to include, but not be limited the following:" Motion carried.

Motion 2009/10-7 Seconded motion from the faculty officers to approve the following resolution: *The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona would like to express its grave concern for not only the safety of faculty, but our students and staff with the Revisions to Arizona Board of Regents Policies 5-303 "Prohibited Conduct" and 5-308 "Student Code of Conduct to allow guns on campus in locked vehicles or in locked containers on motorcycles.* Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456