

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
December 1, 2003**

**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 and Presiding Officer Wanda Howell at 3:02 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Benedict, Baughman, Burd, Christenson, Conway, D. Davis, G. Davis, Erickson, Green, Gruener, Hancock, Hildebrand, Howell, Impey, Jenkins, Joens, Jones, Kiefer, Kim, Larson, Likins, Pintozzi, Pitt, Powell, Radebaugh, Rainer, Schlager, Silverman, Songer, Strittmatter, Tomanek, Warburton, Willerton, Witte, S. Wright, Zizza, and Zwolinski. Terrence J. Monks substituted for Timmermann. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Arabyan, Bixby, Borden, Bui, Chandler, Cusanovich, Dahlgran, Diaz, Garrett, Lynch, Miesfeld, Mitchell, Spece, Swanson, Tatman, Timmermann, Vierling, Weinand, and Wysocki.

2. OPEN SESSION

(Please note that speakers at the Open Session are expressing their personal opinion, which may not reflect the position of the Faculty Senate. Written statements submitted during Open Session are available in full at the Faculty Center.)

Senator Jennifer Jenkins – Senator Jenkins, Chair of Undergraduate Council, announced three information items: 1) Undergraduate Council has developed an optional Independent Study Proposal Form for faculty to provide a record in the department office of the project that was agreed upon by the faculty member and the student. This form is posted on the web at www.registrar.arizona.edu/forms.htm; 2) The Curriculum Office will be conducting the Biennial Course Review for courses that have not been taught during the last three academic years, Fall 2000 through Summer II 2003. The form to request that a course be retained must be filed by March 1, 2004; and 3) The Graduate Council/College is proposing expanding the 3/2 programs to allow top students to earn both an undergraduate and graduate degree in 5 years with a blanket agreement as to the minimum standards so that any department that wishes to may institute a 3/2 program. This item is still in discussion.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President J. P. Benedict

President Benedict ASUA President J. P. Benedict announced that ASUA is mostly working on events for next semester, but is currently soliciting nominees for the Student Regent position that rotates to UA for next year. ASUA is also continuing to receive student input about tuition and fees increases, and is planning a non-alcoholic event for Dead Day, December 11.

3B. GPSC President Jani Radebaugh

No report.

3C. Vice Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell

Vice Chair Howell informed the Senate that the Shared Governance Review Committee is preparing feedback from the colleges about Shared Governance involvement in the upcoming college faculty salary adjustment decisions.

3D. Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Secretary Mitchell reported that an ad hoc committee appointed by the Senate Executive Committee has met to brainstorm ideas about how best to coordinate items coming from the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council to the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee and the Faculty Senate.

3E. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock

Chair of the Faculty Hancock announced that two proposals for Reorganization are at an impasse and will require Faculty Senate Review Committees. One faculty member from the Humanities Program has yet to be placed so the proposal for elimination of the Humanities Program will require a review committee. The School of Planning's faculty have objected strenuously to the proposed

elimination and the School's response to the request for a proposal for elimination has been to continue to describe alternatives to the elimination instead of the plan itself. A plan has now been accepted and the administration desires to go forth with the elimination so this will also require a Senate review committee. At the Arizona Board of Regents' meeting last month, the Arizona Faculties Council devoted one full meeting to the Academic Affiliation Agreement between Translational Genomics (TGEN) Research Institute and ABOR. Also at that ABOR meeting, President Crow of ASU noted that ASU's willingness to take on additional students is what makes it possible for the UA to continue with the focused excellence plan and to cap enrollment at 40K.

3F. Provost George Davis

Provost Davis reported that at the November ABOR meeting, the Provosts presented their respective university recommendations for five university measures that the Board will review annually to evaluate success, progress to goals, and in UA's case, progress to goals in part related to focused excellence. This minimal number of individualized highly relevant measures include 1) undergraduate graduation rates for 4, 5, and 6 years; 2) student engagement which is about ranked faculty, intellectually-based engagement in learner-centered activities, such as preceptorships, research experiences, independent study, honors theses, and important and innovative study-abroad programs; 3) grants and contract expenditures, 4) numbers of terminal degrees (MFA, PhD, or first professional degrees) awarded, and 5) the College of Medicine's telemedicine program for service and outreach. Vice President Ota's Enrollment Management Policy group is currently developing the enrollment management models that project from 2003 to 2013. These models will generate conversations about total enrollment and what the upper limit should be, the mix of undergraduate and graduate students, what we expect in terms of graduation rates and retention of first-year students, and the mix of transfer students versus first-year freshmen. VP Ota is also establishing task forces that will examine recruitment and retention and faculty recruitment for the enrollment models. Provost Davis informed the Senate that he expects to receive reports from the four Study Teams on 1) Neurosciences and Cognitive Science, 2) Life Sciences, 3) Cultural, Ethnic, Gender and Area Studies, and 4) Earth Sciences and Environmental Programs by January 15. These themed reports will help to identify what is subsumed by each theme, where the intellectual action is both nationally and internationally, what are the key driving questions and critical outreach to society and then observations and recommendations on how UA can contribute intellectually and create links to these areas within departments and centers. The Academic Affiliation Agreement between Translational Genomics (TGEN) Research Institute and ABOR was approved by ABOR in November and Provost Davis reassured the Faculty Senate that any UA-TGEN faculty appointments will be recruited and awarded faculty status and tenure in ways that conform to UA's normal procedures.

3G. President Peter Likins

President Likins reported that the UA's Capital Campaign has reached its \$1B goal and reminded the Senate that this amount is only a small piece of a complex financial picture and that continued public funding of the University is essential. His report on the fundraising campaign has now been posted to the Web. Action items at the recent Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) meeting included approval of the Academic Affiliation Agreement between Translational Genomics (TGEN) Research Institute and ABOR. He noted that the agreement did not require any changes to the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual and that the rules of faculty engagement were protected in this public agreement. Each of the three University Presidents and one Regent serve on the TGEN Board. He has a strong sense of the continued quality of the TGEN enterprise and believes the leadership is drawing talented people to the state of Arizona as well as some Arizona faculty members who are choosing to affiliate with TGEN. He believes this enterprise will allow Arizona to compete in the national arena and that Tucson will derive its share of the benefits from this initiative. ABOR also participated in a detailed review of the media's national college rankings and ratings that began in 1983. When the rankings began, US News editors merely surveyed 200 college presidents and asked them to rank the 200 institutions. This survey was mostly a broad reputational survey, which produced an academic perception of quality. Later, more objective measures of quality such as graduate rates and alumni contribution percentages were added along with a complicated system of 15 weighted objective measures of quality. Some of the current measures such as dollars spent per student, or SAT scores, typically do not serve public institutions such as UA well in the rankings. UA's graduate college ranks considerably higher. As the UA begins to manage its enrollment and shape the student body over the next decade, this will radically alter the profile of the institution. UA's rankings will improve as increased selectivity in freshman admissions raise retention and graduation rates.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3

Senator Impey inquired about whether the UA might push for more outcomes-based funding strategy from the Regents and the legislature since ASU President Crow's strategy probably involves the traditional 22:1 funding formula. President Likins responded that a Study Session for ABOR is scheduled for January on how the Regents and the Universities might recommend to the legislature changes in the funding formula structure based on more than just enrollment, but also on outcomes. Capping enrollment and shifting the mix of students can cause continuing increase in degree awards without continuing increase in instruction provided. President Likins also noted that the universities haven't received 22:1 funding for the past two years, of course, and it is not clear that the governor or the legislature will restore full 22:1 funding this year. ASU's challenge will be to continue increasing enrollment and it will be obliged to emphasize funding necessary to increase instruction. Because the UA's distinguishing mission is research, President Likins will be able to emphasize funding for faculty raises in order to retain the faculty that generates the research grants and contracts.

Senator Jones asked for a description of how the tenets and principles of shared governance were honored during the development of the TGEN affiliation agreement. President Likins replied that if the administration had been asked to modify any of the University's standing precepts such as faculty employment or intellectual property, then some level of consultation beyond what was applied would have been necessary, but Vice President for Research Powell and Provost Davis were able to protect those precepts. Other long

discussions about details such as insurance were not fundamental to the rights and privileges of faculty. The VPR routinely approves affiliation agreements with various entities, so the TGEN agreement was a somewhat scaled-up version of the normal course of business for the Vice President for Research. VPR Powell added that an ad hoc faculty task force began the process by working out a 6-page agreement that retained ABOR policy and stipulated that interactions with TGEN would be the same as with any other entities. The attorneys expanded this agreement to be over 50 pages, but there are no deviations from normal University procedures.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2003**

The minutes of November 3, 2003 were approved with one spelling correction.

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

The first two consent agenda items detailed at the end of these minutes [**Motions 2003/04-28 and 2003/04-29**] were approved. The third item, a revision to the policy on the Major GPA in the general catalogue regarding undergraduate degrees requiring a 2.0 or better GPA to graduate was removed from consent agenda. This revision essentially says the Major GPA average needs to be defined by courses listed in the Academic Program Requirements Report. Provost Davis inquired whether the Provost's Management Group (PMG) had approved any exceptions to the policy change. ICPC Chair Jenkins stated that the PMG voted against any policy change for exceptions, so the management of this policy remains in the colleges with the associate deans. Senator Willerton moved [**Motion 2003/04-30**] to approve the policy revision. Motion was seconded and passed.

7. **APPROVAL OF FACULTY CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS REVISIONS FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON UHAP, CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES (attachment)**

Continuing the discussion about the Committee on UHAP, Constitution and Bylaws Changes' remaining proposed revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws, Secretary Mitchell directed the Senate's attention to the Bylaws Article VII Section 4 which comes as a seconded motion [**Motion 2003/04-31**]. The first change adds wording to clarify that items coming from Senate standing committees come to the Senate as seconded motions, to read:

Section 4. Faculty Senate Standing Committees

All action items that are forwarded by the Faculty Senate Standing Committees come to the Faculty Senate as a seconded motion.

The next changes to Article VII, Sections 4 b, c, d, and e, are to make these four standing committees' descriptions more consistent while attempting to more accurately describe their charges and purview. The changes and Senators' comments and questions are below as follows:

b. Academic Personnel Policy Committee. This committee ~~shall deal with such~~ **considers matters as and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to promotion and tenure/continuing status** (policy and procedures; statistical report on decisions from the previous year), sabbatical and leave of absence policy, performance evaluation policy and procedures and their relationship to salaries, definition of faculty membership, governance (for example, the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, General Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, and Conditions of Faculty Service), affirmative action, and solicitations for faculty time and money.

Senators' comments and questions about the APPC included the following: 1) Is there any overlap between the Committee on UHAP, Constitution and Bylaws Changes and the APPC? Secretary Mitchell responded that the Committee on UHAP, Constitution and Bylaws Changes exists to simply ratify changes and to provide a final review before sending whatever Constitution and Bylaws (C&B) changes the Faculty Senate has approved to the General Faculty for a vote. Since the faculty grievance policy and procedures contained in the C&B represents such a major revision, the faculty officers and Faculty Center staff reviewed the entire C&B to remove obsolete references and inaccuracies.

c. Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee. This committee ~~deals with policy~~ **considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to curriculum, academic programs of study, and degrees, teaching effectiveness, and the Honors Program, and Commencement**. ~~It serves as the conduit of academic issues and coordinates activities with and receives reports from such groups as the Undergraduate Council, and the Graduate Council, and the Intercollegiate Writing Committee to the Faculty Senate.~~

Senators' comments and questions about the ICPC description included the following: 1) Why was Commencement removed from the ICPC's charge? Senators Jenkins and Warburton responded that the Office of Campus Life, not Faculty Senate, is responsible for the Commencement ceremony. Many years ago the Senate did receive lists of graduates but that has been discontinued, probably at the Senate's request. Senator D. Davis moved to reinsert the word, "Commencement" after "teaching effectiveness" in the charge to the ICPC. Senator Warburton offered a friendly amendment to move "commencement" to the Student Affairs Policy Committee's charge.

Motion was not seconded and Senator D. Davis withdrew his motion. Senator Warburton suggested that the academic Senate is responsible for actually awarding the degrees. Senator Likins suggested that it would be very helpful if the faculty as a whole would embrace Commencement to a greater degree than is the current practice.

d. Research Policy Committee. This committee ~~considers deals with such~~ matters as **and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate as relating to secrecy policy, research policy, conflict of interest, data retention, intellectual property, research ethics, research parks, interaction with industry, patent policy, Arizona Research Laboratory, research institutes, human and animal research, and safety.**

Senators' comments and questions about the RPC description included the following: 1) Since the Arizona Board of Regents policy on Intellectual Property requires each university to have an Intellectual Property Policy Committee (IPPC), Vice President Powell asked Chair Hancock for names of faculty members to serve on this committee and then appointed them. 2) Should this IPPC be recognized as a separate committee instead of including intellectual property in the charge to the RPC? 3) Should the IPPC be a Senate standing committee? 4) Could the IPPC be merged with the RPC? 5) The way the IPPC has been operating, for example, is to create a first draft of an IP policy or other issues and then forward it to the RPC on its way to the Senate. This seems redundant and the IPPC ought to be able to forward things directly to the Senate. 6) The type of people who serve on the IPPC are very knowledgeable and active in invention disclosures, patenting, and spin-off companies. A number of research faculty are not concerned with these issues, so it's almost like two very different subsets of faculty that would be most effective on the two committees. 7) Perhaps the Senate should withhold its vote on the changes to the RPC charge until it receives a proposal from the RPC. 8) RPC Chair Pintozzi believes the RPC should retain intellectual property in its description, and noted that the RPC is currently revising the Intellectual Property Policy. 9) If you have an intellectual property committee, do you factor out patent policy and research parks or where do you really draw the line? 10) To what extent is the Intellectual Property Policy Committee an implementation committee versus a policy committee? Vice President Powell said the IPPC's charge changes from year to year depending on the issues. In the first year it was actually involved in drafting the interim intellectual property policy, but the ABOR policy only requires this committee to adjudicate any disagreements or appeals between faculty and vendors and the Office of Technology Transfer. 11) The faculty want intellectual property to be within the RPC's purview and to keep the RPC's breadth. The faculty should have a committee that represents an undiluted faculty interest in these matters, and if additional expertise is needed, the committee can simply expand its membership and retitle its name. 12) Are dispute resolutions within the purview of the RPC? Secretary Mitchell responded that the RPC is a policy-making committee, and that there are other avenues for dispute resolutions. 13) If the Board policy requires the dispute resolution, and rolling the IPPC into the RPC would require the RPC to assume an additional roll, this may not be able to be resolved today. 14) Perhaps the RPC could create an Intellectual Property/Patent Policy sub-committee. 15) A new description of the RPC might consider including some of the sources of policy or action proposals such as are described in the ICPC and SAPC's charges. The IPPC could be listed as one of the sources. Secretary Mitchell removed this item from the Senate's further consideration today and asked the RPC to consider this item and bring recommendations to the Senate Executive Committee or the Committee on UHAP, Constitution and Bylaws Changes.

e. Student Affairs Policy Committee. This committee ~~deals with such~~ considers matters as **and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to student quality of life, financial aid, the Code of Conduct, the Code of Academic Integrity, student comportment, admission and domicile classification, high school and community college relations, recruitment and retention policies, and registration, and such matters as brought forth from Campus Life and the Dean of Students. The Chair of the Student Affairs Policy Committee is a member of the Campus Advisory Council.**

Senator Warburton moved [Motion 2003/04-33] to add the word "Commencement" after "recruitment and retention policies." Motion was seconded and passed. Senators' comments and questions about the SAPC description included the following: 1) What is the definition of comportment in this description? Secretary Mitchell suggested the term might indicate a higher standard for behavior. 2) Does the SAPC actually hear disputes about admission and domicile classification? Secretary Mitchell responded that this committee makes policy but does not hear disputes. Senator Jenkins moved to add the word "policies" into the description, even though it is included in the committee's title. Motion was not seconded and Senator Jenkins withdrew her motion. 3) The language, "from Campus Life and the Dean of Students" is too restrictive and should include the Office of Enrollment Management. Senator G. Davis moved [Motion 2003/04-34] to add the words "Office of the Vice President of Enrollment Management" after "Dean of Students." Motion was seconded. Other areas that forward issues to the SAPC include ASUA, GPSC, Advising, or the Vice-Provost. SAPC's description is very broad and it receives issues from a number of sources, but Secretary Mitchell explained that the intent of specifying the Offices of Campus Life and of the Dean of Students was to strengthen the link between SAPC and those bodies. Motion passed. Secretary Mitchell asked the Senate to vote on the Motion 2003/04-31, the multiple proposed draft revisions to the Faculty Bylaws Article VII, Section 4 excluding subsection "d," as amended by Motions 2003/04-32 and 2003/04-33. Motion passed.

8. **SECOND READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: SECONDED MOTION FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: ACCEPTABLE USE OF COMPUTERS AND NETWORKS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA POLICY (attachment)**

Senator Pintozzi led the Senate's continued discussion on the Acceptable Use of Computers and Networks Policy, which comes as seconded motion [Motion 2003/04-34]. She reported that the RPC had received no feedback since the last meeting. Senator's questions and comments included: 1) In example #4 under "IV. Acceptable Use Guidelines," it appears that even people on the listserv cannot send a message if sending unsolicited email messages via listservs is prohibited. Senator Pintozzi responded that the language is intended to prohibit setting up listservs and sending messages without the knowledge and consent of the recipients. 2) It seems almost presumptuous to discuss penalties in #7, "Respect copyright and intellectual property rights," since faculty are used to operating under

the "fair use" guidelines and even the highest courts haven't yet ruled on these issues. Senator Pintozzi responded that the RPC is assuming that the "fair use" is an exemption under the Copyright Act. 3) The legitimacy of that assumption has not been tested in cases where faculty routinely make available course materials on-line for one-time use in the classroom. Senator Pintozzi agreed there are a number of electronic areas that have not been tested. 4) Is there any other place where faculty can be reminded of this because as usage patterns evolve from traditional on to the Web, people are vulnerable? Senator Pintozzi said the Library's WebPages on Copyright has reminders and a link to a very good copyright page posted by the University of Texas at Austin with specific questions for faculty. 5) RPC should add a link in the document that deals with fair use issues because it is difficult for faculty to find correct information. 6) Since the language in #4 is circular, might the word "unsolicited" be replaced with "without recipient approval?" Recipients who sign up for listservs are, in a sense, approving the flow of information to you, but you do not expect that anyone can use that listserv for "spam" or personal use. 7) Aren't we really talking about "illegitimate" use of listservs? 8) It also includes the illegitimate creation of listservs. 9) Maybe some ground rules for listservs are needed. 10) Perhaps the term, "member-initiated" could replace "unsolicited." 11) Some administrative listservs that department members are required to be subscribed to are occasionally misused for personal use. Is it possible to have guidelines for these personal messages? Senator Pintozzi responded that there are some email guidelines governing the types of messages that can be sent. 12) The solution requires two additional sentences that deal just with listservs. Senator Pintozzi said the RPC will work on this wording and return it to the Senate in January.

9. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: POLICY ON MISUSE OF UNIVERSITY ASSETS (attachment)**

Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock advised the Senate that this policy revision has been brought before the Appointed Personal Organization and Staff Advisory Councils and that it is not necessarily a response to any change in the misuse or increase in misuse of University assets, but rather that this is upkeep to an existing policy. There are no deletions in the current policy and the additions are shown in bold on pages 2, 3, and 9. A new section on reporting thresholds has been added to create a mechanism for reporting more serious offenses and keeping less serious offenses from being sent to the President's office. Senators' comments and questions included the following: 1) Article IV, section C, "Incident Reporting Thresholds" describes five criteria that must be met before supervisors report, and this appears to conflict with article V, section A, 2, "Supervisors" which reads that supervisors are "responsible for immediately reporting information received regarding known or suspected incidents involving misuse of University assets to their immediate supervisor or" 2) In fact, article V, section A, 1 even states that "all university employees are responsible for immediately reporting. . . ." without meeting the five criteria in article IV, section C. 3) Is #5 in article IV, section C really necessary and what does it mean? Does a reporting criteria really have to be that public disclosure would cause embarrassment to the University? 4) What if stolen funds did not benefit the individual because s/he donated it to charity? Would that be embarrassing? 5) If standard outline form is employed, Article V, section A, 2 does not require the lower case "a" since there is no lower case "b" to follow. Senator Mitchell moved [Motion 2003/04-35] to amend the beginning of Article V, sections A, 1 and A, 2 to read: "Taking into account the incident reporting thresholds described in Article IV, all University employees are responsible" and: "Taking into account the incident reporting thresholds described in Article IV, supervisors are responsible" Motion was seconded and passed with three abstentions. Senators' comments and questions continued: 6) Article IV, section C, 5 definitely does not belong in this policy as an additional requirement. 7) Article IV C, 2 suggests that if a university employee inappropriately makes use of University assets in ways that benefit a third party, there is no harm and no reporting, which is absurd. 7) Instead of requiring all of the reporting criteria in Article IV, section C to be met, change "all" to "any." 8) The problem/question is, What is the threshold above which one reports directly to the Provost or President?" Chair Hancock noted that Article IV, section A describes "incidents or conditions that warrant the attention of the Executive Vice President and Provost and Senior Vice President for Business Affairs." Everything in Article IV refers to this paragraph. 9) But that is not what this policy says. Article IV, C says department or unit heads or higher, so it is not exclusive to the Vice Presidents. 10) The language is very awkward but it is intended to say "to include" or "in addition to" the Vice Presidents. 11) What has triggered these changes? What is broken that this policy revision is intended to fix? This policy gets into areas and issues of legitimate whistleblowing, crimes that may occur on campus that one may wish to report to the police department first rather than to the University, and areas of the research agreement like conflict of commitment and use of space, where there might be a legitimate disagreement about what is a legitimate activity. There are a lot of vague implications in this policy. President Likins responded that yes, there have been specific incidents of employee behavior that were not captured by existing rules, consequences or reporting structures. 12) In Article IV, section B, what does "incidental" mean? It seems very casual. 13) Article XI "Recovery of Losses," section A on page 10, reads: "The administrator responsible for University assets that have been misappropriated or otherwise shall take steps to recover such assets, if practicable." Some language should be inserted suggesting what happens if a person refuses to reimburse the University or an appeal process. 14) In Article IV, section C, 3, the language should say "seems" or "appears" to exceed \$500.00 per incident, since the reporting is a matter of judgment. 15) What are the consequences if an employee fails to report? 16) What is the University's responsibility in letters of offers to inform employees of these responsibilities to report? Presiding officer Howell asked Chair Hancock to return this policy to the drafters for revisions to address the Senate's concerns. Additional revisions can be directed to Chair Hancock at jory@u.arizona.edu.

10. **FIRST READING: REVISIONS TO UHAP 5.09 "GUIDELINES FOR FIVE-YEAR REVIEWS OF DEANS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS" FORWARDED AS A SECONDED MOTION FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE (attachment)**

Senator Kiefer advised the Senate that these proposed revisions to UHAP 5.09 came to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee from the Interim Vice-Provost and are intended to make the language conform to what is already in current practice. APPC has met twice to review the proposal and voted to approve the suggested revisions and bring them to the Senate as a seconded motion [Motion 2003/04-36]. Senators' comments and questions included the following: 1) The suggested changes seem perfectly reasonable but the

biggest problem is the credibility of the process, not who is on the committees. 2) If there is reconsideration of the composition of this policy, it should address increasing the credibility of the process. It is discouraging when these reviews are conducted and all of the information, including deficits in performance, are reported to the administration, but then the review report comes back to the faculty declaring that this unit head is doing a "great job." 3) One way to increase credibility would be to make public the findings of the review committee rather than having it sanitized. There are, of course, privacy concerns, but it is important that the nature of the data collected by the review committee be made known. 4) The language in 5.09.04, sections 1 and 2, where the revisions read: "and to appoint others from the following groups:" is too general, since preceding sections specify the exact number of faculty to serve on such committees. If the faculty are unhappy enough to have initiated this review, some sort of number or limit should be added to the "others," since they could conceivably outnumber or outvote the faculty, although the faculty need not necessarily have a majority on the committee. Senator Kiefer responded that the intent was to broaden the scope and to reach out to as many groups as possible. 5) The first policy on reviews for deans and department heads was initiated in 1974 by a group of women faculty. Its guidelines were very stringent, the committees were composed of all elected faculty, and the results of their reviews were certainly made known to the faculty, although not necessarily to the public. Those review results became the cornerstones by which to improve the department or, if the unit head was unimprovable, to lead to personnel changes, which was crucial to the process. This was an excellent policy and its intent was clear, but it has never worked, in part because there is no true shared governance on this campus at the departmental level. This process needs to be made useful to the faculty without retaliation, which has been reported to the Senate on occasion. 6) Regarding the "others" who may be appointed to the review committees, APPC should review the concepts of shared governance in terms of constituted committees and the proportionality of the general faculty vis-à-vis other members of the mix. Presiding Officer Howell closed discussion on this item and returned the draft revisions to the APPC.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM: SENATE'S RESPONSE TO STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGET ADVISORY COMMITTEE'S "CHARTING THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA'S FUTURE: A CONVERSATION ABOUT CHOICES" (attachment)**

Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee Chair Jerry Hogle asked the Senate for input on Stage One of the new Strategic Plan as requested by the Board of Regents. SPBAC has received suggestions about our mission, core values, and vision and would now like to know if the core values or general goals should be amended. SPBAC has been asking all campus groups to answer the questions on page 4, from their point of view, especially "what would you like to be able to say to someone thinking of coming to UA?" Given the general trends in higher education in Arizona and in the nation, what specifics in the Strategic Plan need to be addressed in order to achieve the goals? Suggestions can be directed to raphael@email.arizona.edu.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate recessed at 4:56 to go into Executive Session.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Robert L. Mitchell, Secretary

Appendix*

1. University of Arizona Independent Study Proposal Form
2. University of Arizona Guidelines for Independent Study Proposal Form
3. Memo dated Dec. 1, 2003 from Patti King re: Biennial Course Review
4. Biennial Course Review AY 2003-04 Request for Retention Form
5. Memo dated Oct 17, 2003 from Dianne Horgan re: 3/2 Programs Proposal
6. Consent Agenda items forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
7. DRAFT Changes to Bylaws Article VII, Section 4, Faculty Senate Standing Committees.
8. "Acceptable Use of Computers and Networks at the University of Arizona" dated 9/23/03.
9. "Misuse of University Assets" policy from Joel Valdez dated 10/8/03.
10. DRAFT of revisions to UHAP 5.09 "Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads" dated 10/30/03.
11. REVISED "Charting the University of Arizona's Future: A Conversation About Choices 2005-2010" from SPBAC dated 11/10/03.

*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 1, 2003

Motion 2003/04-28 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve transfer of the Genetic Counseling MS Graduate Interdisciplinary Program to the College of Medicine, Department of Obstetrics/Gynecology. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-29 Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve splitting the existing Graduate Interdisciplinary MS and PhD in Pharmacology & Toxicology into two programs each and transfer administrative responsibility for all. The resulting programs shall be the MS and PhD in Pharmacology & Toxicology in the College of Pharmacy (transfer of old GIDP) and creation of the MS and PhD in Medical Pharmacology in the College of Medicine. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-30.Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve Proposed Revision to the policy on Major Average in the General Catalogue as follows: (changes are in bold print) Majors for undergraduate degrees require a 2.000 or better grade point average (GPA) for all University Credit work in the major as defined on the Academic Program Requirements Report (APRR) or for any work in the major satisfied by the Special Examination for Grade. All grades for repeated courses will be calculated in the major GPA, with the exception of grades that have been replaced by the Grade Replacement Opportunity (GRO) and those removed from the grade point average through Academic Renewal. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-31 Seconded motion from the Committee on UHAP, Constitution and Bylaws Revisions to approve multiple proposed draft revisions to the Faculty Bylaws Article VII, Section 4 excluding subsection "d" as detailed in the body of these minutes. Motion carried, as amended by Motions 2003/04-32 and 2003/04-33.

Motion 2003/04-32 Motion to reinsert the word, "Commencement" after "recruitment and retention policies" in the Bylaws Article VII, Section 4, subsection e. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-33 Motion to insert the words "and the Office of Enrollment Management" after "Dean of Students" in the Bylaws Article VII Section 4, e. Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-34 Seconded motion from the Research Policy Committee to approve the "Acceptable Use of Computers and Networks at the University of Arizona" policy. Motion was not acted upon.

Motion 2003/04-35 Motion to amend the beginning of article V, sections A, 1 and A, 2 of the University Policy on the Misuse of University Assets," to read: "Taking into account the incident reporting thresholds described in Article IV, all University employees are responsible" and: "Taking into account the incident reporting thresholds described in Article IV, supervisors are responsible" Motion carried.

Motion 2003/04-36 Motion to approve the 10/30/03 draft revisions to UHAP 5.09 Guidelines for Five-Year Reviews of Deans and Department Heads." Motion not acted upon.

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473