

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®  
February 9, 2004**

**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 Secretary Robert Mitchell at 3:03p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Arabyan, Baughman, Benedict, Borden, Burd, Chandler, Chapman, Christenson, Conway, Cusanovich, Dahlgran, D. Davis, G. Davis, Erickson, Green, Gruener, Hancock, Hildebrand, Jenkins, Kiefer, Mitchell, Pintozzi, Powell, Rainer, Schlager, Silverman, Songer, Spece, Strittmatter, Tatman, Timmermann, Tomanek, Warburton, Witte, Wysocki, Zizza, and Zwolinski. Amanda Brobbel substituted for Radebaugh. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Bixby, Diaz, Garrett, Howell, Impey, Joens, Jones, Kim, Larson, Likins, Lynch, Miesfeld, Pitt, Radebaugh, Swanson, Vierling, Weinand, Willerton, and Wright.

**2. OPEN SESSION**

There were no speakers for the Open Session.

**3. REPORTS**

**3A. ASUA President J. P. Benedict**

ASUA President J. P. Benedict reported that the ASUA election process is underway. He took part in an Arizona Students Association Tuition Forum last week. ASUA will begin conducting interviews for the next Student Regent soon. A Community Relations Forum to help understand some of the community's grievances regarding student relations took place last week. This forum involved students, campus police, and community members. ASUA continues to work on an advising contract or agreement to increase advisor accountability for students.

**3B. GPSC President Jani Radebaugh**

Amanda Brobbel reported for GPSC that the Student Showcase will take place next Tuesday in Phoenix and a number of the GPSC representatives will also attend UA's "Pride Night" with the legislators that evening.

**3C. Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell**

Secretary Mitchell reminded Senators that petitions for the General Faculty Primary Election are due February 13, 2004.

**3D. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock**

Faculty Chair Hancock encouraged faculty to run for office and for elected committees because the majority of the work is done at committee level. He announced that he and President Likins have selected Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee member Antonio Estrada to replace Jerry Hogle as Chair of SPBAC. A SPBAC sub-committee working on the revised Strategic Plan is considering the "building blocks" of space, time, and support services that are essential across campus to allow excellence in all endeavors. As a part of Focused Excellence, the administration has initiated a plan to review some of the central service functions, with respect to efficiency, quality and accuracy. Those functions served by Purchasing are the first to be examined. Two Senate reorganization committees, which are advisory only, have been constituted to consider the eliminations of the Humanities Program and the School of Planning. Chair Hancock expects preliminary results by the April Senate meeting, with final recommendations for the May Senate meeting. The Senate will have an opportunity to respond and perhaps create its own recommendation and then the recommendations are forwarded to SPBAC, the President, and the Provost. SPBAC can also respond and create its own recommendation. Some campus community members have been inquiring about how the Capital Campaign money is being collected and distributed, and what has happened to the Capital Campaign projects that were proposed at the beginning of the Campaign. John Welty, Associate Vice President for Information Services and Annual Giving at the UA Foundation, will speak about the Campaign's finances during today's Senate and will also answer any questions. Chair Hancock

said that the response to the survey about a Faculty Club has been overwhelmingly positive he has never received so many happy e-mails.

**3E. Provost George Davis**

Provost Davis reported that the University has been proactively and aggressively recruiting students to UA by offering weekend and evening events hosting prospective students and their parents. This past Saturday morning, the top 5% of southern Arizona high school juniors and their parents met in Centennial Hall and then dispersed to college-intensive visits. He thanked the deans, associate deans, and faculty who have offered their time to make these events as meaningful as possible for these prospective students. Former GPSC President Peter Morris has been emceeing these events and is a wonderful ambassador for the UA. Provost Davis commented that he is committed to implementing something similar to an Academic Program Review for the central support units on campus, such as Financial Service Operations, Sponsored Projects and other research units on campus. He is also advocating having faculty user groups act as advisors to the directors of support functions in such units as Research, Business Affairs, Campus Life and Academic Affairs. It is constructive for those who serve in these support functions to hear from the users about how the activities and the services are being received. The Gen Ed Committee is completing a self-study and self-evaluation. Vice Provost Hogle will convene a group including students who have completed the Gen Ed program, faculty who teach Gen Ed, department heads, academic advisors, Faculty Senators, deans, and graduate teaching assistants to review and evaluate the General Education Program. ABOR President Chris Herstam is adamant about having each of the University presidents be as specific as possible regarding recommendations and suggestions to create a more stable funding protocol for the universities, preferably as a group with ideas shared in common, but because the Regents' "Changing Directions" initiative allows for differentiated missions, and because the UA's boundary restraints will limit enrollment to around 40K, an enrollment-driven funding formula such as the 22:1 will not serve UA well. Furthermore, the 22:1 formula funding has never been fully funded by the legislature and was not even addressed last year. For the UA, a better incentive would be graduation rates, and in the case of formula funding, assigning the correct dollar amounts to graduate education, upper division, and lower division courses. Another formula involves building renewal, which has not been addressed for the past three years. This issue will be emphasized in the next few Board of Regents meetings. The implications are very significant and we must advocate and work in a way that ties in with our intent to enhance the diversity of the institution, to increase the quality of students being recruited, to increase the number of graduate students and to be mindful of the research agenda.

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

Senator Burd asked whether SPBAC would be conducting the service unit reviews. Chair Hancock replied that these reviews are being handled on a case by case basis, and do not really involve units, but rather a category of services. Provost Davis added that President Likins will need to charge the review process and that he is asking Joel Valdez and Richard Powell to recommend names of individuals to serve and to develop key questions to be explored for such functions. He also emphasized that he wants focused reviews of key areas that impact the life of faculty or departments, not a broad review of every aspect of a unit or function. Such focusing may help to identify areas that can be changed to produce rapid results.

Senator Silverman inquired whether any Senate Advisory Committees for reorganization/program eliminations have been constituted. Chair Hancock noted that he has formed two such advisory committees for the School of Planning and the Humanities Program. The two committees are comprised of some core members which include himself, the Presidential appointees: John Hildebrand, Nancy Huber, and Ted Tong; the SPBAC representative Antonio Estrada, ASUA representative J.P. Benedict, GPSC representative Jani Radebaugh, SAC representative Karen Stanley and APOC representative Carol Beltran. For the School of Planning, the faculty members are Barbara Becker and Sandra Rosenbloom. The Reorganization Procedure calls for each advisory committee to elect its own chair, but this has not yet taken place. Secretary Mitchell suggested that the Senate might need to schedule a special session in April to allow adequate time for debate before the end of the academic year.

Senator Strittmatter, speaking as a member of a Regents' Professors Task Force, said that this group strongly endorses the concept of the central service function reviews. He urged the reviewers to consider whether these service functions that are meant to serve the faculty and students are actually helpful, and that after such reviews, that there be some actual visible actions or consequences.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 2004**

The minutes of January 26, 2004 were approved with the following correction: to the Information Item: Report From The Office Of Intercollegiate Athletics, in the section on Senators' questions and comments: 3) Does the ICA receive paid pay tuition for its students?

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

The consent agenda items detailed at the end of these minutes [Motions 2003/04-38 and 2003/04-39] were approved.

**FOURTH READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: SECONDED MOTION FROM THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE: ACCEPTABLE USE OF COMPUTERS AND NETWORKS AS THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA POLICY**

Senator Pintozzi led the Senate's fourth reading and continued discussion on the "Acceptable Use of Computers and Networks at the University of Arizona" policy, which is carried over as seconded motion [Motion 2003/04-34]. She called the Senate's attention to the two changes in the policy in bolded type in Articles I and V. Senator's comments and questions included the following: 1) According to revised Article III, "Violations of this policy are subject to sanctions prescribed in, but not limited to, . . ." Is there a limitation somewhere on the sanctions? Senator Pintozzi responded that the policy is just saying that there might be another University policy somewhere with sanctions that isn't mentioned here. 2) This seems pretty open-ended about sanctions. Can we remove the phrase, "but not limited to?" 3) If a new policy is created and we forget to revise this policy, we create an obstacle. 4) An extreme example would be criminal activity that falls under the purview of laws well beyond the University, but we rarely call attention to those laws in our policies. 4) In Article IV, Section 2, how will the requirement for users to install anti-virus software be checked or enforced? The policy doesn't detail how this would be enforced, but perhaps it should specify that if there is a virus that can be traced to an unprotected computer, this is a violation of the policy and what steps would be taken. 5) Article IV, Section 3 requires clear and accurate self-identification in electronic communications, which seems to be at odds with a CCIT policy to allow students the liberty to choose their own e-mail addresses, instead of the university giving them composites of their first and last names. Senator Pintozzi said CCIT would have a record of the user's identity, but that this policy is intended to prevent people from creating false untraceable electronic identities for the purpose of sending threatening messages. 6) If a user does not install antiviral software, the network manager can remove that computer from the network. 7) If this solution is already in place, why are we overburdening ourselves with policies? 8) This policy is more uniform across campus, rather than relying on network managers to work out policies and enforce them in individual units. 9) This policy gives network managers more authority to require antiviral software. 10) Article IV, Section 2 talks about "users" but the real responsibility seems to lie with the network managers keeping everyone in a unit up-to-date and current, i.e. "management directives." Motion passed unanimously.

8. **THIRD READING: POLICY ON MISUSE OF UNIVERSITY ASSETS (attachment)**

Senator Pintozzi thanked the Senators who responded with questions and comments about this policy. The RPC met this morning and considered all of those issues and determined that this policy is not yet ready to go before the Senate for a vote. Questions include "Is this policy necessary?" and "Who makes the decision to require a more in-depth audit?" The RPC will continue to discuss these and other questions and asked that any additional concerns be sent to Chair Pintozzi via email. Senator G. Davis commended Chair Pintozzi and the RPC for the open and generous invitations for input in the interest of creating the best possible policy.

9. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: COALITION ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS FRAMEWORK (attachment)**

Senator Silverman introduced the "Framework for Intercollegiate Athletics Reform," which has been put forward by the Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics (COLA), a group advocating for reform in intercollegiate athletics, created by and representative of faculty senate leaders at Bowl Championship Series conference schools. The Coalition's purpose is to articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work with other groups committed to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission. The "Framework" has already been endorsed by the faculty senates of Stanford, Duke, Texas, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Northwestern, Oklahoma State, Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Vanderbilt, Idaho, Hawaii, Eastern Michigan, Texas Christian, and New Mexico, and is under consideration by 39 more. Furthermore, no faculty senate, which has considered it thus far, has failed to endorse it. Sections of the Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform include: I) Academic Integrity: A) Initial eligibility and admissions: Athletes should not be enrolled if they do not have reasonable prospects of graduation; B) Continuing eligibility: Support NCAA's strengthened standards for continuing eligibility; C) Grading and program integrity: Faculty should be provided with data concerning the majors and academic performance of athletes; and D) Academic Advising and Related Services: Athletic department advisors should be appointed in the regular campus advising system, report through the academic advising structure and be assessed by an academic review; II) Athlete Welfare: A) 20-hour rule: NCAA places a weekly maximum on non-academic athletics activities; Athletics Governance Committees should be empowered to develop principles for training schedules and to monitor compliance; B) Schedules for Competition: Schedules should provide an adequate competitive season with the least possible interference with the academic needs of athletes; C) Scholarships: No athlete should feel the need to shortchange academic commitment in order to retain scholarship support; D) Integration in campus life: Athletes on campus are students first and should have the opportunity to participate fully in campus life; e) Professionalism: Athletics departments should make their goal the development of well-rounded students and coaches who win at the cost of the balanced development of their athletes should not be rewarded or retained; III) Governance: Faculty Athletics Representatives (FAR): A) The FAR must be supported with funds, release time and authority; B) Athletics Governance Committee: Athletics Governance Committee should exist on every campus, bringing faculty, administrators and students together to oversee intercollegiate athletics; C)

Faculty senates: Faculty senates should receive detailed reports on sports programs at least annually from the FAR and Athletics Governance Committee, including academic performance of athletes, program budgets and NCAA infractions; D) Financial reporting principles: Uniform reporting standards for athletics budgets should be established; E) Role of conferences: There should be stable conference structures that represent academic rather than simply financial relationships; IV) Financial Issues: Issues of costs and commercialization need to be addressed including such issues as tying financial success to winning, number of athletic scholarships, football squad sizes, length of seasons and off-campus recruitment; and V) Over-commercialization: Marketing of intercollegiate athletics impairs institutional control and may link universities to products and corporate sponsors that present conflicts with institutional values. Senator Silverman asked the Faculty Senate to take time to discuss and then possibly vote to endorse the framework. Endorsement does not mean that the UA Faculty Senate agrees with every single point within the framework, but rather, that the Senate agrees "in principle" and that this document can then be used as a basis for discussions with faculty leaders, university presidents, and the NCAA. Also, endorsement does not mean that the issues addressed in the framework are problems at UA, but rather that the UA endorses this framework as a way for other campuses to address these issues if they do exist. Senator Silverman invited Professor Dudley Woodard, who serves on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (ICAC) and also as UA's Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR), to address the Senate. As a member of the ICAC, Pr. Woodard commented that this group welcomes more faculty participation in academic reform, reform of revenue, of commercialization and particularly governance. He also commented that the national Faculty Athletic Representative Association (FARA) has been meeting on academic reform for the past five years, but isn't mentioned as a partner in this coalition. The Arizona Board of Regents also spent two years looking at academic reform in athletics, and group is another partner not mentioned here. He would like an opportunity to work with the Senate and go through the framework carefully looking at each proposal. Senators' questions and comments included the following: 1) Why is there no reference to gambling, which may be the most serious and challenging issue in intercollegiate athletics? 2) How many faculty sit on the ICAC? There are nine members, five or six of which are faculty. 3) The wording of the first principle of the framework seems to perpetuate the separation of student-athletes from the student body by singling them out for special consideration. 4) II, C should be reversed: no student should be obligated to undertake athletics that compromise his/her scholarly activities. 5) Are we being asked to endorse this framework as a means to open up discussion on academic reform? The framework's language is rather strong and doesn't seem open to discussion. 6) The Coalition doesn't have a good understanding of what is taking place in intercollegiate athletics, but rather general knowledge or media-generated attitudes. 7) The twenty-hour rule is really an idealized notion. We probably want to make a commitment to try to reduce the student-athletes' commitment to twenty hours. 8) The NCAA does have a twenty-hour rule, but the framework may be more concerned with how that rule is monitored. 9) A student who doesn't perform well academically, can lose his/her academic scholarship. Can an athlete who doesn't perform well athletically lose the athletic scholarship? Scholarships are awarded on an annual basis, and coaches can make a decision not to renew a scholarship. UA has an attitude that if a student is a scholarship player, remains in good academic standing and follows the team rules, that student usually continues in his/her career or four years of eligibility. 10) Does Section I, D mean that athletics can allow extra funding for advising, since that has proven to enhance student success? Five years ago, UA separated academic advising from athletics counselors, who help students understand what they need to do in order to stay on track and stay eligible. 11) What is the motivation for the framework? Two years ago a small group of faculty leaders formed the Coalition because they were concerned about ICA and how it interfaces with academic mission, and because they believed faculty should be involved in these issues. The Coalition has since met with the NCAA and would like to take the endorsements of faculty senates across the nation to the NCAA and ask that these issues be addressed. 11) II, C, and IV, A, seem to be in conflict with each other. Cutting the number of scholarships may increase competition and put a lot of pressure on scholarship players. Senator D. Davis moved [Motion 2003/04-40] that this Faculty Senate endorse the Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform in principle. Motion was seconded. Some senators expressed reluctance to endorse something in principle, and also to endorse something with considerable political ramifications after only one reading. Senator Hildebrand moved [Motion 2003/04-41] to postpone consideration of this item. Motion was seconded and passed. The Senate Executive Committee will decide when to return this item to the Senate.

#### 10. INFORMATION ITEM: CAPITAL CAMPAIGN / UA FOUNDATION

John Welty of the UA Foundation reported to the Senate on the Capital Campaign's progress to date, detailing the types of donors, the types of gifts, the amount of endowed funding, and the projects that have begun receiving Capital Campaign funds. As of October, UA's Capital Campaign has raised \$1,002,552,652, making it one of only seventeen institutions to raise over a billion dollars. The Campaign continues to the end of June 2005. Gift commitments include cash received, pledges with binding commitments, charitable trusts, gift annuities, and estate plans. One goal was to increase endowments, which are meant to last in perpetuity, by investing and spending only the interest generated. Campaign Arizona inspired the alumni base to increase its giving, while non-alums have historically supported UA and continue to do so. About 30% has been designated for the Health Sciences Center, 45% to the main campus colleges, 3% to the museums and 20% for the other administrative units. Many of the faculty-proposed projects for Campaign Arizona have not yet been funded, but of those that have been, most have become involved in the fundraising effort. Only 1% of the gifts are designated as unrestricted giving, and the Campaign is promoting greater unrestricted giving because there is an absolute need for a "war chest" to permit the campus administration to respond to opportunities or crises. The overall cost of this fundraising effort to date is 9¢ on the dollar.

11.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Robert L. Mitchell, Secretary

**Appendix\***

1. Consent Agenda item forwarded from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee.
2. "Acceptable Use of Computers and Networks at the University of Arizona" 1-30-04 DRAFT.
3. "Misuse of University Assets" policy from Joel Valdez revised 1-23-04.
4. Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) "Framework for Intercollegiate Athletics Reform."

\*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 February 9, 2004**

**Motion 2003/04-38** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the transfer of the graduate interdisciplinary Gerontology Program, including the MS degree, graduate minor and certificate, and undergraduate courses to the College of Nursing. Motion carried.

**Motion 2003/04-39** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve the a proposal to add a requirement on Minimum University Credit in the Major to include no fewer than 18 units of University Credit, to be identified on the Academic Program Requirements Report. 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 carried.

**Motion 2003/04-40** Seconded motion that the Faculty Senate endorse the Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform proposed by the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics in principle. Motion postponed.

**Motion 2003/04-41** Seconded motion to postpone the motion that the Faculty Senate endorse the Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform proposed by the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics in principle. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER  
1400 E. Mabel  
PO BOX 210473