

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
April 7, 2008**

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

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair of the Faculty Robert P. Mitchell at 3:05 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Bruce, Burd, Christenson, Conway, Dahlgran, A. Davis, O. Davis, Effken, Garcia, Green, Gruener, Hildebrand, Howell, Jones, Knutson, McKee, Miller, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Mutchler, Pintozzi, Sander, San Martin, Sarid, Schlager, Shelton, Silverman, Slugocki, Smith, Songer, St. John, Sterling, Ulreich and Witte. K. Corcoran substituted for C. Neish and T. Tong substituted for P. Nolan.

Absent: Senators Bergsma, Cuello, Cusanovich, D. Davis, Engel, Estrada, Foley, Jenkins, Joens, Mosher, Mountford, Neish, Nolan, Pavao-Zuckerman, Ruiz, Spece, Strittmatter, Weinand and Willerton.

**2. OPEN SESSION**

Presiding Officer Mitchell reminded everyone that the maximum number of speakers per session is four and that no discussion is permitted, and no votes allowed. Please note that speakers at the Open Session are expressing their personal opinions, which may not reflect the position of the Faculty Senate. Written statements submitted during Open Session are available from the Faculty Center.

College of Medicine (COM) Professor of Molecular and Cellular Biology Carol Gregorio expressed appreciation for the opportunity to address the issues that the Committee of Eleven (C11) has called to the Senate's attention, particularly the structural relationships between University Medical Center (UMC), the COM and its clinical practice group, University Physicians Healthcare (UPH). Gregorio expressed support for Dean Keith Joiner's leadership which she stated is going in the right direction as the COM positions itself to be more productive and competitive.

College of Medicine Cancer Center Professor M. Peter Lance echoed C. Gregorio's appreciation for the opportunity to address the issues that the Committee of Eleven (C11) has called to the Senate's attention and expressed support for Dean Joiner as he shepherds the COM-Phoenix through a difficult, complex and sometimes painful effort to change direction. Lance indicated that major new recruitments are underway and agreed with the C11's assessment of the importance and goals for the College of Medicine and observed that neither the University nor the COM is likely to meet these goals without the COM-Phx expansion.

**3. REPORTS**

**3A. ASUA President Tommy Bruce**

ASUA President Tommy Bruce deferred his report until today's ASUA agenda item.

**3B. GPSC President Catherine Neish**

GPSC Vice President Kathleen Corcoran reported for President Neish who is ill today. A draft Request for Proposal for on-campus child care is being edited and will be released this Summer. GPSC held its elections and Stephen Bieda was elected the GPSC President for the coming year. Ms. Corcoran thanked the Faculty Senate for all of its help this year.

**3C. Faculty Officers' Report**

Presiding Officer Mitchell indicated that the runoff faculty election ended last Friday and results are on Senators' desks. He reminded the College Representative Senators who did not run for reelection that their terms run through the end of May so to be sure to attend the May 5 Senate meeting. Provost Meredith Hay will be attending her first Senate meeting on that day and the Senate will be electing members for the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment, the Committee on Conciliation, the University Hearing Board as well as Senate representatives to the Senate Executive Committee, the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee and the Shared Governance Review Committee and two Senate representatives to the Senate's Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning. Anyone wishing to run for these positions should contact the Faculty Center. The Faculty Officers thanked Provost Sander for serving as our Provost this past year and commemorated his service with the dedication of a campus

heritage tree that will be designated with a brass plaque to read, "To Provost Eugene G. Sander, with gratitude, respect and affection for your extraordinary leadership and commitment to shared governance at the University of Arizona. Presented before the Faculty Senate on behalf of the entire faculty, April 7, 2008." A dedication ceremony will be scheduled soon.

**3D. Provost Eugene Sander**

Provost Sander thanked the faculty for the past ten months during which he has come to understand and appreciate faculty governance. He thanked Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee Chair Miranda Joseph and Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell for working with him to accomplish several things for the good of the institution. He suggested that the working relationships he has forged could be enhanced whenever new faculty committees are being organized, by putting an administrator on some committees because ultimately the implementation of recommendations will fall to the administration. This should help avoid any ping-pong effect. Provost Sander announced that Janice Cervelli from Clemson has accepted the position of Dean of the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture beginning July 1. Carolyn Murdaugh will serve as interim dean of Nursing beginning May 19, and Provost Sander is currently identifying an interim dean for Humanities beginning July 1. The search committee for the deanship of the College of Public Health has completed interviewing four candidates and Provost Sander is waiting for a recommendation to begin a second round of interviews that Provost Hay will be involved in.

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

President Shelton thanked the Committee of Eleven for its work and for the earlier meetings members held with him personally to advise him of the critical and serious issues that are raised in the report on today's agenda. President Shelton said he is working with the dean of COM to address some of the issues which are similar to challenges at a number of medical colleges in the United States. One challenge is the extraordinary administrative structure and relationships among the three very independent entities of COM/UPH/UMC that are unique to the UA. He does, however, see important marks of progress in COM including a significant number of new faculty hires, the unprecedented COM-Phx expansion, a completed Medical Research Building, a completed review of curriculum in both Tucson and Phoenix, and new residencies beginning at Kino Hospital. He does not discount the complexity of the issues and the challenge, however, and while the report brings the concerns to the attention of the broader community and some negative interpretations may ensue, he hopes that with the continued involvement of the Committee of Eleven and the faculty, the college will continue to make improvements and move the institution up in the ranks. Turning to the state budget, President Shelton advised the Senate that there seems to be agreement between the governor and the legislature about the Fiscal Year 2008 (FY08) budget, although that budget is not yet being released and may not be released until July 1. A majority of legislators are really struggling with the FY09 budget and want to do the minimum harm. The Southern Arizona legislators strongly support the universities, of course, but a few individuals believe that the state's government is too big and spending should be reduced. The Regents and the universities have proposed an aggressive component to the state's FY09 budget, requesting a \$1.4B construction-based economic stimulus package that would help put 30,000 workers in Arizona's construction industry back to work, jumpstart the state's economy and build new buildings or restore and remodel aging structures on campuses in Flagstaff, Phoenix, Tempe and Tucson to accommodate the tremendous predicted enrollment growth and Arizona's need for more baccalaureate degrees to build our educated workforce. The universities received approval in 2003 for a number of bonding projects. The universities have agreed to fund 20% of the total costs. Business leaders are on board with this proposal and the idea is beginning to gain traction in the legislature.

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

Senator Silverman asked President Shelton whether the universities will suffer budget cuts in 2008. President Shelton responded that the governor continues to try to hold the universities harmless, but the deficit has increased by another \$400M since the initial talks began. He hopes to make the cuts as small as possible and to make them one-time cuts.

Senator Sterling asked President Shelton about the source of the universities' 20% funding for the economic stimulus package buildings. President Shelton explained that multiple sources will be tapped, the first being gift money.

Senator Conway asked President Shelton whether the main contractors for the last few buildings built on campus are from Arizona. President Shelton replied that he is not sure and he would expect that a rider on the economic stimulus bill would be to mandate Arizona contractors except in cases needing out-of-state expertise.

**5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 3, 2008**

The minutes of March 3, 2008 were approved.

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

Presiding Officer Mitchell reminded Senators that the Consent Agenda comes as a seconded motion [Motion 2007-08-46] from the ICPC. The Consent Agenda item detailed at the end of these minutes passed unanimously.

7. **APPROVAL OF ICPC NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEM (attachment)**

Presiding Officer Mitchell reminded Senators that the Non-Consent Agenda item comes as a seconded motion [Motion 2007-08-47] from the ICPC; because it is a policy, this item is not listed on the Consent Agenda. ICPC Chair Conway explained that this proposal is to clarify the undergraduate Leave of Absence (LOA) policy and makes it clear that an occasional exception might be made for first semester undergraduates or transfer students requesting a leave of absence. Faculty and the Registrar are supportive of giving LOA benefits to students who drop their courses due to personal or family emergencies, to make it easier for such students to return to the UA. Curriculum Associate C. Pardee explained that such a request may only happen twice a year, but the policy makes it clear that students can ask. Motion carried unanimously.

8. **SECOND READING AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVISED REORGANIZATION PROCEDURES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA (attachment)**

Academic Personnel Policy Committee Chair Larry Aleamoni informed the Senate that APPC held an extraordinary meeting to consider input from over 25 people including faculty staff and appointed professionals regarding proposed revisions to the Reorganization Procedures. Some changes arrived after that meeting. The revisions to the document are intended to clarify and emphasize that this document provides *guidelines* for developing reorganization proposals, not for implementing proposals. He introduced several minor edits. On page 1, paragraph 1, he inserted a transitional “Therefore,” at the beginning of the second sentence to read, “**Therefore**, the institution must be able...” In the second paragraph, he made the following edits to the first and second sentences of that paragraph to read, “The following procedure pertains to reorganizations **proposals**...” and “They do not pertain to reorganizations **proposals**...” Senator Ulreich moved [Motion 2007/08-48] to insert “staff,” into the fourth paragraph on Page 1 to read, “A proposal for academic reorganization can originate from diverse levels; however, the faculty, **staff**, and academic administrators (such as Deans, Heads and Directors) in the units to be affected must be involved in the development of a proposal.” Motion was seconded. While senators expressed appreciation for the inclusiveness, they wondered whether appointed professionals are included in the definition of staff. Provost Sander suggested the language “academic support personnel” in place of “staff.” Senator Ulreich withdrew his motion and moved [Motion 2007/08-49] to insert “academic support personnel,” into the fourth paragraph on Page 1 to read, “A proposal for academic reorganization can originate from diverse levels; however, the faculty, **academic support personnel**, and academic administrators (such as Deans, Heads and Directors) in the units to be affected must be involved in the development of a proposal.” Motion was seconded and carried.

Senator Ulreich moved [Motion 2007/08-50] to strike the first paragraph on Page 2 and replace it to read, “**If 75% of the affected faculty members approve the proposed reorganization, and if the President believes it is of value, then implementation can proceed in accordance with University processes and ABOR policies as appropriate. If a majority (50%+1) but less than 75% of the affected faculty approves the proposed reorganization, and if the President wishes to pursue the matter further than the following steps are required.**” Motion was seconded. Senator Green asked to clarify that if a majority of faculty opposes a reorganization proposal, the proposal stops there. Senator Ulreich indicated that is his understanding unless someone offers to revise it. Motion carried with one abstention.

Senator Ulreich moved [Motion 2007/08-51] to amend the composition of the Advisory Committee by striking the first sentence of I.a. that reads “Three faculty members...transfer is proposed,” and replacing it with “**Five faculty members, to include two members elected by the faculty in the sending unit(s), two members elected by the faculty in the receiving unit(s), and one**” Motion was seconded. Senators’ comments and questions included: 1)

Increasing the number of faculty on the advisory committee is a good objective, but based on experience in a previous reorganization effort, there may be as many as five or more receiving units and such a committee could quickly become unwieldy. 2) Perhaps the language should be changed to read, “at least five.” 3) It seems like every affected unit should have at least one faculty member on the advisory committee. 4) The amendment was intended to address the balance between the number of elected faculty and the number of faculty members selected by the Senate Executive Committee. 5) The original proposal’s wording should be retained with one faculty member from each unit affected, whether receiving or sending. 6) Speaking on behalf of the rights of faculty, the widespread feeling is that it is better to have too many than too few. 7) Having one faculty member from each affected unit seems like a better approach to balancing appropriate representation without becoming unwieldy. 8) There is a preponderance of faculty members on the Advisory Committee because it calls for four faculty members, three to be selected by the Senate Executive Committee and one by SPBAC. Senator Ulreich withdrew his motion. Senators Mitchneck and Ulreich moved [Motion 2007/09-52] to amend the first sentence of I.a. to read, “**No fewer than three faculty members**...” Motion was seconded and passed. Senator Mitchneck proposed a further amendment to the constitution of the Advisory Committee, to address concerns that persons with the right knowledge bases such as staff or appointed professionals are included on the Advisory Committee. She moved [Motion 2007/08-53] to amend the second sentence in paragraph I on the

second page to read, “The Chair of the Faculty (or designee) will chair the committee and ensure that the members of the committee collectively have the necessary knowledge bases to adequately assess the curricular, operational, research and outreach costs and benefits.” Motion was seconded and passed. Senator Witte brought forth a seconded motion from the Committee of Eleven [Motion 2007/08-54] that restores the central role of faculty in this process by amending the second sentence in paragraph II to read, “...to the Faculty Senate for comment approval....” Motion passed. Provost Sander commented that his initial motivation for revising the Reorganization Procedure was to streamline the timeline for achieving all of the necessary approvals and allow the institution to be more nimble. He thanked the Senate and commented that he is satisfied with the additional amendments today. Presiding Officer Mitchell called for a vote on the returning motion 2007/08-45 to approve the “Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona, Revised 3-27-08” as amended today. Motion passed.

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

Chair of the Faculty Howell called Senators’ attention to the Provost’s February 21 Memorandum to the College Deans asking them to implement the instructional accountability process. On the second page are the Colleges’ responses received to date relative to 100% teaching loads. A full-time teaching load averages four courses per semester, but there are variations, of course. The next question comes with the departments identifying what is an equivalent set of activities to teaching a course? Many other activities are instructional, such as mentoring graduate students, etc. Chair Howell offered examples from her home Department of Nutritional Sciences, which identified different activities and quantified how much those activities would contribute. She challenged Faculty Senators to go back to their units and identify what the faculty agrees are equivalent activities. The range of credit hours per semester depends on quantity and the judgment of the faculty member and the department head. Some of the areas include mentoring, curriculum and course development, student advising, Tier I GenEd preceptor training, administrative duties such as the graduate and undergraduate program coordinators, or writing training grants. Most UA faculty will measure well over the 100% workload. Some areas may lead toward a discussion of faculty roles whereby instructional creativity and scholarship might be credited and considered as contributing toward promotion and tenure decisions. Senators’ questions and comments included: 1) Enlarging the definition of teaching is appropriate, and faculty are the ones to do that. 2) Faculty have barely begun to have discussions on this instructional accountability process that originated with the Provost and went to the deans and now will be going to the units with implementation set for April 15. 3) Too many departments have no faculty governance, or have no elected faculty representatives in the governance bodies and committees. 4) There needs to be 360° accountability, instead of the full burden of accountability always falling on the grassroots faculty doing the teaching. 5) The Summary Table of College Instructional Workload does not reflect the full richness of many of the college proposals which included extensive menus of teaching activities. Senator Witte said she doesn’t agree with dissecting teaching into a collection of activities and she offered to share an article entitled the “Meta-Profession of Teaching” from *Thriving in Academe June 2006*, which describes many of the activities that faculty are engaged in and how everything that full-time faculty members do is, to a large extent, teaching. She also offered to share a letter she has written annually to her unit’s P&T/Performance Review Committee about the difference between bean-counting versus sowing the seeds, which is what faculty ought to be doing. Chair Howell agreed that faculty governance is variable at the departmental levels all across campus, and suggested that perhaps faculty leaders can help to influence shared governance at the department level. Provost Sander clarified that this memorandum was just a reminder that followed up an earlier, initial memo signed by SPBAC Chair Joseph, Chair Howell, Vice President for Instruction Hogle, and himself which asked each college what is the scope of teaching and called for faculty governance participation. One impetus for this accountability exercise was the last budget renormalization exercise that took place under Provost Davis, which yielded an extensive list of faculty members producing fewer than 100 credit hours to the overall teaching. Provost Sander added that the universities in the future are going to have to be more accountable because the public is demanding it. He hopes this process will yield an agreement between each faculty member and department head at the time of the annual reviews that will speak to the amount of good and useful work produced by each faculty member’s teaching, research and service. Chair Howell asked how much the department heads were involved in producing the Colleges’ responses. Senator Mitchneck explained that in SBS, many of the conversations that Provost Sander hopes for are occurring in very detailed annual performance reviews according to guidelines that were voted upon by faculty at each unit. These criteria vary widely among departments and disciplines. Chair Howell offered to share her overheads detailing faculty workload activities in the Nutritional Science Department.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM: ASUA FACULTY MENTORING PROGRAM (attachment)**

ASUA President Tommy Bruce and Senator Justin Miller introduced a proposal for an ASUA faculty mentorship program and asked for faculty feedback on how to solicit faculty mentors who can offer more than the academic advisers who are focused on graduation requirements, credits and classes. Senator Miller described how one-on-one faculty mentors could offer more experience, guidance on lifestyle, broad insight and counseling. T. Bruce hopes this will provide an opportunity for faculty to be more involved in students’ lives. The current student/advisor ratio is far too high and the advising resources are stretched too thin to serve students who are looking for information on career choices and other insights. ASUA and the advising Resource Center would serve as the intermediary between the faculty mentors and students. Although information about how best to solicit participation, market the program and implement is still being gathered, ASUA anticipates that this program would work on a referral basis through an academic advisor consulting a mentor database and referring that student. The student seeking more information would then be responsible for contacting that faculty mentor. ASUA has not yet received or allocated any funding for

this project. Senators' comments and questions included 1) How will this program dovetail with the Arizona Assurance Program? ASUA's project will work with the Arizona Assurance Program to provide about 50 mentors for economically underprivileged students who qualify for admission to the University and are guaranteed a college education. 2) The type of mentoring ASUA describes often takes place within a long-term relationship that faculty simply don't have time for. It may be better to look to the community for such real-world mentors. 3) Congratulations to ASUA for making this idea a reality. Begin by contacting emeritus faculty; the names are available from the Faculty Center. 4) A kickoff event such as a reception may help to launch the program. 5) This is a great idea and ASUA should be encouraged to think even bigger. A number of departments already have graduate student, faculty, and peer mentors. Among the staff of the University there is experience and expertise among research areas and support areas like UITS. 6) If students who belong to local organizations within a college ask the faculty who are involved in that organization, faculty are more likely to say yes because the request is coming from the students themselves.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM: COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN REPORT ON ISSUES OF FACULTY CONCERNS AT THE COLLEGE OF MEDICINE (attachment)**

Committee of Eleven Vice Chair J.D. Garcia explained that the committee was approached by a number of faculty from the College of Medicine last Fall. Because the C11's charge is to initiate, promote, and stimulate study and action dealing with and looking toward solution of situations and problems of interest and concern to the faculty and to the University, members undertook a study of the issues. The process was as follows: first C11 recused all members who hold faculty positions in the College of Medicine; then the C11 sent letters to every department head requesting meetings with COM faculty to initiate discussion about the concerns. C11 received seventeen invitations to meet with COM faculty, spoke with over 140 faculty members including ten department heads, four former department heads and several section heads, and received several letters signed by multiple COM faculty members. The C11 concluded that the most important issue that faculty spoke to is the complex relationship between the COM, UPH and UMC. These relationships are proving to be deleterious to the perception of the COM faculty's ability to fulfill their roles as faculty and researchers. A second concern is the large number of changes that have been made with minimal or no faculty input or buy-in resulting in dissatisfaction and unrest. Faculty governance in COM is not strong and changes have been made in some units without regard to the quality of the faculty or departments affected, which has seriously affected collegiality. C11 believes that the COM plays a very important role in the institution's research funding efforts so it is important to increase COM research funding as soon as possible. The COM faculty that C11 interviewed felt that faculty morale is a significant problem. C11 already provided President Shelton and Provost Sander with a copy of this report and is now providing it to the Faculty Senate. Senator Howell asked President Shelton what kinds of interventions might help to change the mood and make a difference for COM faculty. President Shelton said a number of activities are underway and a key concern is the complexity of the interactions among UPH-UMC-COM, all of which are experiencing pressures not unlike other medical schools all across the country, but UA's pressures are exacerbated by this unique structure. The leaders of the three organizations have engaged an experienced outside group to determine how to restructure in a way that is sensitive to the pressures on the faculty. President Shelton and Dean Joiner are also planning some gatherings with COM faculty to develop effective mechanisms to engage faculty in broader cross-section discussions of issues. Much of the tension within COM is coming from an insufficient number of clinical faculty to handle the existing workload. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) The Faculty Senate should be most concerned when there is a lack of faculty governance and shared governance in a unit as important as the College of Medicine, a fact which has been articulated many times over many years. There needs to be a report back either from the C11 or from the COM Senators to ensure that this problem is addressed. 2) Speaking as a COM faculty member who did not participate in the C11 study, this report is very much on target. There are COM faculty who strongly support the current dean but there certainly are quite a few faculty who are not in agreement with Dean Joiner's policies, management and decision-making style. The issue of the COM-UPH-UMC structure is an important issue that predates the current dean, but some of concerns that fall under faculty governance and academic freedom have increased under Dean Joiner and there is a widespread sense of an "us versus them" mentality which is not constructive. Many of the critics of the dean's style and policies are nevertheless very supportive of the dean's goals, but not the manner of reaching that goal. This is a difficult time in the COM and this report captures it well. 3) The problems at the COM seem extraordinarily acute. As the earlier discussion about accountability indicates, where faculty governance is missing at the college and departmental levels, there is no faculty buy-in. Free and frank and sometimes even tense discussions about ideas that are liberal and progressive between faculty and administrators on every level is healthy. The Faculty Senate's role should be to support and energize our colleagues from COM in their desire for more participation and to open up the process. 4) When is the dean of Medicine's next evaluation because that mechanism is part of our normal process and will a clearinghouse for all the information and concerns heard today? Provost Sander responded that he believes that the dean's five-year review will begin in AY2008-09.

12. **INFORMATION ITEM: REPORT FOR THE FACULTY SENATE TASK FORCE ON GENERAL EDUCATION**

Faculty Senate Task Force on General Education (GETF) Chair Roger Dahlgran advised the Senate that in May 2007, the Senate established this task force and charged it 1) to view existing University-wide GenEd Committee (UWGEC) reports, 2) to design mechanisms to measure and assure the quality and cost effectiveness of the GenEd program, 3) to recommend actions to provide greater access to a choice of GenEd courses, and 4) to review rules and procedures for the substitution of GenEd courses. A wide-ranging Task Force was established that included four faculty senators, two members of the UWGEC and representatives from various colleges across the campus. Chair Dahlgran began the Task Force by asking what objectives

the GenEd curriculum was supposed to accomplish when it was established ten years ago. Improving student mobility between majors, channeling funding for GenEd to GenEd, providing fulltime instructors for GenEd instructors, strengthening writing proficiency, exposing students to interdisciplinary approaches to problems, improving retention of first-year students, improving course sequencing, creating experiences that expose students to different points of view, creating experiences in recognizing diversity, and improving course availability. The GETF began with a fact-finding step to determine how well the GenEd program is working. Improving student mobility has been an unqualified success; with a very few exceptions, students can change majors across the colleges. Channeling \$14M in temporary funding to the various colleges to provide the GenEd classes as needed is an annual problem which the administration faces. Initially, providing fulltime instructors for GenEd instruction was a great success, but the obvious trend from the University's databank shows a deterioration of that success in recent years. Looking at TCEs and asking students about writing experiences in courses and looking at the data over time indicates an initial success in strengthening writing proficiency but those gains, too, have deteriorated. Exposing students to interdisciplinary approaches to problems is difficult to assess; team-teaching is rare but student opinions for the TCEs indicate that students believe those courses to be highly applicable to real-world problems and those scores have increased over time. Exposing students to different points of view is also difficult to assess but GenEd courses frequently use discussion sections where students are free to share opinions. Looking at the retention data, there was no big "bump" when the GenEd curriculum was implemented from which the GETF concluded that if GenEd is not done well, it can hurt first-year retention, and if it is done well, it's not going to help much. Improving course sequencing has been successful because 80-90% of Tier I and II enrollment is freshmen and sophomores, so the appropriate students are filling those courses. Courses in race, gender and ethnicity are offered across the board to help create experiences in recognizing diversity. The Vice President for Instruction has been managing seat and course availability adequately but the number of large classes is increasing over time and course choice remains an issue.

A review of GenEd was completed in 2003 and a list of recommendations was put forward in 2005. The GETF then reviewed those recommendations and the UWGEC's responses to avoid duplication of efforts and made comments about those recommendations in the full report. GETF's main recommendations are: 1) The GenEd curriculum should undergo five-year reviews comparable to departmental academic program reviews including external reviewers and a self study. 2) Assessment remains a concern as there appears to be an ongoing search for the "perfect" assessment tool. As the purpose of assessment is to track trends, the Task Force recommends using multiple assessment tools and making a report to the Undergraduate Council (UGC), ICPC and the Faculty Senate, so that assessment leads somewhere. Assessment results should be used by UWGEC to help in the evolution of GenEd, and by departments to evaluate courses and instructors. The GETF believes that more liberal substitutions for both Tier I and II should be allowed to provide students with greater course choice and flexibility; the UGC should examine the rules for such substitutions. 3) Since many departments did not eliminate their introductory disciplinary courses when the GenEd curriculum was implemented, those courses should go through UWGEC's vetting process to be considered for fulfilling the requirements of GenEd. 4) Students taking more advanced courses that fulfill the spirit of GenEd should be allowed to count those credits toward their GenEd requirements. 5) GenEd course syllabi should be available online to make course selection easier. 6) The administration should reaffirm that accountability for instructional resources rests with the offering department, regardless of who teaches the course, whether fulltime ranked faculty, temporary faculty, or adjuncts. These departments must also be responsible for Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) employed in the GenEd enterprise. 7) The use of temporary adjuncts should be minimized. Although the use of temporary adjuncts provides flexibility and a cost advantage, accountability is largely absent. Colleges and departments should consider a class of teaching faculty and multi-year adjuncts. 8) GTAs involved in GenEd instruction experience disparities in teaching load and pay. 9) Students booking a seat in a class just to maintain their options should bear more of the cost of leaving that seat empty after the first week of class. This principle should apply to all University courses.

### 13. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

J.C. Mutchler, Secretary of the Faculty-elect  
Panela S. Bridgmon, Recording Secretary

#### Appendix\*

1. ICPC Consent Agenda
2. ICPC Non-Consent Agenda: Approval of the proposal to clarify the undergraduate Leave of Absence policy
3. "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona," Revised 3-27-08
4. Memorandum from Provost Sander to College Dean re Instructional accountability dated February 21, 2008
5. Summary Table College Instructional Workload dated February 2008
6. ASUA Faculty Mentorship Program
7. Committee of Eleven Report on Issues of Faculty Concern at the College of Medicine, dated February 8, 2008

*\*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.*

**Motions of the Meeting of April 7, 2008**

**Motion 2007/08-46** Seconded motion from the Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee to approve a Graduate certificate in Hydraulics and Water Resources. Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-47** Seconded motion to approve the proposal to clarify the undergraduate Leave of Absence policy. Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-48** Seconded motion to insert the word "staff" into the fourth paragraph on Page 1 of the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona, Revised 3-27-08" to read "A proposal for academic reorganization can originate from diverse levels; however, the faculty, **staff**, and academic administrators (such as Deans, Heads and Directors) in the units to be affected must be involved in the development of a proposal." Motion withdrawn.

**Motion 2007/08-49** Seconded motion to insert the words "academic support personnel" into the fourth paragraph on Page 1 of the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona, Revised 3-27-08" to read "A proposal for academic reorganization can originate from diverse levels; however, the faculty, **academic support personnel** and academic administrators (such as Deans, Heads and Directors) in the units to be affected must be involved in the development of a proposal." Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-50** Seconded motion to strike the first paragraph on Page 2 of the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona, Revised 3-27-08" and replace it to read, "**If 75% of the affected faculty members approve the proposed reorganization, and if the President believes it is of value, then implementation can proceed in accordance with University processes and ABOR policies as appropriate. If a majority (50%+1) but less than 75% of the affected faculty approves the proposed reorganization, and if the President wishes to pursue the matter further, then the following steps are required...**" Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-51** Seconded motion to amend the composition of the Advisory Committee on Page 2 of the "Guidelines for Reorganization Proposals at the University of Arizona, Revised 3-27-08" by striking the first sentence of I.a. that reads "Three faculty members...transfer is proposed," and replacing it with "Five faculty members, to include two members elected by the faculty in the sending unit(s), two members elected by the faculty in the receiving unit(s), and one member elected by those whose transfer is proposed." Motion withdrawn.

**Motion 2007/09-52** Seconded motion to amend the first sentence of I.a. to read, "**No fewer than three faculty members...**" Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-53** Seconded motion to amend the second sentence in paragraph I on the second page to read, "The Chair of the Faculty (or designee) will chair the committee **and ensure that the members of the committee collectively have the necessary knowledge bases to adequately assess the curricular, operational, research, and outreach costs and benefits.**" Motion carried.

**Motion 2007/08-54** Seconded motion to amend the second sentence in paragraph II to read, "...to the Faculty Senate for **comment approval...**" Motion passed.

**Motion 2007/08-45** Return of seconded motion from the Senate Executive Committee to approve the revised reorganization Procedures at the University of Arizona as amended today. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER  
1400 E. Mabel  
PO BOX 210473