

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
January 26, 2015**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/107812>

Visit the faculty governance webpage at:

<http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/>

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair of the Faculty Michael Brewer at 3:03 p.m. in the Old Main Silver and Sage Room.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Armstrong, Ayoun, Bourget, Brewer, Brock, Brooks, Colina, Comrie, Conway, Cuillier, Dai, Duran, Finnegan, Fountain, Fregosi, Harris, Ghosh, Guertin, Harris, Hart, Hildebrand, Johnson, Kohler, Leafgren, Lee, Lega, Martin, McKean, Miller, Moreno, Nadel, Najafi, Neumann, Ortega, Padias, Paiewonsky, Pau, Polakowski, Ray, Richardson, Sager, Secomb, Spece, Story, R. Vaillancourt, Valerdi, and Yeager.

Absent: Senators Cuello, Dahlgran, Galilee-Belfer, Hamilton, Higgins, Jones, Joseph, Nfonsam, Ritter, Silverman, Simmons, Smith, Snyder, Trump, A. Vaillancourt, Vercruysee, Visscher, M. Witte, and R. Witte.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 1, 2014

The minutes of December 1, 2014 were approved with one abstention.

3. REPORT FROM CHAIR OF THE FACULTY LYNN NADEL

Nadel announced that the new Faculty Center website was up and running and thanked the members of UITS Donna Bieg, Bernadine Cannon, Danielle Stilgenbauer and Jonathan Theurbach. There will be some additions to the membership of the Senate Executive Committee to include an APAC representative, an internet technology designee, and an athletics representative from Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (ICAC). The Breakfast with the Regents will be held on February 5, 2015 and Nadel encouraged all faculty to attend the ABOR events that are open to the public. On a separate note, Vice Chair Brewer announced that there is a proposal for an organization merger in the iSchool that was distributed to all faculty. The three neutral observers are Michael Brewer, Lisa Ordenez, and Rob Miller. Please provide feedback if you have any.

4. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR ASUA, GPSC AND APAC REPORTS

No reports were submitted this meeting.

5. REPORT BY PROVOST COMRIE

Provost Comrie reported that the search for a new dean of Eller College has begun. The search committee is comprised of nineteen faculty, students, alumni/national advisory board members and staff nominated through Eller College. The search committee is chaired by Dean of the College of Law, Marc Miller. Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) continues to move at a brisk pace. Comrie presented an overview of RCM to department heads and directors in late December. Workshops were held for the deans and senior financial/academic leadership in early January. Senior Vice President for Research Kimberly Espy and Comrie are in the process of receiving feedback in the form of ranked proposals from the review committee on the cluster hiring process in order to better understand the University's needs.

6. REPORT FROM PRESIDENT HART

President Hart reported Governor Ducey's budget proposed a General Fund reduction of \$75M (10%) to the University system. Distribution of the fund reduction among the three in-state Universities may be determined by student enrollment. Building on the principle of the parity movement from six to eight years previously, the Governor recommends that any cuts eventually imposed on higher education be distributed according to FTE or student funding. Some have suggested that the Arizona Board of Regents should be in charge of the distribution of funds. The proposed distribution of fund reductions will be split, with a \$21M cut for the UA, \$43M for Arizona State University (ASU) and \$13M for Northern Arizona University, with no reduction for the Arizona Board of Regents' budget. The deans, Provost, senior leadership teams and SPBAC will focus on the budget repositioning as it relates to student services and the UA's core academic mission. Hart apologized for having to leave the Senate meeting early for a Board of Regents conference call in which final decisions relating to the signing of the Banner Academic Affiliation Agreement and ABOR approval of the merger of University of Arizona Health Network (UAHN) into Banner Health Network. The schedule has been modified because three key compliance issues have emerged that are critical to Banner liabilities. The agreement will be signed, but closing will occur at the end of February 2015.

7. QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR THE CHAIR, PROVOST AND PRESIDENT

Senator Cuillier asked President Hart if ASU President, Michael Crow's comment about not raising in-state tuition is realistic. President Hart responded that ASU has received parity funding in the past three years that the UA has not received. At the request of the leadership of UA students, the UA offers incoming in-state students a four-year guarantee to keep tuition constant without any increases. UA tuitions set for any incoming class are set for the next four-year period.

8. **ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE NON-CONSENT AGENDA - PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE CLASS ATTENDANCE, PARTICIPATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE DROP POLICY, DENNIS RAY, CHAIR, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

Brewer explained that all items forwarded to Faculty Senate from Undergraduate Council come forward as seconded motions. Senator McKean asked for a friendly amendment to be added at the end of the first paragraph to read, "Because students may be permitted to add classes to UAccess beyond the class start date, instructors should be attentive to student enrollment dates when assessing adequate participation for the purposes of administrative drop." Senator Fountain said that she doesn't have access to UA Analytics to see students' enrollment dates and asks how a faculty member can be attentive to the policy under the circumstances. Senior Vice Provost Gail Burd said a request for reports could be submitted to the Provost's office. [Motion 2014/15-11] to amend the Proposal to Amend the proposed amendment to the Class Attendance, Participation, and Administrative Drop Policy was seconded and approved. [Motion 2014/15-12] to approve the (amended) Proposal to Amend the Class Attendance, Participation, and Administrative Drop Policy was approved. Both motions are detailed at the end of these minutes.

9. **ACTION ITEM: NON-CONSENT AGENDA - PROPOSAL TO ACCEPT CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS (CIE) AS A CREDIT-BY-EXAM OPTION – DENNIS RAY, CHAIR, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL**

1) Senator Conway reiterated that the CIE exam has two levels; an A taken by high school freshmen and sophomores and an AS, taken by high school juniors and seniors. What happens when a high school freshman takes intermediate algebra and receives a score that yields University credit and then comes to the University and takes the UA's entrance exam in math and places into a course which he/she has already received university credit? Ray said those instances are handled by the department. Burd said that the way the advanced placement (AP) exam works, different areas of study may pick different scores that they will accept for credit. The faculty in an articulation unit decide on the acceptable scores. 2) Senator Leafgren asked if the general education course requirements are accepted with the AP exam. Burd said the UA accepts AP and International Baccalaureate (IB) credit in areas of general education. AP exams are articulated to particular courses. The faculty who are in those areas of general education are approving courses at a certain score, and this proposal is to make the AP and IB comparable to other schools. 3) Senator Bourget asked if anyone knew which two high schools in Tucson were offering the credit-by-exam option. Senator Ortega answered that the schools are Amphitheater and Basis High Schools. Brewer asked for a vote [Motion 2014/15-13], motion passed with four abstentions and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

10. **OPEN SESSION**

There were no speakers for open session.

11. **DISCUSSION ITEM: A STRUCTURED DISCUSSION AMONG SENATORS ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM – LYNN NADEL, CHAIR OF THE FACULTY AND AMY FOUNTAIN, ACADEMIC FREEDOM WORKING GROUP**

Nadel opened the discussion by asking faculty to look at the stance on academic freedom both locally and nationally. Amid changing landscapes at universities, are the vast increase of hiring non-tenure track faculty in both the classroom and research laboratories, and vast increase of social media in university life. The Academic Freedom Working Group created a faculty survey that was distributed widely across campus. Last week, there were two faculty forums. Participants were able to attend in person or by live streaming. Approximately one hundred people participated in the faculty forums. Fountain thanked everyone who participated in the survey. The survey was distributed among many listservs including tenure/tenure-track faculty, appointed academic personnel – continuing and year-to-year, NTT multi-year and year-to-year faculty, graduate students, post-docs and others (Deans, emeritus faculty, etc) at the University. Total population of teaching faculty at the University is approximately 7,300 according to the UA Fact book. There were 778 responses to the survey. Every question was optional, so there is a different number of responses for each item, and about 10% started but never finished the survey. Respondents were asked if they thought that academic freedom was sufficiently, insufficiently, or overly protected. Fifty-three percent thought academic freedom is insufficiently protected. Respondents were asked to identify different areas of concern relating to speech critical of institutional policy, speech critical of university personnel, controversial research/teaching and extramural speech. The working group summarized the four categories based on text responses and themes in the survey. Respondents did not distinguish between speech critical of the institution and speech critical of personnel. In terms of controversial teaching the survey yielded comments about concerns or difficulty with external groups such as the legislature. Many respondents expressed concern for vulnerable populations such as graduate teaching assistants and non-tenure track faculty. Some respondents expressed personal political points of view, both left and right members of the political spectrum expressed fear of retribution for communicating politically sensitive information. In the area of controversial research, respondents were concerned with alarming effects posed by external funders, as well as other external sources. Professional agencies within the University as well as other colleagues seem to be an imposition to many respondents in terms of research. Extramural speech was the least commonly cited by the respondents. Sixty percent of respondents reported that they have not experienced or observed violations of academic freedom at the UA, but 15% said they had and 25% said the situation was complicated. In summary, Nadel said the numbers were consistent among the minority population who responded to the survey. Who is protected by academic freedom and in what areas are they protected? The UA's academic freedom definition is a good one when looking at others nationally, but retribution is a big fear among a mainstay of the faculty. Conveying confidence about protections that are in place at the UA is a priority, as it may improve the mindset of faculty at the UA. Culture clash is very prevalent between colleges.

Questions and comments included: 1) Senator Paiewonsky stated that an internet search for academic freedom at the UA does not yield any results or a directing link. 2) Senator Martin said most of the challenge is knowing the definition of academic freedom. 3) Hart said that it's important to understand other protections available in addition to UA academic freedom, like free speech rights, and speech extending outside our areas of expertise. We are also protected by employment law and it's important to know those laws as well. A better understanding of our rights as citizens and employees would be an increase in security and understanding. 4) Comrie said that when an employee discusses another employee with a third party, there is a cloak of protection called the Whistleblower Protection Policy. The Whistleblower Protection Policy does not encompass all communications concerning employee relations, one of these being a charged

disagreement with another colleague. 5) Fountain said a participant at the forum talked about how most companies have developed strategies where employees' diverse points of view are heard and understood. Academies are lacking in this respect. 6) Senator Ghosh wanted to know if there was another mechanism in effect for faculty when they disagree with a department head. Nadel responded that last year, the Senate oversaw the revision of the grievance policy, but is not sure that this type of disagreement would fall in line with that policy. 7) Senator Spece said that a faculty elected Dean's Advisory Council/Committee within a college is a good source for hearing disagreements within a department. 8) R. Vaillancourt said that culture, or lack thereof can complicate instances where people are reluctant to recuse themselves because of perceived conflict of interest. Peer retribution can be increased by these certain instances. 9) Bourget stated that the role of the department head needs to be better defined and that the five-year review is too long a period for feedback and constructive criticism. Brewer responded that the five-year review process for heads and administrators has been brought to Vice Provost, Tom Miller's attention. 10) Senator Moreno concurred that the same issue is prevalent with Directors of the non-academic units.

12. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Non-senators were asked to leave so that the candidates for Honorary Degrees could be discussed and voted on.

13. **OTHER BUSINESS**

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Barbara McKean, Secretary of the Faculty
Jane Cherry, Recording Secretary

Appendix*

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

1. Minutes of December 1, 2014
2. Report from the Chair of the Faculty
3. Report from the Provost
4. Report from the President
5. Proposal to Amend the Class Attendance, Participation, and Administrative Drop Policy
6. Proposal to Accept Cambridge International Examinations as a Credit-by-Exam Option.
7. Academic Freedom PowerPoint Presentation

Motions of the Meeting of January 26, 2015

Motion 2014/15-11 Motion to amend the Proposal to Amend the Class Attendance, Participation, and Administrative Drop Policy to include, "Because students may be permitted to add classes to UAccess beyond the class start date, instructors should be attentive to student enrollment dates when assessing adequate participation for the purposes of administrative drop." Motion was seconded and passed.

Motion 2014/15-12 Seconded motion to approve the Proposal to Amend the Class Attendance, Participation, and Administrative Drop Policy as amended. Motion passed.

Motion 2014/15-13 Seconded motion to approve the Proposal to Accept Cambridge International Examinations as a Credit-by-Exam Option. Motion passed with four abstentions.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456