

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
April 6, 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 Secretary of the Faculty Bobbi McKean at 3:02 p.m. in the Old Main Silver and Sage Room.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Ayoun, Bourget, Brock, Brooks, Colina, Comrie, Conway, Cuillier, Dahlgran, Dai, Duran, Fountain, Galilee-Belfer, Ghosh, Guertin, Harris, Hart, Hildebrand, Johnson, Jones, Leafgren, Lee, Lega, Martin, McKean, Miller, Moreno, Nadel, Neumann, Ortega, Padias, Paiewonsky, Pau, Ray, Ritter, Secomb, Snyder, Spece, Story, A. Vaillancourt, R. Vaillancourt, M. Witte, R. Witte, and Yeager. J.C. Mutchler served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Armstrong, Brewer, Cuello, Finnegan, Fregosi, Hamilton, Higgins, Joseph, Kohler, Najafi, Nfonsam, Polakowski, Richardson, Sager, Silverman, Simmons, Smith, Trump, Valerdi, Vercruyse, and Visscher.

2. MEETING OF THE GENERAL FACULTY

McKean announced that the General Election is currently underway and will conclude on Friday, April 10, 2015. In accordance with Article X, Section 1 of the Constitution, amendments to the Constitution may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or by petition to the Chair of the Faculty signed by five percent (5%) or one hundred (100) members of the General Faculty, whichever is smaller. The Chair of the Faculty shall send copies of such proposals to all members of the General Faculty and shall convene a special meeting of the General Faculty to consider them not fewer than ten (10) class days after distribution. The proposed amendment(s) shall then be submitted to a mail or electronic ballot of the General Faculty. Notices of the revisions were emailed to the General Faculty on March 16 and March 23, 2015, and the Faculty Officers agreed to schedule the General Faculty meeting to coincide with today's Senate meeting to answer any questions from the General Faculty. There were no questions.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 2, 2015

The minutes of March 2, 2015 were approved.

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

There were no questions. McKean congratulated the incoming ASUA President Manny Felix.

5. REPORT FROM THE FACULTY OFFICERS

Chair of the Faculty Nadel reported that the PAC 12 Academic Leadership Coalition is an emerging organization consisting of the PAC 12 schools' Senate leaders and support staff. Conferences are held annually, and last week, Bobbi McKean, Michael Brewer and Jane Cherry, as staff support, attended the conference at Washington State University. The consensus was that the UA's involvement in the organization is beneficial to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of each member school's shared governance organization, and where commonalities occur, to facilitate academic and research cooperation that is jointly beneficial to participating PAC 12 institutions. The Non-tenure Task Force has been appointed and the members are listed in the report. The Shared Governance Caucus, originally called the Gang of Five, consists of five UA groups; faculty, appointed professionals, staff, graduate students and undergraduate students. Its purpose is to work in concert around issues of concern at the University and to bring more cohesiveness and sharing in shared governance across the entire institution. The Senate discussion toward the latter part of the meeting was originally scheduled for faculty to discuss the Committee of Eleven's White Paper on the Research Mission at the UA, but the faculty officers thought it would also be useful to bring in members of the Office for Research and Discovery to explain how the research world works. Because she couldn't be here today, Senior Vice President for Research, Dr. Kim Espy, will present at a Senate meeting in the fall to continue the conversation on the research mission.

6. REPORT BY PROVOST COMRIE

Comrie said the UA's tuition recommendation proposal has been delivered to ABOR, but will be subject to public discussion by April 10, 2015. The administration team sought major input from the student body in the tuition recommendation process. There is a public tuition hearing scheduled for April 20, 2015 in UA's Gallagher Theater, a business and finance committee meeting on April 27, 2015 and the final vote on the tuition setting scheduled for May 4, 2015. Academic Program Reviews and Promotion and Tenure reviews are underway in the Provost's Office. Comrie thanked faculty, students and staff who contributed to the processes.

7. REPORT FROM PRESIDENT HART

Hart reiterated that the current tuition setting process has included students in developing the guiding principles. Every member of ABOR has been contacted either by phone or in-person to preview the process and the recommendation and incite questions in advance that may lead to unexpected obstacles. Hart explained the shared governance process at the UA with its inclusiveness of staff, administration, faculty,

appointed personnel, and the graduate and undergraduate students, who all share in the decision-making process-preserves the mission and values of the UA. With the commitment to the future of the UA, Hart urged everyone to think about the upcoming decisions for tuition that will be made by ABOR, which are a direct result of the Governor's budget deficits. Hart voiced concern for long-range planning and the future for the State of Arizona in conjunction with the role of higher education. The UA is committing to a guaranteed tuition, including mandatory fees, for resident and non-resident students, for four years. The UA also submitted a pilot program to the Regents that includes guaranteed tuitions for two to three-year master's degree programs.

8. QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR PROVOST, PRESIDENT AND FACULTY OFFICER REPORTS

1) Senator Ghosh asked President Hart if there are other states that employ long-range tuition plans. Hart responded that there are positive trends in California for 5% a year increases in tuition and fees, accompanied by increases in state appropriations by the Governor for the Cal-State and community colleges. Colorado has a long-range plan and guaranteed tuition plan for out-of-state students, Texas has mineral extraction taxes and a plan for investment in the Texas education system, and Florida's long-range plan includes the Governor's delay in retirement, as well as targeting the Universities that could be exemplary research/flagship Universities. Utah spends significantly more dollars per college student in its University college system than UA. 2) Senator Martin asked Nadel if Non-tenure track faculty included continuing-status faculty. Nadel responded that the Task Force is going to look at removing all differentiations between tenure-track and continuing-track faculty. Comrie reiterated that both tracks are equivalent. 3) Senator Paiewonsky applauded the long-term plan and including key players in the tuition discussion. He asked President Hart about decisions concerning tuition rates and recruitment. In the School of Music (SOM), when final recruitment and scholarship offers are made, students already know what tuition will be at other schools they've applied to. The SOM has a difficult time telling students what the SOM can offer as a scholarship package, and inform them how much the package will cover for tuition. Normally, would the SOM know what tuition will be sooner than the current year, so it falls in line better with the recruiting picture? Do you notice that this affects recruitment in other parts of the University? Hart responded that the time-line is set by the Regents, and the guaranteed tuition plan is for continuing students. Starting last year, the UA set four years of tuition for the entering class with a guarantee that there will be no increases for the next four years. For new music students, there is competition with student auditions at the undergraduate level and this includes a different type of financial aid and admission than other undergraduate programs. Because the Regents' vote on tuition isn't until May, the April 10th recommended tuition is what should be conveyed in the recruitment. Paiewonsky asked if other states also have such late dates for setting tuition. Hart responded that many other states' tuition settings are later than Arizona. Only a private University will be able to offer that information before March or April. The Enrollment Management Team knows exactly what the set tuition will be. Before finalizing the recommendation to the Regents last Thursday, other peer institutions and Universities, who complete for UA's students were looked at.

9. INFORMATION ITEM: A PRESENTATION AND QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD ON THE POLICY PROPOSAL FOR ENGAGED LEARNING – DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC INITIATIVES AND PROJECT DEVELOPMENT, ABRA MCANDREW

McKean advised Senators that the proposal is being presented as an Information Item on which the Senate will vote at the upcoming May Senate meeting. McAndrew said that the impact of the policy when implemented will create a notation on the student transcript for *Engaged Learning Experience*. The definition of engagement is when students translate and apply their learning within and beyond the classroom into transformative practices and experiences that impact their professional and personal lives. The definition was created by the Task Force on 100% Engaged Learning that met throughout 2014. There are two pathways for the notation to appear on the transcript; a "for credit" upper division 300-400 engagement pathway which occurs in the classroom or "non-credit" engagement experience that has been approved by the University of Arizona's Office of Student Engagement. All non-credit experiences will meet a threshold requiring at least 45 hours of work, and a reflection component. Credit engagement experiences will be approved through the individual colleges. Attributes of one activity and one competency will be assigned at the course or section level or at the student level. A strategic investment of \$700,000 was split with \$540,000 going to colleges for position and request for proposals and \$160,000 was focused centrally for coordination and systems.

Questions and comments included: 1) Senator Brooks asked if there was a similar program for graduate students. McAndrews responded that graduate students by nature of the research, teaching and fellowship are already engaged. Brooks stated that not all graduate students are engaged in all of the areas mentioned. 2) Senator Martin asked how the proposal can have different grading systems for pass/fail, but the upper divisions require a class grade of "C" or better. McAndrews responded that for it to count as an addition on the transcript, a grade needs to be applied. Lower division courses may have an attribute side or applied learning component to that board and could have one of the alternative grading systems, but notation on the transcript is not given in lower division courses. 3) Senator Moreno asked about undergraduate engagement for non-college activities. McAndrew responded that the Request for Proposals is distributed to all faculty, a request was made to partner with either a non-academic unit or external partner.

10. OPEN SESSION

Senator Brock from GPSC spoke to the Senate about GPSC's recent trip to Washington, D.C. for the National Association of Graduate and Professional Students Conference. Starting in 2013-14, graduate students were charged a different interest rate than undergraduate students. Brock's tuition doubled during undergraduate enrollment at the UA. Graduate students borrow approximately 40% of their tuition at 6 – 7.2% compared to undergraduates at 3.8-4.6%. Graduate students are three-times less likely to default and result in 77% more profit for the lending provider. As a medical student, Brock will be expected to repay \$380,000 in student loans within ten years after graduation. This is an increase from \$292,000 in 2013, or a \$500 a month difference in payments. Graduate students, as the future professors and doctors of tomorrow, we strive to never settle or take for granted our students, patients or colleagues. We ask you in turn, to never settle or take us, in our tuition struggle, for granted either.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM; A STRUCTURED DISCUSSION AMONG SENATORS ON THE WHITE PAPER “STATUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA RESEARCH PROGRAM” – DIRECTOR FOR RESEARCH ADVANCEMENT, LORI SCHULTZ, ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH, NEAL ARMSTRONG, ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, NICOLE SALAZAR, CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, PAT HOYER, C11 SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIR, PETER STRITTMATTER**

Strittmatter opened by explaining the origination of the White Paper and the committee’s definition of research to include creative, scholarly activity. The committee thought the topic was sufficiently important to the future of the UA, and has determined that a realignment of funding will be necessary in order to promote and increase research excellence at the UA. After speaking to many different people, both individually and in groups, the messages were consistent; deans had difficulty in recruiting and retaining top faculty; the lack of support was hindering new research endeavors; there is ever-increasing bureaucratic burdens on faculty and staff; a concern for risk aversion and compliance, thereby stifling innovation; and a perception that support for research excellence ranks low in the priorities of the UA leadership. The distribution of Sponsored Projects research awards by age shows that in 2014, the top-tier age range was sixty to sixty-nine years (60-69). Recruitment of faculty will be necessary to replace the aging population with younger and brighter prospects who can continue to achieve the same degree of grant research. The internal ways the C11 Committee thought would be beneficial to maintain and enhance the UA’s International standing as a leading research institution are as follows: 1. UA leadership and faculty unite in raising the priority of research and its impact on students to the highest possible level and in making changes in expenditure necessary to implement that priority. 2. The quality of the faculty be enhanced. Resources are needed immediately to enable hiring/retention of top scholars/prospects and initiation of promising new programs. Tenure criteria should be strengthened. 3. The way in which UA research/teaching is organized should be reviewed especially in regard to interdisciplinary activities – the path to the future in many fields. 4. The UA could streamline its administrative processes on the basis of the “value-added” by each to the research/teaching efforts versus their costs. The goal would be to reduce unnecessary bureaucratic burdens on faculty as well as the cost in both staff and faculty time. 5. The UA’s administrative systems should be based more on trust and accountability rather than multiple layers of control and/or policing. The UA should avoid punishing the many for the sins of the few. 6. Take steps to make the UA a more attractive location for non-tenure track research faculty given their likely increasing role in developing UA research activities. 7. To enhance the quality and productivity of the UA faculty implement policies and create attitudes that maintain long-term upward pressure on the quality of UA research/teaching programs and establish an upward spiral of achievement for the indefinite future. This cannot be directed in detail from the top but can be achieved with a system of “carrots and sticks” to provide the upward pressure. C11 also recommends UA action in collaboration with external entities: 1. Encourage the UA Foundation give higher priority to supporting UA research/academic activities – such as providing resources for endowed chairs, fellowships and scholarships and to seed-fund new projects. 2. Encourage entrepreneurial activities and create the reward and administrative structures necessary for such activities to succeed. The Catapult Corporation (CatCorp) initiative is an example of such a program. 3. Work with its sister universities, Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University, the Board of Regents, and business and industry to increase public awareness of the close correlation between research investment and GDP growth and hence the advantage to Arizona’s citizens of maintaining strengths in research and development activity at its universities. Philanthropy needs to be greatly increased to align more with private Universities. “*Research is the lifeblood of a high-tech economy and plays a critical role in the economic and personal well-being of most citizens.*” (American Academy of Arts and Sciences report “*Restoring the Foundation*”)

President Hart added that the UA has been invited to a consortium of fifteen other research universities to develop separate philanthropic initiatives for raising money from private sectors for research purposes. Espy has already met with the group and there has been a preliminary discussion with the UA Foundation.

Schultz explained that the three-day proposal deadline is designed to give Sponsored Projects enough time to review the faculty members’ proposals prior to submission. At the five-year anniversary of the deadline in 2012, Sponsored Projects sent out a reminder about impacts on pre-award and how the proposals were being submitted. Feedback indicated that it would be helpful if Sponsored Projects offered help to individuals who were having difficulty making the deadline and understanding the impact of late submission. A list of late submissions is compiled on a weekly basis and submitted to the Vice President for Research Office. The effort of the support staff in Sponsored Projects is designed to assist the faculty members who have trouble meeting the proposal deadline. Late proposals impact the on-time proposals because the staff usually have to reorganize time schedules to accommodate those proposals that are submitted late.

Salazar explained that Facilities and Administrative (F&A) costs, formerly called indirect costs, are costs that cannot be associated directly with any particular item that serves to run the University. F&A’s are allocated by the federal agency Cost Allocation Service (CAS) and negotiated by component. An agreement is reached by both parties and a rate proposal is posted online. Depreciation rates, compartmentalization of buildings, and usage of space are all under scrutiny. The cap on general administration prohibits research covering the costs to perform research.

Armstrong talked about the importance of inviting Senior Vice President for Research, Kim Espy to an upcoming meeting. One stumbling block is the increased bureaucracy of getting proposals submitted. Faculty need to be more strategic to avoid duplication in research. Sponsored Projects can assist faculty with proposal writing and the entire process for grant submission.

Questions and comments included: 1) Senator M. Witte stated that the major point of the Committee of Eleven’s report was to have more dialogue with administration and the Senior Vice President for Research Office. The Senate Standing Research Policy Committee and College of Medicine Research Committee have both been inactive, and these two committees should be reviewing all the policies and the White Paper. Some other issues that need to be addressed are indirect costs and faculty’s role in distribution, research integrity and core facilities designation. Associate Vice President for Research, Jennifer Barton has taken on the task of assisting faculty with filling out complicated Department of Defense tables. The policing aspect of one of the research offices with the “Three Day Offenders List” includes people who bring in most of the grant money to the University. M. Witte makes reference to what she calls a “No Fly List” that contains faculty who are repeat offenders of the “Three Day Offenders List,” and who are no longer allowed to submit proposals unless they are

received a full three days in advance of the deadline. Faculty who are on either list are never told that their name exists on the list(s), and news is usually given by the faculty's department head. 2) Senator Spece mentioned that the actions are troubling and a further investigation may conclude that this behavior is an egregious violation of academic freedom as defined on this campus. Schultz responded that to her knowledge, the deans provide the follow-up with faculty on the late list. 3) Senator Martin asked about county offices whose buildings are not owned by the UA and reducing the 26% rate charged for research. Schultz said that the breakdown of rates is dictated by the federal government, making negotiations on rates limited. Comrie discussed Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) and asked how the UA should apportion revenues to align with the University's expenditures? The portion of revenue attributed to tuition has increased from one-third (1/3) tuition and two-thirds (2/3) state funding to two-thirds (2/3) tuition to one-third (1/3) state funding. The state is no longer the majority shareholder in the Universities. How much tuition money from the students should be spent on research? The budgets behind the *Never Settle* plan are followed. Nadel said that recruitment procedures need to be better strategized and asked how to accomplish this task. 4) Senator Hildebrand said that start-up on a recruitment in the biological sciences is \$1M. In the last two years, all departments in the biological sciences have had unsuccessful searches due to the inability to gather enough resources from other departments. In another instance, an offer was made in January 2015 to a candidate and the offer letter has still not been sent. The processes in place to assemble and mobilize and offer are broken and the UA is losing out on the recruitment of outstanding young faculty. Comrie said that the process on hiring commences first with a conversation with the deans about needs in the colleges/departments, and then follows with a meeting with the dean, Provost and Senior Vice President for Research. The slowness is a shared responsibility of three or four parties, but the challenge is whether or not the UA has the resources ahead of time so when the time is right, we can make the offer immediately. 5) Armstrong said the difference now is that the offers no longer emanate from the Senior Vice President for Research Office. 6) Senator M. Witte said that the University has very few training grants which would benefit the students with more allocated research dollars.

12. **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:56 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. Constitution and Bylaws Revisions with Summary
2. Minutes of March 2, 2015
3. Report from ASUA
4. Report from GPSC
5. Report from the Faculty Officers
6. Report from Provost
7. Report from President
8. Policy Proposal on Engaged Learning
9. PowerPoint "Graduating with an "Engaged Learning Experience" Notation
10. PowerPoint "Status of the University of Arizona Research Program"

Motions of the Meeting of April 6, 2015

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456