

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
April 4, 2016**

**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 3:02 p.m. in the Old Main Silver and Sage Room. Brewer announced that the General Election was underway and will be closing on Thursday, April 14, 2016 and urged Senators to vote for the Representatives in their respective colleges. Colleges Representatives to be elected are two seats for Engineering, one seat for CALS, one seat for Law, one seat for the College of Fine Arts, one seat for Education, one seat for the College of Public Health, one seat for Nursing and one seat for the College of Medicine-Tucson. There are also two seats available on the Committee on Committees for which no petitions were received.

Present: Senators Abraham, Aleamoni, Breci, Brewer, Colina, Comrie, Conway, Cuillier, Duran, Fountain, Galilee-Belfer, Ghosh, Harris, Hart, Hazen, Hildebrand, Labate, Leafgren, Lee, Martin, McLain, McKean, Meixner, Miller, Moreno, Nadel, Neumann, Paiewonsky, Pau, Polakowski, Ray, Richardson, Russell, Schwartz, Silverman, Smith, Simmons, Story, A. Vaillancourt, R. Vaillancourt, Visscher, and M. Witte, R. Witte, and Yeager.

Absent: Senators Armstrong, Brock, Cox, Cuello, Dahlgran, Dai (sabbatical), Felix, Finnegan, Fregosi, Guertin, Hammer, Johnson, Jull, Najafi, Netherton, O'Keeffe, Pietz, Rees, Ritter, Snyder, Spece, Sun, and Valerdi.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2016

The minutes of March 7, 2016 were approved as amended with two corrections and one abstention.

3. REPORT FROM THE FACULTY OFFICERS – CHAIR OF THE FACULTY LYNN NADEL

Nadel referred to the written report and there were no questions.

4. QUESTIONS FOR ASUA, GPSC AND APAC

Nadel had a questions for the students regarding Spring Fling set up on Campbell Avenue. No students were present to address the question. Nadel rides his bike to campus and the entrance to campus at the UA Mall/Campbell entrance was shut down, forcing people to go blocks out of their way to get onto campus. Nadel will contact Bob Smith, Vice President of Business Affairs for answers. Senator Martin asked Senator A. Vaillancourt to elaborate on her visit with the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC) members, and the welcome conversation of having a single employment classification rather than the division of Classified Staff and Appointed Professionals.

5. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST – PROVOST ANDREW COMRIE

Comrie reported that the interviews for the Chief Diversity Officer took place with leadership and faculty. The search advisory committee will be providing comments on both candidates on Friday, April 8, 2016. The draft ABOR Quality Markers for student success have been developed via a number of meetings between ABOR staff and the provosts of the three institutions. These markers are on the agenda for the ABOR meeting on April 7, 2016. A survey of students upon graduation pertaining to the quality of academic programs and teaching will be developed during the current year. The Research and Community impact markers will be developed next year. The cluster hires have been approved for most of the groups with offers to be made to the selected finalists. A summary will be prepared and communicated once the process is complete. A multi-year budget and strategic plan for each of the colleges will be implemented starting April 15, 2016. The Promotion and Tenure letters will be issued by April 30, 2016. Negotiations for the Interim Dean of the College of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture are nearly complete.

6. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT – PRESIDENT ANN WEAVER HART

Hart's report included a legislative update concerning the Regents and other University Presidents. The Arizona Senate has dropped its budget to \$8M in recurring funds. The three University Presidents, along with ABOR President Klein, are pushing for appropriation dollars in the amount of \$32M, as well as a commitment to fund Arizona resident students at the 50% level. Hart thanked the three co-chairs Senator Javier Duran, Tanya Gaxiola and Bryan Carter, of the newly formed, broad-based University Diversity Task Force. Hart has asked Senior Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Financial Officer, Greg Goldman to begin an immediate study on the subsidy for childcare and rethink a childcare facility on campus. Faculty salaries are a key component of the use of the dollars the UA hopes to gain, both from the small increases in state appropriations and from small increases in revenue that enrollment growth and tuition increases might bring. The student leaders from GPSC and ASUA made it clear that the first priority for next year's budget should include a plan

for increasing the faculty salaries on the UA campus. In addition, increases should not be a one-year plan, but should be a long-range integration of faculty salaries into a financial and business twenty-year plan. The contract will be a yearly commitment to the UA community.

7. **QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS REPORTS**

Senator Silverman asked the Provost about describing an example of a quality marker for successful students. Comrie responded that most universities have not been able to identify quality markers in many areas, and is hopeful that the UA will be successful with groundbreaking work. The qualities currently being discussed are in the areas of doing away with rankings, the educational experience, learning retention while at the UA, and developing surveys for students once they've graduated.

8. **ACTION ITEM: DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE OPEN ACCESS POLICY – DAN LEE AND SHAN SHUTTON**

Lee provided a PowerPoint presentation. Senator Moreno asked about articles that faculty have previously published. Lee replied that the policy will address only future publications, and journal articles. Senator Silverman asked about publicizing the policy so that faculty are aware of the new process being implemented. Lee responded that the communications and marketing entities of the University, including Lo Que Pasa, have been featuring articles but the main announcement will be in fall 2016. Senator Breci asked if non-faculty would also be monitored. Lee responded no. Breci said that as an Appointed Professional, she is not a member of the General Faculty, but many researchers publish research in journals. Associate Vice President for University Communications, Pam Scott, said that her office would like to help with process of using the Repository. Martin asked what precautions would be taken for enforcing the regulations in the publishing process. Lee said that the Library would be in charge of enforcing rules and regulations. Senator Miller asked about articles not subject to the peer review requirement. Lee said that the peer review language is standard. Articles are usually submitted after the peer review process. Visscher asked about using the UA's Repository as opposed to another Repository. The UA is committed to long-term preservations of the Repository. Senator M. Witte asked if there would be some sort of review process in place. Ghosh asked how many people would be in charge of monitoring the process on a yearly basis. Lee said the Office of Digital Innovation Stewardship matches Repository data services, among others, to support the research enterprise of faculty. The staffing model is doable with only minor supplemental student employment that will be needed. Senator Mclain said that monies have been spent on journal publication, and wants to know the comparison with what is proposed. Lee said that the policy allows faculty to publish anywhere and make publications available to Open Access. Lee said the policy makes it more accessible to publish anywhere and also in Open Access. Brewer asked for a motion [Motion 2015/16-13] to approve the Open Access Policy. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

9. **DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY HANDBOOK FOR APPOINTED PERSONNEL (UHAP) – VICE PROVOST TOM MILLER**

Miller reiterated that Senators received a link to the revisions to UHAP, which were last updated in 2014. Main revisions pertain to the Non-tenure track faculty being supported in promotion and annual reviews and being made aware of the career development and advancement opportunities that may be available. Also included are provisions pertaining to professional misconduct in annual reviews. Senator M. Witte asked where the Committee on Ethics and Committee stands with faculty governance. Miller replied that the appropriate process has been expedited in the individual's misconduct, but now there is well-defined policy brought forth to allow review of the findings by college committees, department heads or a Promotion and Tenure committee. The new changes pertain to documented findings. Non-tenure track faculty have several different titles. For instance, lecturers receive a local review done by the department committee and head and then progresses to the Provost's Office for approval. Ranked Non-tenure track faculty go through a comparable review process, but some colleges require external review letters and some do not. Research misconduct would apply to both categories. Senator Silverman asked if the inclusion of the Disability Resource Center (DRC) causes delays with the process. Miller replied that the DRC is implemented only in medical leave cases. The DRC makes recommendations to the Provost. Miller said the five-year review process previously was unclear as to who received the five-year review. This change includes Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts and as specified by ABOR, senior leadership. Senator M. Witte mentioned Assistant and Associate Vice Presidents, and recommends they also get the five-year review. On the 360 degree review process, Witte's understanding is that the faculty member gets feedback from the 360 review. Miller agreed. Senator Russell talked about implementing a metric associated with job categories. Miller said that the UA is hoping to move toward performance-based assessments. Russell would like to know how transparent the metrics will be. Miller said that deans and department heads would have a common set of metrics for publications, RCM, grant dollars and integration of academic analytics. Faculty Chair Nadel said that since the UA is concerned about quality, that moving away from the quantitative measurement seems appropriate.

10. **ACTION ITEM: NON-CONSENT AGENDA MAJOR UNIVERSITY CREDIT POLICY – CHAIR OF UNDERGRADUATE COUNSEL, DENNIS RAY**

The policy comes before Senate as a seconded motion [Motion 2015/16-14]. Senator Fountain asked who was the determining party for "departments may also include supporting foundation course work in the major as appropriate." Ray responded the department. [Motion 2015/16-14] passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

11. **OPEN SESSION: STATEMENTS AT THE PODIUM ON ANY TOPIC, LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPEAKERS IS FOUR. NO DISCUSSION IS PERMITTED, AND NO VOTES WILL BE TAKEN. 8 MINUTES OR LESS.**

Senator M. Witte addressed the Senate regarding the items that she has previously addressed in open session. The first update was her submission of two competitive renewals within the three-day window requirement from Sponsored Projects. The second update on cluster hires is a matter of discussion in the Committee of Eleven. The third item addressed consolidating core facilities from formerly shared

instrument and shared faculty services. Shared areas are being turned into service areas. The fourth update has not been resolved and that is the undergraduate research grants that have previously gone out to thirty students from the Vice President for Research and Discovery Office, will hopefully be subsidized by the Honors College so this practice may continue. Finally, Witte was not re-elected to the Committee of Eleven this past election. Witte asked for the vote count since she maintains that election results used to be published in the Wildcat. Witte appealed to the Elections Committee who granted the request, but reminded Senators that faculty vote counts are important and the essence of the democratic process.

12. **LOOKING AHEAD: NON-TENURE TRACK FACULTY – MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC NON-TENURE TRACK COMMITTEE**

Vice Chair of the Faculty Brewer introduced committee member Rob Miller who presented the compiled table discussion comments from the previous Senate meeting. Two questions were presented at the previous Senate discussion, “What are the current practices in your units regarding non-tenure track faculty participation in shared governance and are those practices effective?” and, “What are the implications of including non-tenured track faculty as members of the General Faculty?” Regarding the first question, responses were that in multiple units, non-tenure track faculty had voting privileges and serve on committees not mandated by Promotion and Tenure. Around current practices, some concerns were generated; 1) ambiguous or missing policies mean that voting can be *ad hoc* rather than systematic and consistent, 2) year-to-year versus multi-year status complicates voting facilitation and impacts collegiality, and 3) that some non-tenure track faculty have no voting rights of any kind, including over the issues that impact their own teaching. On including non-tenure track faculty as members of the General Faculty, the benefits that were discussed are, 1) more complete information, and therefore, more informed decision making; 2) improved collegiality between members and therefore, more cohesive and effective units; 3) a broader diversity of voices within the faculties; 4) better understanding of the needs and insights of the non-tenure track faculty; 5) enhanced connection between faculty and students; and, 6) a healthier, vibrant and more democratic Faculty Senate. In the area of concerns, with three categories vision, power, and protections. Under vision; 1) Do non-tenure track faculty have the experience or the investment to focus on matters of long-term vision? 2) Given the differences in hiring non-tenure track faculty, will all non-tenure track faculty be qualified to shape the trajectory of the department, college or University? 3) Because non-tenure track faculty will not be as rigorously selected nor vested for the long-term, might they be less qualified and more distracted from dealing with long-term issues. Under power; 1) If non-tenure track faculty make up a significant percentage of our faculty, will selecting and voting on a new faculty member be skewed away from core academic values. 2) Will the high numbers of non-tenure track faculty members’ representation on committees and other initiatives lower the quality of its work? 3) Will non-tenure track draw untenured hires and resource allocations in unwanted ways? Under protections. Because non-tenure track faculty don’t have the protections of their tenured counterparts, they may not voice or vote their consciences. In summary, the non-tenure track *ad hoc* committee sees these concerns as credible, although offset by the benefits. Most of the concerns can be mediated by policy, for example, a careful apportionment of voting rights in the unit can largely diminish the risks of the growing non-tenure track population. The Non-tenure track *ad hoc* committee has put together a series of recommendations. Senator M. Witte said that the College of Medicine Banner clinical employees should be included in the proposal, even though they are not UA employees since the College of Medicine includes them in voting matters for its college.

Brewer went through the proposal to talk about the total number of Non-tenure track faculty (~1600) as well as the number who would qualify under the proposal (~500 or ~600, depending on the criteria that is agreed upon). Brewer reminded senators that shared governance is largely advisory and often affords us a voice in decision making rather than a vote. Colleges would continue to have flexibility related to participation in shared governance at the college/department level, and clear bylaws in the college may be used to describe how NTT faculty will participate. The current General Faculty is made up of approximately 1600 Tenure Track faculty, 200 Continuing Status Professionals, and approximately 190 NTT faculty holding multi-year contracts. Amongst year-to-year faculty, 500 have been in their positions for four out of the last six years. Comrie commented that a solution needs to be made to include Non-tenure track faculty as part of the University, on a level where they can contribute fully to governance and departmental matters. Russell has concerns that the UA’s rankings are slipping and that it appears that the UA is now a regional University. The requirement for the external peer review process that Tenure-track/eligible faculty undergo is something that a Non-tenure track faculty member does not always require, therefore, lowering standards for the teaching faculty of the UA. Senator A. Vaillancourt asked what could possibly happen if we included NTT faculty members into the General Faculty. Colina said that the College of Humanities’ Dean’s Advisory Council no longer has a full professor as the chair. The dialogue of the committee has changed drastically in recent years, because the majority of the members are Non-tenure track. Committee member John Pollard from the College of Science added that if every Non-tenure track faculty member quit teaching undergraduate students at the same time, the University would shut down. The number of student credit hours that NTT faculty contribute is enormous. Brewer added that many of the UA’s peer institutions include NTT faculty in major roles like Senate and Chairs of the Faculty. The NTT faculty inclusion in the Constitution will be revisited at a Senate meeting in the near future.

13. **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 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 March 7, 2016
2. Report from Faculty Officers
3. Report from ASUA
4. Report from APAC
5. Report from the Provost
6. Report from the President
7. Proposed Open Access Policy
8. Open Access PowerPoint Manuscript Submission Process
9. Proposed changes to the University Handbook of Appointed Personnel
10. Major University Credit Policy
11. NTT Proposals
12. NTT Faculty Demographics

Motions of the Meeting of April 4, 2016

Motion 2015/16-13 Motion to approve the Open Access Policy. Motion carried.

Motion 2015/16-14 Seconded Motion from the Undergraduate Council, Major University Credit Policy. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456