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.


2. **OPENING REMARKS BY VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY MICHAEL BREWER**

Brewer announced that the upcoming General Faculty Election will commence on March 30, 2015. Petitions are due at the Faculty Center no later than March 24, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. There is one seat available for the Committee of Eleven, one seat for the Committee on Committees, and eight seats for Senator-at-Large. Brewer will call for a vote to re-establish the Non-tenure Track Task Force at the end of the meeting, and requested that Senators remain until the end of the meeting.

3. **REMEMBRANCE FOR RICHARD RUIZ**

Sofia Ramos from the Department of Mexican American Studies and Dr. Ronald Marx, Dean of the College of Education, spoke in remembrance of Dr. Richard Ruiz, who died February 6, 2015. A University celebration of life will be held in April or early May 2015.

4. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 2, 2015**

The minutes of February 2, 2015 were approved with one abstention.

5. **REPORT FROM CHAIR OF THE FACULTY LYNN NADEL**

Chair of the Faculty Nadel was absent.

6. **QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR ASUA, GPSC AND APAC REPORTS**

Senator Moreno asked APAC Representative Padias about a non-working link provided for the Appointed Professional Compensation Study. Padias responded that Senator A. Vaillancourt could probably help with the link. Vaillancourt offered to discuss the matter after the Senate meeting.

7. **REPORT BY PROVOST COMRIE**

The Board of Regents meeting held at the UA in February 2015 was structured around updates for the Never Settle plan. Never Settle was originally presented at the November 2013 Board of Regents meeting, and updates to the original plan included the UA’s accomplishments and successes since the plan was first implemented. The presentation materials can be viewed at http://neversettle.arizona.edu.

The legislative budget process is following the Governor’s budget proposal. Comrie and UA Chief Financial Officer, Gregg Goldman held a discussion in SPBAC, Provost’s Council and Deans’ Council on how the UA should approach the impending budget cuts. Several discussions will ensue to gather feedback and advice from campus constituencies.

Comrie and Vice President for Research, Kim Espy, met in late January with each of the seven review committees for the cluster hiring initiative. The letters responding to the proposers are in the process of being drafted and will be sent out this week.

8. **REPORT FROM PRESIDENT HART**

Senior Associate to the President and Secretary of the University, Jon Dudas reported in President Hart’s absence. Dudas explained that Hart was called last-minute to Phoenix in an effort to mitigate the budget cuts to higher education. Two weeks ago, Hart testified to the Senate and House Appropriations Committees in support of the UA’s contributions to the State of Arizona. Current laws discourage savings and entrepreneurial endeavors by the Universities, but ABOR has introduced a package of bills that will incentivize Arizona Universities to adopt tactical business principles, while removing outdated and archaic regulations that do not favor strides in the entrepreneurial arena.

9. **QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR PROVOST AND PRESIDENT REPORTS**
1. Senator Silverman asked for clarification on Hart’s statement, “Governor Ducey’s policy direction is implicit in his proposed budget, and they are right for Arizona.” He asked if the word “right” meant politically right, or some other kind of right, as it implies that the President agrees with the Governor’s proposal. Dudas responded that the policy direction refers to the Governor’s budget having limited cuts to Health Sciences and no cuts to Cooperative Extension. The other in-state institutions have expressed opinions about across-the-board cuts, and possible reasons for the exclusion could be UA’s uniqueness with its contributions to the state. Senator Simmons asked if there was division between Presidents Crow and Hart concerning the budget cuts, or is there a unified front between the two Universities as they approach the legislature. Comrie responded that the Board of Regents have a policy, to which all University Presidents agree. Regarding the Governor’s proposal, each President responded with a different viewpoint. Senator Bourget asked what areas will be funded in the cluster hiring. Comrie responded that first the proposers will need to be notified, and in each of the areas, different permutations to the outcomes will need to be modified. A list will be posted as soon as more of the details are worked out. 4) Senator Jones asked about the funding for staff and research space associated with the cluster hires. Comrie responded that a meeting with the deans has been conducted to go over initial feedback, and as the leading proposals become clearer, start-up, spacing, and salaries will be formulated.

10. OPEN SESSION

Senator M. Witte opened by informing Senators that the UA campus has an increasing number of delinquents/offenders in the Office of Research and Discovery. The offense is violation of a three day window for grant submission. An offenders list has been developed and 25% of the faculty on the list come from the Arizona Health Sciences, College of Science and College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, collectively. Faculty have been reprimanded and accused of bad behavior. Witte would like to know how the list was developed, where the idea for the list came from, and what faculty committee approved of the list. Access to the list should be available so the individuals named can respond to the allegations.

11. ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AND NON-CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS FORWARDED BY UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL – UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL CHAIR, DENNIS RAY

Brewer reminded Senators that all Consent and Non-consent agenda items come forward as seconded motions. Brewer introduced the first Consent agenda item. [Motion 2014/15-15] Request for Authorization to Implement a New Degree Program for American Indian Studies BA. Senator Paiewonsky questioned Chair Ray on the naming of the program, pointing out that in the Purpose of Program narrative, the terms Native North Americans, Indian Population and American Indian Students are used. Ray said the proposal comes from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Undergraduate Council voted on the implementation of the program itself and not the name. With no further questions, [Motion 2014/15-15] passed with one abstention and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

Brewer introduced the second Non-consent agenda item, [Motion 2014/15-16] Proposal to Revise the Second Bachelor’s Degree Policy for Concurrent Degrees. Senator Martin asked Ray to explain the difference between each of the Non-consent agenda items being considered, [Motion 2014/15-16] and [Motion 2014/15-17] Proposal to Revise the Second Bachelor’s Degree Policy for Sequential Degrees. Ray stated that the difference is that the Concurrent Degree policy is for two degrees given on the same date with different titles, such as a Bachelor of Science and a Bachelor of Arts. The Sequential Degrees Policy deals with degrees given on different dates, and can be two degrees of the same title, such as Bachelor of Science degrees. [Motion 2014/15-16] passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Senator Lega asked for clarification on [Motion 2014/15-17], “For partly overlapping but sequential degrees—when the second award date differs from the first—the 30 additional units are added to the first degree’s total units for a minimum of 150, although some of the excess units may have been completed before conferral of the first degree.” Lega asked if the thirty units shouldn’t be added to the second degree instead of the first. Ray affirmed that thirty additional units are added to the first degree’s total units for a minimum of 150 units. Senator Galilee-Belfer asked if a student receives a minor in a first degree, can the student then elevate the minor to a second minor or major that is sequential. Comrie responded that the units used for the first degree cannot be used for a second degree. McKean suggested that the clarification goes forward to the academic advisors. Paiewonsky pointed out two spacing errors. [Motion 2014/15-17] passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

12. INFORMATION AND ACTION ITEM: PROPOSAL FOR THE SCHOOL OF INFORMATION REORGANIZATION/MERGER – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER, INTERIM DIRECTOR, SCHOOL OF INFORMATION-SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY/ARTS (SISTA), KELLAND THOMAS AND DIRECTOR, SCHOOL OF INFORMATION RESOURCES AND LIBRARY SCIENCE (SIRLS), BRYAN HEIDORN

Bourget commented that SISTA was a branch of the Department of Computer Science, and asked if the faculty in the current department was given the opportunity to join the new school. Thomas answered that SISTA Director, Paul Cohen, was the original founder of SISTA, and that because the Department of Computer Science in the College of Science will be merging with SIRLS, the new school will be housed in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Brewer added that the proposal was voted on by the affected faculty, and then the proposal went to the faculty at-large to get comments and suggestions, Senator Martin asked what kind of support the faculty showed in response to the proposal. The response was unanimous with one abstention because that faculty member was absent. Heidorn said that the Library degree in SIRLS will remain intact with accreditation from the American Library Association. Comrie asked for clarification on the iSchool Caucus (iCaucus) was started by the deans of several Information Systems schools. More than half of the students were obtaining jobs outside of the Library field after graduation, so a rebranding effort to the iSchool was implemented. Currently, there are many iSchools across the country, having grown from ten to almost sixty schools in the last twelve years. Bourget said that the initial planning committee included members of the College of Humanities, and on behalf of a colleague, she wants to know why faculty in the College of Humanities have been excluded from the original proposal. If the iSchool is to forge links with other units on campus, why would the College of Humanities be removed from the proposal? How does the School of Information plan on attaining iSchool status with no international expertise or international digital arts and humanities? Heidorn quoted Section 6 from the proposal, “We will pursue new collaborations/partnerships when the new School is established.” This is the case in Schools of Information around the world, particularly in the areas of the digital arts and humanities, cultural informatics, information ethics, computational intelligence, human-computer interface design, and computer game studies. Every intention

McKean presented two new changes since the initial presentation of the Constitution and Bylaws revisions at the February 2015 Senate meeting; adding “Senior” to the Vice Provost title for SPBAC membership and taking out the requirement for members of the Senate Standing Committees to vacate positions after three, one-year consecutive terms. Senator Silverman pointed out that in Article X, Amendments and Ratification, the amendment procedure was changed to reflect that housekeeping changes will only require a Senate vote and will bypass the University election process. Silverman moved [Motion 2014/15-19] that the language, “unless the Faculty Senate determines otherwise” be added to the end of Section 1. Motion passed unanimously and is detailed at the end of these minutes. The Revisions of the Constitution and Bylaws [Motion 2014/15-20] passed as amended and are detailed at the end of these minutes.

14. **INFORMATION ITEM: A STRUCTURED DISCUSSION ON NEVER SETTLE – CO-CHAIRS OF SPBAC, MIKA GALILEE-BELFER AND RANDY RICHARDSON, AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC PLANNING AND ANALYSIS, BARBARA BRYSON**

Richardson opened by saying that faculty have been involved in the strategic planning process for a very long time. SPBAC, since its inception in 1995, has primarily been responsible for generating strategic plans for the University. The strategic plan is a requirement of the Arizona state government and Arizona Board of Regents. Galilee-Belfer said that one of the critiques of strategic planning has been that the upper administration’s goals differ from those in the colleges and units within the colleges. As Never Settle was being developed, each college was asked to present its own strategic plan. Each college’s strategic plan was then incorporated into Never Settle. Bryson presented a PowerPoint outlining some of the steps over the last year and a half of developing the Never Settle plan. An original eight-page document created in the summer of 2013 reflected on the mission, vision setting and values and defined the four pillars of engaging, innovating, partnering, and synergy. The document aligns with the traditional mission of the University for teaching, research and service, and each pillar is defined by its goals, strategies, actions, and initiatives. The focus has been to build on the UA’s strengths, expand opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, and to create a nurturing environment for expanding, developing and sustaining local and global partnerships. The November 2013 Never Settle presentation created a very clear plan that was a livable, sustainable plan for the University that connected with ABOR’s 2020 goals. The Boundless presentation was a report on the strategic plan for this year with fourteen months of accomplishments. Strategies to meet the UA’s goals were working and turning into successes. The Regents were engaged by the questions and accomplishments. The synergy presentation encompassed total infrastructure issues that affect the UA, and did not just focus on the business plan. The trifold document incorporates all of the Never Settle strategies and goals at one glance and should be completed and ready for distribution in a few weeks.

Richardson and Galilee-Belfer asked questions of the Senators as follows: 1) How well do you understand the Never Settle Strategic Plan? 2) (Table discussion) What could the University do to help you better understand Never Settle? 3) Can a UA Strategic Plan influence your professional life in a positive way? 4) (Table discussion) In what way can/could a UA Strategic Plan influence your professional life in a positive way? 5) How often does your unit leadership (department or college) refer to Never Settle as a tool for decision making? 6) (Table discussion) In what ways that are meaningful to you could this strategic plan be used for decision making at the unit (department or college) level?

The outcome of the discussions were as follows: 1) Instruct the deans to make the Never Settle plan meaningful to the members of their college/departments, 2) Create a one-page, short document that is easily understandable with bullet points, 3) Make sure that there is a personal connection to individuals that fit into the Never Settle plan, 4) Drop the word research and use the word scholarship instead, 5) Have more specific outcomes in measurable ways, 6) Specificity at the student level, 7) Make sure the plan provides spaces of opportunity to carry out the faculty’s mission in teaching, research, and scholarship, 8) Make sure the strategic plan facilitates what faculty do, 9) Integrate the strategic plan with RCM, 10) Incorporate the word student into the strategic plan.

15. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Brewer moved [Motion 2014/15-21] for Senate’s approval to reinstate the ad hoc Non-tenure Track (NTT) Task Force to follow up on some of the action items that were outlined in the 2013 report. The charge of the ad hoc Task Force would be to develop a fuller picture of our NTT faculty workforce, their contributions to the University, and the issues they face (through data gathering, surveys, forums, etc.) To review and report out on progress on action items from the 2013 NTT Task Force Report, or to address areas where sufficient action has not yet occurred. To identify new areas for potential action and make recommendations to Senate. [Motion 2014/15-21] was seconded and passed.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.
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Motions of the Meeting of March 2, 2015

Motion 2014/15-15 Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council to approve a Request for Authorization to Implement a New Degree Program for American Indian Studies BA. Motion carried with one abstention.

Motion 2014/15-16 Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council to approve the Proposal to Revise the Second Bachelor’s Degree Policy for Concurrent Degrees. Motion carried.

Motion 2014/15-17 Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council to approve the Proposal to Revise the Second Bachelor’s Degree Policy for Sequential Degrees. Motion carried.

Motion 2014/15-18 Approval of the Proposal for the Reorganization/Merger of the School of Information. Motion was seconded and passed.

Motion 2014/15-19 Motion to add the wording “unless the Faculty Senate determines otherwise” to the end of Section 1 in Article X, Amendments and Ratiifications in the Faculty Constitution. Motion carried.

Motion 2014/15-20 Approval of the Constitution and Bylaws revisions as amended. Motion carried.

Motion 2014/15-21 Approval to reinstate the Non-tenure Track Task Force. Motion carried.
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