Voting Representatives Present: Mike Staten, Renée Clift, Pam Perry, Lisa Ordóñez, Jim Baygents, Martina Shenal, Janet Sturman, Kimberly Jones, Elliott Cheu, Amy Kimme-Hea, Barbara Citera, Lucinda Rankin, Amanda Gluski, Laura Berry, John Koshel, Douglas Taren, Chris Impey

Additional Representatives Present: Pam Coonan, Chrissy Lieberman, Martin Marquez

Absent (without proxy): Barbara Bryson, Keith Swisher, Ted Tong

---

Chair Kim Jones called the meeting to order at 11:00 AM.

I. **Approval of Minutes from the December 19, 2017 Meeting**

II. **Strategic Plan Process**-Elliott Cheu and Lisa Ordóñez

Elliott and Lisa are co-chairing the strategic planning process. Includes a partnership with a consulting firm to support the process. Elliott reported that Dr. Robbins has discussed creating a strategic plan that is bold, distinctive, and differentiating. Focus is on identifying areas for which UA has strengths and areas that UA could or should be a leader. Phase 1 is data/information gathering process that includes focus groups and town halls. The result of Phase 1 is to provide data to develop a number of pillars upon which the strategic plan will rest. Student experience will be a pillar. Pillars will have initiatives that the UA will commit to in order to support the plan. Phase 2 is to develop the pillars and initiatives. The pillars and initiatives will be re-evaluated using a continuous iterative process. The process has a direct connection with funding since initiatives cost money. The process is about getting information and creating big ideas focused on the future.

Discussion:
- What about the use of resources to drive/move the campus? We want to identify strategic goals and implement initiatives and tactics to meet those goals. Could result in conversations about organizational efficiencies. Buy-in and voice from the colleges needed. An initiative working group will be formed focused on feasibility studies related to the initiatives and tactics. Co-chairs and consultant will help committees move forward instead of being stuck on territorial items.
- What community groups are you talking to in this first round? Donors (including business community), alumni, parents, Pima CC, and open community (including schools). Open to suggestions.
- Pull together at associate deans levels for bouncing around ideas. Include associate deans early in the process. Suggest President Robbins come and speak at CAAC.
- Are you looking at the definition of land-grant? Not clear about mission and vision. Essential to have a clear vision. University is not only about strengthening the great colleges, but having an overall vision of the institution. This is part of the data-gathering phase: identifying areas where we are strong, areas where we are on the verge of being better, and areas where we are not as good as we could be.
- How is this process connected to the re-evaluation of RCM? Co-chairs are on the review committee. We will have a good idea of the strategic plan as the RCM evaluation process is completing in parallel.
- How do we define "doing well"? What metrics will be used? Do not want to only use financial and ranking. Identifying and defining broad fact-based metrics will be a task of the feasibility groups. Many measures can be used.

- We have to decide how centralized/decentralized we are as a university. Where does innovation come from? Things can get too centralized, hindering innovation. Resources within college are not being used when outside resources being used. Need balance between centralized and decentralized. Need to give opportunity to be innovative and take risks. Sometimes it requires work to make things happen in a decentralized model with faculty governance, but it can be done.
- Where is online education going at UA? Would like to see this discussed during the strategic plan.
- Cautionary note on verb use. Avoid using words like "eliminate, blow up, and start from ground zero" during this process because it may cause departments to resist.
- Would like to hear from disenfranchised stakeholders from the community when considering the land grant mission. It has come up in our discussions.
- Technology as a pillar or integrated throughout. Consider UA interface and users' experience.
- Consider cost containment- seem to be out-pricing ourselves and have several fees.
- Consider other institutions: how have they approached these processes? What did they do to get stakeholder involvement? How did they address centralization and innovation?
- CAAC would like to hear updates on the process regularly, as scheduling permits.

III. **Items for Discussion and Vote**
   a) **MS in Business Analytics**- Richard Boulger and Vikram Ghosh
   College-wide program including coursework from various departments within Eller. Anticipate high demand due to limited spots for MIS program and applicant interests in analytics. Potential for attracting students in undergraduate technical domains seeking business careers. Knowledge of analytics techniques and availability of large data create career opportunities.

   Discussion:
   - Graduate council would like to see ethics as part of the curriculum. Interesting questions related to ethics and a good suggestion.
   - Provide an addendum that outlines the operational mechanism. Executive committee composition. Do have committee and will make it clear. Eller has a vision to hire centralized services to help multiple programs.
   - Can you speak to the interdisciplinary nature of this program? Application domains are related to the specialization in individual departments. The introductory courses exposes broad relevant topics and problems. All application-based curriculum will use business data. Partnerships will continue to be used and developed. In addition, consulting projects are included. Electives give opportunity to provide a focus area that would give students significant application within a specific domain.
   - Is the annual revenue on the budget form annual or program revenue? Blend, based on student head growth-primary driver of revenue noted.

   Cindy Rankin moved to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded by Mike Staten and approved with 14 votes.

   b) **GIDP PhD Minor in Indigenous Food, Energy, and Water Systems**- Karletta Chief and Kim Ogden
   Consists of four courses including a foundation course focused on how to work with Native American communities, natural resources management, and other challenges facing Native American communities. Remaining coursework includes interdisciplinary science and engineering curriculum focused on training around the food, energy, and water (FEWS) nexus. Additionally, the minor includes a project based course. Goal is to train engineering and science students on how to problem solve and address FEWS challenges facing native communities. Many Arizona tribes face lack food, water, and energy security. Brings together work already happening on campus focused on addressing FEWS challenges and includes partnerships with tribes. Help prepare engineering and

science students in social skills and intercultural awareness for working with tribes to develop socially aware solutions. Aim to attract students interested in global challenges. Motivated by an NSF NRT grant "Indige FEWS" program that provides fellowships for 24 graduate students. The comprehensive program consists of the PhD minor, training for students on teaching at tribal colleges, developing FEWS pilot system, FEWS research, a year-long professional seminar related to FEWS, and an internship in industry.

Discussion:
- Which colleges are involved? CALS, ENGR, and SBS. Do have letter of support from SBS. AIS students has a natural resources certificate bridging social sciences with natural sciences. Missing letters of support. Do not think we have current version of the proposal.
- Was public health considered for inclusion? Health component is not included in the proposal because the grant focuses on engineering and science. The minor could be expanded in the future to include more options including public health coursework.
- How will AIS and TLS students, listed as feeder students on Table 2, be able to take graduate level ENGR courses? Included students because STEM indigenous education is available. Will keep experiences and background in mind. Clarify that there should be a background in STEM.
- Need to correct table information and references in the proposal. Will update the tables.

Discussion without presenter:
- Prefer to see updated proposal before voting. CAAC members agreed.
- Discussion on proposal approval process including challenges, dean approvals, routing, new workflow, resources, recruiting/marketing/advertising needs, ABOR approval, support letters, and impact on innovation.

CAAC members moved to delay vote until receiving updated proposal and hold as e-vote.
Update 2/17/18: Proposal passed per e-vote.

c) **Proposed definitions of undergraduate majors, minors, and certificates –** Pam Coonan
Task force on undergraduate certificates ran into issues on definitions. Undergraduate council unsure of difference between a minor and certificate. Undergraduate Council started to look at definition of a major, minor, and certificate to provide distinct definitions. Went over the current and proposed major, minor, and certificate definitions. Proposal does not impact policies.

Discussion:
- Not clear how the proposed definitions are providing clarification. Could invite Undergraduate Council to provide clarification on why these definitions are better.
- "Specific subject matter area" -is that the same thing as subject or specific subject? Current description does not address the interdisciplinarity of a major. The proposed sentence does not make sense, does not address interdisciplinary majors. Cluttering language, need distinction.
- Current definition of a certificate sounds closer to defining a major than the proposed major definition.
- Suggest simplifying the certificate definition, proposed wording is confusing. Consider something like "A certificate is a set of courses that provides X, Y, and Z". Possibly including "provides deepening of knowledge, opens new area of inquiry".
- Why even modify major and minor definitions? Leave those alone-they seem clear. Why are the three current definitions so confusing that we need new ones?
- Was there a specific problem we were solving when moratorium was put in place? A certificate came through that made committee members question the purpose of certificates. What are we certifying? What is the purpose? Went from specific purpose to general and "this is for RCM". The Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee put these definitions together.

Additionally, the Academic Program Subcommittee is concerned about rigor and not knowing what is being certified. Created rubric that may help with the review/approval process. Senior Vice Provost Gail Burd wants to know what the difference is between minor and certificate. We had included student populations that can declare minor and undergrads. Was not considered enough of a distinction.

- Undergraduate issue only? Unlike graduate, undergraduates cannot minor in the same subject area as their major. People thought certificates were for recruitment of students in programs. Problem is financial aid does not pay for certificates. Everyone is scrambling for determining the purpose of undergraduate certificates. Certificates have different purposes. We have about four different purposes and it is hard for the committee to look at them to determine rigor based on purpose. The proposal will require departments to identify the primary purpose.
- Could have a definition that includes "A certificate accomplishes one of four purposes". Do not have to change the definition of a major or minor.
- Has ABOR talked about evaluating the interest in certificates 5 years? What is the process for elimination? The task force added a sunset clause based on ABOR productivity of 24 graduates in 3 years.

Jim Baygents moved that Undergraduate Council revise the proposed definitions. CAAC moved to invite Claudia Stanescu.

IV. **Additional Items and Open Discussion**
   a) **Executive Coaching Service-** Diane Brennan
   Coaching is an opportunity to engage in a partnership with a thought partner in order to continue in professional development and accelerate learning and growth. Coaching previously viewed as a way to coach people out of positions or only for individuals needing remedial work. However, we view coaching as an opportunity to help people grow and develop as leaders in order to support people in their organizations and themselves. Work one-on-one and based on individual needs. Coaches' illicit solutions, not provide solutions. Coaches help individuals analyze and reflect on the situation in order to illicit approaches to address the situation and lead to an outcome. Recurrence of coaching sessions dependent on individual needs and situations. Working with individuals wanting leadership feedback based on UA leadership competencies. Involved in the 5 year review process to help committee members look at the process and help individuals going through the review to pull out themes and identify actionable items. Looking at making the process better. Gathering data and information of effective leadership and creating curriculum around those data. Peer, team, and group coaching is available.

   Discussion:
   - Working with Academic Leadership Institute? Work closely with ALI faculty and staff.
   - Great resource. How do you make sure your people know about confidentiality? Coaching agreement developed that includes confidentiality. Aware and understand the concern. Willing to work with others on this consideration.

   b) **eSMS Announcement-** Pam Perry
   Discussed the process of working with UITS, colleges, and getting support to move this forward.

   c) **Workflow and approval process**- Pam Coonan
   Reminder to have departments work with Curricular Affairs before submitting. ABOR added more requirements to assessment. Curricular Affairs taking back shepherding graduate proposals.

VI. **Meeting Adjourned**
Respectfully Submitted by Martin Marquez, 2/19/18