APPCC Members:
Leslie Ritter, Nursing/Neurology (7/14-5/15) CHAIR
Alberta Charney, Eeller (3/13-5/15)
Trey Cox, ASUA (6/14-5/15)
Roger Dahlgren, Agricultural/Res Economics (6/10-5/15)
Alexander Karaman, GPSC (8/14-5/15)
Moisés Palewonsky, Music (11/10-5/15)
Brad Story, Speech, Language & Hearing Science (7/10-5/15)
Richard Vaillancourt, Pharmacology (6/14-5/15)
John P. (Pat) Willerton, School of Gov't/Public Policy (6/10-5/15)

Three action items came before the APPCC during the 2014-2015 year and are summarized below.

Action Item #1: Should the Academic Personnel Policy Committee be the point of contact for academic personnel with questions concerning policy at the University?

Proposed by: Michael Brewer, past APPC chair on behalf of the Faculty Officers

Pros: Members of APPC are willing to field faculty questions regarding policy. All members feel that it is equally important to have all senate committee chairs or members field questions that might be applicable to their committee charge. Members agreed that a statement concerning where to find information and policy might appear in the bylaws before the listing of the individual committees and that the Faculty Governance website could reflect this information more clearly.

Cons: All senate committees, not only the APPC, should be the approachable and accessible for questions from faculty.

Vote Tally: Full consensus from present members

Action Item #2: Should Teacher-Course Evaluations be accessible to more than the instructor that is being evaluated and how should they be formatted?

Proposed by: Tom Miller, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and the Office of Instruction and Assessment

Recommendation: The Committee supports the development of departmental questions on the TCE that would be used by all departments/units across campus in the teaching reviews of faculty.

Pros: The committee believes that newly developed campus-wide departmental/unit questions should come from a working committee who are specifically tasked to develop said questions. Members of APPC will/should review the proposed campus-wide departmental/unit questions, specifically because these questions are related to matters of performance review.

Cons: Attention should be paid to the number of questions developed; the Committee recommends that only two questions be considered. Attention should also be paid to having individual faculty provide input as to how the information from the evaluations is used by their departments/units. Finally, it was recognized that department/unit use of the information from these newly-devised questions should necessarily take into account the strengths/weaknesses of the existing TCE (e.g., low participation rate).

Vote Tally: Full consensus from present members.
Action Item #3: Should Teacher-Course Evaluations policy language be changed to add the sentence, “Departmental reports also include the open-ended responses to TCE surveys.”

Proposed by: Tom Miller, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and the Office of Instruction and Assessment.

Pros: The Committee supports the development of departmental questions for use across campus for all departments that would be used in the teaching review of faculty. It feels that the actual questions should come from a working committee tasked to develop the questions. Members of APPC will look at the proposed changes to TCE questions/process.

Cons: The process defining the use of these open ended questions should be better defined before recommending a policy change to the Faculty Senate.

Vote Tally: Full consensus from present members.

Respectfully submitted,

Leslie Ritter

Leslie Ritter
Chair, APPC
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure
May 6, 2015

CAFT Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Members</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Shaw (Chair)</td>
<td>Disability &amp; Psychoeducational Studies</td>
<td>6/09-5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nafees Ahmad</td>
<td>Immunobiology</td>
<td>6/13-5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalila Ayoun</td>
<td>French and Italian</td>
<td>6/15-5/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Brescia</td>
<td>Arizona State Museum</td>
<td>6/14-5/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Colina</td>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td>6/10-5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celestino Fernandez</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>5/12-5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberto Guzman</td>
<td>Chemical &amp; Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>6/12-5/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dante Lauretta</td>
<td>Lunar &amp; Planetary Laboratory</td>
<td>6/13-5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Milem</td>
<td>Educational Policy Studies &amp; Practice</td>
<td>6/14-5/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Patricia Stock</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>6/13-5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynda Zwinger</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>6/14-5/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission Statement

The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry and to conduct hearings in two general areas contained in ABOR 6-201 and 6-301, namely: in regard to those matters contained in the Conditions of Service dealing with the contractual employment relationship between the General Faculty member and the University /Board of Regents; and in regard to any internal matters relating to grievances against or by any member of the General Faculty. The committee shall consider the protection of academic freedom and tenure as a principal obligation. (Certain preliminary steps for dismissal situations are described in Chapters 3 and 4 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel and Sections 6-201 and 6-301 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel and Sections 6-201 and 6-301 of the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual.) Faculty Constitution, Article V, Section 10b.

Under this policy, CAFT shall hear any faculty allegation that a decision affecting his or her employment relation with the University was not determined in substantial compliance with regular University procedures, but only after any administrative appeal mechanism applicable to the decision in question has been exhausted. This includes, but is not limited to, non-renewal of contracts, denial of tenure, promotions, sabbatical leaves, leaves, and disputes on the amount of salary due to a non-tenured faculty member who has been suspended or dismissed before the expiration of the employment period. Faculty Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 5b, iii (2) (a).
CAFT shall hear other faculty grievances, such as alleged unfair treatment, where no policies or procedures exist or existing policies or procedures have been misinterpreted, misapplied or violated by a University administrator. *Faculty Bylaws, Article VIII, Section 5b, iii (2) (b).*

**Grievances and Hearings**

The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee (GCC) referred two cases to CAFT late in the 2014-2015 academic year. A summary of each case with current status is provided below:

1. A grievance was filed alleging wrongful alteration of teaching assignment citing conflict of interest and academic freedom violation; and gender bias. The grievant and respondent completed Conciliation unsuccessfully and this hearing is in the process of being scheduled. A hearing panel is currently being selected.

2. An appeal of a notice of dismissal in which a tenured faculty member alleged that the notice of dismissal was issued without “just cause” in violation of ABOR Policy 6-201/(J)(1)(a). The grievant and respondent completed Conciliation unsuccessfully and this hearing has been scheduled for June 10-12. A hearing panel and chair have been appointed.

**New Heads’ Seminar**

I responded to a request from Associate Provost Thom Miller to present at one of the seminars for incoming/newly appointed Department Heads at the University of Arizona. This program was initiated following a 2011 request by CAFT, and subsequently supported by the Committee of Eleven to establish training “arising from findings of CAFT hearings over the past decade (where)...it has become apparent that at the Dean and/or Department level, grievances that escalate to become CAFT hearings might be avoided if more effective administrative oversight had been in effect.” (Committee of Eleven letter dated July 27, 2011). I provided this training at a “New Heads’ Seminar” on 10/3/14. A handout used at the session is attached.

**Academic Freedom Workgroup**

Lynn Nadel, in his role as Chair of the Faculty, appointed an Academic Freedom workgroup, with the purpose of starting a faculty-wide conversation about Academic Freedom. The workgroup undertook several initiatives aimed at promoting this conversation including:

- Making basic documents and information about academic freedom available
- Conducting a survey about academic freedom and sharing results with faculty
- Holding two Faculty Forums to share survey results and information, and to invite discourse
The forums were held on Jan 21st and Jan 22nd. I attended one of these and the discussion was interesting and thought-provoking. The information and discussion from the forums were subsequently shared with the faculty senate.

**Procedural/Administrative Issues:**

Two issues have emerged that warrant additional attention by CAFT in the upcoming year. First, Mary Beth Tucker requested that CAFT review its procedures to ensure that it is compliance with new Title IX requirements, and offered the assistance of the Office of Institution Equity in conducting such a review.

Second, the Chair recommends that CAFT work with the Office of General Council (OGC) to identify and resolve inconsistencies and improve the clarity of the various documents that guide its operations. Both the 2013-2014 CAFT Chair and I confronted numerous areas of confusion, where there were inconsistencies and a lack of clarity that resulted in various interpretations and opinions about procedural matters. This inconsistency resulted in confusion as to proper procedure and delays while legal and administrative clarifications were sought.

For example, the previous chair noted in his 2013-2014 annual report that “CAFT internal guidelines describe that for ABOR-required hearings involving allegations of unconstitutional or illegally discriminatory behavior by the University and for “just cause” suspension or dismissal hearings the CAFT panel shall be composed of 5 panel members. There is no requirement in the ABOR rules, the UHAP, or the faculty by-laws that a CAFT panel be composed of that many panel members. The language in the current ABOR rules is for allegations of unconstitutional or discriminatory action by the University [and states that] there must be an impartial hearing committee of “not fewer than three committee members. (ABOR 6-201M 2 a.).

An issue came up for the current Chair when I wished to appoint a Hearing Officer for a hearing, as provided for in Article VII Section 6 a. viii. (6) (c) of the bylaws, which appears to be designed specifically to handle a situation in which the CAFT panel members may not be entirely comfortable with establishing ground rules, dealing with prehearing discovery, and running a hearing. The bylaws state that “At the discretion of the CAFT panel, when the parties are represented by counsel, a hearing officer may be secured under the University's agreement with Tri-University Outside Counsel. The hearing officer assists the panel in developing findings, conclusions and recommendations during deliberations and may prepare the written report in consultation with the panel but does not participate in the decision-making process of deliberation.” The OGC, however contends that because the ABOR Policy Manual establishes both policy and procedural guidelines in cases involving dismissals, and because the ABOR Policy Manual has no provision for a hearing officer, this is only allowable in cases not involving dismissals. The OGC's office agreed that the relationship of the ABOR policy manual, the By-laws and CAFT's internal guideline documents should be reviewed and revised, as necessary, to achieve consistency, and greater clarity to all parties involved in CAFT processes.
Finally, I wish to thank the committee members and the personnel of the Faculty Center (especially Jane Cherry) for her support and work on behalf of CAFT. Additionally, I would like to thank the past-Chair of CAFT, Jamie Ratner for his support and advice. Finally, I must share my perception that the time, effort, and careful deliberation with which CAFT members have approached their responsibilities continues to be an outstanding example of the many strengths of the faculty of the University of Arizona.

Respectfully submitted,

[Linda R. Shaw]

Linda R. Shaw, Ph.D.
Chair, CAFT (2014-2015)
On behalf of the

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT)

Welcome to your new role as Department Head!

CAFT is a university committee made up of elected faculty of the University of Arizona that reviews, investigates and/or holds hearings, as necessary, in a variety of cases, including, but not limited to recommendations for dismissal or suspension, violations of due process and/or academic freedom, procedural violations in performance reviews, and unreconciled grievances.

Several years ago, the Chair of CAFT made several recommendations for training of new department heads, with training topics based upon several themes that seem to have emerged over multiple hearings. These same issues seem to be present in many of our more recent hearings, and others have also emerged. Issues that tend to become problematic include the following:

- Poor faculty mentoring
- Outdated college criteria for tenure and promotion
- Outdated criteria for annual faculty performance evaluations
- Lack of clear rationales and documentation to support annual faculty performance evaluations
- Failure to resolve personal disputes
- Poor communication between deans or heads and faculty
- Lack of knowledge and use of university resources for obtaining information and support in managing faculty challenges and resolving interpersonal conflict.
- Failure to consistently follow University, College, or Departmental procedures

A little bit of advance planning, knowledge, and consultation can go a long way in preventing the build-up of frustrations, perceptions of unfair treatment, and resentfulness that result in the unpleasantness of grievances, dismissals, and hearings.
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Faculty Senate January 2015
ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Survey Results
Forum Overview
Open Discussion
Academic Freedom Survey Results

Presented at faculty forums
January 21 and 22, 2015

Respondents (N=778)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – tenured or tenure track</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Professional</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Professional – continuing or continuing-eligible</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Professional – not continuing, year-to-year</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – non-tenure, year-to-year</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty – non-tenure, multi-year</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholar</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*i.e. Emeritus, Dean, Department Head, Staff Scientist, Undergraduate student.

**Since all survey items were optional, total responses per item will differ.
Academic Freedom at the UA is...*

...at least for some.

* N = 606.
Levels of Concern*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech critical of institutional policy</td>
<td>362 (54%)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech critical of university personnel</td>
<td>312 (46%)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversial research</td>
<td>308 (46%)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversial teaching</td>
<td>313 (47%)</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extramural speech</td>
<td>249 (37%)</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ranked by ratio of concerned/not concerned
Speech Critical of the Institution

• Concerns about retaliation for speech critical of
  – higher administration and institution-wide policy; and
  – deans and department heads and college or department policy.
  – (critique of personnel vs. policies *not* separated in most comments).
• Concerns about retaliation for speech critical of groups of faculty within academic units, or of other campus units.
• Self-censorship driven by fear of reprisals widely reported.
• Non-tenure track and pre-tenure faculty, and other academic professionals are particularly vulnerable in this regard – though concern was not limited to them.
Controversial Teaching

• Many expressed concern about teaching controversial subjects:
  – about objections being lodged by external groups, including the state legislature, political advocacy groups, and the like
  – about student and faculty reactions to contentious in-class discussion
• Concerns expressed in roughly equal numbers by respondents concerned about ‘censorship’ from the political left and the right.
• A ‘chilling effect’ on the discussion of controversial or sensitive issues was identified by some respondents.
  – GTAs form a particularly vulnerable population in this regard.
• Several respondents expressed concern about perceived interference in teaching modes and methods, curricular matters, and classroom policies.
Controversial Research

• Possible ‘chilling effects’ posed by external constituencies, state government, external funders were a concern.
  – Here several local cases were identified by respondents.
• Some noted lack of support from colleagues and other internal constituencies when research programs were under threat.
• Concerns about research ‘outside the mainstream’ of a particular academic unit were expressed.
• Concerns about interference in research by university-internal offices (such as the IRB) were voiced by a number of respondents.
Extramural Speech

• What is the role of speech via social media in policies and discussions about Academic Freedom?

• Several identified cases in which an employee’s or a job candidate’s social media presence may have been a source of reprisals, decisions to not hire or not promote, etc.

• A number of respondents noted reluctance to discuss potentially controversial topics outside of the university, and/or instructions from deans, department heads, or others to avoid discussing controversial topics outside (sometimes also inside) of the UA community.
Do you believe that you have experienced or observed violations of Academic Freedom at the UA?

Yes (15%)
It's complicated (25%)
No (60%)

N = 673.
MAIN THEMES

• what is academic freedom?
• who is protected by academic freedom?
• What protections are in place at the UA
  – and can they be trusted?
• The fear of retribution
• The special problems faced by NTT and other vulnerable populations
My Personal View: A Challenge

Instilling confidence in “protections” either in place now, or to be put in place, so that people at the UA will not fear retaliation and retribution.

Doing something about the “two academic cultures” problem – there is a general lack of understanding of, and sympathy for, the pursuits of our brethren across the STEM-Humanities divide. Given all the challenges we face in the academy, internecine warfare is a serious waste of our time.
The Committee on Conciliation received one case this year.

1. In late December 2014, a case came to the Faculty Center that involved an inter-departmental dispute concerning teaching assignments and that case was referred to Conciliation in January 2015. Due to scheduling conflicts, the case required an extension. Conciliation was not reached in this matter.

2. In March 2015, the Chair of Conciliation was contacted by the Office of the General Counsel concerning a dismissive decision that had come before Conciliation the previous year. After several e-mails and phone calls with the OGC, it was determined that the case not be referred to Conciliation, but that it go before CAFT.

The Committee on Conciliation’s work could not have been completed without commitment of the various faculty members who donate a large amount of their time to serve on this committee.

Respectfully Submitted,

Homer Pettey, Chair
Committee on Conciliation 2013-15
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®  
General Faculty Standing Committee  
Faculty Center  
1216 E. Mabel St. - PO Box 210456  
621-1342 (Fax: 621-8844)  

Committee of Eleven  
Annual Report 2014-15  

Dr. Patricia Hoyer, CHAIR (5/05-5/15), Physiology  
Mr. Peter Strittmatter, VICE CHAIR (6/09-5/15), Astronomy  
Dr. Warren Breidenbach, (1/13-5/16), Surgery  
Dr. John Hildebrand (5/00-5/16), Neuroscience  
Mr. Doug Jones (6/07-5/15), University Libraries  
Dr. Lynn Nadel (6/14-5/16), Chair of the Faculty  
Mr. Moisés Paiewonsky (1/15-5/15), Music  
Dr. Jerzy Rozenblit (1/15-5/16), Electrical & Computer Engineering  
Ms. Hannah Sager (8/14-5/15), ASUA  
Dr. Steven Schwartz (6/13-5/15), Chemistry/Biochemistry  
Ms. Jasmine Sears (8/14-5/15), GPSC  
Dr. Marlys Witte (6/08-5/16), Surgery  
Dr. Maria Nieves Zedeno (6/12-5/16), Anthropology  

The committee was established in 1947 by President James Byron McCormick to obtain advice from the faculty. When the Faculty Senate and Constitution were established in 1948, the Committee of Eleven was defined constitutionally and membership determined by faculty-wide election. It is unique in higher education governance structures and is independent of other faculty or administrative committees or organizations. The Committee of Eleven is University-wide and does not have a prescribed agenda.

Faculty Constitution Article V, Section 3 provides:

The Committee of Eleven shall:
a. Initiate, promote, and stimulate study and action dealing with and looking toward solution of situations and problems of interest and concern to the faculty and to the University.
b. Make reports to the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate.
c. Speak for the General Faculty as and when authorized by the General Faculty.

The Committee of Eleven's focus for 2014-2015 Academic Year included the following activities and topics:
- Health Sciences/Medical School Issues
- White Paper
- UA Foundation Board
- Research Office Changes
- Student Enrollment and Diversity
Over the summer, Chair Hoyer and Vice Chair Strittmatter (Chair of white paper subcommittee) met with a number of Deans as well as the Head of Bio5 and members of the Council of Academic Business Officers. The discussions provided a global overview of concerns about the research mission. Those individuals are acknowledged and their input summarized in the report. During Fall Semester 2014, the Committee continued to work on drafting and preparing the white paper entitled “Status of the University of Arizona Research Program”. Vice Chair Strittmatter prepared the draft of the document with input from the subcommittee (Schwartz, Jones, Hildebrand). The final draft was presented to the entire Committee of Eleven for discussion and approval. The document was finally approved in late January. An original signed document was delivered to the President’s office, and released in electronic form to the University community on February 2, 2015. A presentation and discussion of the report was held in the Faculty Senate on April 6, 2015. The document can be viewed at http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/committee/26

As is its practice, the Committee of Eleven met with key individuals throughout the academic year. These included:

President Ann Weaver Hart
Gail Burd, Senior Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Tom Keating, Chair of the Arizona Foundation Board
Laura Todd Johnson, Office of the General Counsel
Kim Espy, Senior Vice President for Research
Gregg Goldman, Senior VP for Business Affairs and Chief Financial Officer
Provost Andrew Comrie

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Hoyer

Patricia Hoyer, Chair
Committee of Eleven
The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee 2014-2015 Annual Report

Committee Members  Department/College  Status  Term
Linda Shaw  Disability/Psychoed COE  Chair, CAFT  2014-2015
James Cook  Art COFA  Vice Chair, CAFT  2014-2015
Joel Cuello  Agric/Biosys Engr CALS  Faculty Senator  2014-2015
Homer Pettay  English SBS  Chair, Conciliation  2014-2015
Mary Beth Tucker  Dir/Office Inst. Equity  OIE Representative  2014-2015
Karen Zimmerman  Art COFA  Chair, UCSC  2014-2015

The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee (GCC) members are the Chair of the Committee Freedom and Tenure (CAFT), the Chair of the Committee on Conciliation, the Chair of the Committee on Ethics and Commitment, a representative of the Office on Institutional Equity (OIE), and a faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate at its May meeting. The Vice Chair of CAFT serves as a non-voting member. The bylaws make the Chair of CAFT the ex officio voting Chair of GCC. The GCC evaluates grievance petitions submitted by faculty members and makes an initial determination concerning which dispute resolution committee or office, if any, is the appropriate place for the submission. (The GCC has no authority concerning dismissals. Dismissals are regulated by the ABOR rules, and the dismissal process establishes requirements that eliminate the need for a GCC determination.) The GCC has the power to forward matters to Conciliation, Ethics, OIE, the Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Office or to CAFT (although it has no authority to require a grievant or respondent to participate in Conciliation).

Committee Actions:

Petitions:

GCC members reviewed two petitions during the 2014-2015 academic year, which were filed by a single faculty member.

- The first petition was received in December, 2014 and was based on a faculty member’s charge that her teaching assignment was unreasonably altered due to retaliation, and possible gender bias. The GCC recommended that the matter be referred to Conciliation, but that the petitioner also be offered an opportunity to discuss the complaint with the OIA to determine whether she might wish to file a complaint through that office. The complainant did not contact the OIA. The Committee on Conciliation completed its work in March, 2015.

- The second petition was received in April, 2015 by the same petitioner, following her unsuccessful conciliation. This petition was based on a wrongful alteration of teaching assignment for Spring, 2015 (the same basis as the original complaint) due to “conflict of interest and academic freedom violations; and gender bias.” The GCC recommended that the matter be referred to CAFT and the hearing is currently in the process of being scheduled.
The Chair acknowledges and thanks the work of the members and staff of the GCC for their efforts and for their careful deliberations in the matters brought before the committee this year. Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Linda R. Shaw, Ph.D., Chair
Grievance Clearinghouse Committee
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
Faculty Senate Standing Committee
Faculty Center
1216 E. Mabel St. - PO Box 210456
621-1342 (Fax: 621-8844)
Research Policy Committee

ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

2014-2015 Committee Members

Charles Higgins, (CHAIR) Neuroscience (8/07-5/15)
Will Box, ASUA (8/14-5/15)
Joni Dean, GPSC (8/14-5/15)
John Hildebrand, Neuroscience (7/10-5/15)
Dan Lee, University Library (7/10-5/15)

Ken McAllister, English (7/10-5/15)
Stanley Pau, Optical Sciences (6/11-5/15)
Jonathan Sprinkle, Elec./Comp. Engineering (7/10-5/15)
Marlys Witte, Surgery (6/13-5/15)

2013-2014 Committee Work
The Research Policy Committee met one time this academic year, to review a revised Intellectual Property Policy.

The committee did not find any objectionable changes in the document. To the contrary, the committee felt that the revised document outlined a more user friendly style. The committee felt that the document was clearer and listed more helpful examples of intellectual property that would be excluded from this policy. The chart labeled Exhibit A: ABOR-Owned IP Revenue Distribution, was also viewed favorably. There being no objections from the committee, the document was sent forward to the Senate Executive Committee.

The work of RPC would not be possible without the commitment of the various faculty members who donate their time to serve on this committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles M. Higgins, Chair
Research Policy Committee
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA®
General Faculty Standing Committee
Faculty Center
1216 E. Mabel St. - PO Box 210456
621-1342 (Fax: 621-8844)
Shared Governance Review Committee
Annual Report 2014-15

2014-2015 Membership:

Michael Brewer, CHAIR
Jarad Brock, GPSC
Gail Burd, Provost Designee
Javier Duran, SPBAC
Mika Galilee-Belfer, Co-Chair SPBAC

Tom Miller, Administration
Lynn Nadel, Chair of Faculty
Mark Napier, APAC
Randy Richardson, Co-Chair SPBAC
Richard Salazar, SAC

William Simmons, Senate
Joey Steigerwald, ASUA

Mission of Committee as Outlined in the Constitution of General Faculty:
The Shared Governance Review Committee addresses issues regarding the implementation and functioning of the procedures contained in the Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements as may be entered into from time to time. It will establish and maintain processes to (1) review compliance with the agreement, (2) examine ways in which apparent breaches of the agreement can be addressed, and (3) consider possible extensions of the agreement. It is the body to which members of the University community can bring particular shared governance concerns, and it will also examine whether the agreement has been violated or is in need of clarification or modification.

2014-2015:
The Shared Governance Review Committee did not meet this academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Brewer, Chair
Shared Governance Review Committee
SPBAC Annual Report 2014-2015

Dr. William (Bill) E Conway
Mathematics

Dr. Vincent Del Casino
Vice Provost Digital Learning/
Student Engagement

Mr. Peter Dourlein
Planning Design & Construction

Dr. Javier D Duran
Spanish & Portuguese

Dr. Hanna (Johnny) Fares
Molecular & Cellular Biology

Mr. Jim Florian
Associate VP for Inst. Analysis

Mr. Gregg Goldman
Senior Vice President for Business
Affairs & CFO

Dr. Sabrina Helm
Family & Consumer Sciences

Ms. Sheri Hill
SAC Representative
Office of Community Relations

Mr. Mike Jonen
Medical Admin & Finance

Dr. J.P. Jones
Deans’ Representative, SBS

Dr. Marc Miller
Deans’ Representative, Law

Dr. Lynn Nadel
Chair of the Faculty, Psychology

Mr. Issac Ortega
ASUA President

Mr. Mike Proctor
Vice President for Global Initiatives

Ms. Marilyn Taylor
Senior Assistant VP, Finance &
Administration

Ms. Teri Thompson
Senior VP, University Relations

Dr. Theodore (Ted) Tong
Pharmacy

Dr. Kasey Urquidez
Enrollment Management

Dr. Allison Vaillancourt
VP, HR & Institutional Effectiveness

Ms. Kathy Whisman
Assistant Vice President for Budget

Plus regular guests Tom Miller, Vice
Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Mary
Fleming, Coordinator, Academic Planning

Staff support provided by Barb Kuehn

Initial meetings in AY 2014-15 were dedicated to working sessions to establish goals and priorities for SPBAC, which were identified as:

- input and refinement of Never Settle
- supporting the campus during move to RCM and associated governance
- participating and contributing to alignments between college and institutional planning, and
- working toward broadening campus communication

There was a strong commitment to SPBAC’s mission as advisory to the Administration, and not just reacting to events. Efforts included identifying measures of success for the academic year. SPBAC met 17 times in AY 2014-2015.
COMMITTEE ISSUES AND ACTIONS

A. Progress on Never Settle
SBPAC members:

1. Worked with Barbara Bryson, Vice President for Strategic Planning and Analysis, on developing a one page draft document that summarized and aligned both the online Never Settle documents and the data and ideas that emerged with the ABOR presentation of last Fall. The goal is to produce a tri-fold document for the campus community that captures the essential components of the strategic plan to facilitate understanding and communication within the campus community. Barbara Bryson presented the document to SAC, and Co-Chair Mika Galilee-Belfer presented it to APAC. Co-Chairs, along with Barbara Bryson, facilitated a structured discussion in Faculty Senate around Never Settle, and heard from faculty senators of the need to better align the work being done on campus with the strategies and actions identified in the strategic plan. The tri-fold document is still being finalized by Barbara’s office, with hopes that it will be ready this summer.

2. Provided feedback on a number of areas relative to the student experience after hearing updates from Vincent Del Casino, Vice Provost Digital Learning/Student Engagement, on institutional plans for UA Online and on policies related to the UA’s 100% Engagement initiative. Members also heard updates regarding guaranteed tuition plans and the move to include student fees as part of the guarantee. Later in the Spring, SPBAC members were updated about the tuition setting process and the critical role that our student government leaders took in making recommendations.

3. Requested, and responded to, a facilitated discussion with Senior Vice President for University Relations Teri Thompson about types of communication that are being used and who the target audiences are, to better build UA awareness and reputation. SPBAC members now receive the daily news update from Teri Thompson’s office.

Strategic Planning and Positioning

1. After hearing from key representatives of the Office of Sustainability, the Diversity Coordinating Council, and the Office of Global Initiatives, SPBAC members created a set of recommendations for upper administration on leveraging the institution’s competitive advantages in the areas of diversity, sustainability (broadly defined), and globalization, which are key attributes in the cross-cutting/synergistic pillar of Never Settle: Identify the potential strategic benefits of these competitive advantages to build buy-in across the institution.
   a. Identify values and goals from which action can be generated, and into which faculty and other campus constituents can both integrate their work and see how they contribute.
   b. Establish institutional principles and sets of commitments.
   c. Establish institutional ‘baselines’ regarding each of the three areas.

2. Consider the value of allocating responsibility/accountability for progress and goal attainment in each area, and ensure that any individuals given responsibility/accountability have the administrative authority and resources to affect change.

3. Make sure that, in each area:
   a. research dimensions, academic dimensions, and operational dimensions are considered, valued, and integrated to the fullest extent possible;
   b. administrative and other domains work together to reach University goals.

4. Identify the cost of actions and act quickly on those with no or low costs (e.g., policies and practices rather than institutional investments), so that action is possible and seen, even in times of economic constraint.
5. Tap “point persons” or “champions” to act as institutional “weavers” – people who can help those across the institution fit their own work into the competitive advantage areas as well as into Never Settle (i.e., a cadre who can answer the question of ‘Where can you fit your work into these principles/goals?’).

Progress on RCM and Budgeting

SBPAC members:

1. Heard from Tom Miller about the key findings of the Collaboration on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) survey, which compares faculty-related perspectives from 98 universities, included five UA peers; discussed impact of RCM and accountability-based budgeting on faculty work lives and agency.

2. Were involved in discussions around ‘decision-points’ in budgeting given cuts in state funding, as well as in conversations about progress and communication of RCM (to Deans, to department heads).

3. Responded to proposed changes to ERE around the number of different ERE rates, the handling of vacation payouts, and graduate student ERE.

4. Requested a panel presentation, which included active engagement and questions from SPBAC members, of four College deans and their teams about RCU plans for RCM. The four Colleges included Humanities, Education, Agriculture & Life Sciences, and Science. While there was quite a bit of variation in the implementation and governance processes between colleges, it is clear that each college was making significant progress in preparing for RCM for FY16. College representatives discussed shared governance mechanisms and their approaches to strategic investment and for accommodating fluctuation in majors and student credit hours from year to year. College representatives also acknowledged that issues relating to historical practices become much more visible with the transparency provided by RCM, and for this reason, among others, it is important that faculty and others involved in revenue generation and expenses better understand how the system, and hence University, work. Among the challenges for colleges in RCM will be monitoring course enrollments carefully; to that end, the ability to nimbly adjust or change teaching spaces will become even more important moving forward.

5. Reviewed recommendations for dealing with budget cuts from campus stakeholders who responded to a request from the Provost to email ideas directly to him, and made efforts to provide guidelines for budget cuts.

6. Responded to a set of guidelines designed to help in decision making around budget cuts in state funding for FY16.

\[\text{Randall Richardson} \quad \text{Mika Galilee-Belfer}\]
SAPC Members:
Theodore Tong, Pharmacy, CHAIR (6/11-5/15)
Cheryl Cuillier, University Libraries-Research & Learning (6/14-5/15)
Amy Fountain, Linguistics (6/14-5/15)
Lauri Macmillan Johnson, School of Architecture/Landscape Architecture (7/10-5/15)
A. Tim Jull, Geosciences (7/10-5/15)
S. Mae Smith, Disability/Psychoeducational Studies (6/11-5/15)
Joey Steigerwald, ASUA (8/14-5/15)
Jeff Stone, Psychology (6/14-5/15)
Kendal Washington White, Dean of Students, ex-officio (8/09-)

Committee actions:
The committee met on January 12, 2015 during the 2014-2015 academic year to review the Faculty Senate Bylaws for Student Affairs Policy Committee (SAPC) and the need for updating language and revising provisions to reflect current status. Recommendations for rewording, updating and revising the Bylaws specific for student affairs policy were drafted and forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee for review and consideration.

Dean of Students, Kendal Washington White updated SAPC members on current interests regarding: 1) institutional oversight for campus diversity and inclusion; 2) status of the Ombuds program; and 3) progress with Title IX compliance. Topics and matters for prospective (@ 2015-2016) SAPC attention and consideration were identified.

Respectfully submitted,

Theodore Tong

Theodore Tong,
Chair, SAPC
University Committee for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues
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Membership:

Dr. Susan Shaw, Anthropology CHAIR (1/09-5/15)
Dr. Paloma Beamer, Community/Environment/Policy (5/11-5/15)
Mr. William Box, ASUA (8/14-5/15)
Mr. Jim Collins, GPSC (6/11-5/15)
Mary Carol Combs, Teaching, Learning & Sociocultural Studies (6/14-5/17)
Dr. Jennifer Croissant, Gender/Women’s Studies (2/11-5/15)
Dr. Suzanne Dovi, Gov't & Public Policy (6/14-5/16)
Ms. Carolyn Trowbridge, Community Member (1/10-5/16)
Dr. Marv Waterstone, Geography (1/09-1/15)
Ramin Yadegari, Plant Sciences (1/13-5/16)

Charge of the Committee

The University of Arizona bears a responsibility to exercise leadership in labor and human rights matters. To this end, the University Committee for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues strives to ensure that fundamental labor and human rights, particularly those articulated in the April 30, 1999 Commitments Relating to Sweatshops, are implemented by University licensees.

a. The committee makes recommendations to the President regarding fundamental labor and human rights issues including codes of conduct for licensees, monitoring of licensees, efforts to improve licensee compliance, and relations with non-compliant licensees.

b. The committee is also charged with educating the University community and the broader public about these issues.

Summary of Activities 2014-2015

The committee met two times during the 2014-2015 year.

Due to problems with timely deliveries and their inability to meet royalty payments described in our previous annual report, the Committee is no longer promoting Alta Gracia apparel in the ASUA Bookstores. Alta Gracia is a sweatshop-free factory in the Dominican Republic that produces an apparel line of university logo goods carried at over 400 colleges and universities. Allixandra (Alixie) Holcomb Gustafson, with the University Relations Department, continues to monitor Alta Gracia performance through the Fair Labor Association (FLA) and the Worker Rights Consortium (WRC).
Most of the committee’s work this year focused on the development of a university-wide code of conduct to guide university contracts and purchase. The committee feels a policy addressing a Code of Conduct for UA contractors and vendors should be in place and readily available to all vendors so that issues do not need to be addressed on a case by case basis after a University stakeholder complains that an entity doing business with UA does not uphold the UA missions and values. This policy started during President Shelton’s tenure and progressed through Interim President Gene Sander’s time with positive feedback from both Presidents. The committee had been working with Ted Nasser, Director of Procurement and Contracting Services, and Stephanie Rosenberg, from the Office of the General Counsel. The committee has finalized the language of the code of conduct, met with Stephanie Rosenberg in February 2015 to work towards agreement and resolved questions regarding wording. Previously, the committee met with Wanda Howell, former Chair of the Faculty and Robert Mitchell, former Vice Chair of the Faculty, to seek input and develop a policy champion. The final draft is now in the hands of Laura Todd Johnson (the UA General Counsel), who is conveying it to the UA President. Once that has happened, the next steps going forward are for the committee to meet with Lynn Nadel, current Chair of the Faculty, so that he can present the proposal to the President’s Cabinet as its sponsor, and from there the University Policy on Polices will be followed to final approval and implementation.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Shaw

Dr. Susan Shaw, Chair
UCMLHRI
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
University Committee on Corporate Relations
Faculty Center
1216 E. Mabel St. - PO Box 210456
621-1342 Fax: 621-8844
facultycenter@email.arizona.edu
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UCCR Members:
Mr. Doug Jones, CHAIR, Science/Engineering Library
Dr. Ara Arabyan, Aerospace/Mechanical Engineering
Mr. R.D. Castillo, Tech Launch Arizona
Mr. Fabian Cordova, UA Alumni Association
Dr. Jennifer Croissant, Gender/Women’s Studies
Dr. Indraneel Ghosh, Chemistry & Biochemistry
Ms. Elena Gold, ASUA
Mr. Yan Han, University Library
Ms. Allixandra Holcomb Gustafson, Trademark & Licensing
Mr. Joe Lowney, GPSC
Dr. Paul Sheppard, Tree Ring Laboratory
Ms. Kathy Whisman, Budget Office
Ms. Meg Hagyard, UA Foundation (Advisor to the Committee)
Ms. Stephanie Rosenberg, University Attorney (Advisor to the Committee)

Charge of the The University Committee on Corporate Relations:
The University Committee on Corporate Relations makes recommendations to the President of
the University (or his/her designee, upon request) about potential or changeable relationships
between any part of the University of Arizona and one or more businesses or corporations.
These recommendations will always consider how much any proposed new or altered
relationship accords with -- or violates -- The University of Arizona Policy on Corporate
Relations as approved by the President in a memo to the Chair of the Faculty dated January 29,
1999. This Policy mandates that the committee consider proposals in three areas:

a. Use of the University’s name or symbols by an external entity;
b. Implied University endorsement of a particular service, product, company, individual, or
c. Public display of advertisements or other corporate symbols.

The committee is also charged with recommending modifications to this Policy or proposing
additional policies, so long as its policy-change proposals are approved by the Faculty Senate
before they are recommended to the President.

Committee actions:
The committee met three times this year. In addition, Chair Jones and former Chair Andrew
Silverman met with VP David Allen and RD Castillo from Tech Launch Arizona and VPR Kim
Espy and Associate VPR Neal Armstrong.
No outside issues were brought to the Committee this year for review or consultation. The Committee reviewed and clarified the relationship between UCCR and the University Policy on Corporate Relations which, along with other policies, is being put into a standardized format.

The focus of committee work addressed the role of the UCCR in performing its role ensuring compliance with the University Policy on Corporate Relations in a significantly changed internal University organization and increased activity, as well as a much more comprehensive and rigorous regulatory environment. It seems clear to the committee that the University’s increased emphasis on corporate activity in Tech Launch Arizona, the Office of Research and Discovery, and other units may require a different approach to communication and implementation of the Corporate Relations Policy. To this end, the Committee has sent a request for feedback and suggestions (appended) to University and shared governance leaders on how best to address this issue in the changed environment. The responses will provide next year’s Committee with useful background information to proceed in one or more areas:

- Education with respect to the Corporate Relations Policy and the UCCR
- Options for appropriate levels of communication and interaction with those engaged with corporations
- Possible changes to the structure and organization of the Committee
- Request for the reaffirmation of the Corporate Relations Policy by the President and her designees
- Recommendations for possible modifications to the Policy or additional policies, as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Jones

Doug Jones
Chair, UCCR

Attachment: Request for feedback from University administrators and shared governance leaders.
22 April 2015

David Allen, Vice President, Tech Launch Arizona
Kim Espy, Senior Vice President for Research
Teri Thompson, Senior Vice President University Relations & Chief Marketing Officer
Andrew Comrie, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
Gregg Goldman, Senior Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Financial Officer
James Moore, President and Chief Executive Officer, UA Foundation
Greg Byrne, Vice President and Director of Athletics
Melissa Vito, Senior Vice President, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management
Skip Garcia, Senior Vice President, Health Sciences
Melinda Burke, President, Alumni Association; Vice President, Alumni Relations
Lynn Nadel, Regents Professor, Chair of the Faculty
Zach Brooks & Sarah Netherton GPSC President
Issac Ortega & Manny Felix ASUA President

SUBJECT: University Committee on Corporate Relations (UCCR)

Dear University Leaders,

I am writing to you in my role as Chair of the UCCR, a University-wide shared governance group established in 1999 through an agreement between the Faculty Senate and then-President Likins (attached). The UCCR is codified in the University Faculty Constitution (attached) and is responsible for ensuring University compliance with the University Corporate Relations Policy http://policy.arizona.edu/ethics-and-conduct/corporate-relations-policy (attached).

The Committee recognizes that many significant changes have taken place over the past 16 years internally at the University—as well as in state and federal funding, corporate-university relations* and the regulatory environment—that impact the implementation of the Policy and the ability of the UCCR to ensure compliance. Therefore, the Committee believes it is both necessary and prudent to re-examine the processes, relationships, communication and commitment required to enable the Committee to fulfill its responsibilities and work with other key stakeholders to ensure compliance with the University’s Corporate Relations Policy.

We would like your feedback and suggestions on the following:

1) Efforts by units in your respective areas to ensure awareness of and commitment to assuring that the Corporate Relations Policy is being followed.
2) Ways in which the UCCR can most effectively communicate with and support individuals or units which may be making decisions within the scope of the Corporate Relations Policy. NOTE: The Committee recognizes that its role and limited resources must necessarily address general, high-level implementation issues and policies. However, the Committee—with broad-based, neutral representation—may, and has over the years, conducted investigations and provided recommendations on complex, sometimes sensitive, individual cases. Committee meetings are closed, except by invitation, and explicit guidelines for confidentiality (when required) are part of the UCCR Bylaws.
3) Any additional feedback or suggestions you may have regarding the UCCR, the Corporate Relations Policy or other related issues.
The UCCR will carefully review all feedback received as we consider possible recommendations for changes to the
- University Corporate Relations Policy
- UA Constitution and Bylaws
- UCCR membership, guidelines and activities

Please send all responses to Barb Kuehn bkuehn@email.arizona.edu, at the Faculty Center. We would appreciate your response by May 29, 2015.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Douglas Jones

Douglas Jones, Chair
University Committee on Corporate Relations, on behalf of the UCCR
dejones@email.arizona.edu

*See for example

And the University-Industry Demonstration Partnership of which the UA is a member
http://sites.nationalacademies.org/PGA/uidp/PGA_049074
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UCEC Members:
Pr. Karen Zimmermann, (COFA) (6/12-5/15) CHAIR
Pr. Paul Bennett, (LAW) (6/12-5/15)
Dr. Andrew Lotto, (COS) (6/14-5/17)
Dr. Jean McLain, (CALS) (6/14-5/17)
Dr. Raymond Runyan, (COM) (6/13-5/16)
Ms. Ping Situ, (NON) (6/13-5/16)
Ex-Officio: Dr. Lucinda Rankin, Research Integrity Officer (RIO)
Ex-Officio: Dr. J. D. Garcia, Professor Emeritus, Physics

Mission (from Faculty Constitution, Article V, Section 7)
"The University Committee on Ethics and Commitment shall deal with questions of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative endeavor; conflict of commitment; and facilities misuse; and receive reports from the Research Integrity Officer. In its deliberations it will use the current versions of the University policies on research integrity, professional commitment and proper facilities use."

See also the inquiry function of the UCEC as described in UHAP 2.13.09: "Policy and Procedures for Investigations of Misconduct in Scholarly, Creative and Research Activities."

The committee had no inquiries for the 2014-2015 year.

UCEC will hold its annual meeting in the fall semester to elect its Chair and Vice Chair.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Zimmerman

Karen Zimmermann
Chair, UCEC