

DA: November 14, 2002

TO: All members of the Faculty Senate, SPBAC, and the University Council

FR: The Shared Governance Review Committee (the SGRC)  
Professor Wanda Howell, Chair,  
and the Subcommittee of J. Hancock, J. Hogle and J. Schwarz

RE: The Tracking of Proposals to the Faculty Senate or SPBAC

The University of Arizona is entering a period where very serious decisions will need to be made about focussing for excellence long-term and the consequences of immediate and continuing state budget reductions. Our President and Provost have assured us that all of these decisions will be arrived at after careful and extensive conversations throughout the University, particularly with representative groups, as per the Shared Governance Memorandum of 1997 and the Plan for Extended Shared Governance of 1998. The SGRC wants to make certain that the various proposals and problems we will soon need to discuss are channeled through the appropriate Shared Governance groups, including their appropriate subcommittees in some cases. This message is at least a first *and clarifying* step in that effort.

One question that faces us in processing proposals is: “which group deals with University-wide *academic* proposals that may involve organizational, curricular, student-service, and/or financial changes?” More specifically: “which such proposals should be sent through the *Faculty Senate* (including its standing committees) and which are more appropriate to be evaluated by *SPBAC* (the UA Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee),” both of which are predominantly faculty bodies including elected representatives from the faculty. A general answer is that both groups do have areas of interest in common where both should have a major voice, an example being reorganizations. Still, after carefully rereading sections B and E of the Shared Governance Memorandum and the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty, the SGRC has concluded that the following *types of proposals*, once they reach the University-wide level, should be channeled *first* through these groups (though both may be ultimately involved at different points in time):

**To the Faculty Senate (through the Chair or Vice Chair of the Faculty):**

General Policies & Procedures on the Opening/ Closing / Reorganizing of academic units  
UA Curriculum (incl. addition or deletion of degree programs & Gen. Ed. requirements)  
Personnel Policies (incl. overall UA policies/procedures on faculty employment)  
Research Policies (incl. policies on conflict of interest and research ethics)  
Student Affairs Policy (incl. policies on admissions, financial aid, and tuition)  
Student and Faculty Codes of Conduct  
Faculty and Administrative Salary Policy (incl. policies on salary equity)

The Setting or Resetting of the Academic Calendar  
Policies Governing Official University Catalogs  
Corporate Relations Policy (aided by the University Committee on Corporate Relations)

**To SPBAC (through the SPBAC Chair, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty):**

The Overall University Budget (incl. short-term allocations/reductions, long-term prospects, and decisions involving revenues)  
The University Strategic Plan (incl. partial annual revisions and mid-year adjustments)  
The University Mission Statement and its Elements (as part of the Strategic Plan)  
Principles and Criteria for Prioritization (within both the budget and the Strategic Plan)  
--- incl. criteria for evaluating programs from a planning and budgetary perspective  
Prioritizations and Funding Sources for New University Space (incl. space planning)  
The Measures by which the UA is Assessed (as part of the Strategic Plan)

**Proviso:** In all the above categories, these groups make recommendations to the President or his designees *and* do so within the Arizona Board of Regents (or ABOR) policies governing each of these areas. In certain areas of interest to faculty, such as policies governing Admissions, Tuition and Financial Aid, ABOR has a primary interest that may require first consideration, but these areas still warrant consultation with either SPBAC or the Senate or both.

The SGRC, again, recognizes that there are some areas of overlap between the Senate and SPBAC. Prioritization and reorganization are among these. It is consequently important for both groups to communicate with each other on such matters, at least through elected faculty and others who are members of both. After all, SPBAC is an expanded and more widely representative extension of what once were the General Faculty Committees on Space and on Planning and Budget in the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty.

In general, however, the Senate recommends *policies* that are specifically implemented elsewhere, and SPBAC recommends budget and planning guidelines and arrangements directed at specific financial and organizational results that are worked out elsewhere. Consequently, a proposal for an academic reorganization (for example) must be handled through the policies and procedures established by the Senate (subject to ABOR policy and Presidential approval) but will be evaluated according to SPBAC criteria from a planning and budget point of view (again, towards a decision by the President or his designee within ABOR policies). In these particular matters now facing us more and more, in other words, both groups make recommendations from their different points of view.

In this way, we believe we have clarified where different academic proposals should go in Shared Governance, depending on their nature. Please contact us, through our chair, if you have questions or concerns. If there are uncertainties about where a

proposal goes, this problem should be referred to the Vice Chair of the Faculty, as Chair of the Shared Governance Review Committee.

Cc: Academic Personnel Policy Committee  
Instruction and Curriculum Policy Committee  
Research Policy Committee  
Student Affairs Policy Committee

shgov/2002-03/SPBAC-Senate tracking