Summary of the UA Faculty Senate meeting on Monday, April 4, 2016
Approved Minutes of previous meetings, plus agenda, reports from Faculty Officers, ASUA, GPSC, APAC and the Provost and President are available at: http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu

REPORT BY PROVOST COMRIE
- Interviews for Chief Diversity Officer took place with leadership, faculty and students.
- The Veterinary Medicine accreditation should be received by the end of March 2016.
- Draft of ABOR Quality Markers for student success have been developed and are on the April ABOR meeting agenda. Among the proposals is a survey for graduating seniors to gauge their satisfaction with their quality of education. 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 has been requested by April 15, 2016.
- Promotion & Tenure and Continuing Status & Promotion 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.

REPORT FROM PRESIDENT HART
- 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 of the newly formed, broad-based Diversity Task Force: Senator Javier Duran, Tannya Gaxiola and Bryan Carter.
- Hart has asked Senior Vice President for Business Affairs and Chief Financial Officer Gregg Goldman to begin an immediate study on campus childcare options (subsidies, or a campus facility).
- 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 are in agreement that a plan for increasing faculty salaries is critical, and that such increases should be considered in light of a multi-year plan.

ACTION ITEM: DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON THE OPEN ACCESS POLICY
After discussion, Faculty Senate approved the Open Access Policy. http://new.library.arizona.edu/research/open-access/policy

DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY HANDBOOK FOR APPOINTED PERSONNEL (UHAP) – VICE PROVOST TOM MILLER
Senators discussed proposed changes including clarified language regarding non-tenure track faculty promotion and annual reviews and, for all faculty, provisions pertaining to professional misconduct in annual reviews. Also clarified: who receives 5th Year Administrative reviews. Senators will vote on these at the May meeting. http://policy.arizona.edu/faculty-affairs-and-academics/proposed-revisions-university-handbook-appointed-personnel
ACTION ITEM: NON-CONSENT AGENDA MAJOR UNIVERSITY CREDIT POLICY – CHAIR OF UNDERGRADUATE COUNSEL, DENNIS RAY
Approved by Faculty Senate
http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/sites/facgov/files/major_university_credit_policy_3-1-16.pdf

OPEN SESSION
Senator M. Witte addressed the Senate regarding the following:
- Update on her submission of two competitive renewals within the three-day window requirement from Sponsored Projects.
- Update on cluster hires is a matter of discussion in the Committee of Eleven.
- Consolidating core facilities from formerly shared instrument and shared faculty services. Shared areas are being turned into service areas.
- Concerns that undergraduate research grants that had previously gone out to thirty students from the Vice President for Research and Discovery Office were eliminated, though the hope is that the Honors College will find a way to continue this resource.
- Witte asked for the vote count on the election for Committee of Eleven membership, as per her recollection such used to be published in the Wildcat. She reminded Senators that faculty vote counts are essential to the democratic process.

Looking ahead: Non-tenure track faculty – MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC NON-TENURE TRACK committee
The Non-tenure track ad hoc committee revisited the proposal to consider unifying and expanding active participation in shared governance by expanding the definition of general faculty in the Constitution. Under the new definition, the number of years of service to the institution is the key variable, not whether or not the contract status is multi-year (with the latter being the current demarker of eligibility).

Compiled table discussion comments from the previous Senate meeting were presented.

To the first question: “What are the current practices in your units regarding non-tenure track faculty participation in shared governance and are those practices effective?” responses were that in multiple units, non-tenure track faculty had voting privileges and serve on committees as appropriate. 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.

To the second question: “What are the implications of including non-tenured track faculty as members of the General Faculty?” the benefits discussed included 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.
Three areas of concern were noted: vision, power, and protections.

Relative to **vision**: (a) Do non-tenure track faculty have the experience or the investment to focus on matters of long-term vision? (b) 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? (c) 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.

Relative to **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?

Relative to **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.

Brewer went through the proposal to review the number of non-tenure-eligible faculty who would be affected by the new definitions: approximately 500 have been in their positions for four out of the last six years and would therefore have voting rights at the institutional level with a change in definitions. He also reviewed the numbers of faculty under the current definition: approximately 1600 Tenured/Tenure Eligible faculty, 200 Continuing Status/Continuing Eligible Professionals, and approximately 190 non-tenure-eligible faculty holding multi-year contracts.

Brewer also reminded Senators that units and colleges would continue to have flexibility regarding participation in voting and committee service at the local levels. He also noted that many of the UA’s peer institutions include non-tenure-eligible faculty in major roles like Senate and Chairs of the Faculty.

The non-tenure-eligible faculty inclusion in the Constitution will be revisited and voted on at the May Senate meeting.