



**Shared Governance  
Review Committee**

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 East Mabel Street

PO Box 210456  
Tucson, AZ 85721

Ofc: 520-621-1342  
Fax: 520-621-8844

[facultygovernance.arizona.edu](http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu)

**Shared Governance Review Committee**  
Annual Report 2020-21

**2020-2021 Membership:**

**Faculty**

Melanie Hingle, Vice Chair of the Faculty & SGRC **CHAIR**  
Jessica Summers, Chair of Faculty  
Sabrina Helm, Co-Chair SPBAC  
Diana Liverman, SPBAC Member  
Leila Hudson, Senator  
Paul Gordon, Senator

**Administrators**

Liesl Folks, Provost  
Betsy Cantwell, Senior Vice President, Research, Innovation, and Impact  
Laura Todd Johnson, Senior Vice President for Legal Affairs

**Staff**

Jennifer Lawrence, Chair of Appointed Professionals Advisory Council  
Jeffrey Jones, Chair of Classified Staff Council

**Students**

Shilpita Sen, President, Graduate and Professional Student Council  
Tara Singleton, President, Associated Students of the University of Arizona

**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.

**2020-2021 Summary**

The Committee was reconstituted in Fall 2020 after more than a decade. Members convened five times over the course of AY20-21: December 10, 2020, January 22, 2021, February 18, 2021, March 19, 2021, and April 19, 2021 (see below for activities and agenda). Primary tasks were revisiting (and as needed, revising) the Committee charge, establishing a shared understanding of shared governance, and producing a set of guidelines by which the faculty and administration could agree to work moving

forward (the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), and a proposed Shared Governance (SG) “Playbook,” designed to onboard new colleagues and remind current members of shared governance processes at the University of Arizona).

**December 10, 2020 Agenda:** What we are doing well, what we could be doing better; establishing goals for the group. **Summary of the discussion and next steps:** Members were oriented to the charge of the committee (revised MOU, address health of SG and help solve issues/disputes that arise), history of the group (haven’t met in over a decade) and asked to comment on what was going well at UArizona, and what could be better. Possible goals for the academic year were discussed, including an updated MOU that was acceptable to all constituent groups.

**January 22, 2021 Agenda:** Member beliefs & perspectives about shared governance. **Summary of the discussion and next steps:** A member sent out a brief survey to other members to solicit opinions / beliefs about SG, to use the resultant data as a conversation piece. Members from one constituent group did not complete the survey but did participate in the discussion. Members expressed views of Senate including “ceremonial”, “privileged”, and had the most “power” of all SG groups. Positive transformation of another SG group—SPBAC— was noted by several members, as was the differences between SPBAC and Senate (both positive and negative). The idea of a “University Senate” (inclusive of staff, student issues) was discussed, with most agreeing that this might be better served as another group (or even by SGRC) and not taking away from what is already in place. It was suggested that members look at other SG models to take away best practices; members made suggestions and the list was circulated prior to the next meeting (Feb).

**February 18, 2021 Agenda:** What are big ideas from the MOU. Our definition of SG. Other models of SG around the U.S. **Summary of the discussion and next steps:** Members discussed the focus on faculty (since this is the focus of the original committee, and the MOU) but emphasized the importance of inclusivity, especially with regard to staff and students. The MOU was discussed as only one aspect of the Committee’s charge, and that the members could be tasked with solving problems, and /or suggesting a “playbook” by which new and returning members of SG would understand everyone’s roles. The importance of Committee work that is built up was also emphasized, including a more accessible website / repository. The discussion turned to the definition of shared governance, of which members had diverging and diverse perspectives – e.g., some thought SG was to “counterbalance managerial power”, and/or a “check and balance system”, while others believed “everyone at UA has responsibilities and should be accountable for their decisions and roles” and while not everyone can participate in every meeting, there should be clear mechanisms for soliciting feedback and sharing input.

**March 19, 2021 Agenda:** Indicators of a functioning SG system – quantitative and qualitative indicators. Pre-read/conversation piece: [“Implementing Shared Governance at the University of Arizona.”](#) **Summary of the discussion and next steps:** Members had a robust discussion about the way in which information is currently shared, and the timing of the sharing, and how this needs to change; additional conversation focused on who among the faculty & other constituent groups need to be ‘at the table’ for discussion and decisions. One member suggested a shared governance ‘dashboard’, which would focus on the guiding principles of shared governance and should reflect measurable indicators of what is / is not working. The discussion turned to aspects of the revised MOU (August 2020 version), which were not acceptable to all SGRC members and constituent groups. In particular, the 2020 MOU proposed expansion of the SG groups to include C11 (which is a general faculty committee representing the faculty, and not explicitly listed in the Constitution & Bylaws as a SG group) and lacked measurable

indicators of when SG was functioning/not functioning. A member offered to revise the draft MOU with an eye to shortening / making more concise and sent out to the group for considering in between the March and April meeting.

**April 19, 2021 Agenda:** Inclusion of staff and student constituent groups; looking ahead to AY21-22.

**Summary of the discussion and next steps:** Members reviewed the draft MOU (and heard the feedback of 3 additional members) which one member disaggregated into 2 documents, a set of “Guiding Principles” (enduring, revised infrequently) and an “Implementation Plan” (operationalizing SG principles, revisited annually). Members were generally accepting of the new format and saw value in the separation of principles from operationalization of the principles; however, some of the content was debated, specifically, the degree to which SPBAC was involved in strategy & planning, and non-trivial debate over the meaning of words in the document. Members agreed to move forward to complete a draft by end of this AY, with a plan to develop the implementation plan this fall when we convene again.

New members will rotate on to this committee over the summer according to the bylaws and membership requirements for this Committee. Quarterly meetings are planned for AY21-22.

Respectfully submitted,



Melanie Hingle, PhD, MPH, RDN  
Vice Chair of the Faculty 2020-22  
Chair, Shared Governance Review Committee 2