REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: The Faculty Officers [http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/](http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/)

DATE: December 2, 2019

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- Faculty leadership has collaborated with the proposers of the Graduate Faculty policy to address concerns expressed by Senate while moving forward key components of the policy that we believe share broad support (for example, providing support for graduate students who experience difficulties with faculty on their committees). We will continue to keep Senate involved in any discussions moving forward.
- As part of the ABOR meetings, UA Faculty Leadership joined with peers from the other State Universities in the Arizona Faculty Council to prepare a report to ABOR. Shirley Rose, chair of the Faculty at Arizona State University, is chair of AFC, and delivered the report to the Regents.
- Leadership has engaged in informal and collaborative discussion with the provost and Regent Duvall to share information and concerns about matters relating to shared governance.
- Vote codes have been created for the new College of Applied Sciences and the College of Veterinary Medicine and faculty are having their vote codes changed to the correct college. A senate representative for the College of Applied Sciences will be elected in the spring. Once there is a critical mass of faculty from Vet Med (there is currently only one member of the General Faculty – the Dean), a representative will be elected for that college.
- Worked to improve the transparency and effectiveness of the process by which various proposals come to the Senate. This includes providing more information about rationales, history, and motivations for these proposals.

GOALS:

- In consultation with Provost Folks, we will be assisting, with the help of Senate, in the formation of an *ad hoc* committee to advise on streamlining administrative processes surrounding curriculum and academic policy.
- Convene the Committee on Faculty Membership to begin a review relating to the various situations in which Designated Campus Colleagues (DCCs) participate in the Faculty, to ensure that guidelines for inclusion in the General Faculty are correct and appropriate. Committee on Faculty Membership recommendations would then be forwarded to Senate for discussion and eventual action.
- Ensure that initiatives from the Strategic Planning process are proceeding in a manner consistent with the principles of shared governance at the University of Arizona.
- Mobilize faculty who do not participate in shared governance for input on issues of shared governance.
- Broker critical relationships between the faculty and administration in an effort to open channels for transparency in how we work collaboratively at the University.
- Develop a Qualtrics tool (drawing on our current voting system and UAccess Analytics) that will allow individuals not picked up by the Census to petition the Committee on Faculty Membership for inclusion. The tool will automatically draw pertinent data on petitioners from UAccess and elicit any other necessary information through a survey.
BACKGROUNDER

The following is composed by Secretary Fountain. Any errors or omissions are her responsibility.

1. A Request

The Proposal for a new Senate Standing Committee (DEI) has been unanimously approved by Senate, and will therefore appear on the ballot for the General Election in the Spring. Approval requires a change to the Bylaws, as marked-up here:

The Ballot must provide a rationale for the proposal, as well as ‘pro’ and ‘con’ statements. Our typical process for this is that the Secretary of the Faculty creates those statements.

In order to ensure that the ballot language is clear, accurate and fair, Amy is asking for the assistance of Senators in the drafting of the pro and con language. If you are willing to help in the drafting or review of proposed ballot pro and con language, please contact Amy (avf@email.arizona.edu).

2. Revisiting the Memorandum of Understanding on Shared Governance (Second Review)

Why is this being proposed? The current MOU was passed by Faculty Senate in 2005. In the intervening years, a number of organizational structures and policies have changed, and the landscape in which we are all working has also changed. Vice-Chair Brewer identified the opportunity for an update in the run up to this Academic Year, in light of the fact that there would be a new Provost. Whenever there is a change in President, Provost, and/or Chair or Vice-Chair of the Faculty, the MOU should be (re-) signed.

Why now? Because changes in leadership require a new signing of the MOU.

What's been the process so far? Officers shared our intent to begin work on this in our Officers' Report at last Senate. Since then we have benefitted from contributions from and discussion by the Chair of the Committee of Eleven, the Faculty co-Chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee, and the Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, as well as from the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. We brought a previous draft to Senate to ask for contributions and feedback from Senate. Senate asked for a red-line version, and recommended some changes for discussion, and that was provided in November. We return with a further revised red-line version of the draft for discussion today.