REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: The Faculty Officers  http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/

DATE: October 7, 2019

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- Faculty Leadership bring a set of proposed revisions to the Memorandum of Understanding on Shared Governance for Senate discussion. The revisions are intended as reorganization for readability, utility, and currency. Your input is welcome!
- Chair Summers brings a proposal to today's meeting to create a Senate Standing Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. This proposal represents work undertaken last year including a series of day long community forums on Gender and Equity. More on this can be found at the end of this report, and on today's agenda.
- Vice Chair Brewer brings a proposal to today's meeting to alert Senate to several issues around the Census of the General Faculty, and the application of the Constitution's definitions to faculty with the titles 'Global Lecturer' and 'Global Professor'. In the latter case, we report the outcome of discussion by the Committee on Faculty Membership. More on this can be found at the end of this report, and on today's agenda.
- Senate ad-Hoc committee on Career Track Faculty co-chairs Bill Neumann and Secretary Fountain are working with the Senate ad Hoc Committee on Career Track faculty to investigate ways in which Career Track faculty titles are used by various units on campus.

GOALS:

- 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.
- 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.
- Continue to assist in the development, approval and implementation of changes to UHAP Chapter 7.
- 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.

BACKGROUNDERS

The following are composed by Secretary Fountain. Any errors or omissions are her responsibility.
1. Revisiting the Memorandum of Understanding on Shared Governance

**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 is signed by the current holders of those titles.

**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 bring the current draft to Senate to ask for contributions and feedback from Senate, and to encourage Senators to discuss this document with their constituents and bring additional insights.

2. Proposal for a new Senate Standing Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI)

**Why is this being proposed?** Last year, Chair Summers put together a series of Gender and Equity Town Halls that explored these issues. As a consequence of that process, Summers and several faculty members determined that it would be useful to establish a Faculty committee that could explore and address issues of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, and report to the Senate on these topics.

**Why now?** There are a number of pressing concerns around Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at the UA, and the UA landscape around organizational structures, policies and practices is undergoing significant change. The Faculty voice needs to be strongly included in this process, but there is not yet a stable, persistent, Faculty committee to contribute to the dialog.

**Why a Senate Standing Committee in particular?** University-wide shared governance includes three main types of standing Committees:

- **General Faculty Committees** (i.e. Committee of Eleven, Constitution and Bylaws Committee...). These Committees specialize in particular areas and carry out much of the day-to-day work of the General Faculty. There are currently 10 General Faculty Committees.
- **University Committees with Shared Governance Participation** (i.e. Undergraduate Council, University-Wide General Education Committee). These committees provide opportunities for faculty, staff, students and administrators to participate, appropriate to their special knowledge and expertise, in decisions affecting the institution. There are currently 7 University Committees with Shared Governance Participation.
- **Senate Standing Committees** (Academic Personnel Policy Committee, Student Affairs Policy Committee, Research Policy Committee, and Senate Executive Committee). Each Faculty Senate standing committee, except the Executive Committee, consist of seven General Faculty
members, a majority of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate. Student members of standing committees shall be nominated by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and by the Graduate and Professional Student Council. Members of standing committees shall serve one-year terms. All action items that are forwarded by the Faculty Senate standing committees come to the Faculty Senate as a seconded motion.

The Senate Standing Committee structure seems to the proposers to be the most appropriate one for the newly proposed group. Senate Standing Committees are more closely connected to Senate than other committees, a majority of faculty members of these committees must be Senators. These committees provide regular reports to Senate, and (like other committees) they are able to bring proposals to Senate as seconded motions.

The PowerPoint that accompanies the agenda item for this discussion provides additional information about who is proposing the Committee, and why.

If the Senate approves this proposal, the Bylaws change will go to a vote of the General Faculty in the Spring.

3. Considerations around the application of the Constitutional definitions of 'General Faculty' to the titles 'Global Lecturer' and 'Global Professor'

Why is this coming to Senate? Senate should be advised about the appearance of these titles, and their relationship to the criteria for membership in the General Faculty.

What has happened so far? Vice Chair Brewer noticed the appearance of these two faculty titles in the UAccess Census of the General Faculty. He discovered that they are being used for faculty members in UA Global whose terms of employment raised questions about whether or not they meet the criteria established in the Faculty Constitution for membership in the General Faculty. Faculty leadership brought the issue to the attention of the Committee on Faculty Membership. After discussion, the Committee determined that application of the current Constitution's definition of 'General Faculty', and the Senate ratified Guiding Principles on the inclusion of DCCs (non-UA employees), to these titles leads us to determine that, under current practices, these faculty members are not eligible to be members of the General Faculty. One reason for this was that their terms of employment are identical to those for adjuncts and visiting faculty (that mean they cannot be promoted, do not get annual reviews, and are not eligible for 90-day notices of nonrenewal).

What are some possible next steps? It might be appropriate to review the Constitutions' definitions to clarify the position of faculty with the 'global' modifier. Senate may wish to learn more about how and why these titles are being used in UA Global.

The materials provided with this agenda item provide further background and relevant information around this topic.
OBJECTIVE

- The objective of the Spring 2019 Praxis Workshops at the University of Arizona was to unpack the findings of the Occupational Health Index (OHI) Survey administered to faculty and staff in Fall 2018 (n =4,209, 33% response rate); see link for OHI results: [https://strategicplan.arizona.edu/strategic-plan-implementation](https://strategicplan.arizona.edu/strategic-plan-implementation).
- Our process was informed by the Effective Academic Governance report derived from the Harvard COACHE survey (Wellundemo & Mathews, 2015). The workshops sought to build consensus around action areas to create our best work environment. Praxis workshops results summarized here used the following procedures:
  1. Participants were given the OHI results data pack;
  2. Individuals reflected on UA strengths, weaknesses, climate, and measurement strategy. These were anonymously collected;
  3. Brief presentation was given on workshop goals and OHI key findings;
  4. Gallery walk for OHI findings provide group reflection;
  5. Individuals chose which OHI outcome they wanted to discuss further;
  6. Small group discussion on focused topics identified action steps; and
  7. Large group discussion solicited consensus for shared action steps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Representation</th>
<th>Staff Representation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deans or Associate Deans</td>
<td>Program Coordinators 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/Department Head/Vice</td>
<td>Director/Assistant Director 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Administration Staff 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Academic Advising 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Business/ Business Manager 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Practice</td>
<td>Executive/Admin Assistants 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors of Practice</td>
<td>Budget 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty</td>
<td>Researcher/Research Specialist 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>IT 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>Career Educator 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td>Human Resources 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Operating Staff 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Individual Positions 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total 207</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IN THEIR OWN WORDS, FACULTY AND STAFF DESCRIBED UA

**UA Strengths**
- strong teaching reputation
- supportive and caring community
- faculty and students praised
- research opportunities
- brand of the faculty
- dedicated faculty
- excellent salary
- professional development
- strong management

**UA Current Work Environment**
- low communication
- siloed leadership
- leadership not visible
- political climate
- strong management

**UA Weaknesses**
- low morale
- low communication
- low trust
- low engagement
- support from leadership
- clear goals
SUMMARY OF FEEDBACK ON OHI RESULTS BY OUTCOMES

Participants were asked to reflect on OHI results by outcome with the following prompts:
“Do you agree with the findings, why/why not? Help us focus the issue. Why does this issue occur?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>KEY FEEDBACK THEMES</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT QUOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>There is a need for more role clarity and title clarity in order to address inconsistency in process for performance reviews, and incentives. There is a need for merit-driven accountability.</td>
<td>“Accountability comes from excellent leadership, so leadership development is essential.” “High performing faculty/staff get more responsibility, but not more help or $.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capabilities</td>
<td>UA has existing tools, capabilities, and talent, but is missing cohesion across units and documentation of best practices.</td>
<td>“We have abundant people capabilities in all areas but we are not good at pulling them together/ coordinating to make the sum stronger than the parts.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination &amp; Control</td>
<td>There are silos between units and across colleges. There is a need for an improved system for performance reviews and best practices.</td>
<td>“We do not include strategic items on performance evaluation.” “Each dept/college has different performance evaluation approach - hard to harmonize with goals.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direction</td>
<td>There is a lack of a central vision and strategic direction across all campuses.</td>
<td>“Staff often don’t get to see the big picture in how their program fits into UA. Staff are often left out of decision-making at the department level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Orientation</td>
<td>We need to continuously improve partnerships with indigenous communities, local community members, and local small businesses. Better tracking and communication is needed.</td>
<td>“We need to better communicate with the public about the amazing things happening here.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; Learning</td>
<td>Units and teams need to adapt to change and update policies and procedures to be consistent with the strategic plan.</td>
<td>“More incentives/rewards for innovation might spur breaking out of the business as usual mode.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>There is a greater need for diversity and equity in UA leadership. There is need for role-clarity and ongoing leadership training.</td>
<td>“Lack of transparency with staff as to why policies are in place/made/changed.” “Leaders in my college show concern for our welfare.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation &amp; Work Environment</td>
<td>Faculty and staff find their work inherently motivational; however, there are salary disparities and lack of incentives. There is a need for creative solutions to support employees.</td>
<td>“Most people are enthusiastic about their jobs. I feel a keen sense of teamwork in my job.” “Employees often seem uncomfortable speaking up about concerns.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOW SHOULD WE MEASURE WORK ENVIRONMENT IN THE FUTURE?

When asked about the best method to assess work environment in the future, the largest percentage of respondents recommended to create our own UA survey.

PARTICIPANTS IDENTIFIED ADDITIONAL OUTCOMES NOT MEASURED BY THE OHI

- Pay equity was mentioned several times at different sessions as something that needs to be addressed.
- Too much decentralization was mentioned several times with a preference for more centralization of certain processes that can improve financial processes and support, uniformity, oversight, IT and infrastructure; and in certain cases may help reduce confusion for students.
WHICH OHI OUTCOMES WERE CHOSEN MOST OFTEN BY PARTICIPANTS FOR DISCUSSION TO IDENTIFY ACTION STEPS TO IMPROVE, BUILD OR SUSTAIN?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Motivation &amp; Work Environment</th>
<th>Capability</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>External Orientation</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Coordination &amp; Control</th>
<th>Innovation &amp; Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACTION STEPS IDENTIFIED BY PARTICIPANTS TO BUILD, IMPROVE OR SUSTAIN OUR BEST WORK ENVIRONMENT

ACCOUNTABILITY and LEADERSHIP
- Do annual reviews for all faculty and staff. Communicate clearer expectations during annual reviews. Link results to incentives. Implement more merit raises, coaching, and focus on soft skills. Use the career conversations tool for faculty.
- Set rubrics and accountability to update guidelines and processes within units every 3-5 years.
- Create safe spaces for accountability conversations, implement more frequent high-yield reviews, and provide incentives that are connected to annual reviews.
- Complete more frequent (possibly annual) reviews of Deans and administrators that include the 360 assessment.
- Accountability messages need to come from our leaders with more transparency.

MOTIVATION/WORK ENVIRONMENT and CAPABILITIES
- Allocate time on-the-job for professional development and management training. Implement more training for leaders. Offer more online trainings and advanced modules for existing trainings.
- Improve work environment for career-track faculty through bylaw inclusivity, more recognition, better communication with this group, and more mentoring.
- Once talent is acquired there is a need for ongoing coaching and mentoring. A structured mentoring program with an online match system was suggested, particularly for faculty.
- More frequent internal hiring, and better hiring packages for internal candidates, are needed.

DIRECTION
- Communicate one clear succinct mission and vision statement across all UA campuses, especially when onboarding new faculty and staff. Help employees see their role in the strategic plan implementation.
- Establish clear communication at the department-level and team-level. Provide early communication with all team members when there are changes in policies, rules, or guidelines.
- Communicate priority for innovation and clear paths for innovation.
- Increase opportunities for employee involvement through faculty shared governance, gather more early input from staff, and increase Zoom access at meetings (especially to include UA South and UA Phoenix).
- Improve community engagement and partnerships especially those with marginalized and vulnerable populations.

BRINGING OUR UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY TOGETHER
- Implement regular town halls to communicate updates and changes at the college or university level. This is also an opportunity to receive input.
- Create University-level events/conferences around strategic plan initiatives and to get to know people, programs, and research across campus. This will help break down silos.
- Hold joint faculty and staff meetings at team-level and unit-level.
- Promote and post better signage for UA South visibility and to feel included with broader UA community.
- “Promote more contagious enthusiasm.”
IN SUMMARY

Participants were pleased to be involved in learning about and interpreting the OHI results. We were able to reach a wide range of faculty and staff in a short time period. The process of the workshops was effective in obtaining significant feedback within a one-hour session. Thanks to everyone’s input, we have developed action plans to move forward with our initiative.

Praxis workshops provided much greater insight and clarification beyond survey findings. The majority of respondents agreed with the key findings from the OHI; however, they also identified new topics and specific action steps. Several key action steps indicated in the Praxis workshops overlapped with action steps identified by UA senior leaders: 1) improve strategic clarity with communication about mission and values; 2) Improve/Implement people performance review; 3) Enhance operational management with improved metrics and processes; 4) Better role clarity. Additionally, Praxis workshops identified more action steps that can easily be implemented at the unit level as well as recommendations for leaders related to community involvement, communication, and ideas to break down silos and bring the university community together.

WE INVITE FACULTY AND STAFF TO HELP IMPLEMENT ACTION STEPS

In the next year 2019-2020, our Initiative will lead work with the following action taskforces. We anticipate that these taskforces will meet twice per month for one hour and will set concrete goals to complete in the next year.

Some taskforces may have additional prep work required outside of the meeting time. Approximately 10 slots per taskforce will be available. **If you are interested please sign up here.**

1. **UA Best Work Environment Internal Assessment Taskforce**
   a. The goal of this taskforce is to review existing surveys and to develop a new instrument to use on an annual basis to track UA’s best work environment. Faculty and staff are invited to participate.

2. **Annual Review and Pay Equity Best Practices Taskforce for Faculty**
   a. The goal of this taskforce is to research current best practices for annual review and pay equity of faculty and provide recommendations to the Faculty Senate and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Faculty are invited to participate. (Note: Human Resources is working on addressing staff pay equity best practices through UCAP.)

3. **Career Conversation Taskforce for Staff**
   a. The goal of this taskforce is to provide recommendations about how to ensure that all staff receive performance evaluations. Faculty and staff are invited to participate.

4. **Motivation/Work Environment and Leadership Taskforce**
   a. The goal of this taskforce is to identify key areas to focus on in the next year to sustain and grow employee talent and motivation, opportunities for leadership development, and bringing our university community together. Faculty and staff are invited to participate.

5. **Fostering a Respectful Workplace Taskforce**
   a. The goal of this taskforce is to identify best practices and reduce current unprofessional workplace conduct such as discrimination, sexual harassment, bullying, etc. Faculty and staff are invited to participate.

**This report was prepared by**

Andrea Romero, PhD, Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, University of Arizona
Sara Knepper, MA, Director of Academic Advising, University of Arizona College of Education
Michelle Rascon-Cañales, MS, LMSW, PhD Student, University of Arizona School of Anthropology

**Under the auspices of**
The Office of Strategic Plan Implementation
Initiative 5.1A: Our Best Work Environment
(previously named Reinforcing Our Cultural Aspirations)