MEMORANDUM
January 29, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Bobbi McKean, Secretary and Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee
SUBJECT: Summary and Impact Statement of Proposed Changes to Bylaws and Constitution of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee proposes several changes to both the Constitution and Bylaws. We believe these changes to our guiding documents serve three purposes. One, the changes clarify the roles and responsibilities of Faculty Senate by aligning the definition and process for membership and descriptions of committees with current practice; two, the changes more accurately describe the voting processes currently used; and three, an addition to the Constitution will allow for more flexibility by allowing for administrative and clerical updates to be done in either document without a vote of the General Faculty. Along with the proposed changes, we have also taken the opportunity to edit the document with regards to punctuation and formatting; minor word changes for clarity, not content; and title changes to reflect current University titles. This summary provides an overview of the changes. A working copy of the proposed revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws is provided with each change (additions and/or deletions) highlighted in yellow for your reference.

Summary of Proposed Changes to Bylaws

Membership (Article I)
Improvements in Technology – Changes to reflect technological advances that no longer require a faculty “census” to be taken, but only a “roster” to be produced (from UAccess).

Committee on Elections and Election Procedures (Article IV)
Addition of language to make clear that, while the Committee on Committees is charged to generate names for elections or nominations for appointments (by others) to committees or other shared governance work through their annual survey of interest in shared governance, any member of the General Faculty may also suggest names or nominate themselves for these elections or appointments. This reflects current practice and widens the pool of potential members. This additional language occurs throughout wherever Committee on Committees is indicated.

1. Online Voting – Changes to reflect the current practice of online (rather than print) elections. (Section 2 d and f)

Committees
Each Committee Chair was asked to review the wording on their Committee and recommend any changes. All changes were minor except for the following:
General Faculty Standing Committees: Membership and Terms (Article V)

1. Eliminate the Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning – SPBAC, and the faculty elected to serve on SPBAC fulfill the role this committee was intended to fill. The committee has not independently met or carried out any work for many years. (Section 4)

University-Wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation (Article VI Section 7 a, b, c)

1. Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC)
   a. Added a provision for appointment of a co-chair where the co-chair’s vote is shared.
   b. Expanded ex officio membership from ten to twelve to reflect changes in University infrastructure. The nine members remain from the same offices (albeit with adjusted titles in five cases to reflect actual titles), with one change: the committee is adding Associate Vice President, Institutional Analysis (Jim Florian’s position) for that vacated by Ed Frisch (Associate Vice President of Academic Resources, Planning and Management); the tenth title, Special Advisor to the President for Diversity and Inclusion, is removed. *Please note that while the title Special Advisor to the President for Diversity and Inclusion is deleted because it’s not a current UA title, SPBAC continues to be committed to diversity and inclusion and will be working with the Diversity Coordinating Council and others on campus to identify future SPBAC member possibilities.
   c. Three new ex officio members are proposed:
      i. Vice Provost for Digital Learning Student Engagement Associate/Vice President Student Affairs Enrollment Management (Vincent Del Casino), to reflect the separation of the online learning from the office of Global Initiatives;
      ii. Senior Vice President for University Relations (Teri Thompson), to better integrate university relations and SPBAC’s work, and
      iii. Vice President for Strategic Planning & Analysis (Barbara Bryson), to ensure alignment between the work that office is conducting and SPBAC’s charge.

Faculty Senate Standing Committees (Article VIII)

1. Faculty Senate Standing Committees: Membership and Terms (Section 4):
   Revised the language to allow members to continue after three one-year renewable terms without going off for one year.
2. Addition of the chair of the Committee of Eleven when the chair is not an elected member of Faculty Senate. (Section 2 a.)
3. **APAC on Senate Exec** - Added a member of APAC as *ex-officio* to the Senate Executive Committee (to reflect the strategic importance of closer shared governance ties with year-to-year NTT faculty and other non-faculty appointed professionals). (Section 4 a.)

4. **Student Affairs Policy Committee** – Changes to the wording to update matter and action item considerations as well as titles. Eliminated membership of chair on the Campus Advisory Council which no longer exists. (Section 4 d.)

**Proposed Timeline**

February 2, 2015   Introduction of proposed changes to Faculty Senate  
March 2, 2015    Faculty Senate vote on proposed changes  
March 30 – April 10   If approved, placed on the Spring 2015 General Election ballot
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ARTICLE I
Membership

Section 1. Membership in the General Faculty is as defined in Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution.

Section 2. Each year the Committee on Faculty Membership shall conduct and publish a census roster of the General Faculty to maintain accurate voting rolls.

ARTICLE II
Officers

Section 1. The officers of the General Faculty shall consist of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary as provided for under Article III of the Constitution of the General Faculty.

Section 2. The Parliamentarian, who shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Chair of the Faculty, shall serve the needs of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate.

Section 3. The representatives to the Arizona Faculties Council shall be the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.

ARTICLE III
Meetings

Section 1. Written petitions of five percent (5%) or one hundred (100) members of the General Faculty, whichever is smaller, shall be sufficient to call a Meeting of the General Faculty. Such petition, presented to the Chair of the Faculty, shall state the purpose(s) of the intended meeting.

Section 2. Notice of Meetings. Notice shall be given at least one week in advance of any meeting, and shall contain a copy of any substantive proposal to be presented.

Section 3. Meetings of the General Faculty shall be open to the public except when that body decides to meet in executive session.

Section 4. Methods of Voting.

a. At meetings of the General Faculty, voting shall be by *viva voce*, by a show of hands, by a rising vote, or by ballot, as decided by the presiding officer, provided, however, that it shall always be in order to move for a vote by ballot.

b. By a majority vote at a meeting of the General Faculty the pending action may be subject to a mail or electronic ballot by the General Faculty.

ARTICLE IV
Committee on Elections and Election Procedures

The General Faculty Standing Committee on Elections shall consist of three members of the General Faculty appointed by the Chair of the Faculty, after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, from among candidates recommended by the Committee on Committees, or by other members of the General Faculty, for three-year staggered terms. The committee shall elect its chair from those of its members who have served at least one year on the committee, and shall follow these procedures: Candidates for any positions elected by the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate shall provide a biographical statement.

Section 1. Nomination of candidates. Candidates for elective office shall be nominated by petitions issued and accepted by the committee as follows:

a. Candidates for Chair of the Faculty, Vice Chair of the Faculty, and Secretary of the Faculty shall have signatures of not fewer than forty members of the General Faculty on their petitions.

b. Candidates for the Committee of Eleven, Senator-at-Large, the Committee on Committees or the Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning/Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee shall have signatures of not fewer than twenty members of the General Faculty on their petitions.

c. Candidates for Senator representing a College Faculty shall have the signatures of not less than ten percent (10%) of the members of their College Faculty on their petitions, except that a minimum number shall be the signatures of three College Faculty members, and the maximum need be no more than twenty.

d. Candidates shall affirm in writing their willingness to hold office.

e. The Committee on Elections shall verify the eligibility of each nominee.

Section 2. Conduct of elections:

a. The Committee on Elections shall notify the General Faculty, no later than January 15 each year, of elective offices to be filled that year.

b. The committee shall issue nominating petitions no later than January 15. The nominating petitions for appropriate offices will be available until ten (10) class days prior to the election.

c. The committee shall accept completed nominating petitions no later than the close of business ten (10) class days prior to the election.

d. The committee shall conduct primary elections for elective offices no later than March 1, allowing ten (10) class days from the opening of the online election to the close of the election. Paper ballots are available from the Faculty Center and need to be requested and returned within the same ten (10) day time frame. From the date of mailing or emailing the ballots for members of the General Faculty to mark and return their primary election ballots.
e. The committee shall notify members of the General Faculty of the results of primary elections no later than March 22.

f. The committee shall conduct general elections for faculty offices no later than April 1, allowing ten (10) class days from the opening of the online election to the close of the election. Paper ballots are available from the Faculty Center and need to be requested and returned within the same ten (10) day time frame. Date of mailing or emailing the ballots for members of the General Faculty to mark and return their election ballots.

g. The committee shall notify the General Faculty of the results of the general election no later than April 25.

h. In the event of a tie vote, the decision shall be made by lot. Lots are cast by the Committee on Elections. The candidates or their designated witnesses are invited to observe the casting of lots.

Section 3. Election of candidates:

a. Chair of the Faculty, Vice Chair of the Faculty, or Secretary of the Faculty: A candidate who receives a majority of the votes cast in the primary election shall be declared elected. When no one receives a majority of the votes in the primary election, the two candidates receiving more votes than anyone else will be nominated for the general election ballot. That candidate receiving the majority of general election votes shall be declared elected.

b. Faculty Senate, at-Large: If forty or fewer, but more than twenty are nominated, the twenty nominees receiving the largest number of votes in the primary election shall be declared elected. If more than forty are nominated, the forty receiving the largest number of votes in the primary election shall be candidates on the general election ballot, provided only that anyone who receives a majority of votes in the primary election shall be declared elected. The candidates receiving the largest number of votes in the general election shall be declared elected to the positions to be filled.

c. Faculty Senate, College Representatives: If the number of nominees from a College is not more than twice the number to be elected, those candidates equal in number to the number of positions to be filled who receive the largest number of votes in the primary election shall be declared elected. If more than twice the number are nominated, those receiving the largest number of votes in the primary election, totaling twice the number of positions to be filled, shall be candidates on the general election ballot, provided only that any candidate who receives a majority of votes in the primary election shall be declared elected. Nominees receiving the largest number of votes in the general election shall be declared elected to the positions to be filled.

d. Committee of Eleven: If more than ten are nominated for the Committee of Eleven, the ten nominees receiving the largest number of votes in the primary election shall be candidates on the general election ballot, provided only that any candidate who receives a majority of votes in the primary election shall be declared elected.
Nominees receiving the largest number of votes in the general election shall be declared elected to the positions to be filled.

e. Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning/Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee: If more than four are nominated for the Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning/Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the four receiving the largest number of votes in the primary election shall be candidates on the general election ballot, provided only that any candidate who receives a majority of votes in the primary election shall be declared elected. The nominees receiving the largest number of votes in the general election shall be declared elected to the positions to be filled.

f. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure: Names of members of the General Faculty who have been nominated in accord with the provisions set forth in Article V, Section 9.8, of these Bylaws for membership on the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall be included on the ballot for primary election each year.

ARTICLE V
General Faculty Standing Committees: Memberships and Terms

Section 1. The Committee of Eleven shall be composed as follows: ten members of the General Faculty, five of whom are elected by the General Faculty each year for a term of two years; the Chair of the Faculty shall be, ex officio, the eleventh voting member, and shall call the first meeting of the committee, at which meeting the committee shall elect its chair. To this number shall be added one voting student delegate selected annually by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and one voting student delegate selected annually by the Graduate and Professional Student Council in whatever manner those bodies determine. The two student delegates shall be invited to attend all regular meetings of the committee. In the event that an elected member shall vacate a position for any reason, a successor to fill the unexpired term shall be the unelected candidate who had the next higher number of votes in the most recent election. If there are no unelected candidates from the most recent election, then the committee shall select a successor to fill the unexpired term.

Section 2. The Committee on Faculty Membership shall be composed of the Secretary of the Faculty who shall serve as chair, and three members of the General Faculty appointed by the Chair of the Faculty after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee from among candidates nominated by the Committee on Committees or by other members of the General Faculty for two-year staggered terms.

Section 3. The Committee on Committees shall be composed of six members of the General Faculty elected by the General Faculty for three-year staggered terms. No more than two members shall be elected from any one College faculty and no member shall serve consecutive terms. The committee shall elect its chair from those of its members who have served one year or more on the committee.

Section 4. The Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning shall be composed of nine members: the Chair of the Faculty and six members who will be elected from and by the General Faculty in classes of two for staggered three-year terms. In addition, each year the Faculty Senate will elect two of its members to the committee, chosen so as to encourage breadth of representation. The Faculty Senate members will be members of the Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning, but will not be members of the Strategic
Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC). The Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning will elect its own chair from among the six members elected by the General Faculty.

Section 5.4. The University Committee on Ethics and Commitment shall be composed of six members of the General Faculty elected by the Faculty Senate to serve staggered three-year terms, from nominations by the Committee on Committees or by other members of the General Faculty. The Research Integrity Officer serves as an ex officio non-voting member. The committee may, in consideration of individual cases or issues, expand itself by no more than three additional General Faculty members having expertise in the subject matter of the case(s) being investigated.

Section 6.5. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is composed of the Secretary of the Faculty (committee chair) and four General Faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. The Provost or Provost’s designee serves as an ex officio non-voting member.

Section 7.6. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee consists of the current chairs of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Committee on Conciliation and the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment, a representative of the Office of Institutional Equity, and a faculty representative elected by the Faculty Senate at its May meeting. The Vice chair of CAFT shall also serve on the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee as a non-voting member. The chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will function as the ex officio voting chair of the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.

Section 8.7. The Committee on Conciliation shall be composed of six members who are tenured or continuing members of the General Faculty other than deans of any rank, elected by the Faculty Senate by secret ballot upon nomination by the Committee on Committees or other members of General Faculty, which shall furnish twice as many names as persons to be elected. Not more than one member of any College Faculty shall be on the committee at any one time. The term of membership shall be two years. Three persons shall be elected each year. The chair of the committee shall be elected by the committee from among those in at least their second year on the committee. Members may be re-elected to this committee. At the request of the President of the University or of a College Faculty or of any member of the General Faculty who has a grievance and has failed to resolve the matter through discussing the same with the appropriate department head or dean, the committee shall act expeditiously. In the event that the committee is of the opinion that the case load is so great that undue delay will be experienced, the committee may direct that temporary members be selected by the chair from a pool of names provided by the Committee on Committees or other members of the General Faculty, which shall contain not less than twice the number of names as there are temporary members to be selected. The Committee on Conciliation shall conduct its business in meetings rather than hearings, and participation by legal counsel will generally be discouraged.

Section 9.8. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall be composed of twelve tenured or continuing members of the General Faculty other than deans of any rank, four of whom shall be elected each year by the General Faculty for a term of three years. The slate of candidates presented to the General Faculty shall be selected in the following manner:

a. The Committee on Committees will prepare a list of names containing not fewer than two times the number to be elected. After consultation with the Chair of the Faculty and the President, the committee will reduce the list to a slate of twice the
number to be elected, giving due consideration to diversity. For each person listed, a brief description of relevant academic experience, qualifications and background will be provided. This information will also appear on the ballot submitted to the General Faculty along with the names and colleges of continuing members. If the outcome of an election cannot be determined because of a tie vote, a runoff election shall take place.

b. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall elect its chair and vice chair from among those of its regular members who have served at least one year. In the event that the committee is of the opinion that the case load is so great that undue delay will be experienced in the hearing and disposition of all cases before it, the committee may direct that temporary members be installed to hear specific cases. Temporary members shall be selected by the presiding officer of the committee by whatever means he or she deems appropriate from a pool of names provided by the Committee on Committees or by other members of the General Faculty. Such a pool shall contain not less than twice the number of names as there are temporary members to be selected. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall select one of its regular members to serve as panel presiding officer in each case. In all cases the tenure of temporary members of the committee shall be limited to the hearing and disposition of the specific case which occasioned their selection.

c. If an elected member of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure resigns or becomes ineligible for membership, this member will be replaced for the remainder of the term of the departing member with the candidate who received the next highest number of votes in the same election, with ties broken by the Chair of the Faculty. If there is no eligible candidate, the Chair of the Faculty will fill the vacancy by appointing a member of the General Faculty who is otherwise eligible for membership on the committee.

Section 10.9. The University Committee for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues is composed of seven faculty members nominated by the Committee on Committees or by other members of the General Faculty and approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, two student representatives appointed by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and the Graduate and Professional Student Council, respectively, and one community member selected by the committee itself. Appointees shall have demonstrated interests and/or areas of expertise in labor and human rights issues. Members shall serve for three-year renewable terms. The Committee will elect a chair and vice chair within the committee who shall serve one-year renewable terms.

Article VI.

University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation

Section 1. The Shared Governance Review Committee is composed of the Chair of the Faculty, the Chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC), the Presiding Officer of the Senate (committee chair), two Senators (elected by the Senate), one additional member of SPBAC (chosen by the chair of SPBAC), the Provost, and two other members of the administration chosen by the President. These members serve two-year staggered terms, and in addition, there shall be one representative each from Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC), Staff Advisory Council (SAC), Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA), and Graduate and
Professional Student Council (GPSC), who will be appointed in the terms determined as these organizational bodies see fit.

Section 2. The University Committee on Corporate Relations (UCCR) is a University-wide committee with shared governance participation. The committee will elect a chair annually who shall be a committee member and a member of the General Faculty. The regular voting membership of the committee shall consist of five members of the General Faculty appointed by the Chair of the Faculty and the remaining voting membership as indicated in the bylaws of the UCCR. If the Chair of the Faculty chooses to attend meetings and is not the committee chair, he or she may attend as an advisor as well. General Faculty members are appointed for two-year renewable terms.

Section 3. The Naming Advisory Committee consists of the Vice Chair of the Faculty (committee chair), President of the UA Foundation, President of the Arizona Alumni Association, Senior Vice President for University Relations, President of the Associated Students (ASUA), President of the Graduate and Professional Student Council (GPSC), Provost of the University, President of the Staff Advisory Council (SAC), chair of the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC), a representative of the Dean’s Council (elected by the Deans), and a representative from the Faculty Senate (appointed by the Chair of the Faculty). Members serve annual terms.

Section 4. The Undergraduate Council shall be composed as follows:

a. The Undergraduate Council (UGC) voting membership shall consist of: the UGC chair; one member of the General Faculty from each college that offers undergraduate degrees; one member from the Library; and one member from the Honors College; each chosen by election in the college OR the appointment by the Dean, after consultation with that college's version of an advisory council in accordance with the shared governance guidelines and agreements. College representatives serve for three-year terms. In addition, the chair of the University-wide General Education Committee or a designated alternate currently serving on the committee; the chair of the University General Petitions Committee or a designated alternative currently serving on the committee; and one to two student representatives from the Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA) appointed to Undergraduate Council by the president of ASUA, shall serve as voting members of the UGC. ASUA members serve one-year terms that may be renewed. The chair shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty, on advice of the Committee on Committees and in consultation with the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, in accordance with the principles detailed in the shared governance guidelines and agreements.

b. Non-voting members may include others as needed, by invitation of the chair.

c. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Senior Director of Academic/Curricular Affairs, and the Registrar are ex officio non-voting members.

Section 5. The University-wide General Education Committee shall be composed as follows:

a. The committee is composed of faculty representatives from each of these colleges: Agriculture and Life Sciences (two voting members); Architecture and
Landscape Architecture, Education, Nursing and Pharmacy (one shared voting member); Eller College of Management (two voting members); Engineering (one voting member); Fine Arts (two voting members); Honors College (one voting member); Humanities (two voting members); Science (two voting members); Social and Behavioral Sciences (two voting members); two student representatives, one undergraduate junior or senior, and one graduate, each have one voting member (two voting members); Pima Community College Office of Transfer Curriculum (ex officio non-voting); and the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (ex officio non-voting). There is additional non-voting representation from three Foundations programs: English, Mathematics, and Second Language. Each faculty member serves a three-year term; each student will serve a one-year term. Colleges are advised that at least part of the membership should be elected by their faculty, but in order to ensure that certain minority interests are heard, it is reasonable that part of the membership be appointed.

b. In addition, there is invited, non-voting representation from areas directly involved in general education.

c. Support for the committee is provided by the Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

d. The chair is chosen in consultation between the Chair of the Faculty and Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, and serves a three-year, renewable term. The chair of UWGEC is an ex officio non-voting a member of the Undergraduate Council, and reports to the Senate through or in concert with the UGC chair.

Section 6. The Graduate Council and its officers shall be composed as follows:

a. Faculty. Faculty members of the Graduate Council shall be chosen by the faculty in each academic college, according to a process approved by the faculty in each college. Faculty representation on the Graduate Council is based on the number of students enrolled in graduate programs within each academic college and the Graduate Interdisciplinary Programs. The number of representatives per college is determined by rank ordering colleges by graduate enrollment. Those colleges whose graduate enrollment is in the upper half will have two members; those in the lower half will have one representative. The term is four years.

b. Graduate Coordinators. Graduate Coordinators shall elect two members of the Graduate Council. Terms are two years, renewable; and the terms are staggered.

c. Graduate students. The Graduate and Professional Student Council shall select, according to its own procedures, three members for the Graduate Council. Terms are one year, renewable.

d. The Dean and the Associate Deans of the Graduate College are ex officio voting members of the Graduate Council.

e. The chair shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty, on advice of the Committee on Committees and in consultation with the Dean of the Graduate
College, in accordance with the principles detailed in the shared governance guidelines and agreements.

Section 7. The Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee’s (SPBAC) membership is comprised of twenty-one voting members and ten twelve (12) ex officio non-voting members.

a. Eleven of the voting members are faculty: the Chair of the Faculty; six faculty elected by the general faculty for staggered, three-year terms; three faculty selected by the Chair of the Faculty in consultation with the President for three-year rotating terms; and the SPBAC chair. The SPBAC chair is appointed by the President in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty for a two-year term. The President and Chair of the Faculty may also select a SPBAC co-chair from the existing SPBAC membership; under such circumstances, the co-chairs have one shared vote. The SPBAC chair chairs must have served at least one year on the committee prior to appointment as chair. The SPBAC chair chairs may be reappointed for one additional term, with the consent of a majority of SPBAC voting members.

b. The remaining ten voting members are appointed: two deans, two representatives from the President’s cabinet, and two non-faculty staff are appointed by the President for three-year rotating terms. Representatives of the following governing organizations: Staff Advisory Council, Appointed Professionals Advisory Council, the Graduate and Professional Student Council and the President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona (who automatically sits on SPBAC) serve at the will of their governing organizations.

c. The ten twelve (12) ex officio (non-voting) members are comprised of: Associate Vice President of Academic Resources, Planning and Management; Associate Vice President for Institutional Analysis; Budget Director; Assistant Vice President in the Budget Office; Associate Dean of Medicine Administration and Finance; Senior Associate Vice President for Health Sciences; Dean of the Outreach College, Vice President for Global Initiatives; Special Advisor to the President for Diversity and Inclusion; Alumni Office Executive Director; Vice President Alumni Relations/President of the Alumni Association; Senior Vice President for Business Affairs and CFO; Assistant Vice President of Finance and Administration; Senior Vice President for Finance and Administration; President of the University of Arizona Foundation; Vice Provost for Digital Learning & Student Engagement and Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Enrollment Management; Senior Vice President for University Relations; Vice President for Strategic Planning and Analysis; and Executive Senior Vice President and Provost.

Article VII

Grievance Policies and Procedures for Faculty

Section 1. Purpose: To provide for review procedures for members of the General Faculty implementing 6-201(N) (See Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual at 6-201(L) and 6-201(M) for procedures applicable to dismissal, suspension without pay or adverse actions concerning promotion, tenure or nonrenewal allegedly based on discrimination or
unconstitutional action, and 6-302 for procedures applicable to dismissal or suspension of Academic Professionals.

Source: Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual - 6-201
Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual - 6-302
University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP)

Section 2. Grievance Principles

a. The Board of Regents and the President, administrators and faculty of the University of Arizona (UA) recognize the importance of providing a prompt and efficient procedure for fair and equitable resolution of grievances without fear of prejudice or retaliation for initiating a grievance or participating in the grievance process. Faculty members should have a reasonable amount of time to file grievances to seek redress for perceived harm they have suffered.

b. Each individual’s attempt to rectify a perceived wrong is considered consistent with UA’s role as an upholder of individual rights and the integrity of the University.

c. The existence of a grievance process in no way diminishes the responsibility of faculty and administrators for the exercise of sound judgment.

d. All grievants shall have clearly defined avenues of appeal and redress that may include mediation and/or an opportunity to present one’s concerns to a faculty committee that reports to the President or his or her designee. The President decides the matter and his or her decision is the final agency decision. The grievant’s rights to relief in the courts shall not be affected by this policy.

e. Faculty grievance procedures apply to general faculty as defined in the Constitution of the General Faculty, Article II.

f. The preferred option is to resolve grievances internally at the level closest to the grievant. By using internal conciliation and hearing procedures first, the grievant should ordinarily be able to obtain acceptable results without escalation to a formal charge with an outside agency.

g. At each level of the grievance process, the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee or decision maker will advise the grievant of the options available for redress and appeal as part of his or her decision if the grievance is not resolved at that level.

h. In cases to which they apply, the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual 6-201 and 6-302 takes priority. In other cases, a grievant may have his or her issues reviewed by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee for potential review by the Committee on Conciliation and/or Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

i. When a matter reaches a formal hearing, faculty may choose to present the grievance before a panel of their peers without counsel present. Alternatively, faculty may choose to be represented by legal counsel at his or her own expense.
in all hearings.

j. At any and all times, the faculty members hearing grievances shall have the opportunity, but not the duty, to consult University counsel or any outside counsel who has or will be appointed for consultation purposes. In all matters and proceedings, however, the faculty members considering a grievance shall have the right to make the final decisions on all matters substantive or procedural. The role of University or outside counsel shall be solely to answer questions put to them by the faculty considering the grievance.

k. Each grievant has the right to a fair and reasonably speedy investigation and judgment by members of the appropriate committee or office.

l. Two or more faculty members with the same grievance have the right to seek redress jointly or individually.

m. Grievance committees shall keep written records, as appropriate, which shall be equally available to all parties in the case, except privileged communications or documents that are confidential pursuant to state or federal laws or regulations. Committees are not required to keep records of deliberations.

n. All parties to a grievance are entitled to notification within three (3) business days of changes in the status of their grievance.

o. Grievances involving faculty members who work off the main UA campus generally shall be handled by grievance procedures prescribed herein.

p. Grievants and witnesses are assured freedom from reprisals related to their testimony or participation in the grievance process. A separate whistleblower policy describes whistleblower protections and when those protections are applicable.

q. Allegations of sexual or other impermissible harassment will be referred to the University Office of Institutional Equity for investigation.

r. Allegations of discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or genetic information will be referred to the Office of Institutional Equity for investigation.

s. Issues of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative endeavor; conflict of commitment, and facilities misuse are handled by the University Committee on Ethics and Commitment (UCEC) or other committees designated under a separate policy. In conducting inquiries on those matters, UCEC or other appropriate committees follow the applicable University policies on research integrity, professional commitment, and proper facilities use.

t. Generally, if a conflict cannot be settled through informal means, a member of the faculty is best served by filing his or her grievance with the single and most appropriate committee or office. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee will direct the faculty grievant to the appropriate office or hearing body.
u. The standard of proof for all findings, conclusions, and recommendations relating to grievances shall be a preponderance of the evidence.

v. No faculty member or administrator can be a decision maker in a dispute in which he or she is a party or in which he or she has a conflict of interest.

w. No faculty member shall forfeit the right to grieve a matter unless he or she has been harmed, has a right to grieve the matter, and is specifically apprised of any time limits regarding contesting the matter.

Section 3. Grievance Resolution Procedures

The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall be composed of the chairs of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT), the Committee on Conciliation, the Committee on Ethics and Commitment, a representative of the Office of Institutional Equity, and a faculty representative selected by the Faculty Senate. The vice chair of CAFT shall also serve on the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee as a non-voting member. The chair of CAFT will function as the ex-officio voting chair of the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.

a. The recommended starting point for resolving grievances is at the head or dean level, whichever is applicable. If, however, the grievant does not wish to follow this route, or this route has not provided acceptable resolution, a grievant has the option of using an Ombuds Committee member, informal University mediator, members of the Committee on Conciliation or review by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.

b. In most cases, faculty may choose an informal route, (Ombuds Committee member, informal mediation or members of the Committee on Conciliation), which may be followed (if appropriate) by review by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee. Grievances alleging discrimination may be filed with either the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee or directly with the Office of Institutional Equity.

c. Informal problem resolution may be requested, or formal grievances may be filed if the grievant believes any of the following:

i. There has been a violation, a misinterpretation, or an arbitrary or discriminatory application of University policy, regulation, or procedure which, applied personally to that faculty member, infringes upon his or her privileges, responsibilities, or terms and conditions of employment, (e.g., salary, teaching assignment, equipment access, or other inequities); or

ii. He or she has suffered an adverse employment decision on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or genetic information; or

iii. There has been an infringement on his or her academic freedom.
Section 4. Informal Resolution Procedures

Informal resolution procedures are provided for the faculty member who desires informal assistance in the resolution of a complaint. An Ombuds Committee member, informal University mediator, or members of the Committee on Conciliation are available to conciliate and coordinate communication among the grievant, respondent and others related to the complaint. The purpose of these processes is to air differences between the parties and to resolve the complaint to the satisfaction of both parties without resorting to more formal review. In some instances, upon the agreement of the parties and contingent on the availability of resources, an outside mediator may be available to conduct dispute resolution. Informal resolution is strongly recommended.

a. Ombuds Program

i. The purpose of the Ombuds Program is to provide informal assistance to prevent or resolve disputes or problems in a neutral setting, to facilitate communication, to preserve or improve working relationships and to create a better working environment.

ii. An Ombuds Committee member is a neutral individual who helps manage conflict or perceived conflict by listening and generating options to help the faculty member resolve his or her problem. The Ombuds Committee member may work confidentially with one, both, or all parties to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement and prevent disputes from escalating.

b. “Point of View”-The University’s Informal Mediation Program

The Point of View Informal Mediation, sponsored by Human Resources, provides neutral trained mediators from the University community. Those who elect to use this process are provided an opportunity to share their uninterrupted point of view. The mediator does not decide who is right or wrong; instead, the mediator helps people understand the conflict and brainstorm options to solve it.

c. Conciliation Process

i. The Committee on Conciliation has jurisdiction to make inquiry and discuss any problem involving any member of the General Faculty in his or her relationship with the University. The committee may consult and advise but shall not conduct hearings. It is the duty of the committee, after careful investigation, to offer advice to the person or persons involved.

ii. The faculty member seeking Conciliation shall file a complaint with the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee within six (6) months of his or her knowledge of the actions which form the basis of the complaint.

iii. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall consider the complaint and assign it to the appropriate committee chair (e.g., Conciliation Committee).
iv. Legal counsel may not attend or participate in the Conciliation. A
grievant may have an adviser from the University community who
has no personal knowledge of the matter, who may attend meetings and
review written documentation.

v. The Conciliator(s) shall have fifteen (15) days after assignment by the
Grievance Clearinghouse Committee to contact the parties followed
by thirty (30) days to try to resolve the conflict. Upon agreement
of the parties, the chair of the Conciliation Committee may extend
the conciliation period by thirty (30) days.

vi. The Conciliation results shall be summarized in a report
prepared by the Conciliator and sent to the parties.

vii. If Conciliation provides a mutually satisfactory result, the process
ends. If the parties cannot resolve the differences, the grievant has thirty
(30) days from the date of the Conciliator's report to contact the
Grievance Clearinghouse Committee to request that the grievance be
reviewed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

Section 5. Grievance Review Procedures

a. Whether or not a grievant has sought Conciliation, he or she may request a
review by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee. If the grievant alleges
unlawful discrimination not covered by Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual
6-201(M) or 6-302, he or she may file a complaint directly with the Office of
Institutional Equity without first going through the Grievance Clearinghouse
Committee.

i. Requests for the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee review should be
filed at the Faculty Center.

ii. If the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee determines the grievant's case
contains an allegation of unlawful discrimination, the grievant's case
shall be referred to the Office of Institutional Equity.

iii. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee has the right and responsibility
to decline to forward grievances for further consideration if the
complaint does not involve:

(1) A violation, a misinterpretation, or an arbitrary or discriminatory
application of University policy, regulation, or procedure which,
applied personally to that faculty member, infringes upon his or
her privileges, responsibilities, or terms and conditions of
employment (e.g., salary, distribution of effort, equipment
access, or other comparable inequities); or

(2) An allegation of an adverse employment decision on the basis of
race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran
status, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information; or
(3) An infringement on his or her academic freedom; or

(4) Those grievances covered under Section 5, b, iii, (2), (a).

iv. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee has the right and responsibility to decline to forward grievances for further consideration if the complaint is substantively identical to an earlier grievance by the same individual which has been, or is being, dealt with through the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure or the Office of Institutional Equity process.

v. If the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee declines to send the grievance forward the grievant has the right to appeal that decision to a special ad-hoc committee comprised of neutral members who are not members of either the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee or the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Members are appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall either affirm the decision to decline to send the grievance forward, or overrule the decision and send the grievance forward.

b. The grievance review procedure will involve the following steps:

i. Within thirty (30) days of the date of the Conciliator’s report on matters that were the subject of Conciliation or within six (6) months of the grievant’s knowledge of the occurrence of the actions which formed the basis for the grievance, the grievant shall make a written request for a formal review to the chair of the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.

ii. The request must be filed by the grievant by hand delivery or by certified mail, return receipt requested, at the Faculty Center and shall contain: grievant’s name, address, telephone number, a statement of the complaint, resolution sought, and either the name and address of grievant’s attorney, or a statement that grievant is proceeding without an attorney.

iii. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall review the facts surrounding the allegation(s) and may either decline to forward the grievance for further consideration or forward the case based on the following jurisdictional guidelines:

(1) Alleged discrimination. If discrimination in employment, program, or activity based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or genetic information is the basis of the grievance, the matter will be referred to the Office of Institutional Equity for consideration in accordance with the procedures established by that office.

(2) Other faculty grievances, including infringement on academic freedom and tenure not covered by Arizona Board of Regents
Policy Manual 6-201(M) or 6-302, will be reviewed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure under this policy.

(a) Under this policy, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall review any faculty allegation that a decision affecting his or her employment relation with the University was not determined in substantial compliance with regular University procedures, but only after any administrative appeal mechanism applicable to the decision in question has been exhausted.

(b) The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall review other faculty grievances, such as alleged unfair treatment, where no policies or procedures exist or existing policies or procedures have been misinterpreted, misapplied or violated by a University administrator, but only after any administrative appeal mechanism applicable to the decision in question has been exhausted.

(c) The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure review process shall include an interview with the grievant who will be afforded an opportunity to express his or her concerns, and may include interviews with other parties which are required if further action is considered. Within ten (10) days of this interview, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will either choose to recommend a formal hearing before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure or will determine that the faculty member will not be afforded a formal hearing.

Section 6. Grievance Hearing Procedures

a. In cases in which a faculty member is suspended or dismissed, receives an adverse decision concerning his or her promotion, tenure, or nonrenewal as a result of allegedly discriminatory or unconstitutional action (including violations of due process or academic freedom), or is released from employment under ABOR Policy 6-201L (Conditions of Faculty Service, Hearing Procedures for Faculty), he or she may request a formal hearing before the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

i. The chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall forward to the respondent the request for a hearing and the formal grievance within seven (7) days after the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee has referred the case to the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, with instructions to respond within fifteen (15) days. If the grievant has indicated that he or she will be represented by counsel, the time for respondent to respond should be extended as needed in order for the respondent to seek the advice of counsel. The response shall contain
the name, address, telephone number of respondent, a statement of respondent’s position on the issue, and the name and address of the respondent’s attorney (if any) if grievant elects to be represented by an attorney.

ii. The chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure will appoint a hearing panel within ten (10) days of a case assignment. The chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure panel will set a hearing date in conjunction with all parties involved in the case. The hearing should begin within sixty (60) days of the date the grievance is assigned to the hearing panel. The sixty (60)-day period includes only the time when the University is in session. Semester breaks and summer recess are not included unless otherwise agreed to by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure panel chair and the parties. The parties shall receive notice of the hearing date at least twenty (20) days before the hearing date. The notice shall include:

(1) A statement of the time, place and nature of the hearing;

(2) A statement of the authority and jurisdiction under which the hearing is to be held;

(3) A reference to the particular statutes, rules, or policies involved; and

(4) A short and plain statement of the matters asserted. If the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure is unable to state the matters in detail at the time the notice is served, the initial notice may be limited to a statement of issues involved. Thereafter, upon application, a more definite and detailed statement shall be furnished.

iii. A grievance shall not proceed if the grievant, after due notice, fails to be present or fails to obtain a continuance. A grievant may withdraw his or her grievance at any stage in the grievance procedure by writing the chair of the panel designated to hear the grievance.

iv. If a grievant commences a grievance with an outside investigative agency based on the same or similar grounds, either the conciliator or the chair of the hearing panel, depending on the stage of the complaint process of the internal grievance, will continue the internal process unless the grievant withdraws the internal grievance or desires a postponement.

v. No later than fifteen (15) days before the hearing date, the grievant and respondent must provide written documentation, including exhibits and a list of witnesses, to the chair of the hearing panel. The chair may require additional written submissions such as a written opening statement prior to the hearing.
vi. The chair of the hearing panel shall send a copy of the written documentation and witness lists submitted by the grievant and the respondent to the panel members within three (3) days after receipt. The grievant’s witness list, exhibits, and other required documentation will be forwarded to respondent, and the respondent’s witness list, exhibits, and other required documentation will be forwarded to grievant by the chair within three (3) days after receipt of lists from both parties.

vii. Any member of the General Faculty requested by the panel to appear as a witness in its investigation of a complaint shall consider it an obligation as a General Faculty member to appear and testify. The chair of the panel may call witnesses upon request of either party or on the chair’s initiative. The chair may also require the production of books, records, and other evidence. Such requests shall be made either by personal delivery or by certified mail. The chair of the hearing panel shall have the authority to issue subpoenas for the attendance of witnesses and for the production of books, documents, and other evidence.

viii. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure has an important fact-finding role. The hearing may be conducted in an informal, collegial manner and without adherence to the rules of evidence required in judicial proceedings. To the extent possible, the hearing should be carried out in a non-adversarial, collegial way. Hearings shall be conducted according to the following rules:

1. No fewer than three (3) faculty members shall constitute a hearing panel. Members shall not participate on a hearing panel when there is a conflict of interest.

2. The hearing, but not the deliberations of the committee, shall be recorded.

3. Unless overriding reasons under law or ABOR policy are given to grievant, respondent, and other appropriate parties, all parties shall have access to all information that is presented during the hearing at no expense to them.

4. The chair of the panel shall keep the parties informed about the status of the grievance.

5. Faculty may choose to have a hearing on a grievance before a panel of their peers without legal counsel present. Alternatively, the faculty may choose to be represented by legal counsel present at his or her own expense in all hearings. In cases between a faculty member and an administrator, if the faculty member chooses not to be represented by counsel present at the hearing, then the administrator shall not have counsel at the hearing either. In cases between faculty members, either party may choose to be represented by counsel present at the hearing at his or her own expense. Any party may obtain legal advice.
and assistance in preparation for a hearing, even if a legal advisor will not be present at the hearing itself.

(6) Legal advice to the grievance panel:

(a) If neither party is advised or represented by counsel and a University attorney has not been involved in the case on behalf of either party, then a University attorney may provide legal advice to the grievance committee upon request.

(b) Outside counsel may be selected by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure from a list of qualified attorneys provided by the University to provide legal advice to the committee if the University attorney is precluded from providing advice to the committee because of a conflict or for other reasons as determined by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The role of counsel is to give sound legal advice and assistance to the panel on the matter it is hearing.

(c) At the discretion of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure panel, when the parties are represented by counsel, a hearing officer may be secured under the University’s agreement with Tri-University Outside Counsel. The hearing officer assists the panel in developing findings, conclusions and recommendations during deliberations and may prepare the written report in consultation with the panel but does not participate in the decision-making process of deliberation.

(7) For good cause shown, upon request of either party or on the chair’s own initiative, the chair may continue the proceedings to another time.

(8) The hearing shall be closed to the public except that the grievant may, at his or her discretion, demand that the hearing be open to the public.

(9) The grievant and respondent may be present during the hearing proceeding. Witnesses shall be excluded except while testifying.

(10) Generally, the panel will allow all witnesses to testify and documents to be presented which are relevant and probative to the complaint or the response. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure panel shall exclude irrelevant, immaterial or unduly repetitious evidence.

(11) Each party may present an opening statement of his or her position. Generally, the grievant will then present all of his or her witnesses and documents. The panel members may question
the witnesses and parties and ask questions about documents presented throughout the hearing. The respondent may question the grievant and witnesses. After the grievant has presented his or her case, the respondent shall have an opportunity to present witnesses and documents, and the committee members may question the witnesses and ask questions about documents presented. The grievant may question the respondent and witnesses.

(12) At the completion of the hearing, including any closing statement and receipt of any written memoranda requested by the panel, the panel will deliberate and prepare a written recommendation. The recommendation shall include findings of fact and conclusions, separately stated, based exclusively on the evidence. Within thirty (30) days of the conclusion of the hearing and receipt of all written documents requested of the parties, the panel will forward its recommendation to the President, who will make the final decision. Upon good cause shown, the President may extend the recommendation date by an additional thirty (30) days.

(13) Within forty-five (45) days of the date of the panel’s recommendation and record, the President shall issue a written decision that includes findings of fact and conclusions, separately stated. Copies of the President’s decision, including the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure recommendation, shall be provided to the Committee and the parties. The President’s decision shall include a statement that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. § 12-901 et.seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision is served upon the party affected. If the President cannot issue a decision within the forty-five (45)-day period, the President will notify the parties within that period of a delay in the issuing of the decision, the reasons for the delay, and the date on which the decision can be expected.

(14) A faculty member who is dissatisfied with the President's decision may request reconsideration of the decision by filing a written request with the President no later than fifteen (15) days following receipt of the President's written decision. If no request for reconsideration is made, the President’s decision is effective at the expiration of the period in which to request reconsideration.

(a) The request for reconsideration shall be based on one or more of the following grounds:

(i) Irregularities in the proceedings, including any abuse of discretion or misconduct by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure
panel that deprived the faculty member of a fair and impartial hearing;

(ii) Newly discovered material evidence which with reasonable diligence could not have been presented at the hearing; or

(iii) The decision is not justified by the evidence or is contrary to law.

(b) If the faculty member requests reconsideration, the President will either deny reconsideration or issue a final decision within twenty (20) days of receiving a request for reconsideration.

(c) The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. § 12-901 et.seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision is served upon the party affected.

Cross-References
For the composition of grievance committees, see "Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona." Article V, Sections 7, 8, 9.

For the Board of Regents’ policy, see Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 6-201, "Conditions of Faculty Service" and Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 6-301, "General Provisions and Definitions for Conditions of Service for Academic and Service Professionals."

ARTICLE VIII
The Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions

Among the functions to be exercised by the Faculty Senate are:

a. To recommend curricula and degrees for approval. While matters pertaining to courses, major and minor requirements, the kinds of degrees and requirements for each will originate in the various colleges, the final formulation which is to be recommended to the Board of Regents shall be determined by the Faculty Senate.

b. To formulate and/or recommend for approval policies governing official University catalogs.

c. To establish committees to assist in carrying out functions assigned to the Faculty Senate by the “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty.”

d. To maintain communication and liaison with the President of the University, administrators, faculty, staff, and students.
e. To recommend policy concerning academic conduct of students.

f. To recommend policies concerning promotion, tenure, continuing status, sabbatical leave, and other leaves of absence.

g. To act upon nominations for recipients of honorary degrees, which may be proposed by one or more of the College Faculties.

h. To make recommendations relative to the general University policies and procedures.

i. To discharge responsibilities assigned by the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty.

j. To act upon matters brought for consideration in accordance with the “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty” and existing University policy.

k. To execute such other functions as are consistent with the “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty.”

Section 2. Membership

The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall be comprised of the following:

a. Ex officio voting members: The President of the University, the Provost, the Chair of the Faculty, the Vice Chair of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, the chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee, the chair of the Undergraduate Council, and the chair of the Graduate Council, and the chair of the Committee of Eleven (when the chair is not an elected member of Faculty Senate) shall be voting members of the Faculty Senate. In addition, one member shall represent the Vice Presidents, and one member shall represent the Deans.

b. Elected members: Elected members of the Faculty Senate will hold office for two years, beginning on June 1 of the year in which they are elected, in accordance with the following:

i. Twenty members shall be elected, prior to June 1 of the odd-numbered years, by the General Faculty. These shall be designated Senators-at-Large.

ii. A minimum of one member shall be elected prior to June 1 of the even-numbered years by each College Faculty. General Faculty members not affiliated with any college shall conduct an election as if they constitute a common college. Elected members of the Faculty Senate in addition to the twenty elected by the General Faculty and the ones elected by each College Faculty, including those acting as a common college, shall be apportioned among the several, but not necessarily all colleges, essentially in proportion to the number in each College Faculty. Such apportionment is to be established in accord with the published census of the General Faculty by the Committee on Faculty Membership.
c. Seven students: four students selected annually by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and three students, selected annually by the Graduate and Professional Student Council in whatever manner those bodies decide.

d. One Year-to-Year Appointed Professional: one member of the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC) of the University of Arizona shall be appointed annually by the Chair of APAC. The member will hold voting membership and be afforded the full privileges thereof.

e. The Faculty Senate shall fill a vacant Senate seat using the following procedure:

   i.) If a Senate seat is vacated due to a Senator's resignation or inability to serve, two circumstances apply: either (a) there were unelected candidates for the position in the election in which the unable-to-serve Senator was elected; or (b) there were no unelected candidates available in that Senator's constituency.

For all vacancies occurring under situation (a), the Committee on Elections will ask the unelected candidate receiving the next highest number of votes to become the successor. If this individual is unavailable, then the next highest vote recipient will be asked to serve, repeating until no unelected candidates are available. All such successors will serve until the return of the regularly elected Senator or until the end of the vacated term, whichever occurs first, but no less than one full semester in any case.

For vacancies occurring under situation (b), two types occur as follows:

1) The vacated term to be filled is longer than one semester, in which case the Committee on Elections will be asked to conduct a special election in the constituency of the vacated seat, complete with nominating petitions and written or electronic ballot voting. An individual elected in this way will serve to the end of the unexpired term of the vacated seat.

2) The vacated term is for one semester, in which case the Committee on Committees will be asked to provide the name of an individual from the vacated Senator's constituency who is willing to serve. An individual selected in this way will serve only until the end of the then current semester.

   ii.) If vacancies occur because there were not enough candidates from a given constituency in an election, the Chair of the Faculty and the Vice Chair shall seek appropriate faculty members from that constituency who are willing to serve, and present these candidates to the Senate Executive Committee for approval, to fill those vacancies.

Section 3. Method of Voting

At meetings of the Faculty Senate voting shall be by *viva voce*, by a show of hands, by a rising vote, or by ballot as decided by whoever is presiding over the meeting at the time of
the vote. Upon request of seven or more members of the Faculty Senate, the vote shall be taken by roll call. Such recorded vote shall be included in the minutes of the Faculty Senate which are distributed to all members of the General Faculty. It shall, however, always be in order to move to vote by ballot. An absent member may send a substitute who shall not vote.

Section 4. Faculty Senate Standing Committees

Each Faculty Senate standing committee, except the Executive Committee, shall consist of seven General Faculty members, a majority of whom must be members of the Faculty Senate. The standing committee members shall be appointed by the Vice Chair of the Faculty, after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, from names suggested by the Committee on Committees or other members of the General Faculty. 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 no more than three consecutive one-year terms, but they may be reappointed after an interim of one year.

All action items that are forwarded by the Faculty Senate standing committees come to the Faculty Senate as a seconded motion.

a. Executive Committee. The committee membership shall consist of the Chair of the Faculty, the Vice Chair of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, chairs of the Faculty Senate standing committees, chair of the Committee of Eleven, chair of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC), chair of the Undergraduate Council (UGC), chair of the Graduate Council (GC), one member of the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC) shall be appointed annually by the Chair of APAC, two members of the Senate elected at the regular May meeting of the Faculty Senate in alternate years from nominees whose names were submitted to the Faculty Center in time for distribution with the agenda for that meeting, the President of the University or his/her designee (non-voting), the Provost or his/her designee, (non-voting), the President of ASUA or his/her designee, the President of GPSC or his/her designee, and the Parliamentarian who shall be non-voting. The Vice Chair of the Faculty shall serve as chair of the committee. The committee shall establish the agenda for each meeting of the Faculty Senate and shall receive reports from the officers, the chairs of the Senate standing committees, UGC, GC and SPBAC.

b. Academic Personnel Policy Committee. This committee receives reports and considers and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to academic personnel policies (e.g., promotion and tenure/continuing status, policy and procedures, statistical report on decisions from the previous year, sabbatical and leave of absence policy, performance evaluation policy and procedures and their relationship to salaries, definition of faculty membership, and governance). (For example, the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel, “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona,” and ABOR Policy Manual 6-201, “Conditions of Faculty Service.”

c. Research Policy Committee. This committee considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to secrecy, research, conflict of interest, data retention, intellectual property, research ethics, research parks, interaction with industry, patent policy, Arizona Research Laboratory, research institutes, human
and animal research, and safety. One faculty member of the Research Policy Committee shall also sit on the Vice President for Research’s Intellectual Property Committee.

d. Student Affairs Policy Committee. This committee considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to student quality of life, financial aid, the Code of Conduct, the Code of Academic Integrity, student comportment, admission and domicile classification, high school and community college relations, recruitment and retention policies, Commencement, registration and such matters as brought forth from Student Affairs, the Dean of Students, and the Office of Enrollment Management. The chair of the Student Affairs Policy Committee is a member of the Campus Advisory Council.

This committee considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to the health, safety, and welfare of the student body, including financial aid, the Student Code of Conduct, Code of Academic Integrity, admission, registration, residency classification, high school and community college relations, recruitment and retention policies, Commencement and matters brought forth from the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. The chair of SAPC is appointed by the Chair of the Faculty.

Section 5. Ad hoc Committees

At times, ad hoc committees may be created to explore, define, and/or address issues of immediate concern to the faculty. If it is an ad hoc committee of the General Faculty, then the Chair of the Faculty shall appoint its members. If it is an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate, then the Vice Chair of the Faculty shall appoint its members. The appointment of ad hoc committee members shall be done by the Chair or Vice Chair only after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, from names suggested by the Committee on Committees or by other members of the General Faculty. Ad hoc committee charges will contain a duration and reporting date, as specified in the Constitution, Article VII, Section 5.
MEMORANDUM
January 29, 2015

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Bobbi McKean, Secretary and Chair, Constitution and Bylaws Committee
SUBJECT: Summary and Impact Statement of Proposed Changes to Bylaws and Constitution of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee proposes several changes to both the Constitution and Bylaws. We believe these changes to our guiding documents serve three purposes. One, the changes clarify the roles and responsibilities of Faculty Senate by aligning the definition and process for membership and descriptions of committees with current practice; two, the changes more accurately describe the voting processes currently used; and three, an addition to the Constitution will allow for more flexibility by allowing for administrative and clerical updates to be done in either document without a vote of the General Faculty. Along with the proposed changes, we have also taken the opportunity to edit the document with regards to punctuation and formatting; minor word changes for clarity, not content; and title changes to reflect current University titles. This summary provides an overview of the changes. A working copy of the proposed revisions to the Constitution and Bylaws is provided with each change (additions and/or deletions) highlighted in yellow for your reference.

Summary of Proposed Changes to Constitution

Membership (Article II Section 1.)

Per our current Constitution, some NTT faculty who would otherwise be members of the General Faculty are not officially members only because their titles (e.g., Asst., Assoc., Full Professors, NTT) are not among those listed in the Constitution. We propose simplifying the membership criteria by removing the list of NTT titles from the membership criteria and replacing it with “Nontenure-eligible faculty members [who hold half-time or more multi-year appointments].” Nontenure-eligible faculty is a term defined in UHAP.

Voting (Article II Section 4)

Currently it is not clear in some instances in which College members of the General Faculty vote. Proposed changes are to clarify that:
1. Those members of the General Faculty who are on administrative appointments vote in the college of their home departments.
2. Should a faculty member’s home college change (i.e., due to the transfer of an individual to another unit, or due to a unit reorganization or merger) his/her voting privileges move to the new college.

Committees (Article V and Article VI)
1. **Description of Committee Charges** - Minor changes to the descriptions of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees and University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation is described in the Constitution. Each Committee Chair was asked to review the wording on their Committee and recommend any changes. All changes were minor except the following entries:

   a. *Improvements in Technology* – Changes to reflect technological advances that no longer require a faculty “census” to be taken, but only a “roster” to be produced (from UAccess). (Article V Section 4)

   b. *Eliminate the Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning* – SPBAC, and the faculty elected to serve on SPBAC fulfill the role this committee was intended to fill. The committee has not independently met or carried out any work for many years. (Article V Section 6)

   c. *Minor Changes to Grievance Clearinghouse Committee, Committee on Conciliation, and Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure* – Minor changes were made to the descriptions of these committees to reflect the approved changes to the Bylaws put into effect in June of 2014, and to reflect changes in ABOR (related to numeration, not content). (Article V Section 9/8 and Section 10/9)

### The College Faculties (Article VIII)

1. Bring the language in Article VIII (on College Faculties) in line with the language in Article II (on members of the General Faculty)\(^1\) to make clear that (unless otherwise limited by college or unit bylaws – see below) all members of the General Faculty in Colleges not only have voting rights, but are also eligible to hold office and participate in shared governance committees within their units.

2. Enshrine in the Constitution College Faculties’ right not only to expand access to shared governance to individuals outside of the General Faculty (which it currently allows), but also, as appropriate based on contract status, to meaningfully restrict participation in defined shared governance activities to certain categories of employee within the General Faculty (i.e., Tenure-Track; Continuing Status Track; Nontenure-Track with Multiple Year Appointments; Emeritus). This reflects current practice, but is not in the Constitution. It is expected that any such exceptions would be detailed in unit bylaws that are approved by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

   a. Example: A unit might choose to exclude NTT faculty on multiple year contracts from participation on P&T committees or in votes related to P&T criteria or to exclude emeritus faculty from being eligible to serve on annual review committees, etc.

---

\(^1\) Currently Article II says: “Members of the General Faculty are eligible to vote in matters of faculty governance and to hold offices and to serve on committees established in accordance with this Constitution.” Article VIII (on College Faculties) only mentions voting rights: “Voting rights in College matters shall be accorded to General Faculty members as defined in Article II, above, and to such other individuals as the College Faculty may decide.”
Process for Minor Corrections or Administrative or Clerical Updates to Constitution & Bylaws (Article X).

Revisions to allow for any minor corrections or administrative or clerical updates to the Constitution or Bylaws that do not materially change the policy’s intent to be approved by the Faculty Senate and not require a vote by the General Faculty. These kinds of basic “housekeeping” changes would include things like punctuation, formatting, title changes, etc. The Faculty Senate could also decide to put such changes (or some portion of them) to a vote of the General Faculty, if deemed appropriate.
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PREAMBLE

This Constitution sets forth the basic organization and processes through and by which the General Faculty of the University of Arizona shall function, within the scope of its authority and responsibility, under state law and the policies and regulations of the Board of Regents authorized by that law.

ARTICLE I
Responsibilities

The General Faculty has fundamental responsibilities in the areas of academic personnel policy; instruction and curriculum policy; research policy; student affairs policy; ethics and commitment; advice on budget and University support; and acts on such other matters affecting the welfare of the University as are brought for consideration in accordance with University policy and Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements as may be entered into from time to time.

The General Faculty shall exercise its authority through its elected representatives in the Faculty Senate, although the General Faculty shall retain appellate power over all official actions of the Faculty Senate as provided in Article VII, Section 1.

Nothing in this Constitution and Bylaws is intended to imply assumption of authority not vested in the General Faculty by state law or Board of Regents policy.

ARTICLE II
Members

Section 1. For purposes of University government, the General Faculty of The University of Arizona is composed of:

a. Faculty members who hold half-time or more tenured or tenure-eligible appointments,

b. Academic professionals who hold half-time or more continuing or continuing-eligible appointments,

c. Lecturers (including Senior and Principal Lecturers) holding non-tenure eligible faculty members who hold half-time or more multi-year appointments,

d. Clinical professors, research professors and professors of practice holding half-time or more multi-year appointments,

de. Such persons in categories (a), (b), and (c) and (d) who hold Emeritus status.

Section 2. No candidate for a degree at the University of Arizona shall be a member of the General Faculty.

Section 3. This membership provision shall become effective upon approval by the President.

Section 4. Members of the General Faculty are eligible to vote in matters of faculty governance and to hold offices and to serve on committees established in accordance with this Constitution. Faculty with administrative appointments vote in their home college. Should any faculty
member’s home college change (i.e. due to the transfer of an individual to another unit, or due to a unit reorganization or merger), voting privileges move to the new college. Emeritus faculty shall have voting privileges in the first five years of Emeritus status, which will be extended for additional five-year periods at the request of the individual faculty member.

ARTICLE III
Officers

Section 1. The officers of the General Faculty shall consist of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.

Section 2. Chair of the Faculty.
   a. The Chair shall serve as:
      i. The chief executive officer of the General Faculty, including serving as Director of the Faculty Center and as a member of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee and the Shared Governance Review Committee.
      ii. The chief representative of the faculty before public and University bodies including the University administration, alumni, Arizona Board of Regents, and Arizona Legislature.
   b. The Chair shall be elected by the General Faculty in even-numbered years for a term of two years beginning June 1, and shall be eligible for re-election.

Section 3. Vice Chair of the Faculty.
   a. The Vice Chair shall:
      i. Preside over Faculty Senate meetings.
      ii. Serve as chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Naming Advisory Committee and the Shared Governance Review Committee.
      iii. Perform any other duties as delegated by the Chair.
   b. The Vice Chair shall be elected by the General Faculty in even-numbered years for a term of two years beginning June 1, and shall be eligible for re-election.

Section 4. Secretary of the Faculty.
   a. The Secretary shall:
      i. Review the minutes of Faculty Senate meetings prior to distribution.
      ii. Serve as chair of the Committee on Faculty Membership, the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and the Committee on Honorary Degrees.
ARTICLE IV
Meetings of the General Faculty

Section 1. Meetings of the General Faculty, limited to the purpose(s) stated in the call, shall be held:

a. On the call of the Chair of the Faculty.

b. On the call of the Faculty Senate.

c. On written petition from members of the General Faculty, as specified in the Bylaws Article III, Section 1.

Section 2. Five percent (5%) of the General Faculty shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of voting.

ARTICLE V
General Faculty Standing Committees

Section 1. The Committee on Elections, the Committee of Eleven, the Committee on Faculty Membership, the Committee on Committees, the Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning, the Committee on Ethics and Commitment, the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee, the Committee on Conciliation, and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, and such other committees as may, from time to time, hereafter be established shall be standing committees of the General Faculty.

Section 2. The Committee on Elections shall conduct elections for offices and committee memberships of the General Faculty, and elections for Faculty Senators representing the several College Faculties in accord with procedures specified in the Bylaws.
Section 3. The Committee of Eleven shall:

a. Initiate, promote, and stimulate study and action dealing with and looking toward solution of situations and problems of interest and concern to the faculty and the University.

b. Make reports to the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate.

c. Speak for the General Faculty as and when authorized by the General Faculty.

Section 4. The Committee on Faculty Membership shall interpret the provisions of Article II of this Constitution and Article I of its Bylaws, determine Senate apportionment and submit recommendations to the Faculty Senate for consideration and action. It shall be responsible for producing, conducting and publishing a roster of the annual census of the General Faculty each year, as provided in the Bylaws.

Section 5. The Committee on Committees shall recommend members of the General Faculty to the Chair of the Faculty for appointment or nomination to all committees of the General Faculty. Upon request of any administrative officer of the University, the committee shall also recommend persons for appointment to new or existing committees whose appointments lie within the discretion of such requesting officer.

Section 6. The Senate Committee on Budget and Strategic Planning shall be comprised of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee’s six elected faculty members; the Chair of the Faculty; and two Faculty Senators. The committee shall represent faculty interests and responsibilities at all stages of budget preparation, policy making and strategic planning. It will serve as a resource for the Faculty Senate through regular reports and responses to requests for information and advice, and to the various budget and planning committees throughout the University through joint meetings. The committee will conduct open forums or hearings as needed on budgetary and planning issues as a means of collecting information and soliciting faculty perspectives and comments.

Section 7. The University Committee on Ethics and Commitment shall deal with questions of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative endeavor; conflict of commitment; and facilities misuse; and receive reports from the Research Integrity Officer. In its deliberations it will use the current versions of the University policies on research integrity, professional commitment and proper facilities use.

Section 8. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall be responsible for proposing changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty necessitated by revisions to applicable law or policy and for proposing changes recommended by the General Faculty or its committees. The amendment process is specified in Article X of the Constitution. This committee also reviews and, if appropriate, recommends changes to the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP).

Section 9. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall be the faculty committee that accepts faculty members’ written requests for grievance hearings and which determines which committee, (Conciliation, Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, University Committee on Ethics and Commitment), or process, (Office of Institutional Equity), should consider a grievance.
The Committee on Conciliation and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) shall be the faculty committees that conduct all investigations and/or hearings regarding recommendations against, or complaints and grievances by or against members of the General Faculty as hereinafter prescribed and not otherwise. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry and to conduct hearings in two general areas contained in ABOR 6-201, 6-301 and 6-302: 1) matters involving contractual agreements between members of the General Faculty and the University/Board of Regents; and 2) internal matters relating to grievances against or by any member of the General Faculty. Protection of academic freedom and tenure is the principle obligation of CAFT. (Certain preliminary steps for dismissal situations are described in Chapters 3 and 4 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel and Sections 6-201, 6-301 and 6-302 of the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual.) Principles of law and policy require that members of the General Faculty have a forum in which grievances can be aired and examined and a known and effective procedure by which this can be done. That procedure, involving the examination of a grievance by the professional associates of the member affected, must reflect both the requirements of the law and the usages and traditions of the academic profession. Such investigations and hearings as are undertaken require the judicious consideration of facts, but they are not and must not be limited by the considerations of judicial hearings. Rather, they are investigations and hearings conducted by professional peers, the purpose of which is to safeguard and protect not only the individual rights of the members affected but also the collective rights of members of the University community. Committees constituted for these purposes perform an indispensable function in providing the due process of law to which every member of the faculty is entitled.

a. The Committee on Conciliation shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry and to meet and discuss any problem involving any member of the General Faculty in his or her relationship with the University. This committee may consult and advise but shall not conduct hearings. It shall be the duty of the committee, after careful investigation, to offer recommendation advice to the person or persons involved. Following the completion of the conciliation process, the President of the University shall be informed of the results. In addition, if conciliation has been unsuccessful, both parties shall be notified accordingly in writing with the member being advised that the grievance at issue may be presented to the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee for assignment.

b. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry and to conduct hearings in two general areas contained in ABOR 6-201, 6-301 and 6-302 namely: in regard to those matters contained in the Conditions of Service dealing with the contractual employment relationship between the General Faculty member and the University/Board of Regents; and in regard to any internal matters relating to grievances against or by any member of the General Faculty. The committee shall consider the protection of academic freedom and tenure as a principal obligation. (Certain preliminary steps for dismissal situations are described in Chapters 3 and 4 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel and Sections 6-201, 6-301 and 6-302 of the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual.)

The University of Arizona bears a responsibility to exercise leadership in labor and human rights matters. To this end, the University Committee for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues strives to ensure that fundamental labor and human rights,
particularly those articulated in the April 30, 1999 Commitments Relating to Sweatshops, are implemented by University licensees.

a. The committee makes recommendations to the President regarding fundamental labor and human rights issues including codes of conduct for licensees, monitoring of licensees, efforts to improve licensee compliance, and relations with non-compliant licensees.

b. The committee is also charged with educating the University community and the broader public about these issues.

ARTICLE VI
University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation

Section 1. 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.

Section 2. The University Committee on Corporate Relations makes recommendations to the President of the University (or his/her designee, upon request) about potential or changeable relationships between any part of the University of Arizona and one or more businesses or corporations. These recommendations will always consider how much any proposed new or altered relationship accords with -- or violates -- The University of Arizona Policy on Corporate Relations as approved by the President in a memo to the Chair of the Faculty dated January 29, 1999. This Policy mandates that the committee consider proposals in three areas:

a. Use of the University’s name or symbols by an external entity;

b. Implied University endorsement of a particular service, product, company, individual; or

c. Public display of advertisements or other corporate symbols.

The committee is also charged with recommending modifications to this Policy or proposing additional policies, so long as its policy-change proposals are approved by the Faculty Senate before they become recommendations to the President.

Section 3. The Naming Advisory Committee: The President shall forward all proposals for honorary naming of any site on University property to the attention of the Naming Advisory Committee. After review and deliberation, the committee forwards a written recommendation on each proposal to the President for further action.

Section 4. The Undergraduate Council reviews all undergraduate curricular action items forwarded from academic units, colleges, auxiliary units, the University-wide General Education Committee, any General Faculty Standing Committee or Senate Standing Committee or ad
hoc committee. All action items approved by the Undergraduate Council are forwarded to
the College Academic Administrators Council, Team Provost, Provost’s Council, and the
Senate Executive Committee before advancing to the Senate for approval. See Appendix II
to the Faculty Bylaws.

a. The Academic Programs Subcommittee deals with the creation, deletion,
suspension or modification of undergraduate academic units, majors, options,
minor, degrees, certificates, and programs of study. Curriculum and academic
issues may also be reviewed by this subcommittee as needed or as time
permits.

b. The Curriculum/Policies Subcommittee deals primarily with all aspects of
undergraduate curriculum and academic policies recorded in the General Catalog,
including creation, revision, and deletion of courses and academic policies
pertinent to instruction, majors, options, minors, degrees, transfer credits, general
education, academic progress, and requirements for graduation. Academic program
issues may also be reviewed by this subcommittee as needed or as time permits.

Section 5. The University-wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) is charged with the
review and approval of all curriculum changes in general education across the University,
assessment of the program, and disseminating General Education information to the
campus community and its partners. All instruction and curriculum action items approved
by the UWGEC are forwarded to the Undergraduate Council for review and submission
to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Section 6. The Graduate Council provides a forum in which matters of concern to graduate
education are discussed and the mission of the Graduate College fulfilled. The Council
works with the Graduate College to review, establish, and update policies affecting
graduate education. Among its roles, the Council is a part of the University process for
creating or changing graduate degree programs in the planning and implementation
stages, leading to ultimate approval by the Arizona Board of Regents. The Council
recommends and reviews the policies and procedures of the Graduate College, including
but not limited to admission requirements, degree certification, graduate teaching and
research assistantships and recommends priorities for graduate education and supports
efforts to achieve them. All instruction, curriculum, and policy action items approved by
the Graduate Council are forwarded to the College Academic Administrators
Council, Team Provost, Provost’s Council and the Senate Executive Committee before
advancing to the Faculty Senate for approval. See Appendix II to the Faculty Bylaws.

Section 7 The Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) in consultation and
dialogue with the President, the Provost, and the University community, supports and
enhances the success of the University through thoughtful and informed advice relating
to: strategic planning, assessment of institutional priorities, review of budgetary policies,
and the evaluation of programs and services. The SPBAC chair(s) shall provide regular
reports to the Faculty Senate.

In partnership with the University, SPBAC:

a. Develops and disseminates the University’s strategic plan.
b. Identifies issues that facilitate or impede the pursuit of the University’s mission.

c. Provides advice on budget policies, significant budgetary actions, and institutional priorities consistent with the strategic plan of the University.

d. Evaluates the effectiveness of plans, policies, and the assessments that affect the entire infrastructure of the University.

e. Develops guidelines for setting planning and budgeting priorities.

ARTICLE VII
Faculty Senate

Section 1. Functions. The Faculty Senate is the legislative body responsible to the General Faculty. Actions of the Faculty Senate may be appealed to the General Faculty by petition, under the provisions of the Bylaws Article III, 1, within eleven class days of the date under which Faculty Senate minutes reporting such actions were distributed to the General Faculty.

Section 2. Membership. The Faculty Senate shall consist of elected and *ex officio* members as provided in the Bylaws. Senators’ terms begin June 1st.

Section 3. Officers. The Vice Chair of the Faculty shall preside over the Faculty Senate meetings and, in his or her absence, the Secretary of the Faculty shall do so.

Section 4. Meetings. The Faculty Senate shall meet regularly the first working Monday in each month during the academic year, except for the Monday meetings omitted from each year’s Faculty Senate meeting calendar. Changes to the calendar can be made, as voted upon and approved by the Faculty Senate. Its meetings shall be open to the public, except when the body decides to meet in executive session. Additional meetings may be called by the President of the University or the Chair of the Faculty. The agenda of each meeting shall be set by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Section 5. The Faculty Senate shall establish such standing committees and such *ad hoc* committees as may be required. The charge to the *ad hoc* committees shall include a proposed duration of the committee and a reporting date. Senate *ad hoc* committees that cease to meet or yield no findings will be disbanded within one calendar year of the initial charge, after review by the Senate Executive Committee in consultation with the *ad hoc* committee chair.

ARTICLE VIII
The College Faculties

The general charge of each College is entrusted to its College Faculty, subject to the Board of Regents and the authority vested by the Board in the President of the University. Voting rights and participation in shared governance in College matters shall generally be accorded to General Faculty members as defined in Article II above, and to such other individuals as the College Faculty may decide. General Faculty members should only be excluded from those shared governance activities that are not relevant to their contract status (e.g., voting on a Promotion and Tenure committee composition; emeritus faculty participation on an annual performance review committee, etc.) Any such exclusions should be detailed in College or unit Bylaws. Bylaws for each College should be established in accordance with the current Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements and adopted by the appropriate College Faculty and made available to each
member. A copy must be filed with the Office of the Provost and in the Faculty Center. In matters of faculty governance, members of the General Faculty not included in a College shall be regarded collectively as a College (Non-College). The general charge of each College is entrusted to its College Faculty, subject to the Board of Regents and the authority vested by the Board in the President of the University. Voting rights in College matters shall be accorded to General Faculty members as defined in Article II, above, and to such other individuals as the College Faculty may decide. Bylaws for each College should be established in accordance with the current Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements and adopted by the appropriate College Faculty and made available to each member. A copy must be filed with the Office of the Provost and in the Faculty Center. In matters of faculty governance, members of the General Faculty not included in a College shall be regarded collectively as a College (Non-College).

ARTICLE IX
Parliamentary Authority

In all matters not provided for in the Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona, the rules contained in the latest edition of Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised, shall govern.

ARTICLE X
Amendments and Ratification

Section 1. Revisions to allow for minor corrections or administrative or clerical updates to the Constitution or Bylaws that do not materially change intent may be approved by the Faculty Senate, and not require a vote of the General Faculty, unless the Faculty Senate determines otherwise.

Section 2. Constitution. Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or by petition to the Chair of the Faculty signed by five percent (5%) or one hundred (100) members of the General Faculty, whichever is smaller. The Chair of the Faculty shall send copies of such proposals to all members of the General Faculty and shall convene a special meeting of the General Faculty to consider them not fewer than ten (10) class days after distribution. The proposed amendment(s) shall then be submitted to a mail or electronic ballot of the General Faculty. A three-fourths majority of the votes cast is necessary for adoption. Immediately upon adoption, the amendments shall be transmitted to the President of the University. Upon consideration and approval by the University President, the amendments shall become effective. The President’s consideration shall be preceded by written analyses by University Counsel and by Board Counsel within 90 days following the General Faculty vote that the amendments are consistent with Arizona Board of Regents Policies.

Section 2. Bylaws. Amendments to the Bylaws may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or by petition to the Chair of the Faculty signed by five percent (5%) or one hundred (100) members of the General Faculty, whichever is smaller. The Chair of the Faculty shall send copies of such proposals to all members of the General Faculty. Not fewer than ten (10) class days nor more than fifteen (15) class days after distribution, a mail or electronic ballot shall be distributed to all members of the General Faculty together with the arguments pro and con. A two-thirds majority of the votes cast is necessary for adoption. Immediately upon adoption, the amendments shall be transmitted to the President of the University. Upon consideration and approval by the University President, the amendments shall become effective. The President’s consideration shall be preceded by written analyses by University Counsel and by Board Counsel within 90 days following the General Faculty vote that the amendments are consistent with Arizona Board of Regents Policies.
To comply with Arizona Board of Regents Policy 1-113
HIGHLIGHTS:

Tuition Discussions:
- After weeks of deliberations with central administration, we have settled on tuition numbers that will be in place for those who are not on the guaranteed tuition program and incoming freshmen.
- Highlight: Currently enrolled students not in the guaranteed program will be able to opt in at last year’s rate significantly saving students from this year’s increase and the very likely scenario of next year’s increase as well.

Student Senate Reform
- Student Constitution changes approve through overwhelming by student body election. Affects will take place in the 2016-2017 academic year.

Spring Fling Around the Corner:
- Nation’s largest student run carnival is back to campus for the second year in a row.
- APRIL 10th-12th

New ASUA President Elect:
- Manuel Felix has officially been elected ASUA President for the 2015-2016 Academic year beginning May 1st.
- Applications out now for directorships
- Transition period to follow soon after.
See GPSC Survey Results reported to ABOR February 5, 2015 here

See all GPSC Survey Results at gpcs.arizona.edu/gpsc-institute

If you were the Graduate Professional Student Body President, what would you do if you had the following information?
Appendix – Results of Three Surveys on Childcare

In 2014-2015, GPSC collaborated with the VETS and the CSW to gather data on childcare needs. The results show that undergraduate, graduate, professional, and VETS students along with faculty and staff have significant childcare expenses that are not currently being met by the UA. Below we report the results of the three surveys.

GPSC (n = 431 out of 4,000 who received random survey) between August – November 2014.

Results

- 135 (35%) respondents indicated that they had at least one child
- Childcare expenses ranged from $93 -- $550 per week
- Childcare expenses averaged $3,120 per semester ($195 per week * 16 weeks = $3,120).
- 88/106 respondents indicated that they had NEVER received non-UA support for childcare expenses.
- 97/103 respondents indicated that additional childcare support would help them graduate in a timely manner.
- 96/103 respondents indicated that additional childcare support would improve their academic experience (graph 2).

Graph 1: Childcare support satisfaction.  
Graph 2: Childcare support and graduation.

VETS

VETS (n = 46) in December 2014.

Results

- Childcare expenses ranged from $20 -- $800 per week
- Childcare expenses averaged $2,864 per semester ($179 per week * 16 weeks = $2,864).
- 36/38 indicated that additional childcare support would help them graduate in a timely manner.

Summary: Childcare support may facilitate graduation rates and career support.

Faculty and Staff

Faculty and Staff (n=95) October – December 2014

- Childcare expenses ranged from $45 -- $550 per week
- Childcare expenses averaged $3,200 per semester ($200 per week * 16 weeks = $3,200).
- 25/45) of respondents indicated that they had received childcare support from the UA at some point in time.

Summary: Childcare support may facilitate career development.
HIGHLIGHTS:

1. The University of Arizona is a member of the PAC 12 Academic Leadership Coalition. The mission of the organization is to improve the effectiveness and responsiveness of each member school’s shared governance organization; and where commonalities occur, to facilitate academic and research cooperation that is jointly beneficial to participating institutions. Michael Brewer, Bobbi McKean and Jane Cherry attended a meeting March 27 and 28 of the group at Washington State University. All of the PAC-12 schools except for UCLA, UC Berkeley and Stanford were present. During the March meeting, we approved by-laws, elected officers and discussed some commonly held concerns and the various approaches by each institution to those concerns.

2. The Shared Governance Caucus, composed of the leaders of ASUA, APAC, Faculty Senate, GPSC and SAC, have generated a Statement concerning the current budget situation (in supplementary materials).

3. The Non-tenure Task Force has been charged to develop a fuller picture of our NTT faculty workforce, their contributions to the University and issues they face. To review and report out on progress on action items from the 2013 NTT Task Force Report, or address areas for potential action and make recommendations to Senate, and to identify new areas for potential action and make recommendation to Senate. Its members are Michael Brewer [Chair] (Librarian, Vice Chair of the Faculty), Maggie Camp (NTT East Asian Studies), Albrecht Classen (Distinguished Professor, German), Daisy Fleur Pitkin (NTT MYE Honors College), Amy Fountain (NTT MYE Linguistics, Faculty Senator), Jeremy Frey (NTT English), Mika Galileebelfer (SBS, co-Chair SPBAC), Rob Miller (Dept Head, Architecture), Bill Neumann (NTT MYE MIS, Faculty Senator), and John Pollard (NTT Chemistry).
Introduction

The University of Arizona is facing extraordinary budget challenges, exacerbated by the compounding effect of prior cuts. While urgent actions will clearly be required, we are concerned that all our actions, urgent or not, reflect the sustained best interests of the institution.

The Shared Governance Caucus, made up of the leaders of APAC, ASUA, Faculty Senate, GPSC, and SAC, would like to convey our collective concerns as we approach these challenges. These concerns are most readily expressed in terms of our values, and some frameworks for action they suggest. Core values should inform decision-making at all times, and especially in times of challenge. Our core values are expressed in Never Settle, which can help us map a successful future.

Conceptual Frameworks for Action

- Ensure that the core functions of the university remain functional despite any budget challenges, while at the same time not forgetting that core functions have depth and reach beyond the obvious.
- Recognize that there are limits to the burden that can be transferred to students, as we seek to meet our charge as a Land Grant University and to ensure the university experience remains as widely accessible as possible.

Strategic Recommendations

- **Spread the pain.** The need for wide organizational support mandates this. No group, unit or class of employee should appear to be beyond the reach of discomfort in meeting these challenges. Symbolic measures are insufficient. Discomfort should be clear, transparent and quantifiable.
- **Make investments.** While cuts are necessary, we must continue to make investments in faculty, staff, and graduate students and other initiatives to ensure our future.
- **Ensure salary parity with our peers.** Longstanding salary issues cannot be ignored in perpetuity. These should be considered in the larger framework of meeting all our fiscal challenges.
- **Consider a well thought-out staged response.** A rush toward permanent solutions that solve the entire budget shortfall in one year may be counter-productive. Now that we have the bulk of the work on RCM behind us, we can use the next year to reassess and reexamine options, and that can only benefit us.
- **Share our value to the public.** We must find a way to convince the public of the value of higher education. Every employee should be armed with facts and be able to act as an ambassador for our message.

Close

The Shared Governance Caucus, and those they represent, seek to partner in addressing the challenges we face. Our ability to speak in one voice as an institution -- one participative, inclusive, thoughtful and positive voice -- will help us navigate the current challenging environment with minimum anxiety and maximum confidence in the future.

Issac Ortega, ASUA
Mark Napier, APAC
Lynn Nadel, Faculty Senate
Zach Brooks, GPSC
Sheri Hill, SAC
HIGHLIGHTS:

**Tuition-Setting Process**
Student body leaders from ASUA and GPSC have been meeting with senior administrators since last Fall, and especially over the last month this Spring, in order to come together in the development of the UA’s proposal to ABOR for FY16 tuition rates. ABOR’s tuition hearings are on April 20, and tuition is decided on May 4.

**Budgeting Process**
Discussions at SPBAC have continued on how the UA should approach the state budget cuts. Final budget details will not be known until after tuition has been set by ABOR.

**APRs and P&T**
As it is every year, this part of the Spring semester is the season for many Academic Program Reviews and for Promotion and Tenure reviews in the Provost’s Office. I’d like to thank all the faculty, staff and students who contribute countless hours to these important processes that are, at heart, about academic quality.
ABOR Process for Setting Tuition and Fees

1) Principles
   a. Tuition costs will not bear the full burden of state funding cuts.
   b. There will be real cuts and reallocations.
   c. We will continue to invest in the Never Settle strategic plan and increase quality.

2) Process
   a. Student leaders have been tremendously engaged with university leaders and have been a key part of the solution.
   b. University leadership has been giving preliminary briefings to regents, and student leaders are independently reaching out to the regents.
   c. The tuition proposal is completed and made public April 10.
   d. There is a statewide tuition hearing on April 20. The University of Arizona will be a hosting site.
   e. The Arizona Board of Regents will discuss the tuition and fees proposals from all three universities on April 27.
   f. ABOR will vote on the tuition and fees proposals of all three universities on May 4.
Proposal to create Student Engagement Policies and Guidelines
Proposed by VP Digital Learning/Student Engagement Vince Del Casino, 2/18/15;
approved by the Undergraduate Council, 3/10/15; by the College Academic Administrators Council, 3/24/15.

Definition and Goal

Engagement occurs when students translate and apply their learning within and beyond the classroom into transformative practices and experiences that impact their professional and personal lives. The goal of the Student Engagement Learning Initiative is to recognize the undergraduate experiences based in:

- original and collaborative advanced lab and field research that students do;
- creative events, performances, and activities that students develop and lead;
- internships and externships they complete;
- practicums and preceptorships that help them reimagine what they are learning in the lecture classroom;
- study abroad experiences that challenge them to think beyond their own national context;
- service learning projects that ask students to apply course content to community-based activities to address needs; and,
- the wide range of student-centered co-curricular activities that build on students’ educational experience.

Core Outcomes of an Engaged Learning Experience

Student engagement courses or non-credit experiences are distinguished from other experiences on campus by the fact that they focus on the following:

1) **Engagement Activities***
   Engagement Activities are experiences that students participate in to develop professional and personal skills. Each engagement experience must focus on one of the following activities: community partnership; creative expression; discovery; entrepreneurship; intercultural exploration; leadership and professional development.

2) **Engagement Competencies***
   Engagement Competencies are the lenses through which students focus their activity to develop an appreciation for and a comprehensive understanding of that area or lens. Each student engagement experience must focus on one of the following competencies: civic and community responsibility; diversity and identity; global and intercultural comprehension; innovation and creativity; interdisciplinarity; professionalism; and sustainability.

3) **Engagement Professional and Personal Skills**
   The following are some recommended professional and personal skills that can be assessed in relation to any engaged learning activity and competency, although others may be developed by colleges and departments: reflection and application (required of all engagement experiences); communication; collaboration/teamwork; problem solving/critical thinking; project management; academic and non-academic career preparedness.

A credit-based or non-credit curricular engaged learning experience must focus on one engagement activity and one engagement competency. In addition, it is recommended that each credit or non-credit experience include the appropriate Engagement Professional and Personal Skills among the learning outcomes.
For a formal description of the above categories, see Definition of Engagement Activities/Competencies.

Graduating with an Engaged Learning Experience

To graduate with an “Engaged Learning Experience” notation on the academic transcript, students must successfully complete (1) at least one credit-based engagement course at the 300 or 400 level, or (2) a non-credit engagement experience that has been approved by the University Office of Student Engagement. Note: If the upper division course is assigned a regular grade, the student must achieve a C or better to graduate with an “Engaged Learning Experience.”

Students may complete more than one engagement experience by registering for a course or non-credit experience that has a different activity and competency. There is no restriction on the number of student engagement opportunities for which a student may register.

Guidelines for Credit-Based Engagement Courses:

1. Credit-based engagement courses may be offered by an academic college or department.
2. The “engaged learning experience” may be assigned at the course level or section level.
3. All student engagement courses are required to have a syllabus detailing: (1) engagement activity, (2) engagement competency, (3) student learning outcomes, (4) grading policy, (5) expected work products and reflection activities, and (6) reference academic policies such as threatening behavior, code of academic integrity, and accessibility and accommodations. Course syllabi must also comply with Undergraduate Course Syllabus Policy.
4. Academic departments and colleges must approve all credit-based engagement course syllabi. No course will be identified in the Course Catalog or Schedule of Classes as meeting the University’s criteria for an “Engaged Learning Experience” without receiving engagement approval from the college.
5. Grading System: Per the course category (e.g., Individual Studies, Small Group Courses) engagement courses may be offered for the S,P,F,I alternative grading system, the Pass/Fail system, or for Regular Grades, as long as the grading system is made clear to students in the class. The grading system is determined by the offering instructor and applied consistently at the section level of that course. Note: For upper division courses with regular grades, students must achieve a C or better to graduate with the notation, “Engaged Learning Experience” on their transcript. Colleges may require a grade higher than a C to earn the notation.
6. Courses may be offered online, in the classroom, or with other formats.

Guidelines for Non-Credit Based Engagement Experiences:

Students may also meet the criteria for graduating with an “Engaged Learning Experience” by registering for one of the University’s formally approved non-credit experiences. The Office of Student Engagement maintains a list of approved non-credit learning experiences. These engagement experiences must:

1. be approved by the Office of Student Engagement, which administers a committee* of faculty and staff that review all non-credit experiences for students;
2. identify the engagement activity and engagement competency met by the experience; and
3. include information on (1) expected supervision by faculty or staff, (2) required hours of
engagement, (3) a reflection component that supports students in making meaning of the experience, and (4) an explanation for how the supervisor will verify that the required minimum of 45 hours of work and a reflection piece have been completed by the student.

[*Note for purposes of the policy proposal, not for the Catalog: The Committee will consist of the following voting members: three faculty members** appointed by the Vice Provost for Digital Learning and Student Engagement, one faculty member from the UG Council, one representative appointed from a combination of the Staff Council and the Appointed Professional Council, one representative appointed by ASUA, one representative appointed by GPSC. Non-voting ex-officio members will include: Vice Provost for Digital Learning and Student Engagement, Director Academic Initiatives and Project Development, and Senior Director Academic and Curricular Affairs. **An academic college can be represented by no more than one member on the committee at any one time.*]
Definition of Engagement Activities and Competencies

Engagement Activities

Engagement Activities are curricular and co-curricular experiences that students participate in to develop professional and personal skills.

Community Partnership

Students serve as part of a formal arrangement that mobilizes both UA and community resources to raise the visibility of community issues; increase individual and organizational commitment to resolving those issues; develop new solutions to old problems; or gain new resources or make better use of existing resources to improve outcomes for members of the community.

Creative Expression

Students develop original works, or interpret existing ones, in independent or collaborative projects that engage communities in thinking about abstract concepts related to such things as everyday experiences, human conditions, environmental change, and affective and emotional relationships.

Discovery

Students engage in independent or collaborative inquiry that contributes to a wider sense of understanding, the development of solutions to challenging problems, or leads the creation of new knowledge.

Entrepreneurship

Students will initiate, develop, and/or manage an organization systematically, with their work characterized by innovation and calculated risk taking. Student entrepreneurship will produce an understanding of strategies and skills for innovative organizational development as well as the tangible implementation of projects that respond to evolving societal and marketplace challenges and delivers services that meet those challenges.

Intercultural Exploration

Students participate in global and international programs that challenge them to think about and investigate the world, explore different cultures, and place their classroom learning into a global context.

Leadership

Students will utilize various theories, models, and styles of leadership through the practice of leadership in some role within or through an organization. Through the practice, they will create collaborative relationships and networks and learn to empower, mentor, and influence others. These experiences will enable students to develop a self-understanding and social intelligence that will help them translate a shared vision into ethical practice.

Professional Development

Students participate in activities that further their understanding, commitment, skill and contribution to a body of work, field, or industry. Students develop appropriate acumen to thrive in a given organizational culture and contribute to problem solving, efficient/effective processes involving products, customers, programs and/or services.
Engagement Competencies

Engagement Competencies are the lenses through which students focus their engagement activity to develop an appreciation for and a comprehensive understanding of that area or lens.

Civic and Community Responsibility

Students develop an understanding of government and community systems in order to contribute to the social cohesion, capacity, and governance of a community. In so doing, students will become motivated to be active community members who model inclusive decision-making, foster relationships of reciprocity in their service/volunteer activities, critically reflect on issues, and educate and facilitate the civic engagement of others.

Diversity and Identity

Students develop explicit understandings of the sociocultural, linguistic, economic, and political experiences of diverse groups representing varying identities and societies, both of their own and others, and apply those understandings in work related to a wide range of communities. Diversity and identity is based on developing an appreciation for differences and a sense of an inclusive community.

Global and Intercultural Comprehension

Students develop an understanding of global issues and the worldwide impact of individual and systemic actions while respecting diverse viewpoints. Students will be able to reflect on their own and other cultural biases and think critically about the world through interaction and collaboration with cultures and societies that are different from their own.

Innovation and Creativity

Students will gain an understanding of how to deliberately apply information, imagination, creative thinking, and initiative to generate new ideas for the purpose of addressing needs. This process will help students become accustomed to the discomfort of questioning the status quo and the excitement of idea generation and exploration at the leading-edge of thought.

Interdisciplinarity

Students will gain an understanding of how to bring together novel and original thinking across disciplines to build on knowledge, practices, theories, or methodologies. Students will be motivated to network and establish relationships that cut across disciplines in the pursuit of common tasks.

Professionalism

Students will develop a heightened understanding of themselves and others as they participate in various experiences to build their knowledge of professional etiquette and expertise. Based on these experiences, students will learn to communicate in an articulate and positive manner, act with integrity, and expand the boundaries of expectation toward a standard of excellence in their work and life.

Sustainability

Students will gain an understanding of the social, environmental, and economic dimensions of conditions or practices that make society vulnerable and unsustainable over multi-generational time scales. Through the exploration of issues from a sustainability perspective, students will be motivated to develop potential solutions to these challenges through the use systems thinking.
to improve the quality of life for all – environmentally, socially, and economically – both now and for future generations.

**Engagement Professional and Personal Skills**

**Reflection and Application**
Students will be able to critically analyze personal strengths and challenges and translate experiences into new professional goals or personal life plans; articulate self-insight in the context of a new learning environment; describe how competencies gained in one experience can be applied to a new context and apply new ideas and insights to improve a process, product or outcome.

**Communication**
Students will be able to verbally communicate in an articulate manner, write effectively with use of traditional and new media tools, conduct engaging group presentations or artistic expression, advocate for a point of view, and interact effectively through listening and empathy with diverse individuals and cultural contexts.

**Collaboration/Teamwork**
Students will be able to work effectively as part of a diverse team, generate new ideas that incorporate the contributions of others, behave in an ethical way, volunteer or lead activities, and demonstrate follow through and collaborate in traditional and virtual spaces.

**Problem Solving/Critical Thinking**
Students will be able to leverage curiosity to construct problem posing and engage in inquiry – based discovery; articulate problem-solving strategies and solutions; synthesize information to develop new perspectives, apply knowledge to current situations, both independently and interdependently and reflect on critical thinking and problem solving through metacognition.

**Project Management**
Students will be able to manage many people and moving parts such as information, resources, and materials into systems and structures that will result in effective and efficient project outcomes. Students will be able to manage their time to address demanding needs and navigate structural processes with ease.

**Academic and Non-Academic Career Preparedness**
Students will be able to articulate a career plan and goals, demonstrate effective self-presentation skills by articulating competencies developed through education and experience, and demonstrate knowledge of the organizations they seek. Students will produce enticing self-branding tools using traditional and new media applications, effectively introduce themselves in a networking environment and demonstrate productivity in changing organizations and cultures.
The following are examples – among many available options – of credit-based engagement experiences subject to the approval of students’ college academic advisors. Such examples include courses and programs already offered on campus, such as 393/493 (internship) or 394/494 (practicum) as well as many other available choices already being offered in departments and colleges as part of major and minor programs.

**PHYS 492 – Directed Research**
Individual or small group research under the guidance of faculty.

*Activity: Discovery*  
*Competency: Innovation and Creativity*

**ECOL 450 – Marine Discovery**
Participate in this marine biology outreach program for grades 3-8. Undergraduates do all of the instruction in on-campus, inquiry-based workshops featuring marine diversity and conservation with a focus on the nearby Sea of Cortez. You will gain experience in developing your own teaching style, while learning about marine biology. As of June 1, 2009, a current US passport is required of all students taking the course for the trip to Mexico. Course includes one required field trip.

*Activity: Community Partnership*  
*Competency: Professionalism/Civic and Community Responsibility*

**AFAS 302: Africana Studies Research Approaches**
This course is designed to provide students with skills in conducting social science research in the field of Africana Studies. The course will consist of discussions of the role of knowledge, the various methods by which knowledge is acquired, and the manner that interpretations of knowledge occur.

*Activity: Discovery*  
*Competency: Innovation and Creativity*

**JPN 345: Megacity Tokyo**
Megacity Tokyo is an intensive six-week summer course held in Tokyo, Japan. In this UA faculty-led course, students will learn about Tokyo from diverse perspectives in history, geography, anthropology, and cultural studies to discover first-hand the myriad ways that infrastructure, traditional arts, and modern social life intermix in contemporary Japan’s fascinating metropolis.

*Activity: Intercultural Exploration*  
*Competency: Global and Intercultural Comprehension*

**HUMS 491A: Writing the Community: Service Learning Internship**
Writing the Community is a one semester internship with the goal of creating community cultural development (or an advocacy tool for the arts) to help the Poetry Center, the College of Humanities,

---

1 The University has not yet formally approved these experiences. Some of these examples are just that examples – the final activities and competencies would be determined through review processes in colleges or in the Office of Student Engagement.
the Honors College and the University as a whole extend its reach into the community and support the critical and creative thinking skills of K-12 learners. Internships are based around volunteer service in which students facilitate hands-on, creative writing related activities as a part of the Poetry Center's in-house education programs. Students extend their volunteer service from the previous course and work in pairs (if undergraduate) or solo teach (if graduate) for any number of Poetry Center education programs. Internships are customized to fit students' interests, skill sets, and community needs for any given year.

**Activity:** Community Partnership  
**Competency:** Civic and Community Responsibility

**SOC 397a Poverty in Tucson Field Workshop**
This workshop-based course explores the problem of poverty in the city of Tucson and its impacts on the well-being of local residents. The workshop combines in-class lectures on poverty with extensive training in the collection of survey data. Partnering with various community agencies and nonprofits, this course includes an intensive period of field research where students will interview households in Tucson in order to help our community partners better understand the problem of poverty and identify potential solutions. Over six weeks, students will work in teams to travel to identified households and request their participation in a survey. Students will be given specific goal of surveys to collect and will do so outside the traditional course meeting time. At the end of the course, students will form teams to analyze their data and present their findings back to the community at a forum hosted by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

**Activity:** Community Partnership  
**Competency:** Civic and Community Responsibility

**NSC 395a: Experiential Learning in Nutritional Sciences**
Students will participate in classroom activities designed to illustrate the importance of 'professional skills'. Students will then keep detailed journals from their experiences at an assigned volunteer site, where they are expected to apply and observe these 'professional skills'. Students will also research their volunteer site and complete assignments related to their volunteer work. Students will be expected to keep signed records to document their volunteer work.

**Activity:** TBA  
**Competency:** TBA

**Anthropology Field Schools**
Field schools rest at the heart of the discipline of anthropology and are core to their undergraduate educational experience. Because anthropology is so varied, so are the field school experiences that they deliver.

**Activity:** TBA, Examples Include:  
- **Community Partnership:** all our field schools are developed in partnership with local entities - high schools, community groups, etc. and include the students working alongside others, helping others tour the site, or giving presentations in the community

- **Creative Expression:** by the end of field school, each student has to come up with an individual project using information collected during the field school, and write it up as a paper and/or give a presentation on it
Discovery: throughout the field school students are working alongside team leaders to gather, process, and analyze data from the site.

Intercultural Exploration: focusing not only on contemporary societies and cultures but also on the past.

Professional Development: students are exposed to professionals who are working at the site, come to give special presentations, and assist with the field schools. The goal is that they gain the knowledge and skills they need to work in the field.

Engagement Competencies: TBA

Examples of Non-Credit-Based Experiences

The following are a sample of the wide range of non-credit engagement experiences that already exist on campus. The activity and competency listed for each is an example – none of these experiences have received formal approval. There are many other examples available.

EcoReps (Office of Sustainability, Dean of Students)
Peer education programming leaders in the residence halls. After participating in the EcoReps Program, students will have a working knowledge of sustainability, appreciate how to build community around a common interest, and create new ways to advocate for sustainability-based work.

Activity: Leadership
Competency: Sustainability

BRAVO (UBRP, College of Science)
Students in this program do a number of outreach-related activities, including conference presentations, appearing on radio programs, hosting visiting physician scientists, and a pen-pal program with 6th graders. Reflection is built into all aspects of the program.

Activity: Discovery
Competency: Professionalism

Outreach Band (College of Fine Arts)
The Outreach Honors Band was formed in 1993. The group services public and private school music programs in the extended Tucson Metropolitan area. Bands are directed by UA Music Education students.

Activity: Creative Expression
Competency: Civic and Community Responsibility

Blue Chip (Leadership Programs, Office of Vice Provost, Digital Learning and Student Engagement)
Students engage in service projects as well as professional preparation programs in a first year intensive program and a longer-four year program. Blue Chip is run by students for students with oversight and direction from the Leadership Programs. Upper division students coordinate activities for first and second year students in the program, providing them on-the-ground engaged learning experiences.
**Activity: Leadership**  
*Competency: Civic and Community Responsibility*

**Student Docents (Arizona State Museum)**  
Arizona State Museum docents receive classroom instruction—including lectures, guest speakers, small group work, and practice tours—before working with the public. After the initial training, docents will be expected to volunteer a minimum of 4 hours a month between October and April.

**Activity: Professional Development**  
*Competency: Interdisciplinarity*

**Alternative Spring Break (Dean of Students)**  
*Activity: Community Partnership  
Competency: Diversity and Identity*

**Hack Arizona (Innovate UA)**  
Hack Arizona is about bringing together the most talented undergraduates to represent the burgeoning tech ecosystem that is appearing in the southwest and across the country. Hosted at the University of Arizona, over 400 participants will build software and hardware projects from start to finish in under 36 hours amongst their peers, mentors and company sponsors.

*Activity: Entrepreneurship  
Competency: Innovation and Creativity*
PATHS TO "ENGAGED LEARNING EXPERIENCE"

**Path 1: For Credit Engaged Learning Experiences**

- Engaged Learning Attributes (ELA) added to Courses
- Students enroll in upper division course with ELA
- Registrar queries graduating students who have achieved the grade required by policy in at least one of these courses
- Batch process to add Graduation with Engaged Learning Experience to Student Transcript (as Non-Course Milestone)

**Path 2: Non-credit Engaged Learning Experiences**

- Proposals submitted by campus community and approved by University-wide Committee
- Student Engagement Program Coordinator adds approved experiences to Non-credit Engagement Table in UAccess
- Approved activities added to student Non-credit Engagement Record (distributed data entry)
- Sponsor approves experience once completed by student
Graduating with an “Engaged Learning Experience” Notation

Abra McAndrew, Director
Academic Initiatives and Project Development
Definitions of Engagement

• Engagement occurs when students translate and apply their learning within and beyond the classroom into transformative practices and experiences that impact their professional and personal lives.

• An “Engaged Learning Experience” notation on the academic transcript occurs when a student successfully completes: (1) at least one credit-based engagement course at the 300 or 400 level, or (2) a non-credit engagement experience that has been approved by the University of Arizona’s Office of Student Engagement.
Engagement Activities and Competencies

**Activities**
- Community Partnership
- Creative Expression
- Discovery
- Entrepreneurship
- Intercultural Exploration
- Leadership
- Professional Development

**Competencies**
- Civic and Community Responsibility
- Diversity and Identity
- Global and Intercultural Comprehension
- Entrepreneurship
- Innovation and Creativity
- Interdisciplinarity
- Professionalism
Personal and Professional Skills

- Reflection and Application
- Communication
- Collaboration/Team work
- Problem Solving/Critical Thinking
- Project Management
- Academic and Non-Academic Career Preparedness
Non-credit Engagement Experiences

- Programs across campus can apply to the Office of Student Engagement to have a non-credit experience evaluated to count toward the “Engaged Learning Experience” notation
- Advanced or Capstone type experiences
- A committee of faculty and students will evaluate the applications
- All non-credit experiences will meet a threshold requiring at least 45 hours of work, including a reflection component
Example: Non-credit

Blue Chip (Leadership Programs, Office of the Vice Provost, Digital Learning and Student Engagement)

Students engage in service projects as well as professional preparation programs in a first year intensive program and a longer, four year program. Blue Chip is run by students for students with oversight and direction from Leadership Programs. Advanced students coordinate activities for first and second year students in the program, providing them on-the-ground engaged learning experiences.

Activity: Leadership
Competency: Civic and Community Responsibility

*Note: No activities have been approved, pending policy approval
Credit Engagement Experiences

• Colleges will each create standards for what constitutes credit-bearing engagement experiences
• Attributes – one “activity” and one “competency” – assigned at course or section level
• Attributes assignable at student level
Example: Credit

ECOL 450 – Marine Discovery
Participate in this marine biology outreach program for grades 3-8. Undergraduates do all of the instruction in on-campus, inquiry-based workshops featuring marine diversity and conservation with a focus on the nearby Sea of Cortez. You will gain experience in developing your own teaching style, while learning about marine biology. As of June 1, 2009, a current U.S. passport is required of all students taking the course for the trip to Mexico. Course includes one required field trip.

Activity: Community Partnership
Competency: Professionalism

*Note: No activities have been approved, pending policy approval
Investment and Support

- $700,000 Strategic Investment
- $540,000 to Colleges for positions and RFP
- $160,000 centrally for coordination and systems
Questions and Discussion
Committee of Eleven White Paper
Status of the University of Arizona Research* Program

Motivation: Widespread faculty concern about the future of the UA’s standing as Research I/AAU university - given the steadily declining support from the state.

Priority: The C11 was unanimous that maintaining the UA’s excellence in research should be a top priority for the future - in the interests of the UA, Tucson and Arizona. This means maintaining and enhancing the research capabilities of the UA faculty.

Governance: Topic is of key importance to the future of the UA and therefore an appropriate issue for C11 study – hence the white paper.

Perspective: While many can contribute to this goal, the C11 chose to focus attention on what could be done from inside the university, an appropriate faculty governance function.

Change: Success in the face of declining state support requires realignment of funding priorities. Each activity should be evaluated in terms of “value-added” to the research enterprise within the framework of the “Never Settle” program.

Goal: Ensure an upward spiral in UA research activity by implementing a reward structure based on a “carrot and stick” approach rather than by “central control” or “policing”.

* This term is used as shorthand for creative scholarly activity
Committee of Eleven White Paper

Status of the University of Arizona Research Program

Members of the C11 Subcommittee met with many individuals, including several College Deans, Directors, Faculty, Administrative Staff Members, while drafting the white paper. Broad recurring themes included:

• Difficulty in recruiting and/or retaining top faculty due to inadequate resources;

• Lack of support for promising new research endeavors;

• Ever increasing bureaucratic burdens on faculty and departmental staff combined with decreasing resources to deal with them;

• A growing concern that the pendulum has swung too far toward risk aversion and compliance, thereby stifling innovation;

• A perception, as documented in the recent COACHE survey, that support for research excellence ranks low in the priorities of the UA leadership.

By and large, C11 members shared these concerns.
Committee of Eleven White Paper
Status of the University of Arizona Research* Program

Figure 6 Distribution of Sponsored Project Research Awards with PI Age Group
Total $1,349,360,921 FY2011-2014*

* 2014 data = Jul ’13 – Mar ’14 excludes JW Space Telescope Award
Assuming that the UA leadership and faculty wish to maintain and enhance the UA’s international standing as a leading research institution, the C11 recommends that:

1. UA leadership and faculty unite in raising the priority of research and its impact on students to the highest possible level and in making changes in expenditure necessary to implement that priority.
2. The quality of the faculty be enhanced. Resources are needed immediately to enable hiring/retention of top scholars/prospects and initiation of promising new programs. Tenure criteria should be strengthened.
3. The way in which UA research/teaching is organized should be reviewed especially in regard to interdisciplinary activities – the path to the future in many fields.
4. The UA streamline its administrative processes on the basis of the “value-added” by each to the research/teaching effort versus its cost. The goal would be to reduce unnecessary bureaucratic burdens on faculty as well as the cost in both staff and faculty time.
5. The UA’s administrative systems should be based more on trust and accountability rather than multiple layers of control and/or policing. The UA should avoid punishing the many for the sins of the few.
6. Take steps to make the UA a more attractive location for non-tenure track research faculty given their likely increasing role in developing UA research activities.
7. To enhance the quality and productivity of the UA faculty implement policies and create attitudes that maintain long-term upward pressure on the quality of UA research/teaching programs and establish an upward spiral of achievement for the indefinite future. This cannot be directed in detail from the top but can be achieved with a system of “carrots and sticks” to provide the upward pressure.
Committee of Eleven White Paper

Status of the University of Arizona Research* Program

The C11 also recommended UA actions in collaboration with external entities namely:

1. Encourage the UA Foundation give higher priority to supporting UA research/academic activities – such as providing resources for endowed chairs, fellowships and scholarships and to seed-fund new projects.

2. Encourage entrepreneurial activities and create the reward and administrative structures necessary for such activities to succeed. The CatCorp (Catapult Corporation) initiative is an example of such a program.

3. Work with its sister universities, ASU and NAU, the Board of Regents, and business and industry to increase public awareness of the close correlation between research investment and GDP growth and hence the advantage to Arizona’s citizens of maintaining strengths in research and development activity at its universities.

“Research is the lifeblood of a high-tech economy and plays a critical role in the economic and personal well-being of most citizens.” (American Academy of Arts and Sciences report “Restoring the Foundation”)
Committee of Eleven White Paper

Status of the University of Arizona Research* Program

University of California, Berkeley
Funding Sources by Amount

| Source: Figure prepared by Robert Birgeneau and John Wilton of the University of California, Berkeley. |
Committee of Eleven White Paper

Status of the University of Arizona Research* Program

In this report, the C11 has endeavored to:

• Document the enormous challenge facing the UA if it is to maintain its high international standing as a research university despite the current difficult funding situation.
• Express its strongly held view that meeting this challenge is essential not only for the University but also for the future wellbeing of Tucson and Arizona.
• Suggest some possible approaches to meeting the challenge by making changes in the way the University operates.

The C11 recognizes that changes are inevitable and will be difficult. It urges that the UA continue along the path of enhancing its research excellence. Given our different circumstances, we will need to be different from our peers - to lead rather than to follow - if we are to succeed in this effort. That is the spirit of the “Never Settle” Program.

The C11 also recognizes that this white paper is neither an exhaustive study nor one that has been endorsed by the faculty as a whole. Rather it represents a good faith effort to address a topic of broad faculty concern and to stimulate actions that to enable UA to continue its upward trajectory in research.
Committee of Eleven White Paper

Status of the University of Arizona Research* Program

Number of Private “Very High Research Activity” (VHRA) Institutions by State

Source: Figure prepared by Henry E. Brady and Jon Stiles of the University of California, Berkeley.
**Executive Summary**

The Committee of Eleven (C11) has undertaken this study because of growing faculty concerns about maintaining the quality of the UA’s research programs in the face of tight current budgets. This concern is not unique to the UA but is felt especially strongly here in light of the recent steep cuts in UA state funding. C11’s goal is to document the situation at UA and to suggest potential actions, within the framework of the *Never Settle* program, to ensure a brighter future for UA’s research programs.²

A successful university must create new knowledge and understanding and impart that new knowledge to others, thereby generating an upward trajectory of human achievement and quality of life. A successful university will, therefore, provide constant inspiration not only to its own students but also to its local community, the nation and indeed the world. The economic benefits of successful university research in generating new businesses, industries and hence jobs and in maintaining a competitive edge in the global economy are well documented³, especially in such fields as the sciences, engineering and medicine. For example, the ~$500M in annual UA sponsored research funding (most of it from out of state) adds approximately $1.2B to Arizona’s economy (using standard multipliers⁴). The positive impact of research on the local cultural environment is equally important. But perhaps most important of all is the inspiration that active involvement in successful university research provides to students, the next generation of research leaders, that can drive the upward spiral into the future. Without the stimulus from research, stagnation is inevitable and the world will pass us by, intellectually as a university and economically as a state.

While many contribute to a successful research program, the key players in a university context are faculty members, who provide the leadership, generate the resources and attract the students and team members to carry the enterprise forward. The principal problem at the UA stems from inadequate resources to recruit new faculty members to replace those retiring or recruited by other institutions. A second major problem is the lack of adequate seed funding to explore promising new ideas that could enable UA to lead the development of entirely new fields. The C11 recognizes that finding the needed resources will not be easy given today’s financial realities but suggests that UA leaders and faculty re-examine internal priorities with a view to maintaining and increasing the upward momentum in its research programs. Unless the necessary resources are found, the UA research effort will first stagnate and then decline – with all the negative consequences to students and the community that are the

---

1 For brevity we will refer to creative programs led by faculty as “research”, recognizing that these programs span all scholarly endeavors.

2 The C11 completed a white paper on “Restructuring Undergraduate Education” in March 2007 as a result of concerns about the quality/appropriateness of the UA Undergraduate program. This was submitted to the Faculty Senate and led to the formation of a Senate Task Force on “Retention and Advancement of Undergraduate Students” .The Task Force Report, based on the C11 White Paper was adopted by the Senate in January, 2009.

3 See report entitled “Restoring the Foundation: The Vital Role of Research in Preserving the American Dream” published by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences (September 2014). See https://www.amacad.org/restoringthefoundation

4 APSS Research Opportunities to Advance Arizona’s economic Growth. 2007 Report prepared by the Arizona Arts, Sciences and Technology Academy.
mirror image of the benefits of an upward trajectory noted above. The purpose of this white paper is both to document the problems and to examine potential internal/organizational changes that would contribute to finding solutions.

To address the situation, we recommend the following:

1. UA leadership and faculty unite in raising the priority of research and its impact on students to the highest possible level and in making changes in expenditure necessary to implement that priority.
2. Resources be found immediately for faculty hires at a level that will ensure that the UA will remain a leading international research institution. These resources will need continual enhancement. Similarly funds are needed urgently for seeding promising projects that should ultimately become path-changing research efforts and generate their own funding streams.
3. The UA Foundation give higher priority to supporting UA research/academic activities – such as providing resources for endowed chairs, fellowships and scholarships and to seed-fund new projects.
4. We should review the way in which research is organized within the UA to focus more effectively on areas of existing strength or great promise. In those cases where interdisciplinary work is needed (a steadily increasing number), encourage the development of “schools” or “institutes” that then lead the research efforts. This will involve changing the current relationship among departments, colleges and interdisciplinary programs, for example, in making faculty appointments that are associated with the research program in question.
5. The University should streamline administrative processes associated with the research effort with a view to simplifying and speeding up procedures and reducing the number of groups/individuals whose approval is required. Consider the “value-added” to the research/teaching program by an activity versus its cost to determine whether it should be expanded or reduced. The point would be to avoid burdening faculty with bureaucratic tasks that distract them from their research/teaching mission.
6. The University’s administrative systems should be based on trust and accountability rather than on multiple levels of control and/or policing. It should avoid punishing the many for the sins of the few.
7. Encourage entrepreneurial activities and create the reward and administrative structures necessary for such activities to succeed. The CatCorp (Catapult Corporation) initiative is an example of a program developed by the UA Foundation and Tech Launch Arizona whereby donors can help both the University and the community.
8. The UA should work with its sister universities, ASU and NAU, the Board of Regents, and business and industry to increase public awareness of the close correlation between research investment and GDP growth and hence the advantage to Arizona’s citizens of maintaining and enhancing its strengths in research and development activity at its universities.

The C11 recognizes that significant changes in UA’s operation might be necessary to achieve the goal of maintaining and enhancing the quality of the UA’s research program in the current financial climate. We urge the entire UA community - faculty, staff, students, alumni and friends - to work together to achieve this goal which we believe is essential to the future well-being of all Arizonans.

---

Introduction. The University of Arizona (UA) has compiled a remarkable record as a Student Centered Research University, an accomplishment recognized by its status as a Research I university and in its membership of the American Association of Universities (AAU). The UA’s research achievements have been immensely important not only to the university community, students, staff and faculty, but also to Tucson and Pima County, to Arizona and to the nation. It is no accident that the Tucson area is known as “Optics Valley”, that Tucson has been recognized as the “astronomy capital of the world” and that the UA has established a world-wide reputation as a pioneer in fields as wide ranging as anthropology and heart transplant surgery. With annual sponsored research income of ~ $500M, the UA research effort also makes a substantial contribution both directly and indirectly to the Arizona economy, estimated to be over $1.2B annually using standard leverage factors. But above all, university research programs attract and inspire the smart and motivated students that create the new ideas and develop the novel products that have enabled the US to maintain a high standard of living and a leadership position in the world. Continuing this great tradition – and indeed meeting the self-imposed challenge of doubling the research program by 2023 - is a major goal of the recently developed “Never Settle” initiative, endorsed by UA President Ann Weaver Hart.

There is, however, growing concern as to how this goal can be achieved given the ever more stringent financial constraints within which the UA is currently operating. Perhaps the most acute problem is maintaining the quality and productivity of the faculty in the face of retirements or departure of those members who have led the university’s research funding success and been instrumental, by their very presence, in attracting high-quality younger faculty to the UA. In the absence of adequate resources to permit competitive salary and start-up offers to new faculty who are capable of generating the research programs and funding necessary for their execution, the UA’s research capability risks entering a downward spiraling path. It has taken decades to build the quality of the UA’s research program, but destroying it can occur relatively rapidly. This would be a tragedy not only for the UA and its students but also for Tucson and Arizona, which would lose their ability to attract high value-added commerce and industry and hence to ensure a rising standard of living for their citizens. The Committee of Eleven, as an elected council of the faculty, has therefore undertaken the current study with the goal of identifying ways, within the framework of the “Never Settle” program, to enhance the national/international standing of UA research, and to move forward on the challenge of doubling the UA’s research efforts by 2023.

The challenge, of course, is to accomplish this in an environment where the effective value of the state support of the university is unlikely to increase. One might argue that if Arizona wishes to improve (or even maintain) its standard of living relative to other states, it should be investing in the research and education programs that inevitably underlie such progress. Significant change in legislative priorities cannot, however, be anticipated in a time short enough to solve our problems. Increasing the level of private support could help enormously in ensuring the continued improvement in the quality of the faculty and the student body, which is essential for maintaining and enhancing the international standing of the UA. While generating private resources is often thought of as the purview of the UA Foundation, faculty can and should be enlisted to help in developing private resources, are generally willing to do so, and should be involved far more actively in this effort than is currently the case. However, as a representative committee of the faculty, the C11 believes it is important to examine the UA’s internal structure and dynamics with the goal of ensuring that the UA’s research programs continue on an upward trajectory. This is the purpose of the current white paper.

Potential for Change. During the presidential terms of Richard Harvill, John Schaefer and Henry Koffler, the UA underwent a major development of its research programs. That development took place in an
era of rapidly expanding federal research funding, greater support from the state and a higher degree of flexibility within the institution, as the enhanced research activity was relatively new. None of these conditions applies today, so that continuing on an upward spiral of research activity inevitably demands a re-assessment of our current research infrastructure and organization, much of which was put in place in an earlier and more favorable epoch. In the spirit of faculty governance, it is appropriate that such re-assessments and the resultant impetus for change should be developed and implemented by the faculty within the framework of the “Never Settle” initiative. Given the absence of expanding external research resources, re-examining and re-allocating resources is the only clear, short-term way of moving forward on the research priority, which is essential to maintaining the overall quality of the UA research effort.

As is generally the case in large, well-established institutions, there is a tendency for processes and programs to endure long after they have outlived their usefulness. While change usually causes discomfort, it is often easier to contemplate within a positive framework such as “Never Settle”. Since enhancing the UA’s research status is a widely supported aim, this should become a frequently and loudly stated element in the UA’s program priorities. To be successful it needs to be reinforced by a series of actions aimed at achieving that goal. We intend to present, in the body of this white paper, some areas in which change should be considered. However, the general principle guiding such evaluations should be to what degree the activity in question adds value to the UA’s research enterprise and consequently contributes to the quality of the faculty and the student body. Programs and processes – indeed even individual roles – should not be continued simply because they have existed for a long time. By re-allocating resources from any such “low value-added” activities, funds can be generated either to provide direct assistance to existing research efforts or to enable renewal of research excellence in the University through appropriate new high-quality faculty hires and seed money for promising new research activities. These needs were met in the past largely through a combination of resources in the VPR’s Development Fund and ICR return to the Colleges and Departments but they are now grossly inadequate to the purpose. At a minimum such resources could be reprogrammed to provide direct, useful support for existing high quality research programs.

Documentation of Process and Issues Raised. The C11 has been motivated to develop this white paper by a strongly held view among its members that the UA is facing serious problems in maintaining the excellence of its research programs. These views reflect similar concerns expressed by the faculty colleagues whom C11 members represent and have apparently been confirmed by the recent COACHE survey of UA faculty opinions. To carry out the project the C11 Chair Patricia Hoyer appointed a subcommittee of John Hildebrand, Doug Jones, Steven Schwartz and Peter Strittmatter (Chair) and participated actively throughout.

The C11 has been assisted greatly by input from many individuals whom it hereby wishes to acknowledge and thank. Special thanks are due to:

a. The Office of the Vice President for Research, in particular Caroline Garcia and Julia Puntenny.
b. The Deans of the following Colleges: Agriculture (Shane Burgess/Parker Antin), Business (Len Jessup), Engineering (Jeff Goldberg/Brian Ten Eyck), Pharmacy (Lyle Bootman), Science (Joaquin Ruiz), Social and Behavioral Sciences (JP Jones/Cecile McKee). For Medicine we received input from VP for Health Sciences, Skip Garcia in his role as interim Dean.
c. The Director of Bio5 – Fernando Martinez.
d. Members of the Council of Administrative and Business Officers (CABO); Kelly Grimm, Jeff Ratje, Susanna Richards and Lisa Rulney.
The broad recurring items of concern may be summarized as follows:

1. Difficulty in recruiting and/or retaining top faculty due to inadequate resources;
2. Lack of support for promising new research endeavors;
3. Ever increasing bureaucratic burdens on faculty and departmental staff combined with decreasing resources to deal with them;
4. A growing concern that the pendulum has swung too far toward risk aversion and compliance, thereby stifling innovation;
5. A perception, as documented in the recent COACHE survey, that support for research excellence ranks low in the priorities of the UA leadership.

While emphases on particular issues differed somewhat, the C11 was impressed by the overall consistency of the input it received both in regard to problems and possible solutions. That input is reflected in later sections containing recommendations for potential ways of moving forward. Before proceeding, however, we wish to present some data relevant to the current situation.

UA Research Profile. The UA is a member of the American Association of Universities (AAU) and, like other member universities, maintains the strong research program that is a criterion for membership of the Association. The UA has also set itself the goal of doubling its sponsored research expenditures over the next decade. Figure 1 shows the ranking of the UA by R&D research expenditures among all US universities. While still good, the ranking has declined significantly and is likely to accelerate, absent resources for faculty hires. Appropriate measures need to be taken to correct this if the UA is to maintain its international reputation as a strong research school – and certainly would be required to meet the doubling goal to which it has committed to ABOR.
In Figure 2 we show the sources of UA external research funding, the great majority of which (80%) derives from federal agencies with most of the balance (19%) coming from private sources. It is noteworthy how little is received from state or local sources.

In the context of federal research funding it is useful to determine how the UA is faring in funding from different agencies. This is shown in Figure 3 for the period 2008-2012. The largest single source is HHS/NIH followed closely by NASA and then the NSF. UA funding from HHS/NIH shows at best very modest growth while NASA is essentially topped out. NSF alone shows steady growth that, if maintained, is reasonably consistent with the doubling goal by 2023. Funding from the other federal agencies is relatively small but resources from DOD show an encouraging recent upswing that can hopefully be maintained. A remaining question is how well...
UA is doing in attracting the available research funding at the various federal agencies.

Figure 4 accordingly shows the fraction of federal research funding provided through each federal agency and the fraction of UA research support received from each in 2012. The UA is clearly excelling in funding from NASA and doing very well with respect to NSF. The amount of NIH funding is low in both absolute terms (Figure 3) and relative terms (Figure 4). Overall the UA achieves funding at close to the average level from all other agencies except HHS/NIH, where the UA is receiving significantly less than the nationally available share. The UA’s doubling goal for research funding requires that the absolute numbers shown in Figure 3 increase. It is clear from the data that improvements in funding from HHS/NIH would help enormously in the doubling endeavor.

---

6 The “above average” performance with NASA and NSF requires that other UA success fractions are below average as the total is 100%. The lower UA success rate at HHS/NIH is not ascribable to this constraint.
**Table 1. Sponsored Project Research Awards by Sample Colleges**  
**FY2011-2014***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Total Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>$809,903.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALS</td>
<td>$112,624,108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$18,117,026.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>$91,815,089.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>$20,823.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$1,662,836.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Phoenix</td>
<td>$17,654,511.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Tucson</td>
<td>$340,144,952.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>$10,071,931.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical Sciences</td>
<td>$91,055,142.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>$39,637,124.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>$31,637,124.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Behav Sciences</td>
<td>$28,811,154.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science*</td>
<td>$628,783,736.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>$102,817,517.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,515,436,012.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 data =
Jul ’13-March ’14
College of Science includes
JW Space Telescope Award

Calculated from data provided by the Office of the Vice Pres. For Research
A third question relates to the research productivity of the individual UA colleges. The C11 recognizes that opportunities and funding sources are very different for individual disciplines. Nonetheless it is instructive to look at the actual funding by college – averaged over the last almost three years. This is shown in Table 1. The College of Science (COS) currently generates the largest sponsored research support. The total is strongly influenced by NASA funding for major Space Science projects at Planetary Science/Lunar and Planetary Lab and Astronomy/Steward Observatory. This is reflected in the strong UA performance in fractional acquisition of NASA funds as shown in Figure 4. The success with NASA has required organization of large teams and close collaboration with the aerospace industry to prepare the proposals and execute the projects and is indicative of steps that might be taken with the creation of large interdisciplinary groups in other research areas. COS also contributes strongly to the UA’s sterling performance at the NSF. COS is followed in sponsored research by the College of Medicine (COM) although in most AAU universities the order is reversed. The doubling goal would, however, require significant increases in dollar funding across many colleges, even if COM were to reach the national average in its share of federal funding.

Faculty Demographics. Figure 5 shows the current age distribution of the AY 2013 tenured (T) and tenure eligible (TE) UA faculty. Almost 30% are above the age of 60 and many are likely to retire in the next few years. This implies the need to replace some 500-550 faculty members over the next decade or so if the level of effort is to be maintained let alone doubling total research funding. Figure 6 (derived from data provided by the VPR’s office) shows the sponsored research awards (in $) generated over the ~ 3 year period from July 2011 to March 2014 by faculty in those same age groups. It is immediately clear that those over 60 are still remarkably productive with over 40% of the award value generated by 29% of the faculty members. While selection effects undoubtedly influence the details (e.g., research productive senior faculty are likely to retire later), their departure over the next 5-10 years will represent a very serious loss to the UA. In normal circumstances one might expect the curve in Figure 6 to remain roughly constant in time as individual faculty get older – move to the right in Figure 2 – and are replaced mainly by young faculty at the left.

To maintain a reasonably stable (hopefully increasing) form of Figure 2, funds must be made available to:

(a) Recruit very promising young faculty; this involves paying competitive salaries and providing recruits
with adequate start-up funds so that they can build successful research programs and essentially move along the curve of Figure 6 as they advance in age;

Figure 6 Distribution of Sponsored Project Research Awards with PI Age Group
Total $1,349,360,921 FY2011-2014*

(b) Ensure that the UA can retain those in the middle age ranges and provide continued support for their upward path; again competitive salaries are required as well as institutional commitment to the pursuit of novel ideas.

(c) Provide adequate seed funding ($10-15M) for development of especially promising new ideas as a basis for generating external support.

The overall problem exists throughout the University although the financial extent varies strongly among the colleges. However, we think it appropriate to use, as an example, the situation in the College of Science, which is currently the UA’s largest recipient of research funding. Its research productivity must be maintained if the research standing of the UA is to be maintained and especially if the quest to double UA research funding is to succeed. The age distribution of faculty within the College of Science is similar to that shown in Figure 6 for the University as a whole. Thus of 339 total faculty, 99 are older
than 60. Stated differently, the College of Science, one of the primary drivers of research excellence at the University, will need to hire ~10 new faculty members each year for the next decade. This in turn will require competitive salaries, which are continually increasing because of more attractive offers from private institutions and better-funded universities, as well as additional start-up funds totaling ~$7M per year for COS alone depending on which disciplines are involved. Several recent searches have attracted superb candidates but have failed due to non-competitive salaries and startup packages arising from lack of funds available to either the College of Science or the Office of the Vice President for Research. At the current rate of hiring the College simply will not keep pace in quality and quantity with the expected retirements over the next years. Similar remarks apply throughout the University. Given the inevitable departure of faculty who contribute heavily to existing research excellence, it is absolutely critical, if the University of Arizona is to maintain research strength, that a sustained, consistent and appropriately funded hiring plan be implemented so that young scholars, with exciting new research programs, can be hired before the existing research excellence is lost and the UA becomes less attractive to such people. Such a hiring plan will be a great challenge and involve significant adjustments in the way UA does business. Such change is the essence of the “Never Settle” plan and essential for its success.

Ways Forward - Creating an Upward Spiral. The following discussion is based on the premise that the UA wishes to maintain and enhance its standing as an internationally distinguished research university and is willing to make the changes necessary to ensure that outcome. Success in this endeavor will enhance the experience of students as they work with and learn from creative faculty; it will also bring benefits, economic and cultural, to the local community, the state and the nation.

A sine-qua-non for such success is to maintain and enhance the quality and productivity of the UA faculty. This is a multi-faceted endeavor and will require implementation of policies and creation of attitudes that maintain long-term upward pressure on the quality of UA research/teaching programs – that is, set the UA on an upward spiral of achievement for the indefinite future.

There are many systematics that can contribute to ensuring the desired upward spiral. As in any large and complex organization involving many independent and creative people, the path cannot be directed in detail from the top. Rather the leadership needs to put in place a system of “carrots and sticks” to provide the upward pressure.

To achieve renewed research momentum within current funding constraints, we see no alternative but for the UA leadership to realign priorities within the University so that funds can be directed where they are most urgently needed, namely to maintaining and enhancing the overall excellence of the faculty. In the following we discuss in general terms some of the possible areas for change, recognizing that implementing those changes will be difficult.

The first and major requirement for enhancing the UA’s research standing is for the UA leadership and faculty to make clear that this is a top priority for the University. The best way to achieve this is by taking immediate action. We suggest the following initial steps:

- Make immediate provision of additional resources to allow faculty hires with competitive salaries and start-up funds; an augmentation of at least $10M is required for this recruiting season and will need to be increased in subsequent years.
• Establish a salary enhancement plan based on the research priority so that the UA can retain its most creative and productive faculty. Among its peers, the UA currently pays the lowest faculty salaries making retention of key individuals very difficult (see Figure 7).

![Figure 7. Faculty salaries for Assistant, Associate and Full Professors at the UA and its peer institutions, illustrating the poor competitive position of the UA.]

• Initiate a review of ways in which procedures and service units could be changed to provide more effective support for the research endeavor; this may involve adjusting reward structures and changing or perhaps eliminating certain administrative functions.

• Examine ways in which UA’s research activities could be structured differently, for example through the creation of interdisciplinary schools or institutes to optimize the research function among departments and colleges.

Even with some new resources anticipated from tuition and enrollment increases, the first action will require that funds be reallocated from elsewhere in the University and is viewed as a first step in a process that will likely have to continue for some time to come. The purpose of the second two actions above is to establish processes whereby the changes can be implemented incrementally over the next few years, accompanied by corresponding changes in funding. This will require review of many options before determining which should be implemented, assisted by data made available through the RCM process. Such a detailed review is beyond the scope of this white paper. Rather we attempt in the following paragraphs to suggest some general areas in which changes should occur and the directions they might take if UA is to maintain, let alone enhance its international reputation as a distinguished
research institution. To succeed, this will require a united effort on the part of the entire UA faculty and staff, alumni, friends of the University and business interests.

a.  **Clearly Establish the Research Priority.** To succeed in this effort, it is essential for the UA leadership to re-establish the research/teaching priority within the University, a priority first established very clearly during the Harvill and Schaefer presidencies. This is largely a matter of creating an atmosphere of respect and encouragement for the research/teaching enterprise and those that lead that effort, namely the faculty. The research priority should be further emphasized, beyond provision of resources for hiring new high quality, by:

- Ensuring that sufficient funding is available to allow the research enterprise to flourish. This level can be estimated from the successful provision made in earlier times for returning the equivalent of 30% of ICR funds to the colleges and departments that generated the funds.
- Increasing the VPR’s Development Fund budget to at least $20M;
- Increasing the priority of fundraising in support of the research/academic mission by the UA Foundation. Endowed chairs, research fellowships and graduate scholarships are urgently needed to redress the very poor standing of the UA relative to its peers in this regard.

As the research priority becomes clear a number of beneficial changes are likely to follow, namely:

- The University’s service units will be seen to support the faculty rather than policing them. Scarce resources will be put to use for positive, creative purposes;
- The overall quality and morale of the faculty will go up as the UA recovers momentum in its research mission, as will the quality of the educational program and the student body;
- UA donors will increasingly support the research/teaching mission of the University by endowing chairs, research positions and student scholarships.

b.  **The Organization of UA Research.** Much of the UA’s research activity is organized traditionally around individual faculty members and their departments; the UA reward structure is geared to this type of organization. While this has worked well in the past and will continue to work well in some fields in the future, it does not account for the UA’s current standing as a research institution (e.g., AAU member) or appear to be the best path to maintaining, let alone enhancing, that standing. Certainly doubling the UA’s research expenditure in a decade cannot be achieved with small individual PI grants (~$100K-$200K each) since this would require a major increase in the size of the faculty, an unlikely occurrence in the foreseeable future. Furthermore it fails to recognize that much current research activity – especially in the sciences, engineering, medicine etc. – is increasingly interdisciplinary and requires active participation on the part of individuals belonging to many different departments. For such endeavors the C11 recommends encouraging the continued development of research “schools” or “institutes” to address major research areas (e.g., Bio5, Space Sciences).

To enhance the overall research efforts we suggest the following steps be considered:

---

7  We use the term faculty in a broad sense to mean UA employees that are tenured, tenure eligible and those with research professor or equivalent titles.

8  The recent pledge by James Wyatt of $10M (with an equal matching requirement) toward graduate scholarships at the College of Optical Science represents an excellent example of effective ways forward in this area.
• Adopt a “can do” attitude, including a willingness to take risks where the potential rewards justify so doing.
• Decide on areas in which the UA either wishes to maintain and augment existing research strength or wishes to develop new capability. This requires judgment on the part of UA leadership, recognition that UA cannot afford to build research strength in all areas and recognition that appropriate resources must be invested in the selected programs.
• In selecting new fields of research endeavor, the UA should be opportunistic (a good program leader and/or funding is available) and seek to be the first in the area. (UA has the capacity to initiate new programs but not to catch up with wealthy institutions like Harvard once they invest in an area.) Adequate initial resources must be provided internally so that the program can become well established before others catch on.
• Examine the appropriateness of the way in which UA research activity is currently organized (see footnote 5). This is currently based on departments that have been configured around the needs of undergraduate education. Faculty appointments and graduate programs would become focused increasingly on the research institutes or schools, working with the departments that would have primary responsibility for the undergraduate programs.9
• Shrink (slowly but steadily) programs that fail to contribute substantially to research or academic excellence so that resources can be used more effectively in supporting the overall research priority.
• Consider establishment of a research organization that is outside the UA formally – like the UA Foundation - so that it can operate to a greater extent outside the purview of the state/ABOR. This could also be linked with efforts to commercialize UA discoveries and inventions through Tech Launch Arizona (TLA) as with the newly announced Catapult Corporation (CatCorp).
• Recognize that a substantial fraction (almost 30%) of UA research funding is generated by non-tenure track faculty. Given the likely evolution of state funding in Arizona, success of the UA research enterprise is likely to depend increasingly on such research faculty. Steps should therefore be taken to make the UA a more attractive location for them and their research programs.
• Promote, in conjunction with the Office of Global Initiatives, more international collaboration since developments in many other countries are on a steep upward trajectory both in quality and in funding.
• Develop a strategy for enhancing the sponsored research program in the College of Medicine without denying critically needed investment in the research programs of other colleges. The recent preliminary agreements between the Banner Health organization and the Arizona Health Network might facilitate additional investment in the College of Medicine research program while maintaining or even increasing funding levels on the main campus. Certainly this would be a welcome outcome.

c. Streamlining Processes and Procedures for supporting UA Research. There is a growing perception that administrative processes in connection with the UA research effort have become steadily more complex and burdensome over the last several years – a trend not unique to the UA but unproductive nonetheless. Among the manifestations of this trend has been multiple and overlapping levels of checking – of “policing” rather than “trusting”. As one frustrated correspondent stated in regard to compliance issues:
   “Multiple and sometimes competing compliance units make routing and navigating through the system complicated and bureaucratic. A unified research administration would be helpful....”

9 Some tentative steps in this direction have been announced by Provost Comrie and VPR Espy in a memo dated September 26, 2014 regarding “Cluster Hiring”.
And, of course, it would cost less.

Furthermore it is unclear whether the policing actually succeeds in reducing the problems which it is supposed to address. According to the New York Times, Charles Munger, Vice-chairman of Berkshire-Hathaway, offered this counter-narrative to the distrustful culture of most businesses today:

“Instead of filling your ranks with lawyers and compliance people, hire people that you actually trust and let them do their job.”

We believe that the UA could, to advantage, simplify its administrative processes by adopting a more trusting approach to its employees and requiring that they act in accordance with the University’s top priority of enhancing the overall research/teaching effort. Each procedure might then be assessed on the basis of the net value it adds to the overall research priority.

More specifically we suggest:

- Recognize that multiple overlapping administrative procedures are costly in terms of central staffing needed to carry out the function, departmental staffing to respond to them and distraction of faculty from the creative work which they can uniquely provide to the research program.
- Review the value/cost ratio of each administrative activity and service function. Reduce or eliminate as appropriate based on the ratio of cost to value-added to the research enterprise.
- While Financials and Analytics have the potential to assist the research enterprise, work needs to be done on providing the “doers” – the faculty and project staff – with the information they really need and in a form that is readily accessible. This will require listening to and acting upon the needs of the doers, rather than simply telling them what they will be given – as has frequently been the case in the past.
- Adjust the University’s accounting system to be more helpful to research-oriented departments/ institutes – especially those undertaking major (multi-million dollar) projects. Feedback on financial status needs to be essentially on demand and fairly accurate; for management purposes it does not need to be precise but it does need to be fast.
- Develop more nimble ways of handling research proposals and in particular reduce the number of approvals required to the greatest extent possible. Avoid requiring signatures from people who add no value to the process - and often do not have time to read what they are signing.
- Reverse the trend of the last decade where ever more administrative burden has been placed by central administrative offices upon the departments while resources to handle these burdens have been steadily cut. Doing so will also reduce the growing perception that the faculty and research staff are there to serve administration rather than the other way around. Such a change will also help with faculty morale.
- Ensure that responsibilities of individuals, departments or institutes are clear and that when things go amiss, deal with the responsible parties but avoid subjecting the entire campus to increased rules and burdens.
- Adopt a UA equivalent of the European Union’s principle of “subsidiarity”, namely that decisions/ responsibilities should be assigned to experienced lower- or mid-level administrative staff who are as close to the action as possible.

---

12 In an email message dated October 7, 2014, SVPR Espy announced welcome changes in the research administration services that appear to move in this direction.
Generally, our recommendation is to trust more, simplify wherever possible and make sure that centrally provided services are truly needed not just impositions. The goal must be to assist the faculty to accomplish their research and teaching mission and to minimize distractions from it.

d. Strengthen the Reward and Penalty Structures to Generate an Upward Spiral. Generating an upward spiral of achievement requires a system of incentives and penalties – of “carrots” and “sticks” – that facilitate the desired outcome.

In a university, the available incentives are usually focused on matters of promotion – which is usually accompanied by salary increases. These considerations apply to essentially all university employees although the procedures are different for faculty and staff. We offer the following suggestions in the UA context:

- For faculty, promotion is principally framed in terms of tenure, which clearly has considerable positive economic value to the individual and significant potential negative value to the institution if mistakenly granted. Tenure evaluations and decisions are among the most important faculty activities and are a major factor in enhancing the overall quality of the research programs.

- Make clear what is expected of faculty in promoting the upward spiral of research endeavor and enhancing the UA’s national and international standing. Make these expectations more significant in reaching tenure decisions, and insure their rigorous application at each stage in the review process.

- In this context, we support continuation of the current UA policy of automatically permitting a department that makes a negative recommendation on tenure to recruit for a replacement. We also urge that the UA consider adopting a policy of normally denying a recruitment opportunity to a department that makes a positive tenure recommendation that is subsequently declined at the College or Provost’s level. 13

- Ensure regular faculty review of the various University services and administrations and incorporate the input into the resulting action plan. While such reviews are already taking place there is a growing faculty perception that the results are too often ignored. Some C11 members believe that RCM may address this issue.

- There is a widely held perception that many of the UA service units are slow to act and charge exorbitant fees. They can do so because they have an effective monopoly. We suggest that the UA should start modest-scale experiments in permitting wider use of external sources to see where economies can be achieved. This should provide a very meaningful quantitative measure of value-added by the services in question and a strong incentive to potential more efficient performance.

e. Encourage Entrepreneurial Activity. Many university based research activities have significant commercial potential and can generate very positive interactions with and support from the local community. An oft cited example is Stanford and its interaction with Silicon Valley. The UA has helped the Tucson area establish a reputation as “Optics Valley” but much needs to be done to create a UA-connected commercial hub. As the interaction with the community grows we expect this to boost the support provided to the UA both through the UA Foundation and through collaborative projects. We believe that:

13 A majority of the C11 supported the suggestion highlighted in italics; a minority disagreed. This footnote acknowledges that fact and represents a compromise to enable completion of the white paper without further delay.
• The efforts recently initiated through the Tech Launch Arizona (TLA) organization are well conceived although still at a very early stage.
• The plan recently announced by the University/TLA and the UA Foundation to establish the Catapult Corporation (CatCorp) through which donations to the Foundation could be used to invest in local startup companies exploiting UA developed technologies is welcome. These companies would ultimately provide income (but not profit) for further investment in research and development at the UA.
• The UA and its sister universities in Arizona should work with Arizona industry to support the expansion of Science Foundation Arizona to expand the basic and applied research activities within the state and thereby generate growth in Arizona’s GDP\textsuperscript{14} and improve the standard of living for its citizens relative to the remainder of the country.

Concluding Remarks. The purpose of this white paper is to:
(a) Document the enormous challenge facing the UA if it is to maintain its high international standing as a research university despite the current difficult funding situation both within the state and in the federal research budget.
(b) Express its strongly held view that meeting this challenge is essential not only for the University but also for the future wellbeing of Tucson and Arizona.
(c) Suggest some possible approaches to meeting the challenge by making changes in the way the University operates.

The C11 clearly recognizes that making the changes needed to achieve the goal of continued development of UA research activity will not be easy and will require the full commitment of all members of the UA community. It will also mean reducing or even eliminating some current activities. This, in turn, requires a willingness to move the UA further from the operating norm of its peer institutions but the C11 believes that this will be to the long term benefit not only of the University itself but also to Arizona. We cannot expect to excel if we configure ourselves in the middle of the pack among our peers. We need to be willing to be different and to lead rather than to follow if we are to succeed in this effort. Certainly that is the spirit of the “Never Settle” plan.

Finally the C11, as a committee elected by the faculty, reiterates its purpose in developing this white paper is to focus attention and stimulate discussion on the challenge facing the UA in maintaining and enhancing the quality of its research programs in the face of ever tightening budget constraints – a subject of concern to an overwhelming majority of the faculty. The Committee recognizes, however, that this white paper is neither an exhaustive study nor one that has been endorsed by the faculty as a whole. Rather it represents a good faith effort by the C11 to address a topic of broad faculty concern and to stimulate action that will enable UA to continue its upward trajectory in research.

\textsuperscript{14} As stated in the American Academy of Arts and Sciences report “Restoring the Foundation” (ref footnote 3) “The predominant driver of GDP growth over the past half century has been scientific and technological advancement” and “Research is the lifeblood of a high-tech economy and plays a critical role in the economic and personal well-being of most citizens.”
ADDENDUM TO THE SIGNATURE PAGE

1. At the time of approval of this report, there are two faculty vacancies on the Committee of Eleven, yet to be filled.

2. The following committee members agree generally with the spirit of the report. However, they are in strong disagreement with the statement cited in footnote #13 on page 16.

Marlys Witte, MD  
Committee Member

Lynn Nadel, PhD  
Chair of the Faculty  
Ex Officio Committee Member

Dated: