

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
SPECIAL MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
October 30, 1995

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** The special meeting was called to order by Presiding Officer Anne E. Atwater at 3:15 p.m. in Room 146 of the College of Law.

Present: Senators Aleamoni, Anderson, Atwater, Barrett, Buras, Clarke, Dahlgran, David, Desai, Gerber, Goggans, Gruener, Hallick, Hill, Houk, Jacobs, Mare, McElroy, Mitchell, Neuman, J. O'Brien, S. O'Brien, Reiter, Schooley, Schwarz, Silverman, Smith, Spece, Sypherd, Szilagyi, Taylor, Troy, Warburton, Williams, Witte and Zwolinski. Observer Schafer (SAC). Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Abrams, Adamowicz, Arechederra, Ayers, Coons, Driggs, Dvorak, Emrick, Erickson, Feltham, Forbes, Huete, Joens, Larson, Marchalonis, Medine, Mount, Pacheco, Pintozzi, Pitt, Reynolds, Sharkey, and Troth. Observer Jull (APOC).

2. **DISCUSSION ON CO-GOVERNANCE PROPOSAL:** Senator Atwater stated that the purpose of the special meeting was to gather input from the Faculty Senate concerning the co-governance proposal (copy in Appendix), drafted by the Co-Governance Working Group.

Faculty Chair Schwarz said the co-governance proposal was designed to serve as a vehicle to promote discussion and, ultimately, resolution. He said it was in the common interest of faculty and administrators to initiate a constructive relationship in order to effectively address the tremendous challenges facing our institution. Faculty need to feel involved in decisions. The approach represented in the proposal can bring about and reinforce a sense of mutual respect and concern with the added advantage that a greater range of ideas and views will be considered in the making of policies. Decisions reached will be ones acceptable to both the administration and the faculty. Senate comments will be collected and added to those from faculty, deans, heads, the Committee of Eleven, and from any other suggested quarters. Where there is consensus, the next working draft will reflect it. Where there is division, a co-governance convention will attempt to resolve such issues. Another draft will then be presented to the Senate for further input. The working group that drafted the proposal contained six faculty and five administrators. The administrative members were chosen by the Provost. Among the six faculty, four are members of the Senate (the Faculty Chair, the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chair of the Committee of Eleven, and the Presiding Officer of the Senate). The other two faculty members were chosen by the Faculty Chair because of their independence of mind and their level of expertise: Professors Sheila Slaughter and Thomas Volgy.

Provost Sypherd said he thought the co-governance proposal represented an important step in the evolution of joint governance on our campus. While some points related to the definition of management versus policy have not been resolved yet, discussion of the issues would result in the forging of a document to be voted on by the entire faculty. Both faculty and administrators may find something in the document they don't like. The working group addressed three issues: (1) to bring into concordance the committees of the Senate with the portfolios of the Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts; (2) to change the way the Senate is selected, so that the membership of the Senate is drawn

from the colleges; and (3) to initiate a more cordial relationship and mutual respect between the faculty and the administration.

Senator Smith, Chair of the Committee of Eleven, distributed a set of principles and concerns developed by one of its subcommittees (copy in Appendix) and approved by the Committee at a special meeting yesterday.

- ◆ The following comments were made by Senators concerning the "Goals and Principles" and "Definition of Co-Governance" sections of the co-governance proposal:

Instead of calling it "definition of co-governance," it should only be considered an "ideal."

Dislike expressed for the term "co-governance;" a constructive relationship is only possible if the faculty and the administration are seen as one entity, rather than two different entities.

One essential element not addressed in the proposal: faculty should be able to select their department chairs.

Shared governance needs to begin at the departmental and college levels which have, as a minimum, governance rules and regular faculty meetings.

Agreement expressed with the concept that, below the level of President, every administrator should be a faculty member, responsible to the faculty through a system whereby the administrative position would last only three to five years, and then the administrator would return to the rank of faculty and live under the rules that he/she implemented. The University should be a community of scholars, and administrators should be accountable.

Accountability has to be built into this process on both ends to achieve full participation.

A comment on the use of the word "co-governance" as opposed to "shared governance," the term utilized in the State law.

Opposition to the proposal was expressed if it was intended to replace the current policy for five-year reviews of Deans, Directors and Department Heads.

A question was raised on how the proposal equates with the current Constitution and Bylaws. Senator Atwater responded that the Constitution and Bylaws would have to be amended by a vote of the General Faculty.

The proposal identifies Faculty Senators as only College Representatives. What about units not in a college, like Optical Sciences?

Increased faculty involvement in governance may be stimulated through the fact that their participation will make a difference.

There is reference in the proposal to policies dealing with "tenure." Could the words "continuing appointment" be inserted?

The goal of co-governance is an unrealistic dream unless we include rotation of administrators, requiring them to experience the situations they have created.

The proposal appears to represent a major overhaul of the Constitution, and that should have been clearly stated at the onset.

Faculty will run for the Senate when the Senate is given the responsibility of voting for Provost, Vice Presidents and Deans.

Provost Sypherd interjected a cautionary note: statutory responsibility for the University lies with the Board of Regents, with a wide range of authorities and responsibilities delegated to the President of the University. What the proposal is trying to address is how the power delegated to the President and other administrators is shared within the context of the University.

One proposal in the Committee of Eleven's document represented a crucial issue: "An administrative organization and operational structure, including administrative positions and their job descriptions, should be developed and approved, by secret ballot, by a majority of the General Faculty." At the present time a University organizational and operational structure does not exist, and it must be developed before we can discuss co-governance.

The following comments related to the "Structure" section of the co-governance proposal:

Chair Schwarz said the proposal outlined a revised structure for Faculty Senate membership: an elected membership proportional to the size of each college electorate and coming from the colleges. Membership would include a representative of each College Council, elected by the colleges. Ex officio members would include the Faculty Chair, the Faculty Secretary, the President, the Provost, one Vice President or Vice Provost, one Dean, and the current student representation. He noted that one main change was the addition of College Council representatives and the absence of At-Large Senators. The working group's focus was the need to get governance by faculty at the college level and faculty governance at the Senate level more connected. The issue of At-Large Senators and representation for units not contained in the college structure is an open issue that needs to be discussed. The Senate Executive Committee would include the Presiding Officer of the Senate, the Chair of the Faculty, the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chairs of the Senate standing committees, the Provost and a representative from each of the College Councils. Currently, the Executive Committee also includes the representative of the President of the University and one member elected by the Senate. The size of the Senate Executive Committee would be enlarged to provide a closer link between college and Senate governance. Information had been obtained on procedures in existence at other campuses which indicated that a committee of this size can work. The Committee of Eleven has raised the question as to whether it will be too unwieldy to work properly, and about the ability of the Senate and the faculty to scrutinize the Executive Committee's activities and the power given to that committee, and he said these are questions that need to be addressed. Secondly, concerning the structure of the Senate's standing committees, it was proposed (1) that they be aligned with the areas of the Vice Presidents or Vice Provosts, increasing their effectiveness and contributing to oversight of the Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts by the standing committees; and (2) that the chief administrator would be included in the committee membership, and other administrators as appropriate. The administrative members would be ex officio and non-voting. Other administrators could be appointed to the committees as appropriate, subject to the decision of the Chair of the committee and the decision of the committee members themselves.

◆ **Senators' comments:**

One member of the Non-College group expressed concern about the absence of Non-College faculty in the proposed structure.

The structural changes appear to represent a step backwards with reference to the elimination of At-Large Senators and the revised composition of the Senate Executive Committee. The current charge of the Senate Executive Committee was primarily to set the Senate's agendas, and its revised charge represented a major change.

The addition of senior administrators on standing committees would have a chilling effect on some discussions.

One Senator suggested equal representation from each college, rather than numbers based on size of the college. Or, perhaps a system based on number of SCH units generated.

Agreement was expressed on the need for Senate representation from colleges, but the University would not be well served by the elimination of Senators-At-Large. At-Large members provide a useful "larger picture." Secondly, concerning the decisions that must be made during the summer months, he thought an effort should be made to eliminate important policy decisions from being made while the faculty is away, including the possible insertion of such a prohibition into the Constitution.

The membership of Senate standing committees should be limited to faculty. Committees could, of course, invite administrators to attend meetings to improve the channel of communication.

Senator Silverman, a member of the Working Group, said the issue of giving the Senate Executive Committee the power to act during the summer represented a way to involve faculty in decisions that were made in the summer. In the past, important decisions were made in the summer and faculty did not learn about them until the Fall. He hoped such actions could be kept to a minimum, and noted that neither the Senate nor its standing committees meet during the summer months. He invited suggestions for improved ways of dealing with that situation. Concerning the addition of administrators to Senate standing committees, he pointed out that the Faculty Chair sits on the President's Cabinet, and the Senate's Presiding Officer sits on Deans' Council. He suggested that perhaps this issue needs discussion, but he expressed concern that the concept of shared governance and shared decisions was being discussed, and the effort was aimed at improved communications between faculty and administrators.

A Senator-At-Large stated that she likes the idea of college representation because it's clear who you represent, and no system of accountability is provided for Senators-At-Large. If the proposed system could include a mechanism for Faculty Senators to appear before their constituents to report on the issues, that would be a big improvement. She thought that as more confidence in the Senate is generated, and more accountability built into it, faculty participation will increase. Concerning alignment of the Senate standing committees with the Vice Presidential areas, she questioned whether the University's Vice Presidential alignment works effectively and, consequently, whether it was advisable to emulate it in the Senate structure.

Faculty Senate standing committee membership should not be restricted to Senators only. A mechanism by which non-Senators would be placed on the committees should be maintained, bringing their expertise into the effort, and increasing the chance that they might well become future Senators.

Concern was expressed that the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council are being referred to as standing committees of the Faculty Senate. It might be better to have them considered committees of the faculty as a whole. That might diminish the perceived concentration of power in the Senate Executive Committee.

Provost Sypherd commented on remarks made concerning alignment of standing committees and the addition of the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council to Senate standing committee status. Alignment of the standing committees with portfolios of Vice Presidents and Vice Provosts was drafted to avoid a situation where a committee with no authority or pursestrings deciding key issues. Placement on the committee of the administrator with the authority and the pursestrings would provide reliable information on financial possibilities and expedite implementation. This relates to the team theory of organization, whereby teams can effect change and are empowered to act.

◆ Further Senate comments followed:

(1) What constituencies would be represented on the College Councils? Students, staff, and administrators? He hoped not. (2) What is the rationale for the Graduate Council, the Undergraduate Council and Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee having Senate standing committee status, but with their members chosen in a different manner than the other standing committees? (3) On what basis will the standing committees include other administrators? What are the criterion for the "appropriateness" and will the Committee on Committees itself be composed partly of administrators under the proposed co-governance plan? (4) What will be the criterion for actions taken by the Executive Committee over the summer? And also, if situations arise during the academic year when extremely fast action is required, will the Senate not be involved in such decisions? New wording for the Constitution would have to spell out very precisely the conditions any such action could take. (5) To what degree would the President, Provost and Vice Presidents be bound to execute decisions arrived at in the collaborative procedure which is contemplated? (6) Why would the proposed co-governance proposal require "faculty agreement on the hiring and retention decisions involving Vice Presidents and Deans" but not the President and the Provost?

In response to Provost Sypherd's comments, objection was expressed to the use of teams as opposed to committees because on teams, committee members who disagree with the prevailing wisdom are viewed as marginal on the grounds that they are not team players.

As an alternative to Faculty Senate Executive Committee action on items that come up during the summer, it was noted that the Committee of Eleven, which is elected by the General Faculty, meets during the summer months, and would be able to add such items to its agenda.

It was strongly recommended that further discussion on the proposal be postponed until the Committee of Eleven's proposal concerning general governance principles of the University of Arizona could be thoroughly discussed, because general principles should precede the

implementation of concrete measures. It was proposed that another Senate meeting be scheduled to discuss the Committee of Eleven's governance principles.

The following comments dealt with the "Process" section of the co-governance proposal.

Senator Schwarz explained that concerning the issue of proposing new policy, the working group's document would have the administration take the matter to the Senate Executive Committee, which would determine the appropriate standing committee and ask the standing committee to begin to work on this issue, along with the administrator, or to set up a select committee to develop the proposal. A timeline set by the Senate Executive Committee would be provided. The select committee would be established by the standing committee through use of the Committee on Committees and would likely include a large number of members from outside the Senate. The proposal would then go to the standing committee, which would continue to work out problems and might well find new problems that weren't discovered by the select committee. When consensus was reached, the item would go to the Senate floor. In all instances where the Senate version was agreeable to the administration, the administration would state the timeline for implementation. Presumably, the standing committee that dealt with the issue would monitor the implementation. Or, if there was not agreement between the administration and faculty, a committee would be appointed by the Executive Committee and the differences resolved. If the differences are not resolved, the status quo would prevail. If the President of the University adopted a policy without Senate agreement, which would only be in rare and exceptional cases, and only where the vital interests of the University are at stake, the President would be required to report and defend his/her policy to the Senate and respond to questions raised by Senators. It was the Working Group's belief that in only rare and exceptional instances would the President override the process, but in such situations the Senate would have the right to express its opinion in as strong a way as it desired, including censuring the President.

◆ Senators' comments:

There is no mention of accountability for the Senate Executive Committee. Also, concerning the rare and exceptional instances when there is a difference in opinion between the President and the Senate, and the President establishes a new policy which the Senate voted against, somehow the President must take into account the Senate position.

Under Parliamentary principles, when a committee of a body reports to the body, that report becomes the property of the body. Under this proposal, it is contemplated that when a committee proposal is submitted to the Senate, the Senate Executive Committee is designated to resolve the differences. The Senate doesn't have the final say, and it apparently is not the body that owns the work of its own committees. It's totally contrary to normal Parliamentary procedure that another committee would have the final say over something that the body that they reported to had already decided or amended.

Is there a model for the proposed structure? Does this system exist in other universities? How is it working?

Extraordinary circumstances tend to be common on important issues. Faculty have put a great deal of effort into its governance processes. Developing procedures for censure is a good way to achieve accountability.

The attempt to outline the process is laudable. But, show us why we need these changes, where it has to be changed in the Constitution and Bylaws, and what the problems are that we're trying to address. Many of today's comments represent confusion with issues like how is the proposal aligned with what we presently do, why there needs to be changes and what the advantages are to change.

3. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Andrew Silverman
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendix*

1. Co-Governance Proposal drafted by the Co-Governance Working Group.
2. Response to the Co-Governance Proposal From the Committee of Eleven.
3. October 18, 1995 Memo to Academic Deans and College Council Chairpersons from Provost Paul Sypherd and Faculty Chair John Schwarz.

*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.