

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
November 1, 2004**

These minutes may be accessed electronically at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/minutes.htm>
Visit the faculty governance webpage at:
<http://w3fp.arizona.edu/senate/>

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Howell at 3:04 p.m. in the College of Law, Room 146

Present: Senators Baca, Brobbel, Bui, Burd, Chapman, Christenson, Conway, Cromwell, Cusanovich, Dahlgran, D. Davis, G. Davis, Eddy, Garcia, Garrett, Gruener, Hancock, Hildebrand, Howell, Jones, Larson, Likins, Marchalonis, Mitchell, Mitchneck, Patterson, Pintozzi, Powell, San Martin, Silverman, Smith, Songer, Spece, St. John, Sterling, Strittmatter, Swanson, Tatman, Tomanek, Ulreich, Vierling, Willerton, Worle, Zizza and Zwolinski. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Bixby, Chandler, Jenkins, Joens, Kiefer, Kinney, Mountford, Pitt, Timmermann, Weinand, and Witte.

2. OPEN SESSION

There were no speakers for the Open Session.

3. REPORTS

3A. ASUA President Alistair Chapman

ASUA's theme of civic engagement concluded with the early voting site at the ASUA offices that served over 2500 students. Governor Napolitano visited the voting site last Friday. ASUA is now turning its attention toward more policy issues such as tuition, mandatory meal plan, advisor accountability, cost of e-reserves and other class materials, making Commencement a success, the statewide university restructuring, the Phoenix medical school, state legislation such as the Arizona Financial Aid Trust (AFAT), federal legislation such as the Direct Loan Reward Act, graduate students' housing needs, and childcare needs.

3B. GPSC President Amanda Brobbel

The National GPSC commended the UA for its students' participation in the October 20, 2004, "National Day of Student Action." President Brobbel thanked *The Wildcat* for publicizing the event. UA's GPSC joined 10,000 students in an email letter-writing campaign to representatives in Washington to ask for support for the Higher Education and Affordability Act. President Brobbel also thanked faculty for encouraging their students to participate in Student Showcase. The number of participants increased this year to over 130 participants and 100 exhibits. Over 40 cash prizes were awarded. Both the graduate and undergraduate "President's Awards" of \$500 were about cancer research. GPSC is grateful to all of the departments who donated funding and resources for the event. Showcase winners will exhibit their work to legislators in Phoenix in February.

3C. Secretary of the Faculty Robert Mitchell

Secretary Mitchell announced that the UA Web Advisory Council is seeking a faculty representative to sit on the Council, which is redesigning the UA webpage and wants faculty input on design and navigability. This Council meets bi-weekly and faculty who want to volunteer should visit the website at <http://uaweb.arizona.edu/council/nomination.shtml> to apply. The Arizona Board of Regents Learner-Centered Education (LCE) grant review process has begun. The annual LCE grants total \$500K and are awarded to applicants from all the Arizona university campuses. UA has submitted 38 applications, along with 14 from NAU and 19 from ASU.

3D. Vice Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell

Vice Chair Howell introduced Dr. Fran Bernat from ASU West, who is currently serving as the Chair of the Arizona Faculties Council as well as the Chair of the Faculty Stakeholders group for higher education restructuring. Dr. Bernat will speak to the Senate later in the meeting.

3E. Chair of the Faculty Jory Hancock

No report.

3F. **Provost George Davis**

Provost Davis described the goals that the Academic Council set during its August retreat related to academic affairs and the intellectual climate of the University. One of the recommendations was to add deans' representatives to the Cabinet, so Deans Sander, Donnerstein and Massaro now sit on the President's Cabinet. A strong set of recommendations to restructure the finance committee has been implemented and the working groups are now meeting. The faculty members who have been named to the restructured finance committee working groups are: Core Financial Committee: Leslie Tolbert (ARL); Financial Restructuring: Julia Hagle (ENGRG); Revenue Projection: Michael Cusanovich (SCI); Enrollment Planning: Gail Burd (SCI); Academic Investments/Priorities: Pierre Meystre (OPT SCI); Infrastructure and Support Services: Art Gmitro (COM); Compensation and Benefits: Katherine Morrissey (SBS). Academic Council has been meeting weekly to discuss protocols for key personnel funding and the importance of the deans working closely with department heads, shared governance college committees and the Millennium Report Oversight Committee (MROC). Academic Council also desires more effective institutional marketing messages to promote our academic focused excellence messages, such as the arrival of new faculty or achievements by faculty. The colleges are contributing financial support to this more systematic effort, which will be aided by Kate Jensen, Director of Marketing in the Office of University Advancement. Provost Davis has recently established the University of Arizona Health Sciences Academic Council, which includes the four deans from Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and Public Health. The deans are the Executive Leadership Team of the Health Sciences and they will meet bi-weekly with the Provost and the two vice provosts to work on high level synergies to optimize the relationships, potentials, and opportunities unique to this campus, which is the only school west of the Mississippi with all four of these colleges. Vice Provost Garcia is now facilitating the Heads Up group, which is brainstorming with the assistance of Roger Caldwell, about early identification of areas in which to improve academic departments. The brainstorming includes: learning best practices from our peer institutions, defining the vision and priorities, improving efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, and interaction and outreach with K-12. The group expects to generate a report to the general campus. Vice Provost Juan Garcia is now the Director of Decision and Planning Support (DAPS), and although he will be recruiting a new DAPS director, he will continue overseeing that unit.

3G. **President Peter Likins**

President Likins deferred his report until later in the meeting.

4. **QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD FOR AGENDA ITEM 3**

Senator Gruener thanked Provost Davis for his visit to the Health Sciences campus and urged him to hold open forums for the health sciences faculty. He believes that bringing these four faculties together is very important. Provost Davis agreed and said he has assured the deans that he is interested in meeting with faculty leaders, deans and department heads to develop a better understanding of the opportunities and issues.

Senator Likins explained that he is trying to change our language habit of referring to the "health sciences" campus and the "main campus," which he terms a "forbidden phrase" because it just increases the sense of divide. He insists that the UA is one campus and he is also trying to get the budget for health sciences integrated into the main budget as it comes from the state.

5. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2004**

The minutes of October 4, 2004 were approved.

6. **DISCUSSION OF HIGHER EDUCATION RESTRUCTURING (attachment)**

Dr. Fran Bernat, Chair of the Arizona Faculties Council and Chair of the Faculties Stakeholder Group came to share her perception of where the faculties stand in the Arizona Higher Education restructuring discussions. She has been to three other Senates and intends to visit UA-South and NAU-Yuma. Dr. Bernat is on the faculty at the ASU-West. She explained that several stakeholders are representing the UA, including Wanda Howell, Roger Caldwell and Beth Mitchneck, and Jory Hancock is serving on the ABOR Working Group. She invited questions to be sent to her at frances.bernat@asu.edu or to Wanda Howell or the Faculty Center. She believes the main issues for higher education redesign will be about access, affordability, the role of each University and the role of each campus of each University. She doesn't believe there is a set outcome, and invited faculty to visit the ABOR website at <http://www.abor.asu.edu/> which has a link for a wealth of redesign materials in the upper right hand corner of the page including the original proposal and fifteen other proposals or letters with suggestions or questions. The Working Group is assigned by ABOR to consider these proposals and provide a recommendation to ABOR that will be funneled through the Council of Presidents and Regent Herstam. A draft of this recommendation is expected in February or March 2005. The faculty stakeholder group is one of eight other stakeholder groups, which include students, alumni, businesspersons, government/legislative and diversity who will be forwarding their responses on the issues to the Working Group. The chairmanship of the Arizona Faculties Council will be returning to UA next year. Senators' questions included: 1) What are some of the specific issues that are of faculty interest? These topics will soon be posted on the redesign website as "FAQ's," and include the following concerns: a) What happens to tenure if a new university is created? b) What happens to faculty with continuing status if they are part of a new institution? c) Would track years be counted? d) Would faculty, academic

professionals, and staff, as well as their spouses or children be eligible for tuition waiver benefits? e) What happens to Foundation money that is accepted for campus-specific endowments? 2) What would be the research mission at newly developed campuses? Several discussions are ongoing, but generally speaking, the newly created universities would have different missions. As an example, ASU West's mission is not the same as a Research I Carnegie Class institution, and it has no expectation that there would be an engineering school, medical school or law school, but the ASU-West faculty have always imbedded scholarship into the teaching and service. NAU's faculty aspires to continue to engage in research and would like the research mission to be protected, but the core departments need to keep teaching at the forefront of their mission, and a key question will be "What is the mission of NAU and ASU-West?"

7. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION: COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN BUDGET CONCERNS RESOLUTION (attachment)

Senator and Committee of Eleven (C11) Chair J. D. Garcia noted that this budget concerns resolution was timely when it was written in July but that it has only just now come before the Senate. The primary issue the C11 is concerned about is what mechanisms the President and Provost are setting up to prevent the 2.06 percent cuts that each department was asked to make this year as a result of the state legislature's decision to fund retention of key personnel without funding the increased cost of health, dental, life and disability insurance, i.e. employee-related expenses (ERE), that occurred in June 2004 from reoccurring. Dr. Garcia illustrated that the Physics Department has to deal with a \$73K budget cut, which could be addressed by eliminating 10 teaching assistants representing about 30 lab sections out of 64, which would mean eliminating half of the seats for students who desire to enroll in physics classes. He remarked that this isn't the method the department will employ to deal with its budget cuts and that if only the Department had known earlier, this funding reduction would have only involved 4 teaching assistant positions. The second concern involves a shared vision of the student-centered research university and asks what institutional changes and new initiatives is the administration taking towards the essential movement to propel the UA into the top 10 research universities? The last concern involves what can be done about the UA's endemic morale problem, which includes the notion that ASU is moving forward and recruiting its own Nobel prizewinner following our own Nobel prizewinner who left just prior to receiving the award. The C11, in writing this memo, hoped to inspire some action on the part of the leadership. Faculty rely on the leadership to move the University forward and the C11 continues to hope for such action. Senators' questions and comments included: 1) What has been the response from the administration? The C11 sent a second memo on August 11 requesting a response and the Provost wrote a note saying he would respond shortly. The Provost said he perceived the Concerns Resolution as heterogeneous and that he intended to respond by identifying specific things that are now in place or are moving into place. He also anticipated that this response would be public and move into a quasi-public forum. The Provost said he anticipates developing the shared ambition to move into a top ten public and in particular to try to link and map that particular goal with major investments and efforts that are currently being made and have been made in the whole health science and health care area. He believes that tremendous potential lies in developing synergies and connecting foundational academic strengths across the whole university, which includes the health sciences. This may be one route by which the UA could move significantly in the rankings. Focused excellence, in terms of fundamental investments, into Bio5, into Drachman, into Chemistry, T-Gen and the Phoenix Biomedical campus may provide another opportunity for moving the UA up in rankings. 2) Does the C11 expect the Senate to endorse, approve, reject or offer thanks for this resolution? If the Senate sympathizes with this resolution, the C11 would be grateful for its endorsement. 3) The central administration should be encouraged to respond as quickly as possible with suggestions for future actions to yield more powerful results. The C11's intent was and is to stir action. 4) What are the C11's expectations for action? The C11 would like to see a plan to help the faculty understand how we will avoid budget shortfalls like last June and a plan on how the UA is going to get into the top 10 or top 15 universities in the country. Senator Likins responded that the administration realized it must change the way it conducts its affairs and how it communicates so he has restructured many of the operations within the Cabinet and the Finance Committee. These Finance Committee working groups should help to prevent a budget crisis like the one in June 2004 from recurring. He warned that the campus community will soon be receiving a communication advising us that the Arizona State Retirement System contributions will essentially double this year, costing the UA \$7M which is due July 05, if the legislature doesn't provide the University with funds to cover these costs. President Likins also explained that while his administration has not responded directly to C11, it has made announcements to the entire campus community about the restructured cabinet and committee and about proposed specific changes to financial policies, which will be open to discussions in which the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee (SPBAC) will be involved. The administration did fail to make timely decisions regarding the ERE last spring and so he has subsequently apologized and taken constructive action. Provost Davis responded that the concerns resolution is heterogeneous with a number of diverse points, and although he missed his October deadline for response to the C11, he hopes to identify specific things that are now in place or are moving into place. He also assumed that the administration's response would be a public response. He hopes to move into a top ten public university, and hopes to link that goal with the current investments and efforts that have been and will be made in the health sciences and health care area. This area has tremendous potential to move us forward significantly in the national rankings, particularly in grants and contracts. The fundamental investments in the medical research building, BIO5, Drachman Hall, Chemistry and other areas such as TGEN and the Phoenix Biomedical campus may well make the difference of whether we ever move beyond the 15th rank. Senator Likins said that in the last survey of national research expenditures (National Science Foundation FY2002), the UA ranked 14th among public universities and 23rd nationally. M. Cusanovich noted that the UA ranked 10th in 1998. Senator and Vice President for Research Powell clarified that the NSF ranking is two years out of date. In spite of an increase in research expenditures by 8% between 2001-02, the UA dropped to 16th in 2002, because two other universities jumped above UA by enormous increases. Although UA increases every year, others are increasing by much more and he is not

sure how or why. 5) Is there a central paradigm for dealing with faculty morale problems or is something already being done somewhere else about faculty morale because this might impact the enterprise? Provost Davis feels he is reasonably aware of the morale problems but when he visits with faculty and department heads on campus, they invariably share the good things that are happening in their units. He also believes that the Deans' emphasis on marketing more effectively involves reporting these accomplishments to both the University community and beyond. Senator Likins welcomed Senator Songer's counsel because he shares the same concern, and wondered whether this administration's management style is contributing to the morale problem. Because this administration is so remarkably forthcoming compared to other universities, he wonders if this candidness about financing and other concerns is discouraging to faculty. Senator Hancock believes that UA faculty members are perhaps too deeply engaged in "the work" and that when the work is completed, they quickly move on to the next project or grant and forget to celebrate the achievement. 6) Does Senator Songer believe that UA faculty suffer from poor morale? Senator Songer said he believes that most of morale means simply being happy with one's work, but the broader question is whether the institution values one's work. When programs are removed, advanced, introduced, or changed, faculty ask what this means to them and then they become more insular and myopic in doing their own work or research, because that is what brings them satisfaction, as opposed to looking at institutional mission. 7) We should never discourage administrators from sharing information with the faculty. 8) A couple of possible morale issues are: a) the faculty is still struggling to understand focused excellence and the status of focused excellence, and b) there exists a perception that ASU is moving ahead while UA is not or is even falling behind. These two issues might be countered by more positive spin and by finding more ways to recognize and reward faculty, even without dollars. Senator Likins said his administration does recognize the perception about ASU's progress, but as he explained, ASU does not have more money available to it than the UA; they just manage and spend it very differently. UA's research contracts are three times greater than ASU's and UA's gift dollars overwhelm theirs. ASU's tuition dollars are greater but they've also grown by 10K students and of course tuition dollars don't even pay for the incremental costs of instruction. It is simply not ASU's style to discuss publicly how money is being reallocated and what is being taken away, but that is surely the only thing that can be happening. Nevertheless, perception does matter and may be creating a sense of dismay among UA faculty. Focused Excellence was announced in August 2002 as a commitment to excellence and concerns about the implications of focus. The Provost and President then identified programs to be merged, contracted, or eliminated in order to reallocate resources to invest in strategies in the appropriate domains in which UA can be truly excellent. There has been so much concern about the cuts, however, that this attention has dominated what focused excellence is really about. The administration has now made a \$5M reallocation and that money is being invested elsewhere. President Likins explained the strategy of focused excellence, which is to select truly excellent domains in which to invest. Now as the state begins to recover financially, he hopes that state funds, like those currently being invested in health and bio-sciences, hydrology, and teacher education, might become available to invest in other strategic areas such as language and culture and technology management. He also expects that, over a course of years, this will allow the University to focus on every corner of the University, albeit not every activity in every corner. This strategy has not changed since focused excellence was announced and the investing phase is just beginning, after a period of about two years of cuts. This strategy is what will propel the UA into the Top Ten Research Universities. 9) This clarification is helpful. 10) The administration has not done a superlative job of communicating this vision and plan to the faculty. President Likins suggested that the administration's sin might be in communicating too much. 11) Where a 2% cut is pulled from or reallocated to is a very real set of decisions that will actually influence whether UA slips to 16 or moves up to 13.

8. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION: REVISED SHARED GOVERNANCE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**
(attachment)

Vice Chair of the Faculty Wanda Howell invited Senator Likins, in his role as president, to share his interpretations and insights about the revised Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding. President Likins began by saying that he has been employed in universities (UCLA, Columbia, Lehigh and UA) for over 40 years and has always taken the role of faculty very seriously. He has participated in faculty governance as a faculty member, a dean, a provost and a president. He came to UA with a pre-commitment to the notion of shared governance and the belief that faculty are the essence of a great university. When he came to Arizona, he was pleased to discover that shared governance has been institutionalized in a statute (ARS 15-1601B) and has been part of the culture. The statute defines the legal context and framework for shared governance. The statute lacks some clarity and also provides some constraints. In dialogues with the Regents, President Likins says he has been reminded that he cannot give away what he does not have, so he has been more engaged in thinking about the degree to which he can extend his commitment to shared governance, in writing, beyond the statutory obligations and still maintain a sense among the Regents that he is meeting his responsibilities not only to the faculty but also to the Regents. Every university president is constantly engaged in a process of balancing multiple constituents including the governing board, the legislature, alumni, students, parents, faculty, benefactors, community members, and neighbors. In the last several months, he has become more conscious of the complexities in maintaining the right kind of balance in his responsiveness to Regents and to faculty, and is now hesitant to commit to further elucidation of what we mean by shared governance. He said, when he returns to his role as a Senator, that he will move to change the title of the document to read: "Recommendations of the University of Arizona Faculty Senate Regarding Shared Governance." This document then would determine what the Senate wants to say to the President about its expectations of shared governance, and that would require that the signature lines at the end be removed. He believes a healthy dialogue in the Senate would convey to him and to the Regents, who read the Senate minutes, about the Senate's expectations of shared governance. He will then have a dialogue with the Regents to be certain that he is not in conflict with their interpretation of the statute. President Likins said he is committed to do his very best to consult extensively about issues that he can see coming that have policy implications for the academic enterprise; to speak openly and extensively about issues as he sees them arising; and to accept the

responsibility to decide. The University is not a democracy, he explained, and he is empowered by the Regents to make the decisions and will not and cannot give away that authority. Furthermore, he said, if a decision is not consistent with counsel received, he will communicate, as best he can, the reasons for his decision. He agrees to consult, to decide, and to explain and he believes that is what shared governance means, regardless of whether he is the actor, or the faculty. He expects the faculty to consult with the administration before taking any curricular actions that might have financial implications, for example. He said he has been committed to these principles of shared governance for his 23 years as a university president and he remains committed to them today. Senator Silverman moved [Motion 2004/05-16] to accept the revised "Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding." Motion was seconded. Senator Likins moved [Motion 2004/05-17] to amend the subtitle of the "Guidelines for Shared Governance" by replacing the words, "Memorandum of Understanding Entered into by the Faculty and the current Administration of the University of Arizona" with "Recommendations of the University of Arizona Faculty Senate Regarding Shared Governance" and to eliminate the second paragraph of section J on page 5 which reads "The Faculty Senate and the administration shall jointly continue to consider the further development of this memorandum of understanding and make arrangements to implement the provisions as adopted" and the four signature lines that follow this text. Motion was seconded. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) What are the ramifications of calling this a recommendation? Will it eventually evolve into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that will be signed by you and the chair of the faculty, or will that never happen and this will only be a document that is a recommendation. President Likins proposed that, upon receipt of this document however amended today, he would consult with the Regents and the Executive Director of the Board of Regents to see how they would react to the document. He would then craft an alternate document and seek a convergence with the MOU. It will differ from this MOU in several ways; for example, the passage that says the president has the final authority to make a unilateral decision if it is judged "to be in the vital interests of the University." While this phrase seemed benign last Spring, President Likins now believes that it may not be interpreted in the same way by everyone and that could lead to serious disagreements about what represents the "vital interests" of the University. 2) One of the reasons for revisions of this document was a series of upper administration appointments that were made last year without a search. Were those appointments in the vital interests of the University in your mind? President Likins said yes, he regarded the summer of 2003 appointments of Dr. Patti Ota and Dr. Edith Auslander to be in the vital interests of the University. 3) Does acceptance of this document void the present agreement? President Likins responded that the current Memorandum of Understanding signed in 1997 by Dr. Hogle and President Likins still stands. 4) The 1997 document also stipulates that the president has the prerogative to declare if the vital interests are at stake. President Likins responded that there are aspects of the original document that are simply out of date and it makes references to organizations that no longer exist, so it is in our mutual interest to converge on an alternate document. President Likins said he cannot sign the version before him now. 5) This document has been negotiated for quite some time, and the traditional and more appropriate thing would be to amend it and perhaps table it. 6) Is there a committee that the Senate could delegate this document to discuss and negotiate? The Shared Governance Review Committee met several times and formed a sub-committee to draft this revision and then began negotiating with the President and Provost. Last spring the President said he felt he could sign it, but he now feels that would not be wise. 7) What possibly could be interpreted by any Regent as not being consistent with the UA's document? President Likins responded that phrase, "the vital interests of the University," is in question, because he is not allowed to delegate his authority. This document may mean that he is not to disagree unless it is in the vital interests of the University. He fears that phrase sets a potential for endless disputes about what represents the vital interests of the University. There are other examples within the document that seem to extend the reach of the faculty beyond academic affairs that are not in the statute, such as financial affairs. 8) Is it possible that the last line in the statute, "shall actively participate in the development of University policy" might mean budget policies, since the budget affects academic and curricular policies? President Likins responded that the document also involves consulting with other constituencies such as appointed personnel, staff and students, and that those groups are specifically not mentioned in the statute. While President Likins accepts this part, the Regents may not agree with it. Since last spring, he said, there has been a very public airing of our differences that has made the Regents think more negatively about the faculty at UA and it is not acceptable to the Regents for the President to respond to pressures of the faculty. Senator Mitchell noted that he helped to negotiate this document and likes it, but realizes that President Likins is under constraints now that weren't there six months ago. If the only way to move forward is to craft a document that is acceptable to the Regents, perhaps the Senate should accept the President's offer to dialogue with the Regents and to avoid amending the language which was carefully worked out over months of negotiations among Jerry Hogle, John Schwarz, Jory Hancock, Andy Silverman, Wanda Howell, the President and the Provost. Senator Mitchell would prefer to let President Likins take this document intact to the Regents and let them negotiate, and suggested that it might be helpful to bring some faculty officers into those meetings. 9) Since this has been on the table for months and months, why hasn't the President consulted with them before? 10) The Board of Regents has never been a very consultative body, itself and doesn't exactly promote shared governance. Why do we need to consult the Board now? 11) This document fits within the statute, and "vital interests" is really only applied when the President acts unilaterally, whereas the normal course is to consult. That is all this document asks, and furthermore it gives the President the opportunity to act unilaterally if is in the vital interests of the University. If the Regents get involved, this document will not look anything like this. President Likins responded that he does not intend to take this document to the Regents, but will craft an alternate document that he believes will be acceptable and then speak only with the President of the Board. He agrees that it would not be a healthy discussion to involve all of the Regents. Senator Davis suggested that in this very public discussion, the President is saying that it is neither in his interest nor the institution's interest to proceed with this document in this way right now because of the changed environment. 12) The President's proposed title change to "Recommendations of the University of Arizona Faculty Senate Regarding Shared Governance" places the faculty on uneven footing and is a poor place from which to begin these negotiations. A better title might be "Discussions between the Faculty through the Faculty Senate and the Administration Regarding Shared Governance." 13) This is a really serious structural

problem; this particular body is or wants to be democratic in its functioning, and is presently in some tension with a body that is not democratic. It takes a great deal of wisdom to negotiate that tension. 14) How does changing the title and eliminating the signature lines improve the negotiations with Regent Stuart? President Likins responded that he cannot sign this document because he knows the Regents would disapprove. If the Senate passes it and he doesn't sign, that will set up a confrontation, with the Senate, the campus and the Regents. The Regents' perception is that the UA's administration is more compliant with faculty concerns than our sister institutions. 15) Is that a bad thing? Senator Garcia moved [**Motion 2004/05-18**] to table the document and return to committee. Motion was seconded. Parliamentarian Sankey clarified that the motion to table is not debatable and the motion to refer back to committee is debatable and the two motions cannot be combined. If the document is referred back to committee, it does so with the proposed amendments from the floor of the Senate today. Senator Garcia clarified that his motion is to refer the matter back to the committee. Motion was seconded. Senators' comments and questions included: 1) The Shared Governance Review Committee (SGRC) should try to find out why we are so convinced that the Regents are against us. 2) The SGRC should then report back to the Senate why the Regents think the UA faculty are so obstinate and why they think a faculty with a strong commitment to shared governance is a negative thing. The SGRC should then suggest what we should do about this. President Likins said he will work with the SGRC and will craft that alternate document. Motion carried.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Robert L. Mitchell, Secretary

Appendix*

1. Homepage of the Arizona Board of Regents website on Leadership in Higher Education.
2. Committee of Eleven "Concerns Resolution" dated July 2004.
3. Revised "Guidelines for Shared Governance: Memorandum of Understanding Entered into by the Faculty and the current Administration of the University of Arizona."

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

Motions of the Meeting of November 1, 2004

Motion 2004/05-16 Motion to accept the revised "Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding." Motion not acted upon.

Motion 2004/05-17 Motion to amend the subtitle of the revised "Guidelines for Shared Governance" by replacing the words, "Memorandum of Understanding Entered into by the Faculty and the current Administration of the University of Arizona" with "Recommendations of the University of Arizona Faculty Senate Regarding Shared Governance" and to eliminate the second paragraph of section J on page 5 which reads "The Faculty Senate and the administration shall jointly continue to consider the further development of this memorandum of understanding and make arrangements to implement the provisions as adopted" and the four signature lines that follow this text. Motion not acted upon.

Motion 2004/05-18 Motion to refer back to the Shared Governance Review Committee the revised "Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding" along with the proposed amendment as written in Motion 2004/05-17. Motion carried

FACULTY CENTER
1400 E. Mabel
PO BOX 210473