Adoption of the Chicago Principles of Free Expression

The APPC met with Kody Kelleher (Senior Advisor, UA Gov't and Community Relations) who advised us on past and current Arizona legislative activity related to freedom of expression on university campuses, and made some suggestions regarding proactive steps we might consider to minimize further legislation on this topic. Several bills passed in recent years were in response to a perception that UA faculty/staff might be actively impeding free speech for selected groups. UA is currently rated as "yellow" by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) https://www.thefire.org/spotlight/using-the-spotlight-database/#yellow which lawmakers and special interest groups consult when proposing new bills related to free expression. In order to minimize unnecessary legislation we have been advised to **adopt a free expression policy** similar to the Chicago Principles of Freedom of Speech: https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/FOECommitteeReport.pdf, developed by the University of Chicago and adopted by 50+ universities https://www.thefire.org/chicago-statement-university-and-faculty-body-support/ including Arizona State University https://provost.asu.edu/adoption-chicago-statement-freedom-expression.

The principles are very much in line with what we already do, promote, and value at the UA. Further legislative activity around freedom of expression is something UA should be very concerned about. There is some urgency related to a timeline action, as the state legislature will pick up steam early next year. The APPC felt strongly (and unanimously, except for one person who was unable to attend today's meeting) that we should support the adoption of the Chicago Principles as the UA policy on free expression. APPC will solicit potential concern/questions regarding this proposal at Senate on Monday December 3rd, 2018, in anticipation of a February vote.

Adoption of Chicago Statement of Freedom of Expression

The University of Arizona has a long-standing commitment to free speech. The purpose of this letter is to affirm UA's endorsement of the "Report of the Committee on Freedom of Expression" at the University of Chicago (the Chicago Statement). The Statement is fully consistent with UA's existing policies.

The University of Arizona is a public institution that is committed to free, robust and uninhibited sharing of ideas among all members of the University community. The University of Arizona values the 1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which provides the right to free speech.

Therefore, after consultation with the University of Arizona Faculty Senate, the University of Arizona is formally adopting the core principles of the Chicago Statement, with minor edits, as set forth below:

Because the University is committed to free and open inquiry in all matters, it guarantees all members of the University community the broadest possible latitude to speak, write, listen, challenge, and learn. Except insofar as limitations on that freedom are necessary to the functioning of the University, the University fully respects and supports the freedom of all members of the University community "to discuss any problem that presents itself."

Of course, the ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is not the proper role of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can never be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. The University may restrict expression that violates the law, that falsely defames a specific individual, that constitutes a genuine threat or harassment, that unjustifiably invades substantial privacy or confidentiality interests, or that is otherwise directly incompatible with the functioning of the University. In addition, the University may reasonably regulate the time, place, and manner of expression to ensure that it does not disrupt the ordinary activities of the University. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University's commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

In a word, the University's fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. It is for the individual members of the University community, not for the University as an institution, to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting

the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University's educational mission.

As a corollary to the University's commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

Without a vibrant commitment to free and open inquiry, a university ceases to be a university.

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

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

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- The faculty officers and faculty center staff provided support for the ABOR meeting in November, including a faculty breakfast organized by Chair Summers. The breakfast involved about 25 UA faculty members in conversation with the regents on topics relating to the faculty's role in student success and retention. The faculty officers and faculty center staff met with the faculty officers from ASU and NAU to discuss shared issues and values.
- The second issue of the Faculty Newsletter will be published the first week of December. Contributions for future newsletters are always welcome!
- Brewer, Fountain, and rest of the Committee on Faculty Membership completed the adjudication of faculty members who were not picked up by the Census, and are ensuring now that all those who met the criteria for membership are included in the Census. Individuals who were picked up by the Census but not assigned a college vote code at time of hire/re-hire (which is now the responsibility of the Faculty Center/Faculty Officers) were also assigned vote codes.
- Chair Summers has ensured faculty representation on the search committees for the new Provost, Chief Financial Officer, and Vice President for Research.

GOALS:
- Seek Senate support to name an ad-hoc Senate Task force to review various non-credit offerings around campus that fit under the rubric Career and Professional Education (CAPE) to ensure that all offerings that should have faculty oversight do have faculty oversight.
- Plan and facilitate the next town hall on gender and equity.
- Ensure that faculty who wish to have input on the upcoming external searches have an easy way to provide that input to us, for sharing with the relevant search committees.
- Facilitate Senate consideration of a proposal to move the Petitions Committee into the shared governance structure as a University-wide Committee with Shared Governance Participation.
- Connect the output of the table discussion on Senators' goals and priorities from October's meeting to a set of ranked priorities for action by Senate over the rest of the academic year. Integrate the outcomes of the Strategic Planning process in this work and continue to work collaboratively to meet our objectives.
- Mobilize faculty who do not participate in shared governance for input on issues of shared governance.
- Broker critical relationships between the faculty and administration in an effort to open channels for transparency in how we work collaboratively at the University.
- Continue to assist in the development, approval and implementation of changes to UHAP Chapter 7.
- Bring a set of proposed changes to the Constitution and Bylaws committee for review and forwarding to Senate. These will include a bylaws modification that would allow Senate meetings that would fall on a major religious holiday to be rescheduled. A plan for converting Constitution and Bylaws updates to html, including a process for managing change in these documents, will be provided.

- Appoint and convene the new Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Career Track Issues, chaired by Bill Neumann.
- Develop a Qualtrics tool (drawing on our current voting system and UAccess Analytics) that will allow individuals not picked up by the Census to petition the Committee on Faculty Membership for inclusion. The tool will automatically draw pertinent data on petitioners from UAccess elicit any other necessary information through a survey.

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Acting Provost Jeffrey Goldberg https://provost.arizona.edu

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

General
- VPR position discussion – either here or in the president report – requested by Jessica Summers
- C11
  - Faculty input on search processes
  - Annual Evaluation
- Training for Department Heads
- Provost fund investment process

Hires/Searches
- Vet Med – Julie Funk – Michigan State University – working on college setup
- UA Global – Brent White – Internal
- Vice Provost faculty Affairs – final 3
- Engineering – in process
- HSI build-out

Strat Plan
- Regents approval

GOALS/Future:

- Tuition setting process begins – April regents meeting
- RCM decisions
- Budget Process for Provost off ice Units – Spring
- Investment allocations – there are many asks outstanding and I am working with Lisa Rulney and others to get this prioritized and distributed

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: President Robert Robbins http://president.arizona.edu/

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS, GOALS and UPDATES

- Strategic Plan

  o Thank you. We have passed an important milestone to advancing our strategic plan.

  o The Arizona Board of Regents unanimously accepted the University of Arizona's Strategic Plan and have shown enthusiastic support. The Board's expectations for implementation and execution are high.

  o Next Steps—Implementing and executing on the strategic plan initiatives, establishing budget and timing priorities.

  o Initiative leads and additional positions supporting the implementation and execution of the plan.

- Updates on some key leadership searches

  o Title IX Director hired and reporting to the President

  o Update on SVP for Research and Innovation

  o SVP and Provost search is ongoing

  o SVP and Chief Financial Officer is ongoing

- Update on faculty discussion meetings at the university residence

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Academic Personnel Policy Committee

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. Chicago Principles:

The APPC met with Kody Kelleher (Senior Advisor, UA Gov't and Community Relations) who advised us on past and current Arizona legislative activity related to freedom of expression on university campuses, and made some suggestions regarding proactive steps we might consider to minimize further legislation on this topic. Several bills passed in recent years were in response to a perception that UA faculty/staff might be actively impeding free speech for selected groups. UA is currently rated as "yellow" by the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE) https://www.thefire.org/spotlight/using-the-spotlight-database/#yellow which lawmakers and special interest groups consult when proposing new bills related to free expression. In order to minimize unnecessary legislation we have been advised to **adopt a free expression policy** similar to the Chicago Principles of Freedom of Speech: https://provost.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/documents/reports/FOECommitteeReport.pdf, developed by the University of Chicago and adopted by 50+ universities https://www.thefire.org/chicago-statement-university-and-faculty-body-support/ including Arizona State University https://provost.asu.edu/adoption-chicago-statement-freedom-expression.

The principles are very much in line with what we already do, promote, and value at the UA. Further legislative activity around freedom of expression is something UA should be very concerned about. There is some urgency related to a timeline action, as the state legislature will pick up steam early next year. The APPC felt strongly (and unanimously, except for one person who was unable to attend today's meeting) that we should support the adoption of the Chicago Principles as the UA policy on free expression. APPC will solicit potential concern/questions regarding this proposal at Senate on Monday December 3rd, 2018, in anticipation of a February vote.

2. Reviewed and endorsed the Postdoc Vacation Policy revision

GOALS

Bring proposed freedom of expression policy adopted from the Chicago Principles of Freedom of Speech to a Senate vote by Feb 2019

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: President ASUA asuapres@email.arizona.edu

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- We received financial support for Campus Pantry from the University as well as increased donations from across campus
- We have more students using SafeRide, our free car service.
- ASUA has begun planning the "I Will" campaign to end rape culture. "I Will" will take place in late March
- ASUA is finishing the Student Regent Selections process. Three finalists will so be sent to the Governor's office for final selection.

GOALS:

- We are looking to help support a proposal to expand the feminist pharmacy to other areas across campus
- Campus Pantry is looking to partner with Parking & Transportation to promote the CatTran route to Safeway
- ASUA aims to help find better ways to support DACA students
- ASUA is looking into lighting on campus to ensure that campus is safe for students

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Marie Teemant, GPSC President http://www.gpsc.arizona.edu/

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

-GPSC completed our first and second rounds of the Travel Grants and our first rounds of both Research and Professional Development grants.

-Working with the Rec Center, GPSC conducted a Student-Parent focus group. The outcome of this has been several initiatives for GPSC to take on to provide a better sense of community among this group.

-GPSC continues to receive positive feedback on the improvement to our newsletter and communication efforts.

GOALS:

-Along with GPSC's efforts to create opportunities for Student-Parents, we will be working with and advocating for programs and areas which support Student-Parents and make the University of Arizona a more family-friendly institution. We are already working with the Rec, who have been great in coordinating on potential programs for families.

-Professional development is a primary focus of future development. In particular, we would like to connect graduate/professional students with workshops and entities to help them across campus. We will be working with the Graduate Center and Graduate College on developing programs and trainings that do not already exist and with OIA to improve the quality of teaching among Teaching Assistants.

-GPSC will be working on tuition and fee setting. We are looking at what peer institutions' processes, tuition structure, and fees are like and how the University of Arizona compares.

In spring 2018, faculty reported their satisfaction in a broad range of areas on a survey conducted by the Collaboration on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) at Harvard. COACHE provides benchmarks from five peer universities and a cohort of 109 universities. 2100 tenure-track, career-track, and continuing-status faculty who were here for more than a year and were not on leave were surveyed, 886 responded. The 42% response rate equals those of our peers.

The top strengths identified by our faculty are opportunities to collaborate and the quality of colleagues available at UA. Personnel policies and benefits were our most highly evaluated area. Faculty expressed the greatest concern about college, department, and faculty leadership, including shared governance leadership.

AREAS OF STRENGTH

Opportunities for Collaboration (responses place us in top 30% of cohort)
High ratings for collaboration opportunities within and outside of departments.

Personal/Family Policies and Benefits (top 30% of peers and cohort)
High ratings for policies such as flexible workload and modified duties, spousal/partner hiring, and family medical/parental leave. High ratings for health and retirement benefits and phased retirement options.

Promotion to Full (top 30% of cohort)
High assessments of the clarity of the promotion process for full, including criteria, departmental support and time clock schedule. Assessments have significantly improved since the last survey in 2013.

AREAS OF CONCERN

College, Department, and Faculty Leadership (bottom 30% of peers and cohort)
Faculty criticized UA leaders on their pace of decision making, stated priorities, communication, and securing faculty input.

Governance Trust & Productivity (bottom 30% of peers and cohort)
Low assessments of governance, including open communication between faculty and administration, understanding how to voice opinions, public recognition of progress, and overall effectiveness of shared governance.

Clarity of Tenure Expectations (bottom 30% of peers and cohort)
Pre-tenure faculty offered low ratings for clarity of tenure expectations.

CHANGES SINCE THE 2013 COACHE SURVEY

Assessments of overall research support improved significantly, particularly for support for obtaining grants (pre-award), managing grants (post-award), and availability of course releases for research.

More pre-tenure faculty are receiving formal feedback on their progress toward tenure. In 2013, more than 30% had *not* received formal feedback, placing us below our peers and the cohort. In 2018, 23% had *not* received formal feedback, which is better than our peers and cohort. This improvement is paralleled by increases in assessments of mentoring.

Interdisciplinarity has become less of a competitive advantage. Ratings dropped from top 30% to the midrange in comparison to our peers and cohort in the 2018 survey.

CT faculty and TT faculty responses only differed significantly in a few areas such as support for research and graduate instruction. Both CT and tenured faculty expressed high levels of dissatisfaction with the amount personal interaction they had with each other. CT faculty were not surveyed in 2013.

The COACHE Survey Asked Faculty to Assess

- Research Expectations & Support
- Service Expectations & Support
- Teaching Expectations & Support
- Facilities & Work Resources
- Personnel Policies & Benefits
- Interdisciplinary Support
- Collaboration Opportunities
- Mentoring
- Tenure Policies & Expectations
- Leadership
- Shared Governance
- Departmental Collegiality & Quality
- Appreciation & Recognition

The Five Best Aspects of Working at UA

- Quality of colleagues (36%)
- Geographic location (32%)
- Support of colleagues (17%)
- Academic freedom (14%)
- Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues (13%)

Five Worst Aspects of UA

- Compensation (31%) [All 5 peers and 95% of the cohort had this as their worst aspect.]
- Quality of leadership (17%)
- Too much service (12%)
- Quality of facilities (11%)
- Quality of undergrads (10%)

DIVERSE PERSPECTIVES

Underrepresented minority (URM) faculty had notably lower assessments of department climate, engagement, and quality, including related items such as fit, collegiality, and shared commitment to diversity. URM faculty also had more negative assessments of departmental mentoring, retention efforts, and diversity efforts.

URM faculty had lower levels of satisfaction in nearly all areas. Less significant differences are also evident in the responses of women faculty, who were less satisfied in almost half of the areas, including research support, service, opportunities for collaboration and interdisciplinarity, tenure policies and clarity, departmental leadership, and appreciation and recognition.

	% Agreeing or Strongly Agreeing			
	Men	Women	White	URM
There is visible leadership at my institution for the support and promotion of diversity on campus.	64%	57%	65%	43%
Recent searches in my department have prioritized the need to diversify the faculty.	48%	41%	48%	28%
The UA offers effective programs to improve the ability of faculty to support the success of underrepresented students.	46%	41%	46%	32%
The UA offers effective programs to improve climate, respond to harassment and bias, and support diverse perspectives and experiences.	50%	38%	46%	29%

THE UA LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE

UA faculty have traditionally had low assessments of our leadership of their deans, heads, provosts, and presidents. In the 2013 COACHE survey, the assessments of heads and deans placed us in the bottom 30% of the 100 universities who did the COACHE survey and also the peer universities in our cohort. While the 2018 survey was conducted amidst changes in senior leadership, the assessments of heads and faculty leaders were even lower than in 2013. The shared governance items were added since 2013. Our responses on those items also fall in the bottom 30% of peer and cohort institutions.

The COACHE Program provides research on best practices that can help us build on our strengths to address areas where we need to improve leadership development and accountability. These reports focus on the impact of departmental leadership on departmental effectiveness, including involving faculty in making decisions and fairness in assessing faculty.

The collaborative dynamics of departmental leadership are the general area where there is the greatest difference between the responses of white and under-represented minority faculty. As noted above, the two groups had major differences in their responses to some individual items, but the area that has a cluster of major differences is the series of items on departmental collegiality, engagement, quality, and recognition. All these items have implications for leadership.

These differences take on broader significance in colleges where faculty see weaknesses in leadership, engagement, and climate. The COACHE survey provides faculty assessments of colleges along with national benchmarks drawn from comparable colleges from other institutions. The comparisons to peer and cohort institutions do not always align with the disciplines in UA colleges. Nonetheless, all UA colleges received faculty assessments that place them in the top rankings in particular areas. Those strengths provide leverage points to strengthen collaborations within and across colleges.

The differences among UA colleges provide lessons in the collaborative dynamics of leadership that we are becoming better able to address. After the 2013 survey, the COACHE leadership expectations were integrated into the criteria we use in annual and five-year reviews of administrators. Those reviews provide opportunities to improve the effectiveness of our leaders. We now have increased capacity to provide coaching and formative feedback to leaders through the new Leadership and Organizational Development unit in Human Resources (LOD). LOD is preparing to help launch leadership programs to respond to the concerns of diverse faculty and help diversify the ranks of faculty and staff prepared to step into collaborative leadership roles. Discussions are also beginning on requiring professional development for all heads and directors. Such training could be used to address the concerns of URM faculty in ways that could also help us advance our HSI mission.

How can we help UA leaders improve in the areas of faculty concern?
- Pace of decision making,
- Clearly defined priorities,
- Effective communication of priorities,
- Opportunities for faculty to offer input on decisions, and
- Fairness in evaluating faculty work.

The collaborative dimensions of leadership are also highlighted in the COACHE items on shared governance:
- Trust,
- Shared sense of purpose,
- Understanding of issues,
- Adaptability, and
- Productivity.

What else can we do to strengthen our collaborative leadership?

Benchmarks Dashboard

COACHE Dashboard Guide

This is the overall score (*between 1 and 5*) for all faculty respondents at your institution.

These columns describe how your faculty's responses compare to similar faculty at other COACHE institutions: tenured vs. tenured, men vs. men, faculty of color vs. faculty of color, etc.

These columns compare groups on your campus: pre-tenure/tenured, associate/full, women/men, white/faculty of color.

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	tenure	rank	gender	race	2008
Health and retirement benefits	3.43	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	full	women		
Interdisciplinary work	3.00	◁▶	◁▶	◀▶	◁▶	◁▶	◁▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	pre-ten	assoc	women	white	
Collaboration	3.46	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	tenured		women	white	
Mentoring	3.18	◁▶	◀▶	◁▶	◀▶	◁▶	◁▶	◁▶	◁▶	◀▶	tenured	assoc		foc	
Tenure policies	3.64	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A			+
Tenure clarity	3.33	◀▶	N/A	◀▶	N/A	N/A	◀▶	◀▶	◀▶	N<5	N/A	N/A	men		

What do these triangles mean?

These symbols represent results that fit COACHE's criteria for "areas of strength" (in green) and "areas of concern" (in red).

Your ranking among peers:			Your percentile among your cohort:
1st or 2nd	◀	▶	Top 30%
3rd or 4th	◀	▶	Middle 40%
5th or 6th	◀	▶	Bottom 30%
insufficient data for reporting	◁		

*This result, for example, shows that your female faculty are **less satisfied** than are women at your peers (◀), but **more satisfied** than are women at 70% of other institutions (▶). Although the women at your institution are "less satisfied" than women at peers, they still fare better than most.*

And these results?

Here, the faculty subgroup with the *lower* rating appears. Shading conveys the *magnitude* of sub-group differences: small effects appear as text only, moderate effects are shaded yellow, and large effects are shaded orange. Trivial differences remain blank. Change over time appears as +/-.

Regardless of your results compared to peers and others (on the left), you should direct your concern to subgroups who consistently appear here in yellow or orange shaded cells.

Your results compared to PEERS ◄
Your results compared to COHORT ►

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) · med. (.3) · lrg. (.5)

The comparison columns (overall, tenured, pre-ten, ntt, full, assoc, men, women, white, foc, asian, urm) are shown as colored directional arrow indicators. The textual content (mean values, within-campus differences, and 2014) is transcribed below.

Item	mean	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	2014
Departmental Collegiality	3.75					foc		urm	
Colleagues support work/life balance	3.67		tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	+
Meeting times compatible with personal needs	4.04			assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Amount of personal interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.65	tenured				foc	white	urm	
How well you fit	3.56		ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	
Amount of personal interaction w/Tenured	3.56		ntt			foc	white	urm	
Colleagues pitch in when needed	3.78		tenured			foc		urm	
Department is collegial	3.92					foc		urm	
Colleagues committed to diversity/inclusion	3.87	pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	
Departmental Engagement	3.51	pre-ten	ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	+
Discussions of undergrad student learning	3.61		tenured			foc	asian	urm	+
Discussions of grad student learning	3.55	pre-ten	ntt	assoc		foc		urm	
Discussions of effective teaching practices	3.48		tenured			foc		urm	+
Discussions of effective use of technology	3.35	pre-ten	tenured			foc	white	urm	
Discussions of current research methods	3.24	pre-ten	ntt	assoc	women	foc	white	urm	
Amount of professional interaction w/Pre-tenure	3.79		ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	
Amount of professional interaction w/Tenured	3.64		ntt	assoc		foc	white	urm	
Departmental Quality	3.62	tenured	ntt	assoc		foc		urm	+
Intellectual vitality of tenured faculty	3.74	pre-ten	ntt	assoc		foc		urm	+
Intellectual vitality of pre-tenure faculty	4.14	tenured		assoc		foc		urm	+
Scholarly productivity of tenured faculty	3.72	pre-ten	ntt	assoc	men	foc		urm	+
Scholarly productivity of pre-tenure faculty	4.00	tenured			men	foc		urm	
Teaching effectiveness of tenured faculty	3.63		ntt			foc	white	urm	
Teaching effectiveness of pre-tenure faculty	3.93	tenured	ntt					urm	
Dept. is successful at faculty recruitment	3.62	N<5		assoc	men	foc	asian	urm	
Dept. is successful at faculty retention	3.21	N<5	tenured	assoc		foc	asian	urm	
Dept. addresses sub-standard performance	2.54				women		white	urm	
Related Survey Items	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Intellectual vitality of NTT faculty	3.77	tenured	tenured		men	foc	asian	urm	N/A
Scholarly productivity of NTT faculty	3.60	tenured	tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Teaching effectiveness of NTT faculty	3.98	tenured	tenured	full	men	foc		urm	N/A
Amount of professional interaction w/NTT	3.77		tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Amount of personal interaction w/NTT	3.67		tenured	full		foc	white	urm	N/A
Recruiting part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Managing part-time faculty	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Your results compared to PEERS ◄
Your results compared to COHORT ►

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1)   med. (.3)   lrg. (.5)

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	2014
Leadership: Senior	3.00													tenured	tenured	assoc				white	urm	-
Pres/Chancellor: Pace of decision making	3.10													tenured	tenured						urm	
Pres/Chancellor: Stated priorities	3.10													tenured	tenured	assoc	men			white		
Pres/Chancellor: Communication of priorities	3.10														tenured	assoc				white	urm	-
CAO: Pace of decision making	2.94													tenured	tenured					white	urm	-
CAO: Stated priorities	2.89													tenured	tenured	assoc				white	urm	-
CAO: Communication of priorities	2.86													tenured	tenured					white	urm	-
CAO: Ensuring faculty input	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Leadership: Divisional	3.05													tenured	tenured					white	urm	
Dean: Pace of decision making	3.13													tenured	tenured					white	urm	
Dean: Stated priorities	3.11													tenured	tenured					white	urm	
Dean: Communication of priorities	3.01													tenured	tenured					white		
Dean: Ensuring faculty input	2.96													tenured	tenured					white	urm	
Leadership: Departmental	3.48													tenured	tenured		women			white	urm	
Head/Chair: Pace of decision making	3.43													tenured	tenured		women			white	urm	
Head/Chair: Stated priorities	3.44													tenured	tenured					white	urm	
Head/Chair: Communication of priorities	3.38													tenured	tenured		women			white		-
Head/Chair: Ensuring faculty input	3.45													tenured	tenured		women			white	urm	-
Head/Chair: Fairness in evaluating work	3.70													tenured	tenured	assoc		foc			urm	
Leadership: Faculty	2.99													tenured	tenured			foc		white	urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Pace of decision making	2.96													tenured	tenured					white	urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Stated priorities	2.97													tenured	tenured		men	foc		white	urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Communication of priorities	2.95													tenured	tenured					white	urm	N/A
Faculty leaders: Ensuring faculty input	3.09													tenured	tenured			foc		white	urm	N/A
Related Survey Items	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Priorities are stated consistently	2.70														tenured		women			white	urm	-
Priorities are acted on consistently	2.54													tenured	tenured	assoc				white	urm	
Changed priorities negatively affect my work	2.67													tenured	tenured	assoc	women			white	urm	+
CAO: Support in adapting to change	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Visible leadership for support of diversity	3.84													pre-ten		assoc	women	foc	asian	urm	+

Your results compared to PEERS ◄
Your results compared to COHORT ►

Areas of strength in **GREEN**
Areas of concern in **RED**

Within campus differences
sm (.1) med. (.3) lrg. (.5)

	mean	overall	tenured	pre-ten	ntt	full	assoc	men	women	white	foc	asian	urm	ten vs pre-ten	ten vs ntt	full vs assoc	men vs women	white vs foc	white vs asian	white vs urm	2014
Governance: Trust	2.92														tenured	assoc		foc	white	urm	N/A
I understand how to voice opinions about policies	2.88													pre-ten	ntt	assoc			white	urm	N/A
Clear rules about the roles of faculty and administration	2.98													tenured	tenured	assoc			white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin follow rules of engagement	3.16													tenured	tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Faculty and admin have an open system of communication	2.87													tenured	tenured	assoc			white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin discuss difficult issues in good faith	3.10														tenured			foc	white	urm	N/A
Governance: Shared Sense of Purpose	2.98													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Important decisions are not made until there is consensus	2.57													tenured	tenured			white	white		N/A
Admin ensures sufficient time for faculty input	2.94													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin respectfully consider the other's view	3.09													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin have a shared sense of responsibility	3.38														tenured		men	foc		urm	N/A
Governance: Understanding the Issue at Hand	2.85														tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty governance structures offer opportunities for input	2.91																		white	urm	N/A
Admin communicate rationale for important decisions	2.81													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Faculty and admin have equal say in decisions	2.66													tenured	tenured			white	white	white	N/A
Faculty and admin define decision criteria together	2.97													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Governance: Adaptability	2.79													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Shared governance holds up in unusual circumstances	2.72													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Institution regularly reviews effectiveness of governance	2.61													tenured	tenured				white	urm	N/A
Institution cultivates new faculty leaders	3.03														tenured	assoc		foc		urm	N/A
Governance: Productivity	2.90													tenured	tenured		men		white	urm	N/A
Overall effectiveness of shared governance	2.84													tenured	tenured	assoc	men		white	urm	N/A
My committees make measureable progress towards goals	3.24													tenured	tenured			foc	white	urm	N/A
Public recognition of progress	2.77													tenured	tenured				white		N/A

REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Research Policy Committee

DATE: December 3, 2018

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

On November 19th the committee had a productive meeting with Kim Ogden (VPR) and Neal Armstrong (AVPR) regarding the finances and governing structure for CORE facilities on the U of A campus. Core facilities tend to be analytical, imaging or support facilities that are necessary for multiple Colleges to use in the course of their research. The importance of shared faculty governance and ownership was agreed upon. Going forward the committee will be focused on a draft Core Faciliies Roles, Responsibilities and Guidance for Operations document that discusses best practices for the Core facilities.

GOALS:

We hope by the end of the year to have worked with the VPR office to establish robust governance approaches for the Core Facilities.