## 2021 Calendar - Distribute SB w/mini break between 7Ws and limit long weekends

**Notes:**
- Includes Undergraduate, Graduate, Pharmacy, & Law - does not include VetMed or Med Careers
- Does not include 8W Carousel sessions for Law and Grad - or DYN or COC sessions for all careers - dates would be unchanged

### Spring 2021 Academic Calendar Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Begin Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Count of MWF</th>
<th>TR Days</th>
<th>MW Days</th>
<th>M-F Days</th>
<th>Count of Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7W1</td>
<td>13-Jan</td>
<td>8-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7W2</td>
<td>8-Mar</td>
<td>29-Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5W3</td>
<td>29-Mar</td>
<td>22-May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2021 Calendar - Existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>Tu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>We</td>
<td>We</td>
<td>We</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>Th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Details:
- The normal length of the semester is 15 weeks of classes plus one week of final examinations.
- There shall not be fewer than 44 days nor more than 46 days in the MWF sequence.
- There shall not be fewer than 20 days nor more than 31 days in the TR sequence.
- Notes:
  - Does not include 8W Carousel sessions for Law and Grad - or DYN or COC sessions for all careers - dates would be unchanged

### Count of Sections
- 113
- 56
- 35
- 40
- 15
- 8

### Days
- MWF: 30
- TR: 28
- MW: 21
- M-F: 19

### Notes:
- Number of meeting patterns MWF/TR is the same as is published for regular session.
- Does not change term beginning or end or last day of class.
- Changes in count:
  - 113 - decrease
  - 56 - increase
  - 35 - decrease
  - 40 - decrease
  - 15 - decrease
  - 8 - increase

Last updated: 10/1/20 4:08 PM - Au
Proposed One-Time Adjustments to Spring 2021 Calendar to Mitigate Spread of COVID-19

A proposal for one-time adjustments to the Spring 2021 calendar in which Spring Break is converted into a series of Reading Days dispersed through the semester in order to reduce the spread of COVID-19 resulting from travel by students, faculty and staff, while still accommodating breaks to help relieve stress during the semester. Multiple factors were considered in the exact placement of the reading days, as noted on the enclosed.
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

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

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

• I am pleased to report that following the Pima County Stay at Home Recommendation order issued for 9/14/2020 – 9/30/2020, we have seen a significant decrease in the number of COVID-19 cases and the overall positivity rate on campus. At the time of submission of this report, the most recent day positivity rate is 2.9%, the past 10-day positivity rate is 4.1%, and the cumulative positivity rate is 6.0%. For real-time daily updates please visit the COVID-19 Dashboard.

• Last month, we welcomed Dr. Deborah Birx, the coordinator of the White House’s Coronavirus Task Force, to campus. During her visit, Dr. Birx met with University leadership and toured several labs conducting antibody and antigen testing. Following her visit, Dr. Birx cited the University of Arizona as a model for transparently tracking COVID-19 cases.

• The University of Arizona has been selected as the recipient of the Outstanding HACU-member Institution Award by the Hispanic Association of Colleges & Universities. This national award recognizes extraordinary support of HACU’s mission “to champion Hispanic success in higher education”. I am grateful for the leadership of Dr. Marla Franco, Assistant Vice President for Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) initiatives, and many others across campus who are committed to advancing this important work.

• The official fall census data represents information as of the 21st day of the fall semester (September 14, 2020) and is used to track and record essential student data, serving as an important comparative benchmark year-over-year. Official Fall 2020 census data shows 7,335 incoming first-year students and 2,738 transfer students. The incoming first-year class is 60.3% resident students, 38.2% non-resident students, and 1.5% international students from 51 states and territories and 32 countries. The class is 30.7% first-generation, 27.4% Pell-eligible, 48% students of color, and includes 66 National Merit Scholars, 111 National Hispanic Scholars, and 12 Flinn Scholars (the most of any Arizona university). The Undergraduate Admissions team, in collaboration with campus partners, adapted to pandemic conditions and moved to virtual events and programming in March, a critical time in yielding the class. Their commitment, innovation, and adaptive practices helped us yield this outstanding class of Wildcats.

• As detailed above, our recruitment and retention efforts this summer and fall have yielded better than expected results in net tuition revenue, resulting in my decision to end the Furlough and Furlough-based Salary Programs earlier than previously announced. I look forward to more updated details about the duration of this financial mitigation strategy in the near future.

• In the newly released 2021 U.S. News & World Report Best Colleges ranking, UArizona is ranked No. 97 overall, an improvement of 20 spots from last year’s ranking. The 20-spot increase is the ninth-highest jump among all higher education institutions ranked in the top 200 and sixth among public universities. UArizona is also ranked No. 40 among public universities. This is our first appearance in the top 100 since 2009 and our overall score of 61 marks an all-time high.

GOALS:
• Continue to monitor internal and external COVID-19 metrics and maintain the safest campus environment possible.

• I am committed to supporting and engaging in shared governance and have appointed two Senior Vice Presidents, Laura Todd Johnson and Dr. Elizabeth Cantwell, to participate on the Faculty Senate Shared Governance Review Committee. They look forward to fruitful discussions about the important role of shared governance on our campus.
FROM: Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Liesl Folks  
https://provost.arizona.edu

DATE: 5 Oct 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS and GOALS:

- Reviewing inputs from around campus on possible modifications to RCM, with CFO Rulney.

- Proposed modified academic calendar for Spring 2021 to remove Spring Break, to reduce travel and risk of disease spread.

- Continuing to adjust policies and procedures as needed for compliance with public health mandates to reduce the spread of COVID-19, including increased
  - Referrals to DoS (Campus Area Response Team (CART)-UAPD or DoS)
    - Since 9/27: CART 3 Red Tags, 5 students involved
    - Monday, Sept 14 – Sunday, Sept 27: CART 12
  - Interim suspensions (DoS)
    - Since 9/27: 4 students, 2 organizations
    - Monday, Sept 14 – Sunday, Sept 27: 25 students, 4 organizations
  - COVID related DoS cases pending
    - 53 cases (37 complete) *the total COVID related cases to date include 154 individual students
    - 3 Organization cases
  - Final actions (DoS)
    - Sanctions issued for COVID related cases to date include: Warnings (mask compliance), monetary sanctions $250, Parental Notifications, Personal Responsibility Workshop (at $ cost), Suspensions, and University Probation.
  - Final suspensions or expulsions if any and if appropriate (DoS)
    - 17 Suspensions
    - No Expulsions to date
    - Suspended (or expelled) students remain on Interim Suspension through the final outcome of any pending appeal to a University Hearing Board

- Bi-Weekly Faculty Chat sessions began July 30th
  - July 30 - Topic: Wildcats in the Classroom in Fall 2020 – What to Expect?
  - August 13 – Topic: Campus Re-entry
  - August 27 – Topic: Campus Re-entry Student Compliance
  - September 10 - Topic: Faculty Development and Funding Resources
- September 24th – Topic: Supporting UArizona Graduate Students
- *Upcoming* October 8th – Topic: Managing Forward
  (https://provost.arizona.edu/content/provost-forum)

- Bias Education & Support Team (BEST) Site launched – see memos to employees and students sent on September 30th, 2020.
  https://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/BEST

- NOA / NOR Clarification Memo from Provost and CFO sent to faculty and staff with employment contracts in the University’s furlough-based program on September 29, 2020.

- Welcomed Ivy Banks, Associate Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, who started in her new role on September 28th.

- Update on leadership searches:
  - Campus and virtual interviews with the College of Science Dean finalists to begin on October 8th.

- Campus Webinars Series on Test, Trace and Treat
  - August 12th - Campus Plans to Test, Trace and Treat
  - September 22nd - Update on UArizona’s Test All Test Smart (TATS) Program
  - September 28th How does the COVID Watch App Work?
  - *Upcoming* October 7th Campus Update on Plans for Expanded In-Person Instruction
  https://provost.arizona.edu/content/campus-webinars
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

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

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the MOU for Shared Governance finished their work and handed off the MOU to the Shared Governance Review Committee to make any last changes necessary for all sides to agree on signing. A survey was sent to Senate to gauge members’ satisfaction with the state of the MOU as drafted. Satisfaction was high, with 75% to 95% of those that responded signaling their satisfaction with different elements of the MOU.

- the Shared Governance Review Committee, an existing University committee that has not met in the past decade, has been reconstituted to address concerns about the health of shared governance at the University of Arizona. Two Senators, Leila Hudson (two-year term) and Paul Gordon (one-year term) were elected to represent Senate.

- The votes on Housekeeping changes taken in September through Qualtrics were voided, due to Senators not being given the opportunity to discuss them prior to voting. The package of proposed changes will be discussed and voted on in October.

- In response to Senator requests for more opportunities for discussion and debate between meetings, the Faculty Officers/Faculty Center Staff continue to offer the following options:
  - A Faculty Discourse Forum wherein topics can be introduced, discussed, and debated by the general faculty. Relevant to Senate, there is a “Lounge” feature within the site for Senators only to communicate with one another between monthly meetings. Should we keep Discourse as a medium for discussion? No one has used it since August.
  - Weekly “Senate Office Hours” every Tuesday, 4-4:50pm hosted by the Faculty Officers https://arizona.zoom.us/j/94767916308; no agenda, open discussion; hosted by Jessica Summers, Michael Brewer, and/or Melanie Hingle.

GOALS:

- GFFAC and SPBAC continue to work together to understand furlough/finance decisions by administration, and are gathering data to present in a one-page summary to our faculty and staff employees. It is mission critical to integrate faculty input and efforts across shared governance groups to better understand the university budget and finances, so that we can advocate for pay equity, a less severe / no furlough, greater participation in financial decisions that impact the university at large.
• Convene the Shared Governance Review Committee who will be tasked with strengthening shared governance input on major operational domains, decisions, and areas of concern at the University of Arizona, as well as any priorities or areas of focus where faculty, staff, students, and administration should work together including but not limited to budget (re)allocations or cuts, inclusion, equity and diversity, employee compensation, academic policy and curricular affairs, recruitment & financial aid, and acquisitions.

SHORT-TERM
• Complete the work of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the MOU for Shared Governance, toward developing a document that can be endorsed by Senate and signed by Administration in September / October 2020.
• Work with the Provost, the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Career Track Faculty, and others to move forward proposed changes to clean up faculty data and improve and clarify titling for career track faculty. Any policy changes will come to Senate prior to approval and implementation.
• Bring potential changes in UHAP to annual reviews and post-tenure review being developed by Vice Provost Andrea Romero, Ron Hammer, Colin Blakely, and Michael Brewer, to Senate for discussion.

LONG-TERM
• To ensure a continued successful, safe, and healthy return to campus life for all members of the UA community.
• To broaden participation in shared governance to ensure that the University lives up to its values and supports its mission as we move ahead.
• To work with you to do all that we, as a community, can do to save lives, support our most vulnerable community members, and increase faculty participation in all decision-making that affects our lives and the long-term health and well-being of all of us.

To Our Senate Colleagues: We remain grateful to you for your hard work, your input, your ideas and your continued engagement in shared governance. We continue to work to support the work of the University and to ensure the prominence of the Faculty voice.
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Tara Singleton, President ASUA  https://asuatoday.arizona.edu/

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- Campus Closet, a new basic needs initiative that started last year had their first successful distribution

- WEB, Wildcat Events Board, has started a WEB Live series of virtual events and engagement opportunities for students

- The ASUA MOU with CAPS, 10,000 dollars for student services, has been expanded to cover new Covid-19 specific initiatives and services

GOALS:

- Continue providing non partisan voting information and resources for students

- Help COBA further their initiatives and conversations with administrators and faculty

- Create more engagement opportunity students where possible in order to continue supporting every aspect of their wildcat experience
General Faculty Financial Advisory Committee (GFFAC)

Monthly Report for Faculty Senate

Activities

- Met with CFO Lisa Rulney and Provost Liesl Folks on September 15 to discuss potential financial loss mitigation strategies and the possibility of a still-to-be-determined earlier ending date for the furlough programs (as announced by President Robbins via email on September 17)
- Met with SPBAC on September 16 to discuss issues related to the furlough programs
- Gathered data from discussions with peer institutions (Indiana, Michigan, and Penn State) about the terms and usage of lines of credit to address COVID-19 losses

Future Plans

- Meet with CFO Rulney and Provost Folks in early October to discuss updated data on net tuition revenue and the process for determining changes to the furlough programs
- Disseminate a one-page update to the campus community on financial and furlough-related issues
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: GCSAC

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The committee has:
- met three times,
- established a biweekly schedule of regular meetings,
- conducted extensive internal discussion on the scope of our charge,
- begun to analyze the redacted asset sale agreement, strategic services agreement and transition agreement available to the public
- requested documents and submitted queries about the Ashford Acquisition and its projected impact on UA from President Robbins, Provost Folks, Vice Provosts White and Wilson (including a query about the identity of the recently appointed president of UAGC).
- not received any requested documents or answers to our queries as of 10/1/20
- scheduled interviews with Vice Provost Wilson on 10/6/20 to discuss plans for UA Online in light of the Ashford acquisition, and with Provost Folks on 10/13/20 to discuss quality, strategy and governance issues.

GOALS:

Our goals are:
- to get access to and study the documents necessary to understand the deal,
- to meet with Vice Provost Wilson and Provost Folks to discuss specific questions generated by the committee
- possibly to meet also with President Robbins and Vice Provost White and experts if necessary.
- to write an interim report outlining our understanding of the governance and overlap issues, the money flow issues and the quality control issues,
- to communicate our outstanding questions and concerns, and our recommendations to the Senate and the administration.
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Research Policy Committee

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

RPC had its first meeting of AY 20/21
New members introduced
Discussion of prior year’s work related to Shared Governance for CORES
Discussion of future agenda items including:
  - Regarding library budget, how does UA value research
  - Lots of discussion regarding shared governance

GOALS:

Will review Shared Governance CORES draft from last semester
Discuss as a committee in October
Invite RII to November meeting (Cantwell, Pawar & Jeffrey)
Need to see CORES budget (this has been requested multiple times)
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Academic Personnel Policy Committee

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- Met with Mary Beth Tucker, Interim Associate Vice President, Equity and Title IX Coordinator, to discuss recent changes to Title IX and how those changes are being implemented at the University of Arizona.
- Met with Ilya Smith, Chief Compliance Officer, Chief Privacy Officer, and Danielle Oxnam, Executive Assistant, Office of University Initiatives, to discuss the Interim Public Health and Safety Policy.
  - Co-chair Dysart raised several concerns on the policy that were discussed by the committee and submitted for consideration:
    - The definition of “pandemic” was too broad and should be qualified by some sort of official designation by some health organization.
    - There needed to be a religious exemption to the policy.

GOALS:
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Student Affairs Policy Committee

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

• Worked during the summer to raise awareness and solve timely and critical issues for students on campus in light of the pandemic. Issues addressed include, but are not limited to: timeliness and clarity of communications to students and lack of consistency in communication directed at different campus constituencies (e.g., students, faculty, advisors); clarification of teaching modalities and campus timeline (worked with Registrar and Provost’s Office); accessibility of resources to students and ease of connecting with and finding them (worked with OIA, UITS, Provost’s Office, etc.); ensuring protection for GTAs (and other vulnerable instructors) when selecting course modalities; lack of oversight in online teaching as a function of student concerns about inconsistent communication from professors and perceived additional pedagogical burdens; student basic needs in conjunction with Student Regent Rusk’s proposal to establish an all state Basic Needs Working Group; concerns about re-entry and safety protocols on and off-campus as well as perceived victim-blaming mentality for non-compliance (especially off-campus).

GOALS:

• Continue to support Student Regents in Basic Needs Initiative, including establishing a local coalition that brings in all campus silos that are currently addressing these needs
• Investigate the needs of International Students, in particular, re concerns of racism and stigma as well as unmet financial needs and other issues
• Continue to comb through data from various surveys (Wildcat Check-In, Cat Pulse, and others) to evaluate and address most pressing student needs as well as increasing awareness
• Investigate the situation with the online teaching of lab courses and required supplies for those courses due to concerns of increased student financial burden, accessibility and safety
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

- DEI had its inaugural meeting on 8/12/2020, comprised of committee members, Troutman, Tsosie, Hudson, Hingle, Acosta, Castro, Adiredja, Strassfield, Acedo.

- Subsequent meetings on 8/21 and most recently on 9/29.

- Issued statement of concern over Ashford Acquisition on 9/4

GOALS:

- Discussion over vision and mission of DEI as a committee

- Identify all entities involved in D&I-related activities on campus to create a synchronous network of resources.

- Contribute to ongoing deliberations across campus over DEI implications for Ashford Acquisition, Campus Reentry, and Mitigation plan.
I. The Undergraduate Council has representation from all Colleges at the University and several student members. It has two subcommittees, one for policies and one for academic programs. All policies and programs presented to the committee in 2019-2020 were brought forward to the senate and approved. (UGC Chair – Neel Ghosh)

Website: https://academicadmin.arizona.edu/undergraduate-council

II. Policy Proposals Reviewed and Adopted by Undergraduate Council (UGC) and Implemented by the University
(subcommittee Chair – Professor Molly Bolger)

1. Policy on Undergraduate Certificates have been developed and new Undergraduate Certificates are being approved starting in 2019 again.
2. Changes to Syllabus to Incorporate New Title IX Language
3. Changes to Syllabus to provide campus pantry information/resources
4. Policy to Standardize Offering UA University Credit for UA Study Abroad Programs
5. Policy to Modify the 18/30 Units in Residence requirement for undergraduates
6. New Military Excused Absence Policy
7. Proposal to Amend General Education Teaching Policy
8. Proposal to add Minimum Units to the Bachelor’s Degree Candidacy Policy
9. Policy to Revise the 18-unit Cap on Withdrawals

III. New Academic Program Proposals Reviewed and Approved by Undergraduate Council (UGC) and Implemented by the University (College listed in parentheses)
(subcommittee Chair – Professor Fabian Alfie)

Majors
- BA and minor in Games and Behavior (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
- BA and minor in Professional and Technical Writing (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
- BA in Studies of Global Media (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
- BAS and minor in Applied Computing (Applied Science & Technology)
- BAS and minor in Human Services (Applied Science & Technology)
- BAS in Intelligence and Information Operations (Applied Science & Technology)
- BLA and minor in Landscape Architecture (Architecture, Planning & Landscape Architecture)
- BS in Game Design and Development (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
- BS and minor in Precision Nutrition and Wellness (Agriculture & Life Sciences) *Fall 2021 start

Standalone Minors
• Criminology (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• Global Education (Education)
• Population Health Data Science (Public Health)

**Undergraduate Certificates**
• Construction Engineering Management (Engineering)
• Cultural Competency in Mexican/Mexican-American and Border Communities (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• Data Science and Visualization (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• Entomology and Insect Science (Agriculture & Life Sciences)
• Games and Simulation (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• Teaching English as a Global Language (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• Tribal Courts and Justice Administration (Law)

**New Emphases (Sub-plans) for Existing Programs**
• BA in Applied Humanities: Game Studies Emphasis (Humanities)
• BA in Applied Humanities: Rural Leadership and Renewal Emphasis (Humanities)
• BA in Spanish: General Emphasis (Humanities)
• BS in Plant Sciences: Plant Health Sciences Emphasis (Agriculture & Life Sciences)
• BS in Plant Sciences: General Emphasis (Agriculture & Life Sciences)
• BS in Public Management and Policy: Environmental Policy Emphasis (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• BS in Public Management and Policy: Public Administration and Management Emphasis (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• BS in Public Management and Policy: Public Policy Emphasis (Social & Behavioral Sciences)
• BS in Sustainable Plant Systems: Urban Horticulture Emphasis (Agriculture & Life Sciences)
• BS in Veterinary Sciences: Applied Animal Behavior Emphasis (Agriculture & Life Sciences)
• BS in Veterinary Sciences: General Emphasis (Agriculture & Life Sciences)
• BSHS in Physiology and Medical Sciences: Exercise and Extreme Physiology Emphasis (Medicine-Tucson) *Fall 2021 start
• BSHS in Physiology and Medical Sciences: Medical Sciences Emphasis (Medicine-Tucson) *Fall 2021 start
• BSHS in Physiology and Medical Sciences: Physiological Research and Innovation Emphasis (Medicine-Tucson) *Fall 2021 start
• BSHS in Physiology and Medical Sciences: Physiology Emphasis (Medicine-Tucson) *Fall 2021 start
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE

FROM: Graduate Council

DATE: October 5, 2020

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

The Graduate Council discussed several Action Items at our meeting on 09/18 with proposals to follow.

- Authorship guidelines for graduate students
  - With the increased incidence of graduate student grievances, we are considering development of authorship guidelines with a plan for resolution of complaints. Any such guidelines would take into account the various authorship strategies in diverse fields. An example of such guidelines in the medical field can be found at: https://grad.arizona.edu/gradcouncil/sites/default/files/agenda/2019_icmje-authorship_of_scholarly_work_in_medical_journals.pdf

- Transition from graduate certificate to graduate degree
  - Increasing the number of credits transferable from certificate to degree

- Defining the P grade allowed during the pandemic in graduate education
  - C is a passing grade by 3.0 GPA is required to graduate.

GOALS:

- Working with CAAC and the Office of the Provost to reduce the time for approval of new academic programs while still providing shared governance through faculty involvement in the decision process
Food Insecurity and Housing Work Group Update

Anthony Rusk

Student Regent

October 2, 2020
The board has received several comments from faculty and student leaders concerning student hunger and food insecurity and housing concerns.

In response, the Chair Larry Penley has tasked the student regents with establishing a work group on student food and housing insecurity.
Definitions

- **Food Insecurity** - the limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe food, or the ability to acquire such food in a socially acceptable manner.
- **Housing Insecurity** - a broad set of challenges such as the inability to pay rent or utilities, or the need to move frequently.
Food Insecurity - UA Campus Pantry

Unique users per semester:
Fall 2019: 1,911
Spring 2020: 1,838

Average visits per week:
Pre-COVID: 1,050
Current: 700
Food Insecurity - UA Campus Pantry

Undergraduate Students: 67%
Graduate Students: 33%

Female: 56%
Male: 44%

Pell- Grant/ Low SES: 50%
Live on Campus: 37%
First Generation: 42%
Honors: 16%

African American: 5%
Asian American: 7%
Native American: 2%
Hispanic: 23%
Pacific Islander: <1%
Two or more races: 4%
White: 24%
International: 33%
Unknown/Other: 2%

“Without the pantry, I would eat every two days” – Campus Pantry Client
Housing Insecurity

• Nationally (4-year university students)
  • 48% experience housing insecurity
  • 14 % experience homelessness

College & University Basic Needs Insecurity: A National #RealCollege Survey Report  (April 2019)

• At the UA
  • 20% of undergrads often or always experience housing insecurity
  • 75 active participants in Fostering Success & growing

2016 Campus Climate Survey: https://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/UA-Campus-Climate-Booklet.pdf
Fostering Success

• Peer Mentoring – mentors are former mentees
• Fall 2018 FTFT 89% retention rate (compared to 78% UA)
• Support through building networks, referrals, mental health access, community/belonging programming, crisis intervention, coordinator involvement
• We consistently have students referred year-round due to homelessness – we are the hub for students that are willing to connect with us.

“I would definitely not be in college and I probably wouldn’t be stably housed if it weren’t for Fostering Success. There was a time not long ago that I was contemplating eating my next meal out of a trash can and terrified of sleeping on the streets another night. And now I’m graduating in May 2021.”

—current Fostering Success student
Workgroup’s Direction

- Study And Assess The Scope Of Student Food Insecurity And Housing Needs
- Evaluate Existing Or Emerging Best Practices
- Gathering Possible Additional Student Data
- Develop Possible Guidance On Campus-based Policies
- Workgroup Membership
WORK GROUP ON FOOD INSECURITY AND HOUSING

TIMELINE: SEPTEMBER 2020 TO APRIL 2021

Aug/Sept 2020
- Development and Appointment of the Work Group Charge on Food Insecurity and Housing

October 2020
- Food Insecurity and Housing Assessment
- Review of Current Practices
- Data and Literature Review
- Best Practices
- Peer Institutional review
  - Work Group Meeting(s)

November 2020

February 2021

April 2021

Spring 2021 semester: working documents and report draft based on data collection and analysis
  - Work Group Meeting(s)
  - Final report and recommendations

Kickoff and development of timeline and work plan/items to review
- ABOR Board Meeting
  - ABOR charge to the Work Group and discussion.

ABOR Board Meeting
  - Update and Discussion

ABOR Board Meeting
  - Update and Discussion

ABOR Board Meeting
  - Final report and recommendations
The Ask for the University of Arizona Senate

October 2, 2020
Basic Need Coalition

• Getting the right individuals in the right room
• Collaboration vs. Competition
• Eliminating silos across campus
• Leveraging data and knowledge of best practices
• Not reinventing the wheel
MEMORANDUM

To: Leisl Folks, Senior Vice President and University Provost
    Robert C. Robbins, President

Cc: Andrea Romero, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs

From: Rebecca Tsosie, Regents Professor of Law and (former) Vice Provost,
      Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs

Re: Assessment of Diversity and Inclusion at UA

Date: August 19, 2019

Introduction:

This memorandum provides an assessment of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) at the University of Arizona and was prepared at the request of Jeff Goldberg, the Interim Provost, when I served as Vice Provost for Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs. I served in that role from October 2018 to June 2019 and was asked to “define the core values of diversity and inclusion and align these values with the intellectual mission of the University” and serve as a consultant for the diversity and inclusion components of the Strategic Plan. I provided a written assessment on the draft Strategic Plan to Jeff Goldberg and President Robbins prior to the Regents’ meeting in November 2018.

My appointment letter asked me to develop a plan for diversity and inclusion through a process of campus engagement with UA faculty, staff, students, and shared governance entities. Although this strategy seemed appropriate in late

---

1 On October 2, 2018, I accepted an administrative appointment as Vice Provost for Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs to extend through June 30, 2019. The appointment formalized President Robbins’ earlier request to me and to Javier Duran and Helena Rodrigues, as co-Chairs of the Diversity Coordinating Council, to develop a one-year plan for diversity and inclusion at the UA, following the departure of Dr. Jesus Trevino as Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion in spring 2018. We authored a joint memorandum to President Robbins and Interim Provost Jeff Goldberg on April 27, 2018 with several recommendations. After several months of internal discussion, this appointment was authorized.

2 Memorandum dated October 21, 2018 from Rebecca Tsosie to Jeff Goldberg and Brew McKenna regarding UA Strategic Plan.

3 The duties are listed in the letter are as follows: (1) “work closely with the Diversity Coordinating Council to map our Institutional capacity, complete an assessment, identify best practices for institutional inclusion, generate a set of metrics for evaluation, and develop and implement accountability structures; (2) assist with the evaluation of the needs and best location in the organization for
October, it was no longer appropriate by January 2019 when President Robbins announced the creation of a new Office of Equity and Inclusion under the leadership of Vice President Ron Wilson. Assistant Vice Provost Teresa Graham-Brett, who directs ODIEX and the newly created Office of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement (IME), moved under Ron Wilson’s oversight, and he was assigned as the Pillar 3 Leader for the Strategic Plan, overseeing the diversity and inclusion initiatives.

Because the institutional leadership of diversity, equity, and inclusion shifted to the President’s Cabinet and my appointment had not been announced to the campus community, Jeff Goldberg instructed me to return to the more modest advisory role that I’ve had at UA since 2016 and write a memo outlining best practices for diversity and inclusion within institutions of higher learning, and comment on our existing capacity by identifying areas of excellence, as well as potential challenges. This memorandum responds to that charge.4

Part I of the memo summarizes the contemporary research on the optimal organization and structure for diversity and inclusion at a modern Research University. Part II of the memo discusses the structure at UA, comparing what exists now with the national norm and trends. The final section of the memo concludes with specific recommendations relevant to the University of Arizona, which might be useful to President Robbins and Provost Leisl Folks, as well as other campus leaders.

The University of Arizona is well-poised to develop an effective institutional structure for DEI. There are at least three senior staff members tasked with aspects of the DEI portfolio: Ron Wilson, Vice President of Equity and Inclusion, Celina Ramirez, Chief Compliance Officer, and Teresa Graham-Brett, Assistant Vice Provost for Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement. All three have the experience necessary to provide exceptional leadership on diversity, equity and inclusion. The challenge will be to create an institutional structure for this work that extends across the University and enables effective leadership and communication with campus constituents and community members.

ODIEX. At this point it will be located in Campus Life under the direction of Teresa Graham-Brett; (3, 4, 5) work with... shared governance [entities] student organizations...faculty...and staff to ensure that their “voice and needs” are included in any strategy and plans you build,” (6) serve on SPBC; (7) serve on SPFI selection Committee; (8) serve as the Inclusion Consultant for the UA strategic plan process...to ensure that initiatives in the entire plan consider the issues of inclusion and multicultural engagement.” [and other duties “as needed” according to specific directives of the Provost and President].

4 This memorandum is based upon my research into the best practices for diversity and inclusion within contemporary institutions of higher learning, my participation in various meetings for the past three years, and conversations with campus leaders.
I. The Structure for Diversity and Inclusion at Institutions of Higher Learning:

Across the nation, corporations and educational institutions have recognized the need for centralized leadership on diversity, equity and inclusion, as well as the need for an organizational structure that can effectuate the optimal goals and outcomes that the entity defines as applicable to its own mission. Educational institutions differ from corporations because they tend to retain their primary organizational structures (for example, academic units and leadership roles as Dean, Provost, Chancellor) and because their mission has historically been tied to transmission of academic knowledge, disciplinary training, and other forms of instruction, such as clinical education.

Despite these differences, universities across the country are adopting corporate models of governance, often because these are more cost-effective. Universities are increasingly asked to generate revenue, making themselves accountable to consumer preferences, and they are also restructuring their organizational systems to eliminate inefficient and outdated structures. For example, a University may centralize its information technology (IT) services or marketing services, rather than leaving those within the administration of discrete Colleges or Departments. With this in mind, it is advisable for universities to examine their existing structures for diversity and inclusion to identify inefficiencies that might exist, and promote an organizational structure that can facilitate campus needs.

A. The Importance of Terminology:

At a basic level, university administrators should ask whether campus constituents understand what is meant by the terms “diversity” and “inclusion,” and whether they can differentiate the concept of “inclusive excellence.” Some universities decline to use the term “diversity” because it has become a politicized term, often associated with “identity politics” and the historic grievances of particular groups. Some universities seek to expand the term to include “intellectual” diversity, even though this should be the norm at a liberal arts University, and there is also a national movement to highlight “ideological diversity” so that conservative groups will feel “included,” given their perception that Universities have become “too liberal.” Some universities substitute the term “inclusion” as a more “neutral” proxy designed to indicate the nature of a campus community where “all belong.” The project of “inclusive excellence,” however, is linked to the idea that diversity can become the cornerstone of an Institution’s mission to achieve academic excellence. In this case, the term “diversity” should be closely tailored to the University’s academic mission. The University of Arizona ODIEX website adopts the latter approach, discussing inclusive excellence as a set of “high quality, high impact strategies to advance diversity and inclusion at the University of Arizona” as “the

leading research University in the Southwest.” However, the website doesn’t define “diversity” or “inclusion.”

Damon Williams, a leading scholar on diversity and inclusion in higher education, encourages campus leaders to understand the differences among four key terms that are often conflated and used interchangeably, but in fact carry a distinctive meaning: equity, diversity, multiculturalism, and inclusion.⁶

According to Williams, “Diversity refers to all of the ways in which people differ” in their primary identities (associated with factors such as race, age, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, ability status), as well as their secondary characteristics (including education, income, religion, work experience, family status, language skills). Primary identities are generally fixed, while secondary characteristics might and generally do shift.

“Equity” refers to “the process of creating equivalent outcomes for members of historically underrepresented and oppressed individuals and groups. Equity is about ending systematic discrimination against people based on their identity or background.”⁸

“Inclusion” is an intentional process designed to ensure that “traditionally marginalized groups and individuals” participate in the dominant society’s structures as “full and valued members of the community.” To adopt “inclusive practices” means that all constituents are involved in shaping and redefining the institutional culture to reflect a shared sense of identity and belonging.⁹

“Multiculturalism” is an attitude that “acknowledges and promotes the acceptance and understanding of different cultures living together within a community. To the extent that a University represents a shared “social environment,” multiculturalism would encourage the peaceful coexistence of diverse races, ethnicities, and religions.

Building upon this foundation, an Institutional commitment to diversity means that the campus community, including faculty, staff and students, will reflect the social/cultural/economic diversity of the nation and region.

An institutional commitment to equity means that the University will act intentionally to identify instances of bias and discrimination and adopt appropriate practices and policies so that the Institution can address conditions that might allow discriminatory behavior to continue.

⁷ Williams, Strategic Diversity Leadership, at 90.
⁸ Id.
⁹ Id.
It is difficult to have a commitment to equity without acknowledging diversity. The institution should examine representational diversity, for example, to ensure that historically marginalized and disadvantaged groups now enjoy equal access to the educational opportunities of the University. This may be required under federal law if the University is a federal contractor or uses federal funds to operate its programs. This is true even if the relevant state Constitution prohibits consideration of race, ethnicity and gender in University admissions or employment.

A commitment to honor **multiculturalism** in and of itself will not ensure equity or inclusion. Nor will representational diversity ensure inclusion or equity. Rather, the Institution must make a commitment to specific goals and adopt institutional structures and policies to ensure that those goals are met. Accountability is a key feature of an effective diversity and inclusion strategy.

### B. Inclusive Excellence and the Diversity Mission of Universities:

The term "**inclusive excellence**" reflects an understanding that the University must adopt specific diversity goals that are in alignment with its mission in order to operationalize inclusion.

While institutions vary in how they organize the portfolio of diversity and inclusion, a recent study of universities and colleges throughout the nation identifies a shared consensus that **four goals** are **essential** to the success of the diversity mission:

1. Achieve access and equity for historically underrepresented groups, including students, staff, administrators and faculty
2. Create a multicultural and inclusive environment for the entire campus community
3. Enhance domestic and international research and scholarship around diversity issues
4. Prepare all students to engage a diverse and international global society

Each of these goals can be fostered in numerous ways, but a successful outcome requires cohesion and collective action by the campus community. Therefore, the trend among national peer institutions is to design institutional structures for diversity and inclusion that contain **three main features:**

1. Centralized leadership;
2. An **effective** implementation structure for each of the functions necessary to achieve the goals; and
3. Alignment of diversity and inclusion with the mission of the Institution (rather than narrowing the role of the Diversity Office to compliance with equity structures that address harassment or discrimination).

---

10 Williams, The Chief Diversity Officer, at 5.
An effective implementation structure requires more than a symbolic office or administrative position. If the Diversity Office exists only for symbolic purposes and has no ability to effectuate change, then it will not be effective in achieving the goals of the campus community. Effective structures require **metrics for accountability**, benchmarks, and continuous and regular assessments of institutional data on representational diversity (student, staff, faculty, administrators), as well as campus climate.

I will summarize each component and identify applicable caveats, where relevant.

**1) Centralized Leadership:**

While the functions of diversity and inclusion extend throughout the campus community, it is very difficult to develop an effective organizational structure without centralized leadership. Most major universities today have a central Office of Diversity and Inclusion with staff or faculty leadership. To be effective, the Office requires sufficient resources and staff to drive the various initiatives, and the Office must also have structures in place that facilitate engagement with University faculty, staff and students. Community engagement structures are also very important, particularly with respect to underserved communities.

A centralized leadership structure is increasingly necessary because of the greater student diversity at universities and the prevalence of contested political issues surrounding “affirmative action,” immigration, campus speech, and gender/sexual orientation issues. The Diversity Office should be able to engage immediately if a bias incident occurs and must know the relevant procedures to ensure that the University is effective in dealing with these incidents.

It is best to think of centralized leadership of diversity and inclusion as a “role” rather than as a title, but intentional design of the role is critically important. In the corporate world, the Chief Diversity Officer serves alongside the CEO and CFO on the senior leadership team, so the CDO title makes sense. Some Universities use the CDO title, but the role is increasingly attached to the traditional offices within the academic leadership structure, for example, as a Vice President, Vice Provost or Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. This is a better practice because the official will generally have access to the University leadership structure (for example, Provost’s Council or President’s Cabinet or both), whereas a staff CDO will generally lack this access.11

---

11 I experienced this personally at UA. In my role as “Special Advisor,” I was not invited to any meetings of the President’s cabinet or Provost’s councils. As “Vice Provost,” I sat on the Provost’s Council, Dean’s Council, and was appointed to SPBAC. I learned more about the UA in 6 months, than I had in the prior 2 ½ years, and much of the knowledge was directly relevant to diversity and inclusion at UA. The senior leader must have access.
The following practices are **not** advised because they detract from the effectiveness of the leadership role:

1) Some institutions develop the CDO by “elevating” the existing role of a minority staff or faculty member, who might transition from a general title (e.g. Associate Dean of Students) to a “leadership” role as Chief Diversity Officer.\(^\text{12}\) This approach is generally not successful because the University is using a “diverse person” to fulfill a set of functions that can only be achieved through institutional restructuring. For example, it is impossible for a staff CDO to “require” University faculties “diversify” the faculty if this is not tied to a directive from the President or Provost and tied to an incentive or accountability structure. A further caveat is that if the CDO role is perceived as the only mechanism for a minority staff or faculty member to enter the administrative structure of the University, this can foster destructive competition among campus constituents for the one coveted spot. It may also incentivize the CDO to avoid “ruffling feathers” and maintain the status quo. Sometimes the status quo must be changed to effectuate inclusion. The CDO role is challenging and it is unwise to create this level of vulnerability in the Office.

2) Some institutions **politicize** the role, so that it is a direct report to the Provost or President and the role is only good so long as that particular leader is in power. When the senior leadership structure changes and the CDO role is attached to a particular leader, rather than a set of institutional functions (like a CFO), the role can be destabilized or dismantled.\(^\text{13}\) Although it can be politically convenient to “shift” responsibility from one office to the other, the better practice is to create the role to report to both the President and Provost. The institutional role of the CDO should be integrated into the basic structure of the University, much like the role of the CFO.

3) Some institutions hire a CDO to serve a "symbolic" role and be the “face” of diversity, but they keep a decentralized structure for the various functions, which creates a competitive environment in which several people are tasked with “diversity and inclusion” and the leadership responsibilities that would typically be tied to the CDO role are contested among various offices and initiatives. This is chaotic and inefficient. It is also unfair to the CDO because that person will be seen as incompetent if things go awry, and possibly become the scapegoat for bad decisions made by other persons who had the actual authority. For these reasons, a decentralized approach is not effective in promoting leadership of diversity and inclusion.

I could not find any contemporary literature that recommended a decentralized approach to the portfolio of diversity and inclusion. The distributed authority


\(^{13}\) See Williams and Wade-Golden, supra note ___ at 191 for case studies of this.
model is generally the de facto result of gaps in leadership, and this approach often results in complaints being directed to the University President, who has the overt leadership role on all aspects of University governance.

(2) Implementation: Institutional Processes to Effectuate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

The diversity and inclusion portfolio at a University contains several dimensions. The National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education (NADOHE) has identified several key functions for the CDO role/Office\(^\text{14}\), which I will summarize as falling within the following categories:

1) Articulates meaning and importance of diversity, equity and inclusion and ensures alignment with institutional mission.
2) Works to implement institutional inclusion by reference to internal and external laws, policies and directives.
3) Can articulate the educational benefits of diversity, equity and inclusion within institutions of higher learning
4) Can foster curriculum development that enhances educational benefits.
5) Can foster institutional programming to serve the diversity mission of higher education for faculty, students, staff and administrators
6) Implements procedures to deal effectively with bias incidents on campus
7) Can draw upon institutional data to benchmark and promote accountability for diversity mission of higher education institutions
8) Understands application of campus climate research in designing an inclusive campus
9) Understands specific laws, regulations and policies related to diversity and inclusion (relevant to faculty, staff and students).
10) Has knowledge needed to engage institutional commitment to norms of nondiscrimination, access and equity in higher education (relevant to faculty, staff and students)

The CDO/VP maintains leadership over each function, but must always work cooperatively with others to achieve the goals. For example, campus climate surveys generated for students must occur in cooperation with the Dean of Students Office. Campus climate surveys for faculty must occur in cooperation with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Staff issues are typically handled through the HR Office, but engagement with a Staff council may elicit other considerations that can be developed through a collateral process.

Similarly, the CDO/VP should be aware of the structure for training faculty and staff, as well as for advising faculty on how to integrate inclusion into the classroom and

\(^{14}\) These are posted on the NADOHE website as “National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education Standards of Professional Practice for Chief Diversity Officer,” approved by NADOHE Board of Directors in October, 2014.
curriculum. The CDO cannot develop and administer all of those trainings and competencies, but should structure a system where faculty, staff and students are aware of the resources and can use them.

The CDO/VP role requires continuous interface with the President, Provost, Deans, Directors, Faculty, Staff and students through the appropriate organizational structures of the University. This is another reason to have a leadership structure that is recognized by all as having expertise and competency.

(3) Alignment with Institutional Mission

Historically, most institutions of higher learning were elitist and lacked significant diversity. Therefore, during the initial phases of institutional development, the CDO functions were generally tied to student services, because the admission of greater numbers of diverse students in the 1970s carried many consequences for the campus community in terms of campus environment and the ability of the institution to respond to the different needs of students from diverse backgrounds. The Diversity role was also tied to the growth of civil rights law in the modern era, particularly compliance with equity directives embodied by Title IX and the other federal civil rights laws that govern institutions of higher learning.

Currently, both the student services and compliance functions are still necessary at each University, but the portfolio of diversity and inclusion is increasingly tied more broadly to the intellectual mission of the institution. A commitment to “inclusive excellence” is a commitment by design to foster the four goals outlined above in ways that are relevant to the student demographics of the University, its educational and research targets, and its knowledge enterprise.

The term “inclusive excellence” is not obvious to many campus constituents, who might argue that diversity and inclusion represent a “political agenda,” rather than a necessary part of the University’s mission. Where diversity and inclusion is tied to institutional accreditation, there is generally a greater degree of alignment of diversity, equity and inclusion with institutional mission. This is true of the UA Medical Schools, for example, which are true leaders in this space, perhaps in part because it is a key component of their accreditation process.

Increasingly, Universities are working through collaborative engagement processes with faculty, staff and students to create a Strategic Plan to implement diversity and inclusion in accordance with the University’s Mission Statement. If the University’s mission changes, as it will upon adoption of a new Strategic Plan, or if it experiences significant status changes, such as becoming a “Hispanic Serving Institution,” this will require an expansion in the portfolio of diversity and inclusion, with new metrics and target goals. The alignment of diversity and inclusion with mission is an organic process, which is exciting and challenging. However, there is also the need to establish benchmarks and metrics to ensure progress toward successful outcomes.
The best practice is to have a proactive and data-driven process for the development of diversity and inclusion and alignment with institutional mission. Too many universities are reactive in this space and crisis-driven, establishing the CDO role or campus environment advisory bodies (e.g. President’s Task Force on Diversity) to deal with student-driven demands or emergent social justice movements, rather than as a feature of institutional development. The crisis driven approach is not a sustainable approach to diversity and inclusion.

II. Assessment of Diversity and Inclusion at UA:

President Robbins has expressed a strong commitment to diversity and inclusion and he has created the Office of Equity and Inclusion, as well as a leadership position at the Vice President level that contains many of the CDO functions outlined above. President Robbins has also created a position of Chief Compliance Officer within his Cabinet, and that position also contains many of the CDO functions. President Robbins has moved the DEI portfolio into the Office of the President, which is a common approach among American universities. Because the DEI portfolio at UA was formerly within the Office of the Provost, there will be a need to harmonize some of those structures and staff positions for maximum efficiency.

This section of the memorandum contains a brief assessment of diversity and inclusion at the UA, in relation to faculty, staff, students, and diverse communities. I describe the historical development of diversity and inclusion at UA, and the current offices, roles, and initiatives that are in place and may need to be restructured to effectuate the goals of the new Office.15 With this understanding of the UA’s historic structure and the current placement of the functions of diversity and inclusion, an effective organizational plan can be generated.

A. Current Structures For Diversity and Inclusion:

The current structure for diversity and inclusion is embedded in several locations at the University of Arizona. This creates a challenge for any effort to centralize authority or create uniformly applicable policies. It also creates a challenge with senior leadership transitions, because it is hard to understand the existing structure and therefore difficult for new campus leaders to “engage” the “campus community” on diversity and inclusion.

Student and Community Engagement:

15 I have only been at the UA since August 2016, so I have relied on my discussions with faculty and staff and my own personal experience to write this summary. My position as Special Advisor was intended to be temporary and transitional, so I include reference to the process for historical interest only. The position was absolutely ineffective to operationalize institutional inclusion and should not be recreated in the future.
The University possesses strongly articulated student services and community engagement structures that correspond to the needs of the specific diversity groups. This approach has been in place for many years, and it is deeply embedded within the University culture.

Kendal Washington White, Vice Provost for Campus Life and Dean of Students, and Teresa Graham-Brett, Assistant Vice Provost for Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement, have direct supervisory authority over student issues. Like many UA staff, both leaders are quite dedicated and serve multiple roles in addition to their “official” roles on campus. The University has several student cultural centers which are organized, respectively, to meet the needs of Latinx/Hispanic students, African American students, Native American students, Asian Pacific American students, LGBTQ students, and women students. Traditionally, each cultural center has had its own distinctive mission and identity. Teresa Graham Brett is developing synergies under the rubrics of “inclusion” and “multicultural engagement,” but the identities of each center remain distinctive. In addition to the cultural centers, the UA campus also provides services to diverse campus constituents through the Disability Cultural Center, the Global Experiential Learning and Community Engagement Center, the Common Ground Alliance Program, the Immigrant Student Resource Center, and the VETS Center. There is considerable expertise embodied within each Center, and this creates a rich foundation for the understanding of diversity on the UA Campus.

The University’s community engagement structure is comprised of six Diversity Community Councils that correspond to the particular groups: Hispanic, Asian-Pacific, African-American, Native American, LGBTQ, and the University Religious Council. To my knowledge, the groups are comprised of volunteer members (many of whom are also UA alums), but each of them meets separately and they have particular agendas specific to their concerns. Karla Bernal Morales has served as a Program Coordinator Senior for the University’s Diversity Community Councils since 2017, when Tanya Gaxxiola, Assistant Vice President for Community Relations, left the UA. The Native American Community Council has always been under the leadership of Karen Francis-Begay, Assistant Vice President of Tribal Relations. All of the Diversity Community Councils have been housed under the UA’s Government and Community Relations Office for several years. One staff member commented recently that the Diversity Community Councils may move under the new Office of Equity and Inclusion. That person was unsure whether the Native American Community Council will also move or will stay under Government and Community

---

16 For example, at a recent meeting of the African American Community Council with President Robbins, the leaders shared a Strategic Plan designed to advance the needs of African American faculty and students at UA, in accordance with the objectives of the new University Strategic Plan. There is considerable expertise on the Community Council and this generated an important discussion that hopefully will be integrated into the campus priorities.
Relations in recognition of the separate political status of the 22 tribal Nations that hold lands in Arizona. This will be an issue to explore.

The University also has academic programs that facilitate the intellectual exploration of each respective group identity (American Indian Studies, Mexican American Studies, Africana Studies, LGBTQ Studies, Gender and Women’s Studies), with the exception of an Asian-American Studies Program, which is currently under consideration by President Robbins. The academic focus on specific group identities implies a commitment to “equality” of resources and opportunities among all of the groups. Where this equality is lacking for particular groups, they will perceive a lack of inclusion. Because the groups are housed within different academic units, there is not a cohesive method of fostering intellectual engagement among the various departments and disciplines. This became apparent when the Strategic Planning Team was trying to figure out how to represent “diversity” and where it should be housed within the Plan. One of the challenges on the UA campus is to develop a shared understanding of diversity and inclusion that is respectful of distinct group identities, but also able to foster cohesion and collective action. I am not sure if the current funding model promotes interdisciplinary participation of faculty across units, and, if not, this should be addressed.17

The Diversity Community Councils operate, to some extent, as accountability monitors. Several of the Councils have expressed the need to know faculty and student data to ensure that representational diversity exists on campus. Similarly, faculty members and staff associated with the diverse academic programs are frequently involved in helping to manage crisis events that concern diverse student populations. There is a deep and rich knowledge of multiculturalism, critical race theory, equity, and implicit bias on the UA campus. Constituent members of the various groups know how to identify bias issues and bring them into consciousness. Often, however, this occurs because of crisis events. In my experience, there has not been an effective institutional structure to include these key constituents in positive and constructive efforts to build an inclusive campus. Rather, the groups tend to come together to express concern over bias incidents or share perspectives on contested issues at meetings of the Diversity Coordinating Council, or alternatively, at Faculty Senate meetings.

Thus, although there is considerable diversity within the programs and centers that respond to student success and community engagement, there are opportunities to create inclusion in accordance with the call of the University's new Strategic Plan.

17 When I was at ASU, I taught in both Law and Philosophy and was also able to cross-list courses. I enjoyed the interdisciplinary engagement with students and faculty, and ASU’s commitment to innovation incentivizes this. When I came to UA, I was invited to teach Philosophy of Race within the Philosophy department and there was strong student interest, but there were administrative complications with this idea, and Provost Comrie advised me not to do this.
Faculty and Academic Units:

Diversity issues among faculty and academic units are largely under the authority of the respective Deans or the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. When Tom Miller was Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, he developed the University’s Strategic Priorities Faculty Initiative (SPFI), which offers partial University funding for faculty diversity hires. Dr. Andrea Romero assumed the position of Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs in Spring 2019, and as a Latina administrator and long time faculty member at UA, she has the knowledge and expertise to develop this Initiative or create additional initiatives. I believe, for example, that the Strategic Plan contemplates a cluster hire that will serve the University’s HSI Initiative, and a cluster hire may also be under consideration with respect to the Native American Advancement Initiative. Both efforts are important, and this may inspire other groups to request similar treatment. Going forward, the cluster hires and any new diversity initiatives must be effectuated in a way that is perceived as fair and transparent.

Each College has the autonomy to create its own diversity and inclusion structure. Many Colleges formed Diversity and Inclusion Committees when Dr. Trevino was Vice Provost, because this was a mandate from the Provost at that time. The Committees receive their charge from the Dean of their College. Currently some diversity Committees monitor and advise on faculty hiring, student admissions, and curriculum development. Other Committees eschew any substantive role and focus primarily on social “celebrations” of diversity. Some Colleges have an Associate Dean of Diversity and Inclusion, and some have a Director or other faculty or staff member with this assignment. Some do not have any formal faculty or staff administrator charged with overseeing diversity and inclusion. Some departments and colleges have a stated “diversity mission,” and some do not. The lack of uniformity at the local level (College, School, Department) causes confusion about what the “University” thinks about diversity and inclusion, or what the University’s shared commitments are, or what policies operate throughout the University (obviously, people are aware that Title IX and antidiscrimination policies apply broadly, but they often cannot understand how the local unit should interface with the University office). In addition, there are individuals across the Universities that have the same title (e.g. Director of Diversity and Inclusion), but have never met one another.

The lack of uniformity is a result of the University’s history of decentralized leadership of diversity and inclusion, as well as the shifting nature of the University’s institutional structures that serve diversity and inclusion.

B. History of Decentralized Leadership and Efforts to Centralize:

The University of Arizona’s land grant mission and traditions are important to this campus community. I spoke with faculty and staff across campus to discover the history of diversity and inclusion at UA. I was surprised by how many faculty and campus leaders had been in their positions for 20 or more years. Many senior
faculty referenced President Likins’ term of leadership as a time when faculty of color and women faculty enjoyed the most direct access to the President and stated that community leaders also got regular meetings with the President. This occurred because President Likins organized campus Diversity Councils and also external Community Councils that met with him on a regular basis. Many faculty members also remembered specific processes that occurred during the last decade involving the ADVANCE grant and efforts to promote inclusion of women and minority faculty and foster pathways into administrative leadership positions. Their perception is that the numbers of minority and women faculty increased as a result of this work, and that more of these faculty members were promoted into University administrative positions. Their perception is that these gains were lost in more recent years.

I do not have access to a data set that would support or negate either perception, but this is worth exploring. The literature on best practices calls for institutions to regularly examine their data and evaluate their performance in relation to key initiatives implemented to foster inclusion. The data on the ADVANCE grant is only partly accessible on the UA website today, so it is unclear whether best practices were incorporated broadly into the UA structure to foster institutional inclusion. The Commission on the Status of Women has been working on this issue and they have asked the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to assist them in obtaining more information about the status of the information gained through the ADVANCE grant and its outcomes.

Most faculty members stated that President Hart’s administration made the most significant change by shifting most of the Diversity and Inclusion functions to the Office of the Provost. Provost Comrie developed a structure where Vice Provost for Faculty of Affairs, Tom Miller, and his staff (most notably Laura Hunter) took care of all faculty recruitment and retention issues dealing with diversity and inclusion. Vice Provost Miller hired a staff person as Chief Diversity Officer for a time, but that individual was gone by 2014. I was told that the person was hired after a national search and had excellent qualifications as a diversity officer; however, I could not find any record of the person’s reports or activities. Laura Hunter continued to work with Vice Provost Miller on faculty trainings, and she conducted all of the exit interviews with faculty who left UA and gained information about campus climate through this process. I do not know whether any of her research was made accessible to the campus community.

When I arrived in Fall 2016, a campus constituent gave me a document entitled “Faculty of Color at the University of Arizona: What We Want Heads, Deans and Directors to Know,” summarizing the discussion of focus group held in Spring 2016 and attended by several faculty members of color. I do not know who sponsored the session or who wrote the document, but it clearly asserts that the faculty of

---

18 I have a copy of this document, but it does not have a named author or date beyond identifying the focus group held in “spring 2016.”
color who attended the session believed that "discrimination and bias" remain a problem for the UA campus and were able to provide specific experiences in support of that assertion. The document provided statistics about the low numbers of faculty of color at UA, stating that “Of our tenure-track faculty in 2015, 2% are African-American 1% are American Indian, 10% are Asian, 7% are Hispanic and 76% are White.” The document states that the “upper ranks” of administrators lack significant diversity. The paper cites specific literature supporting best practices that could be adopted. The document makes an excellent case for corrective change, but it is unclear whether it was distributed to Deans and Directors, or whether any corrective steps were implemented.

**Data on Diversity and Inclusion:**

The institutional data on diversity and inclusion at UA is difficult to access and I have not observed concerted efforts to analyze the data or develop policy priorities. In my role as Special Advisor, I had hoped to do an analysis of institutional data to make policy recommendations on fostering diversity and inclusion. However, during the three years that I have been at the University of Arizona, I was never given access to the University dashboards that house this data. When I joined UA, I participated in the Minority Women Faculty Association (now known as the Women of Color Faculty Association), which was then under the leadership of Professor Toni Griego Jones and Professor Andrea Romero. The MWF requested data on minority faculty, in particular women of color, and after President Robbins was hired, he agreed to provide this data to Professor Romero. The data was shared with Professor Romero just prior to our May 2018 meeting with President Robbins. Professor Romero prepared a masterful synthesis of the data, which illuminated the disparities among UA faculty as a whole and UA faculty women of color, and the President agreed that steps should be taken to improve the current situation.

After I became a Vice Provost, I was able to request data from UAIR, but the process of gathering student data takes many months, and all requests for faculty data must go through the Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs. Vice Provost Romero and I met with the UAIR team in February 2019 regarding the process to secure faculty diversity data. Although I received some student diversity data by mid-June, the faculty diversity data was not available by the time that I stepped down from my appointment on June 30, 2019. The student data indicates a growing and increasingly successful Latinx student body. The data indicates serious problems

---

19 Those numbers are consistent with the information that was posted on the UA website when I interviewed in Spring 2016.

20 Teresa Graham Brett was also working on these issues in Fall 2018. I am unclear whether she received access and support for analysis of the UA Institutional data on diversity and inclusion.

21 That meeting took place on May 4, 2018 and I have the agenda and meeting notes in my files.
with Native American student retention and 6 year graduation rates. African American and Native American student enrollment numbers are also fairly low, given their percentage of the state population. I did not have time to do a complete analysis of the data, but I understand that other administrators are doing this analysis as part of separate initiatives.\textsuperscript{22}

I was also present at meetings of the Provost’s and Dean’s Council during the spring 2019 semester and received reports on some aspects of diversity and inclusion that I had previously not known about. I became aware, for example, that the University of Arizona has participated in a number of surveys eliciting job satisfaction performance of UA faculty (for example, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education or COACHE survey, which was administered in 2014 and again in 2018). I saw that each set of instruments revealed areas where the university was excelling, as well as areas where improvement might be needed. In particular, the summaries that I saw revealed significant differences between the responses of faculty from historically underrepresented groups as compared to the responses of white faculty. I am unsure whether coordinated efforts were made to respond to this data within the Office of the President or the Office of the Provost, but this inquiry should be made. Both Offices have been involved in the work of diversity and inclusion, but there appears to have been a significant lack of coordination between the two offices, at least in the recent past.

\textbf{C. Institutional Structures: The Diversity Coordinating Council, Task Force, and Shared Governance}

According to Provost Comrie, the Office of the Provost exercised appropriate authority over diversity and inclusion during his tenure because this was in alignment with UA’s “shared governance” tradition. Following the departure of the University’s Chief Diversity Officer in 2014, Provost Comrie created a campus advisory council on diversity and inclusion reporting to the Provost as “the Diversity Coordinating Council” (DCC).

The DCC was chartered by Provost Comrie as “an on-going administrative advisory council that ensures coordination and progress toward our goals of inclusive excellence and making diversity a strategic strength for the UA.”\textsuperscript{23} The DCC was designed to report to the Provost, receive its charge from the Provost, and is composed of persons that are appointed by the Provost. The majority of DCC members are “administrators with diversity responsibility,” but a small number of faculty are included to serve the goals of "shared governance."

\textsuperscript{22} At a meeting on July 9, 2019 Professor Robert A. Williams told the Native American Faculty Association that he is working with a team and analyzing the Native American student data. I believe that Associate Vice Provost Cynthia Demetriou is also analyzing the data on student success among the various groups. I am unclear whether the two efforts are operating separately or in tandem.

\textsuperscript{23} DCC, Guiding Principles Document, email from Comrie to Tsosie dated 9/13/16.
The DCC is part of the distributed leadership model that the UA has in the area of diversity and inclusion. The DCC members were already in positions of authority that included diversity functions. Within a relatively short time, the DCC members developed a Draft UA Diversity Strategy, which is a Strategic Plan designed to "build on the values, strategies, and initiatives within President Hart's Never Settle Strategic Plan" in order to promote "equity of opportunity, participation, and treatment" of "our faculty, staff and students." The goal of the UA Diversity Strategy is to "transform diversity into a strategic strength for the UA."

The DCC Diversity Strategy lists 31 "key actions and initiatives" to promote diversity and inclusion at UA. The document also creates a pyramid model for diversity leadership which would result in the creation of an "Office of Diversity Initiatives," headed by a CDO who is empowered to work on all of these items, which extend throughout the University as it functions in relation to students, faculty (hiring, promotion, retention), staff, the community councils, the cultural centers, the financial aid office, and curriculum.

As an outgrowth of this Strategic Plan, the DCC was also charged with developing a description for a centralized administrative leadership position to head the Office of Diversity Initiatives. DCC members collaborated to draft the job description for the Vice Provost of Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer position, which was posted in November, 2015, with the following description:

"The University of Arizona seeks a collaborative, strategic and results-oriented leader to serve as its Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer...The VP/CDO will report to the University Provost and work in partnership with the University’s Diversity Coordinating Council, deans, and other campus leaders to position diversity as one of our key competitive advantages. This is a new role that will position the UA to center diversity work in the mission of the university...as an intentional part of [the University’s] teaching, research and service mission."25

The duties listed were consistent with the functions of a CDO. The minimum qualifications required candidates to have "a graduate degree" and diversity experience. The "preferred qualifications" included "a terminal degree and established record of teaching and scholarship that might warrant an academic appointment," and an "informed understanding of innovations in higher education

24 Diversity Coordinating Council, Diversity Strategy Document, dated 4/19/16, as presented to SPBAC (I received this document from Tanya Gaxxiola when she departed from UA and Provost Comrie assigned me some of her functions).
25 Posting Number A20443, Office of Academic Affairs (9902), opening date 11/12/2015, review to commence 01/20/2016, contact person listed as Laura Hunter.
that have strengthened the prominence of diversity and inclusion in their research, teaching and outreach missions.”

This is the position that I applied for because it corresponded to my view of diversity and inclusion as part of the intellectual mission of a public research University, as well as my belief that a Vice Provost role, working in collaboration with a team of campus diversity leaders (the DCC) was an optimal structure to achieve that goal. As Vice Provost of Inclusion and Community Engagement at ASU, I worked closely with the Provost, faculty, Deans and Directors. I enjoyed the intellectual components of building inclusive structures of higher education, and I hoped to grow my work at the University of Arizona. Dr. Jesus Trevino, who was at the time working as a CDO for the University of South Dakota, also applied for the position. As the two finalists for the position, we were each required to give public presentations and meet with University constituents over a two-day period. Dr. Allison Vaillancourt, Vice President of Human Resources, and Dr. Francisco Moreno, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion at UAHS, served as co-Chairs of the search, and Dr. Laura Hunter was the administrative lead. The DCC was actively involved in the search, interviewed the candidates and stated that the person hired would work closely with the DCC. The DCC was asked to give its recommendations to Provost Andrew Comrie, who made the final decision.

The Diversity Task Force:

The decentralized approach to diversity leadership is also exemplified in President Hart’s 2016 decision to create a “Diversity Task Force” in response to a “demand letter” that was sent to the President and her senior leadership team by several student organizations who had complaints about the University’s approach to diversity and inclusion and its impact upon UA students. Although the University was already in a search process for a Vice Provost and had entrusted the diversity leadership functions to the Office of the Provost, the President created a Presidential Task Force composed of three co-chairs, Dr. Javier Duran, Director of the Confluence Center, Dr. Bryan Carter, Associate Director of Africana Studies, and Tanya Gaxxiola, Assistant Vice President for Community Relations, to advise the UA Senior Leadership Team on how to approach the demands. The co-Chairs worked with Lynn Nadel, who was then Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the Team conducted a “listening tour” throughout the University, and also created several sub-Committees to address the respective grievances.

The Diversity Task Force was a short term response to an immediate crisis. The leaders of the Task Force were extraordinary individuals, and any one of them could have easily filled the role of Vice Provost. It is astonishing to see the number of campus constituents who were engaged by the Task Force within a very short time frame. The work of the Task Force was very important because it represents a thorough evaluation of the concerns of the students. In fact, the Diversity Task Force operated strategically as a campus engagement process on diversity and inclusion, which is often recommended as a first step toward articulating a Diversity
The Vice Provost/CDO Role and Shared Governance Structure:

The 2016 search for a Vice Provost of Diversity and Inclusion culminated with the hire of Dr. Jesus Trevino as a full-time Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Senior Diversity Officer. Provost Andrew Comrie asked me to take a temporary appointment as his Special Advisor for Diversity and Inclusion, and stated that some of the leadership functions might transition to the Office of the President, so he wanted flexibility and would re-design the role after a year. He promised to honor my primary wish, which was to work on institutional inclusion as an aspect of the academic and intellectual enterprise, and also afford me the time to do my scholarship and teaching. He stated that Dr. Trevino would be the “boots on the ground” administrator with daily responsibility for trainings and workshops and meetings, while I would work with him on the design of inclusive excellence at UA. In August 2016, I joined the University of Arizona as a tenured Professor of Law, Regents Professor, and Special Advisor to the Provost for Diversity and Inclusion.26

Between the time that I joined the UA in 2016 and now, President Ann Hart resigned and President Robbins was appointed in 2017 as President. In early spring 2018, Provost Comrie resigned and Jeff Goldberg assumed the role of Interim Provost. In late spring 2018, Dr. Jesus Trevino vacated his Office and that position was never filled. Dr. Trevino did a great deal of work, including establishing the Office for Diversity and Inclusive Excellence (ODIEX), but the Vice Provost role was not well-integrated into the structure of the University. When Dr. Trevino departed in spring 2018, no one understood the functions or responsibilities of his Office, and there was no public announcement of a transition plan. My Special Advisor role, which had been created to be temporary, was never part of the public announcements made during the 2016-17 academic year and so campus constituents had no idea what the division of responsibilities was. My name and title was posted on the website, so I fielded many questions from campus and external constituents. I

26 My Special Advisor role was created through a 9 month faculty academic contract, teaching a 2/3 course load at the law school and spending 1/3 of my time on administrative activities related to Diversity and Inclusion and reporting to the Provost.
worked closely with Javier Duran and Helena Rodrigues, who served as co-Chairs of the Diversity Coordinating Council and were recognized campus leaders, as the third member of an ad hoc “diversity and inclusion triage team.”

None of us was integrated into the Senior Leadership Team, so we did our work as a matter of default, trying to manage the concerns of campus constituents. I had very little contact with the Office of the Provost after Provost Comrie resigned, but I believe that the administrative authority over diversity and inclusion continued to be managed by the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Laura Hunter held a dual appointment, working half-time with Faculty Affairs and half-time with ODIEX. After Vice Provost Trevino left UA, Vice Provost Miller recommended the promotion of two talented UA staff members to fill the void. Teresa Graham-Brett was an Associate Dean of students working on inclusion and multicultural engagement and overseeing the multicultural student Centers. Teresa had played an important role on the Task Force, and she filled many needs related to the student services component of diversity and inclusion. In addition, she had extensive prior experience with institutional inclusion, including developing trainings for faculty. In Fall 2018, Provost Goldberg upgraded Teresa Graham Brett’s position to Assistant Vice Provost, and she took over the leadership of ODIEX and developed a collateral structure for the cultural centers, as the Office of Inclusion and Multicultural Engagement (IME). Marla Franco, who was also recommended by Vice Provost Miller, was appointed as Assistant Vice Provost for Hispanic Serving Institution Initiatives. Both individuals are extremely well-qualified for their positions, and both could serve in more senior positions should that opportunity arise.

The Changing Roles of the Diversity Offices and DCC:

In the summer of 2018, Interim Provost Jeff Goldberg and President Robbins informally asked me to take the lead on the recommendations that Javier, Helena and I had presented to them in April 2018, which would have entailed significant outreach to campus constituents and an articulated role for the DCC. Our recommendations in the April 27 memo were to (1) centralize leadership of diversity and inclusion within the Office of the President, given the importance of the new Strategic Plan; (2) to map institutional capacity and identify challenges to inclusion, working collaboratively with the DCC, ODIEX, and leaders who had served as part of the Task Force; and (3) develop and implement accountability structures including structures to coordinate efforts of President and Provost, and mechanisms to ensure that institutional compliance goals are met.

In July 2018, President Robbins announced my new title as Associate Vice President for Diversity Initiatives at the Quarterly Leadership meeting. In October 2018, Jeff Goldberg told me that a decision had been made to keep my appointment within the Office of the Provost, but upgrade my administrative position to a Vice Provost level. This required me to give up my teaching duties for the spring 2019 semester. My appointment became effective at the end of October 2018, and I was busy with the demands of my faculty position through December. At the beginning of January
2019, Jeff Goldberg advised me that President Robbins had decided to shift the leadership functions to the Office of the President and had appointed Ron Wilson as Vice President of the newly created Office of Equity and Inclusion. Consequently, my role continued to be that of Special Advisor to the Provost, but in an upgraded position that allowed me access to the Provost’s Council and Dean’s Council.

The DCC continued to meet during the Spring 2019 semester, but there was a lack of clarity on what the DCC’s role was, in relation to the new developments. Similarly, the Faculty Senate hoped to schedule an announcement and discussion of the University’s new diversity and inclusion structure but there was too much change and uncertainty to do this during the spring 2019 semester.

**UA Critical Incident Response Team:**

In the first week of June 2019, President Robbins assembled a strategic task force of various “Designated Responsible Individuals” following a campus crisis incident in April involving federal Customs and Border Protection Agency Officers and students on the UA campus.²⁷ That event triggered a “Campus Conversation” with President Robbins, mediated by several UA administrators and faculty, and attended by students and other campus constituents. During this “listening session,” campus constituents had the ability to voice their concerns, and Jeff Goldberg made several promises of corrective action on behalf of the UA. This event led to the creation of an administrative task force under the leadership of Jon Dudas, Senior Vice President, and Celina Ramirez, Chief Compliance Officer. The President outlined 9 areas of specific attention, each under the leadership of a UA staff and/or faculty member. Importantly, many of these areas are the same as areas of institutional competence for diversity and inclusion (identified above under the NADOHE statement), such as “diversity and inclusion training for senior and other campus leaders,” identifying a “structure and protocols for ongoing response to campus climate issues,” and support for “immigrant students” to “ensure inclusion on campus.”

The University of Arizona currently has centralized leadership over the student services and equity compliance components of DEI under the Office of the President. I am unclear whether the titles of Kendal Washington White and Teresa Graham Brett will also shift (last year they were within the Office of the Provost structure). The DCC is the University’s advisory council on Diversity and Inclusion, and that body is chartered to report to the Provost. However, the Critical Incident Response Team is charged with various functions of diversity and inclusion that are central to campus environment concerns, and that task force is led by senior staff within the Office of the President. There is a need to bring the various components of DEI

²⁷ Email dated 6/3/19 from UA President entitled “Supporting Our Students” and directed to various campus constituents identifying the need to centralize objectives and implement policies through the formation of the “Designated Responsible Individual” appointed to oversee each of 9 objectives.
together within an integrated structure that allows the President and Provost to exercise appropriate leadership, and also clearly identifies the respective DEI leadership portfolios for the campus community. The website under construction by Celina Ramirez will provide an excellent opportunity to communicate the new structure and leadership responsibilities to the campus community and external constituents.

**Summary:**

The University of Arizona continues to follow a distributed model of diversity leadership, at least at the internal level. There is an apparent structure, located within the Office of the President, but it will continue to be challenging for the University to identify shared goals and track institutional progress toward Inclusion unless there is further integration of the UA Mission, Strategic Plan, and a coordinated approach between the offices and entities that currently reside or are titled as belonging within the Office of the Provost and the new structures located under the Office of the President.

The UA currently has an excellent opportunity to define a more functional and efficient model of diversity leadership. To accomplish this, the University will be required to engage the historical and current practices and commit to an intentional design for the future. The University will also need to communicate this very clearly to the campus community, including the Faculty Senate, the Diversity Coordinating Council, and the various community and student groups that have concerns about the University's approach to diversity and inclusion. Without a clear and articulated leadership structure, it will be virtually impossible to institute accountability mechanisms.

**III. Creating a Blueprint for the Future: Building Institutional Capacity**

In 2009, President Barrack Obama spoke to Congress about funding for higher education, stating that: “in a global economy, where the most valuable skill you can sell is your knowledge, a good education in no longer just a pathway to opportunity, it is a prerequisite.” President Obama noted that ¾ of the fastest growing occupations require higher education, and yet the United States has one of the highest high school drop out rates of any industrialized nation, and “half of the students who begin college never finish.”

These are very real aspects of what it means to live in Arizona.²⁸ Most high school graduates in Arizona do not meet the prerequisites for admission to one of the three

---

²⁸ I currently serve as the UA representative for the Arizona Minority Education Policy Analysis Center, and when I was Vice Provost at ASU, I was also a member of AMEPAC. The information in this paragraph is demonstrated by the 2016 and 2018 Arizona Minority Student Progress Report, as well as the new Developmental Education Report issued by AMEPAC. I summarized that work for Provost Comrie
state Universities. Many of Arizona’s students are at community colleges and tribal colleges, and many students (including those at one of the three Universities), will have academic deficiencies requiring remediation. This need for additional "developmental education" may increase the years required for a student to complete their Bachelor’s degree by a significant margin. Many students will not finish their Bachelor’s degree program. The disparities are particularly notable for Latinx, African American, and Native American students.

The University of Arizona has an opportunity to create the institutional match between its ambitious mission, embedded in the new Strategic Plan, and its commitment to diversity and inclusion that will result in “inclusive excellence.” With that lofty goal in mind, the final section of this memorandum highlights the University’s institutional strengths, discusses how those strengths map onto the primary goals within the Strategic Plan, and offers a commentary on what is needed to build the institutional capacity to achieve inclusive excellence.

A. Institutional Strengths and Growth Areas:

The University of Arizona has multiple strengths and areas of excellence, illustrated by the overall excellence of the University’s academic units, many of which are highly ranked nationally. The University has significant faculty excellence, a successful research enterprise, and a number of unique institutes and centers that build on regional strengths, including the Environmental and Natural Resources School, and the College of Agriculture, which is supported by a separate funding source from the State of Arizona, and has an important and distinctive community extension function that enhances the University’s public service mission. The University houses many innovative programs, centers and Institutes, and some of these have a strong diversity mission, such as the Indigenous Peoples’ Law and Policy Program at the College of Law, and the Confluence Center.

Many of the University’s areas of excellence correspond to the needs of tribal communities and Latino communities, which have long been regarded as central constituents of the diversity mission. This is also true of the University’s Medical Schools in Phoenix and Tucson, which serve a diverse population and seek to meet the challenges of health disparities among Native and Hispanic populations in the Southwest. The Arizona Health Sciences units are leaders on health disparities research, and the University is rightfully proud of this legacy to the people of Arizona. The fit with other diverse groups is often obscured, and that was a theme in a recent meeting with the African American Community Council when the leaders of the Council commented that they couldn’t “see themselves” in the Strategic Plan. In addition, the UA Global model occupies a separate Pillar in the Strategic Plan, and yet is a natural fit for diversity and inclusion. Increasingly, the domestic “diversity” issues are aligned with the global issues, providing an opportunity to foster new

and Interim Provost Goldberg, and can do so for Provost Folks if that would be of help. A new representative for AMEPAC will be required after I leave UA.
knowledge and understanding about the centrality of “diversity” and “inclusion” to human societies.

Student diversity:

The University of Arizona has increased its student diversity significantly, and it recently became a “Hispanic Serving Institution,” for purposes of U.S. Department of Education grant criteria, in recognition that 25% of the student body is Hispanic and a significant percent of these students comes from underserved communities, as measured by Pell Grant eligibility.

The University of Arizona has traditionally graduated the highest number of Native American Ph.D. students in the country, and the UA is nationally known for its Native American STEM Ph.D. graduates. The UA has one of the two Ph.D. programs in the nation in American Indian Studies, and for many years, it was widely regarded as having the leading AIS Program in the country. Many of the graduates of the University of Arizona have been hired into academic positions nationally, and there are actually several who are now at Arizona State University, as well as some who are at the University of Arizona.

The campus has traditionally had a higher enrollment of Native American students than most universities in the country, and a history of serving Native communities through its cooperative extension programs, health sciences programs, law programs, and educational programs. The campus has robust programs in American Indian Studies, Mexican American Studies, Africana Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and a host of other diversity-oriented academic programs (including Transgender Studies). The University of Arizona has significant numbers of Asian American students, and there is momentum to create an Asian American Studies Program. The University has an Africana Studies Program, though it lags behind peer institutions on the numbers of African American students.

The University of Arizona operates several student centers for each of the diverse student populations. This tailored approach to multicultural student diversity is unusual. For example, Arizona State University enfolds student diversity into “Culture at ASU” programming, which is open to all student groups. Only American Indian Student Support Services is a stand-alone program, in part because of the different pools of federal funding that support many of those students.

The Hispanic Advancement Initiative and Native American Advancement Initiative are natural growth areas within the new Strategic Plan, which will enable greater faculty diversity, student success, and foster the creation of relevant knowledge and community partnerships. As mentioned above, it is less obvious where the issues of the African American community and Asian American community “fit” within the Strategic Plan, and that issue was identified by the DCC during the planning process, but the new faculty leaders of Pillar 3 are well-positioned to develop these goals within the Strategic Plan.
Faculty diversity:

Although there is room to grow, the faculty diversity at the University of Arizona is notable, particularly at the Assistant Professor level. The faculty of color at UA are incredibly talented and very dedicated to the students. Many of these faculty members belong to the Professors of Color Association on campus, led by Dr. Nolan Cabrera, a faculty member at the Center for the Study of Higher Education. The Native American Faculty Association has a vibrant and diverse membership in terms of disciplinary training and tribal backgrounds. The Native American Faculty Association is led by Professors Karletta Chief, Francine Gachupin, Stephanie Rainie, and Ron Trosper. Collectively, the UA Native Faculty represent the Health Sciences, STEM disciplines, and Law, and Education, as well as the social science disciplines that correlate to American Indian Studies. Similarly, the Latinx faculty is incredibly diverse in terms of disciplinary training and they play a major role for the growing population of Latinx students at UA. To my knowledge the Latinx faculty and African American faculty do not have separate faculty associations. However, many of the Latinx and African American faculty belong to the Minority Women Faculty organization on campus, as do Native American and Asian faculty members. The diversity faculty groups do not have a formal place within the shared governance structure, and this is an item for further institutional development of inclusion.

The University must take concrete steps to recruit faculty into the majors that are serving a large portion of the student body. Some UA departments do not have any faculty of color on the tenure track, and in some departments there are not even contract faculty of color. The University should gather data by school and department and see which units lack faculty diversity, and how student diversity is represented within the various majors and disciplines. The University should engage in a data-driven assessment of student success and develop a plan to meet its target goals. It is important to evaluate the multiple factors that facilitate student success, particularly for students from underrepresented groups.

In addition, the University should consciously monitor the retention and promotion of faculty. There is a perception that the University does not do enough to retain senior faculty of color, and that it does not foster their advancement within the academic leadership structure. An analysis of data will show whether or not those perceptions are accurate.

There is a great deal of literature on faculty diversity and leadership that could be very useful to the University if a conscious effort is made to create new initiatives.

---

29 University of Arizona Native Faculty Overview document presented to President Robbins on July 9, 2019, and listing goals and purpose of organization, as well as membership roster with bios.
and policies. There is also literature on the problems that are associated with lack of diversity within University faculties. For example, the problems of stereotyping, bias and “tokens” are often found in departments where there are very few faculty members of color. Intersectionality (e.g. race and gender) is another aspect of faculty diversity that must be analyzed. I know that Dr. Romero is familiar with this literature and I believe that she will create opportunities for the University to explore best practices on faculty hiring, retention and promotion. We are very fortunate to have Dr. Romero as our Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs.

The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs is the only Office on campus that has access to data regarding faculty recruitment, promotion, and retention. Due to confidentiality issues, this data is not shared, and therefore various faculty groups and community councils are suspicious about whether the UA is making progress or is in a time of retrenchment. Various instruments have been used to assess organizational health and faculty satisfaction, and these instruments indicated climate issues for minority faculty. Dr. Romero recently held several meetings with UA faculty designed to follow up on climate issues, and this is an excellent and innovative contribution. Dr. Romero has the position, knowledge and credibility to bring faculty and administrators together on these issues.

Town Halls:

Over the past year, Dr. Jessica Summers, a Professor of Education and Chair of the Faculty Senate, has created a space for faculty and staff engagement as part of her commitment to diversity and inclusion. The Town Halls have allowed University constituents to share their views on diversity and inclusion. I believe that Dr. Summers has collected data from the Town Halls and her findings will be very useful as the UA redesigns its approach to DEI.

Diversity Coordinating Council:

The Diversity Coordinating Council is composed of many senior staff leaders on campus, as well as a handful of faculty, who have expertise on diversity and inclusion. The DCC continues to serve as the primary structure for collective action on diversity and inclusion at UA. DCC members are incredibly dedicated professionals who possess valuable knowledge about diversity and inclusion. Many have long histories of institutional leadership. Although the membership is high capacity and meetings are well-attended, I saw very limited interaction (once or twice per year) between the Provost and the DCC. Major events occurred campus

---

30 See, e.g., Joann Moody, Faculty Diversity: Removing the Barriers (2nd edition 2012); Mack et al (eds), Mentoring Faculty of Color (2013); Karen A. Longman and Susan R. Madsen, (eds), Women and Leadership in Higher Education (2014).

31 See, e.g., Gabriella Gutierrez y Muhs et al., Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia (2012).

32 Id.
(such as the departure of Dr. Trevino) without any engagement with between the senior leadership and the DCC.

One of the most valuable functions of the DCC is to provide a place for members to share frustrations and observations, and to gain information by this mechanism. Yet, there is no way for the DCC to effectuate change because their role is purely advisory and any engagement with the Office of the Provost or President is sporadic. I have not seen the DCC’s work shared with SPBAC or any other shared governance group. If the work is not shared outside the DCC, then the entity will have little value for institutional inclusion. This is an area to address, particularly because the DCC currently reports to the Provost, while the portfolio of DEI has been moved to the Office of the President.

**B. Building Institutional Capacity:**

With reference to the four goals that were identified by Damon Williams’ research as essential to the success of a University’s diversity mission, I would like to comment and make recommendations for the Provost and President to consider.

1) **Achieve access and equity for underrepresented groups, including students, staff, administrators and faculty.**

This appears to be a primary focus area for the new Office of Inclusion and Equity. The Office will need access to the relevant data for each group in order to assess the current status of “access” and “equity.” Dr. Romero will have key data on faculty diversity. The University’s Compliance Office and Title IX officials will also play key roles in the overall assessment. I am not sure how the respective functions are currently aligned, but this is a key need for the University and should be a goal for this year.

2) **Create a multicultural and inclusive environment for the entire campus community**

Campus environment is important and the assessment tools to measure campus climate among students, faculty and staff should be carefully tailored to the group and the Institutional culture. The University has done broad assessments (e.g. COACHE survey, Organization Health Index survey), and it should now measure the data gathered in the past with the most recent data to see what progress has been made. Campus environment issues are interpreted differently among groups. Jessica Summers and Andrea Romero are making significant steps to assess campus climate, and I believe that Kendal Washington White also conducts routine climate assessments for UA undergraduate and graduate students. It would be a good idea to form a campus climate assessment team to ensure that there is adequate knowledge of faculty, staff and student experiences, but there are currently very good people in charge of this process and there are many positive indicators for success. This is another area where alignment among different offices and
initiatives will be needed to collect the relevant data and make effective recommendations.

3) **Enhance domestic and international research and scholarship around diversity issues**

In my view, this goal is the key to achieving “inclusive excellence” within a Research I University, and yet it is the area that receives the least attention from campus administrators. In many spaces, even raising this issue causes profound confusion and elicits a puzzled look or question: “So, how *exactly* does intellectual scholarship and disciplinary knowledge interface with diversity and inclusion?” At most universities, “diversity and inclusion” is relegated to the domain of “difference” and “disparity,” and often associated negatively with the “demands” or criticisms of particular groups. I believe that this is one reason why institutions are reluctant to be transparent with their data and internal assessments. When climate assessments reveal differences that appear to track race or gender, there are often “defensive” responses by University administrators.

In fact, issues of diversity and inclusion are some of the most complex and challenging issues that we face as a national and global society. I am fascinated, for example, with the discussion of embedded patterns of bias in machine learning technologies and artificial intelligence. I came to UA with high aspirations for what could be achieved here in relation to inclusion and the University’s knowledge enterprise, having read, for example, about UA’s innovative programming on the philosophy and science of consciousness, as well as Dr. Andrew Weil’s integrative approach to medicine, which embraces diverse healing modalities. As an ASU faculty member, I attended many conferences and events with UA faculty, and I personally witnessed the transformational work of the UA faculty in the disciplines of Philosophy, Education, American Indian Studies, Mexican American Studies, and the Law.

When I arrived at UA, I was certain that innovative programming across disciplines could occur here and that was a very attractive feature of this University. Unfortunately, I never got the opportunity to connect with these amazing programs and faculty within the intellectual space of inclusive excellence, and that has been a huge disappointment. I cannot think of another University with this incredibly robust intellectual capacity. Yet, as I met with campus constituents to engage discussions, I could see how the notion of “diversity and inclusion” was marginalized from the central academic mission of many units, and was even denigrated within some disciplines that could be fostering innovation. Some units are engaged in transdisciplinary research and are committed to fostering inclusive excellence, and this is very exciting. Yet, this is not true of all units. Siloes and hierarchies persist at UA, and knowledge that could foster inclusion is sometimes marginalized and denigrated as “anti-intellectual.”
Of course, the new Strategic Plan offers multiple opportunities to recast this dynamic. I hope that the UA will take advantage of its intellectual resources and do this.

4) Prepare all students to engage and diverse and international global society.

The student diversity at UA is a rich and impressive resource, and we should be able to provide this level of education to our students. At the moment, there are options for students to join organizations and learn about diversity, and they can select among electives that might foster this knowledge. However, to really achieve the goal would require an intentional restructuring of the General Education requirements, an intentional effort to diversify the curriculum of traditional academic disciplines, and a commitment to bring thought leaders to campus, to interact with faculty and students. We must educate by example and the project of inclusion operates on many different levels.

Universities, as institutions of higher learning, have the responsibility to develop their knowledge enterprise and transfer that knowledge to students. We care about access. We care about equity. But do we really understand what type of knowledge our students need and are we committed to delivering the type of knowledge that would actually enable students to engage respectfully with a diverse and international global society? In my view, if we cannot meet goal number #3 above, we probably cannot achieve goal #4. So, the best approach to inclusive excellence is to work, consciously and intentionally, on each goal, with the realization that all are necessary to achieve the desired transformation.

I will transition from the discussion of these higher order goals into a final discussion of concrete “next steps” that can take place immediately.

C. Final Recommendations Specific to UA:

1. Build a positive presence for DEI on the UA Campus, explaining to the campus community how the various functions of diversity and inclusion are organized under the new structure and which leaders are charged with the various aspects of the DEI portfolio. The compliance, campus environment, and student services functions appear to be within the Office of the President. Faculty diversity, academic program development, and the intellectual mission of the University are likely to remain with the Office of the Provost. There must be careful articulation between the Office of the President and Provost to avoid gaps in leadership or inconsistency.

2. Clearly identify the main findings of the 2016 Task Force and embed this within the current functions and structure of diversity and inclusion. With every campus crisis event or discussion of change, there is a tendency for campus constituents to return to a “grievance” mode, highlighting findings of
the Task Force that were never addressed or resolved. It would be best to create a clear integration of the primary findings and recommendations of the Task Force into the new structure as goals, commitments, or initiatives. A public acknowledgement of the work of Task Force members should also occur.

3. Harness the intellectual momentum of the Strategic Plan and involve academic units in an intellectual discussion of the opportunities and capacity for building scholarship, research, and new knowledge. This can happen, for example, by creating “themes” for campus exploration, by creating a President’s Lecture Series featuring invited thought leaders and engaging campus discussants, and by offering departments and units seed funding for interdisciplinary engagement.

4. Create a master calendar of events that is accessible to every campus constituent and highlights the relevant themes, which will increase attendance and decrease the conflicts that continue to occur on the UA campus.

5. Create an integrated and positive website presence for inclusion, highlighting campus leaders, community leaders, positive events, feature messages of encouragement to students and other campus constituents.

6. Create a way for the Diversity Community Councils to engage campus constituents. Their collective experience is an extraordinary resource, but most campus constituents lack knowledge that they even exist. I doubt that most faculty or Deans would know about the strategic plans that they have developed, and yet this is vital information for programmatic development.

7. Determine the best placement for the DCC and allow the DCC to serve a structured role on campus. The Council is high capacity but under-utilized at the present time.

8. Bring diversity and inclusion into the forefront of who we are as a University, and openly acknowledge and involve the various campus constituents who have knowledge relevant to current issues. The UA has incredible resources to deal with many issues, but often seems hesitant to acknowledge this publicly.

---

33 For example, when the April incident involving the Customs and Border Protection agents occurred, the UA Institute for Civil Discourse was not visibly engaged on the Tucson campus, although a collateral initiative was organized that involved the UA Institute and some faculty members from the three Arizona universities. I found out about this in Phoenix from colleagues at ASU.
Conclusion:

I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with the UA faculty, staff and students over the past three years. Although my role was purely advisory, it was an incredible learning experience to be part of the UA, and I have a much better understanding of institutional inclusion than I did prior to joining UA. I have studied and worked on issues related to diversity, equity and inclusion for over 5 years, both at ASU and at UA. I now appreciate the larger dimensions of institutional inclusion within the state universities, the federal and state agencies we work with, and the private corporations that drive innovation and economic development in Arizona.

The new UA Strategic Plan aspires to solve “the world’s grand challenges” and leverage Arizona’s “unique assets and diversity” as a competitive advantage. I love those aspirations and believe in them. I also recognize that these lofty goals will require the University to come into conformity with the best practices for DEI. The UA has many areas of excellence and it has made excellent hires in key leadership positions. The University of Arizona is now in an excellent position to innovate change with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
Open Meeting Law

As a matter of principle faculty Senate to adhere to basic Open Meeting Law stipulations:

**Discussion and Action items:** “The public body may discuss, consider, or decide only those matters listed on the agenda and ‘other matters related thereto.’ A.R.S. § 38-431.02(H). The ‘other matters’ clause provides some flexibility to a public body but should be construed narrowly.”

**Implications:** Faculty Senate should not discuss or take action on items not posted in the agenda. There are contingency guidelines for emergency situations.

“**New business**” as an item on the agenda: “This requirement does not permit the use of generic agenda items such as ‘personnel,’ ‘new business,’ ‘old business,’ or ‘other matters’ unless the specific matters or items to be discussed are separately identified.”

**Implications:** Faculty Senate should stipulate on the agenda that “new business” topics are not discussion or action. It could be used to recommend future agenda items

A good reference for understanding the Arizona Open Meeting Law can be found at the following link: [https://www.azoca.gov/open-meeting-and-public-records-law/open-meetings/](https://www.azoca.gov/open-meeting-and-public-records-law/open-meetings/). The Arizona Agency Handbook (2013) is available through the Arizona Ombudsman Citizen web site and was used as a reference here.
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PREAMBLE
This Constitution sets forth the basic organization and processes through and by which the General Faculty of the University of Arizona shall function, within the scope of its authority and responsibility, under state law and the policies and regulations of the Board of Regents authorized by that law.

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

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

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

ARTICLE II. Members

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

• Employees who hold at least half-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty
  appointments,
• Employees who hold at least half-time continuing or continuing-eligible
  appointments,
• Employees who hold career-track faculty appointments with multi-year
  contracts,
• Employees who have held at least half-time year-to-year career-track
  faculty appointments for three (3) of the past four (4) years and who
  currently hold lecturer or ranked professorial titles that do not include an
  adjunct or visiting modifier,
• and Individuals who hold Emeritus status.

Section 2.
No candidate for a degree at the University of Arizona shall be a member of the
General Faculty.
Section 3.
This membership provision shall become effective upon approval by the President.

Section 4.
Members of the General Faculty are eligible to vote in matters of faculty governance, to hold offices, and to serve on committees established in accordance with this Constitution. Faculty with administrative appointments vote in their home college. Should any faculty member’s home college change (i.e. due to the transfer of an individual to another unit, or due to a unit reorganization or merger), voting privileges should typically move to the new college. The Committee on Faculty Membership shall make determinations on General Faculty Membership or voting privileges in any cases where there is uncertainty.

Section 5.

Faculty Shared Governance
In matters of faculty governance, the Faculty Senate represent not only members of the General Faculty, but also those who do not meet the criteria for membership in the General Faculty. These include:

a. Non-employee campus colleague (DCC) faculty
b. Employees with career-track lecturer or ranked professorial titles who have not held at least half-time or more year-to-year appointments for three (3) of the last four (4) years, and
c. Employees who have faculty appointments who do not qualify for membership in the General Faculty (e.g., instructors or those with adjunct, global, visiting or courtesy/secondary faculty appointments).

ARTICLE III. Officers

Section 1.
The officers of the General Faculty shall consist of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.
Section 2.

Chair of the Faculty

a. The Chair shall serve as:
   i. The chief executive officer of the General Faculty, including serving as Director of the Faculty Center and as a member of the Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee and the Shared Governance Review Committee.
   ii. The chief representative of the faculty before public and University bodies including the University administration, alumni, Arizona Board of Regents, and Arizona Legislature.

b. The Chair shall be elected by the General Faculty in even-numbered years for a term of two years beginning June 1 and shall be eligible for re-election.

Section 3.

Vice Chair of the Faculty

a. The Vice Chair shall:
   i. Preside over Faculty Senate meetings.
   ii. Serve as chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Naming Advisory Committee and the Shared Governance Review Committee.
   iii. Perform any other duties as delegated by the Chair.

b. The Vice Chair shall be elected by the General Faculty in even-numbered years for a term of two years beginning June 1 and shall be eligible for re-election.

Section 4.

Secretary of the Faculty

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

iii. Perform any other duties as delegated by the Chair.

b. The Secretary shall be elected by the General Faculty in even-numbered years for a term of two years beginning June 1 and shall be eligible for re-election.

Section 5.

Resignation, absence, or incapacity of faculty officers

a. In the event of the temporary absence or incapacity of the Chair of the Faculty, his or her their duties shall be exercised by the Vice Chair of the Faculty, or in the absence of both, by the Secretary of the Faculty.

b. In the event of the resignation or permanent absence or incapacity of the Chair, the Vice Chair shall become the Chair if the remaining term of the Chair is six months or less. If the remaining term exceeds six months, a special election conducted by the Committee on Elections shall be held to fill the remaining term of the Chair.

c. In the event of the resignation or permanent absence or incapacity of the Vice Chair or Secretary, the Chair shall appoint, subject to approval of the Faculty Senate at a regularly scheduled meeting, a replacement for the unexpired term of the Vice Chair or Secretary.

ARTICLE IV. Meetings of the General Faculty

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

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

b. By majority vote of the Faculty Senate.

c. On written petition from members of the General Faculty, as specified in the Bylaws Article III, Section 1.
Section 2.
Five percent (5%) of the General Faculty shall constitute a quorum for the purposes of voting.

ARTICLE V. General Faculty Standing Committees

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

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

Section 3.
The Committee of Eleven shall:

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

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

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

Section 4.
The Committee on Faculty Membership shall interpret the provisions of Article II of this Constitution and Article I of its Bylaws, determine Senate apportionment and submit recommendations to the Faculty Senate for consideration and action.
It shall be responsible for maintaining a current and accurate census of the General Faculty.

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

Section 6.
The University Committee on Ethics and Commitment shall deal with questions of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative endeavor; conflict of commitment; and facilities misuse; and receive reports from the Research Integrity Officer. In its deliberations, it will use the current versions of the University policies on research integrity, professional commitment and proper facilities use.

Section 7.
The Constitution and Bylaws Committee shall be responsible for proposing changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty necessitated by revisions to applicable law or policy and for proposing changes recommended by the General Faculty or its committees. The amendment process is specified in Article X of the Constitution. This committee also reviews and, if appropriate, recommends changes to the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel (UHAP).

Section 8.
The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall be the faculty committee that accepts faculty members’ written requests for grievance hearings and which determines which committee, (Conciliation, Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, University Committee on Ethics and Commitment), or process, (Office of Institutional Equity), should consider a grievance.
Section 9.
The Committee on Conciliation and the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) shall be the faculty committees that conduct all investigations and/or hearings regarding recommendations against, or complaints and grievances by or against members of the General Faculty as hereinafter prescribed and not otherwise. The Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall have jurisdiction to make inquiry and to conduct hearings in two general areas contained in ABOR 6-201, 6-301 and 6-302: 1) matters involving contractual agreements between members of the General Faculty and the University/Board of Regents; and 2) internal matters relating to grievances against or by any member of the General Faculty. Protection of academic freedom and tenure is the principle obligation of CAFT. (Certain preliminary steps for dismissal situations are described in Chapters 3 and 4 of the University Handbook for Appointed Personnel and Sections 6-201, 6-301 and 6-302 of the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual.) Principles of law and policy require that members of the General Faculty have a forum in which grievances can be aired and examined and a known and effective procedure by which this can be done. That procedure, involving the examination of a grievance by the professional associates of the member affected, must reflect both the requirements of the law and the usages and traditions of the academic profession. Such investigations and hearings as are undertaken require the judicious consideration of facts, but they are not and must not be limited by the considerations of judicial hearings. Rather, they are investigations and hearings conducted by professional peers, the purpose of which is to safeguard and protect not only the individual rights of the members affected but also the collective rights of members of the University community. Committees constituted for these purposes perform an indispensable function in providing the due process of law to which every member of the faculty is entitled.

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

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

Section 10.
The University of Arizona bears a responsibility to exercise leadership in labor and human rights matters. To this end, the University Committee for Monitoring Labor and Human Rights Issues strives to ensure that fundamental labor and human rights, particularly those articulated in the April 30, 1999 Commitments Relating to Sweatshops, are implemented by University licensees.

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

b. The committee is also charged with educating the University community and the broader public about these issues.
ARTICLE VI. University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation

Section 1.
The Shared Governance Review Committee addresses issues regarding the implementation and functioning of the procedures contained in the Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements as may be entered into from time to time. It will establish and maintain processes to (1) review compliance with the agreement, (2) examine ways in which apparent breaches of the agreement can be addressed, and (3) consider possible extensions of the agreement. It is the body to which members of the University community can bring particular shared governance concerns, and it will also examine whether the agreement has been violated or is in need of clarification or modification.

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

a. Use of the University’s name or symbols by an external entity;
b. Implied University endorsement of a particular service, product, company, individual; or
c. Public display of advertisements or other corporate symbols.

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

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

Section 4.
The Undergraduate Council reviews all undergraduate curricular action items forwarded from academic units, colleges, auxiliary units, the University-wide General Education Committee, any General Faculty Standing Committee or Senate Standing Committee or ad hoc committee. All action items approved by the Undergraduate Council are reviewed by the College Academic Administrators Council. Actions other than modifications to existing majors, options, minors, degrees, certificates or programs of study go forward for review by Provost’s Council, and the Senate Executive Committee before advancing to the Senate for approval.

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

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

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

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

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

In partnership with the University, SPBAC:

a. Develops and disseminates the University’s strategic plan.
b. Identifies issues that facilitate or impede the pursuit of the University’s mission.
c. Provides advice on budget policies, significant budgetary actions, and institutional priorities consistent with the strategic plan of the University.
d. Evaluates the effectiveness of plans, policies, and the assessments that affect the entire infrastructure of the University.
e. Develops guidelines for setting planning and budgeting priorities.

Section 8.
The University General Petitions Committee reviews all undergraduate petitions completed by students and forwarded from Colleges; and recommendations on petitions for medical retroactive withdrawals forwarded from the Executive Director of Campus Health or a designated alternate. The chair(s) of the University Petition Committee shall provide regular reports to the Faculty Senate.

ARTICLE VII. Faculty Senate

Section 1.

Functions
The Faculty Senate is the legislative body responsible to the General Faculty.

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

Section 2.

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

Section 3.

Officers
The Vice Chair of the Faculty shall preside over the Faculty Senate meetings and, in his or her absence, the Secretary of the Faculty shall do so.
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Section 4.

Meetings

The Faculty Senate shall meet regularly the first working Monday in each month during the academic year except on religious holidays observed by members of the Senate. When the first working Monday of the month falls on a religious holiday observed by one or more Senators, such that observance of the holiday would prevent those Senators from participating in Senate, Senate meetings shall be moved to the second working Monday in the month. Other changes to the calendar can be made, as voted upon and approved by the Faculty Senate. Its meetings shall be open to the public, except when the body decides to meet in executive session.

Additional meetings may be called by the President of the University or the Chair of the Faculty, or by majority vote of Senate. If the call cannot be voted on in a Senate meeting, a petition including half of the elected Faculty Senators will suffice. Any such call or petition shall be presented to the Vice Chair of the Faculty and shall state the purpose(s) of the intended meeting. Notice shall be given at least one week in advance of any meeting and shall contain a copy of any substantive proposal to be presented.

Section 5.

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

ARTICLE VIII. The College Faculties

The general charge of each College is entrusted to its College Faculty, subject to the Board of Regents and the authority vested by the Board in the President of the University. Voting rights and participation in shared governance in College matters shall generally be accorded to General Faculty members as defined in
Article II above, and to such other individuals as the College Faculty may decide. General Faculty members should only not be excluded from those equitable participation in shared governance activities that are not relevant to their contract status unless otherwise indicated by ABOR or University policy (e.g., voting on a Promotion and Tenure committee composition; emeritus faculty participation on an annual performance review committee, etc. tenure-eligible or career track faculty participation on a Promotion and Tenure committee) Any such exclusions should be detailed in College or unit Bylaws.

Bylaws for each College should be established in accordance with the current Shared Governance Guidelines and Agreements and adopted by the appropriate College Faculty and made available to each member. A copy must be filed with the Office of the Provost and in the Faculty Center. In matters of faculty governance, members of the General Faculty not included in a College shall be regarded collectively as a College (common college).

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

ARTICLE X. Amendments and Ratification
Section 1.
Revisions to allow for minor corrections or administrative or clerical updates to the Constitution or Bylaws that do not materially change intent may be approved by the Faculty Senate, and not require a vote of the General Faculty, unless the Faculty Senate determines otherwise.
Section 2.

Constitution

Amendments to this Constitution may be proposed by the Faculty Senate or by petition to the Chair of the Faculty signed by five percent (5%) or one hundred (100) members of the General Faculty, whichever is smaller. The Chair of the Faculty shall send copies of such proposals to all members of the General Faculty and shall convene a special meeting of the General Faculty to consider them not fewer than ten (10) class days after distribution. The proposed amendment(s) shall then be submitted to an electronic ballot of the General Faculty. A three-fourths majority of the votes cast is necessary for adoption.

Immediately upon adoption, the amendments shall be transmitted to the President of the University. Upon consideration and approval by the University President, the amendments shall become effective. The President’s consideration shall be preceded by written analyses by University Counsel and by Board Counsel within 90 days following the General Faculty vote that the amendments are consistent with Arizona Board of Regents Policies.

Section 3.

Bylaws

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

\(^1\) To comply with Arizona Board of Regents Policy 1-113
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ARTICLE I: Membership

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

Section 2.
Each year the Committee on Faculty Membership shall maintain a current and accurate census of the General Faculty for purposes of voting and participation in faculty governance.
ARTICLE II: Officers

Section 1.
The officers of the General Faculty shall consist of the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary as provided for under Article III of the Constitution of the General Faculty. In the absence of a parliamentarian (due to resignation, unfilled appointment, or any other reason), the Secretary of the Faculty shall fulfill this role.

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

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

ARTICLE III: Meetings

Section 1.
Petitions in written or digital format of five percent (5%) of the General Faculty, shall be sufficient to call a Meeting of the General Faculty. Such petitions, presented to the Chair of the Faculty, shall state the purpose(s) of the intended meeting. Petitions shall be validated by Faculty Center staff using the Census of the General Faculty.

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

Section 3.
Meetings of the General Faculty shall be open to the public except when that body decides to meet in executive session.
Section 4.

Methods of Voting.

a. At meetings of the General Faculty, voting shall be by viva voce, by a show of hands, by a rising vote, or by ballot, as decided by the presiding officer, provided, however, that it shall always be in order to move for a vote by ballot.
b. By a majority vote at a meeting of the General Faculty the pending action may be subject to a mail or electronic ballot by the General Faculty.

ARTICLE IV: Committee on Elections and Election Procedures

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

Candidates for any positions elected by the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate shall provide a candidate statement.

Section 1: Declaration of Candidacy

Candidates for elective office shall declare their candidacy to the committee as directed on the faculty governance website:

a. Declarations shall identify the elective office being sought and provide a means for candidates to affirm their eligibility for and willingness to hold the office. Electronic or hard-copy distribution of declarations shall be acceptable.
b. Candidates shall affirm in writing their willingness to hold office by signing their declaration. Electronic or hard-copy signatures shall be acceptable.
c. The Committee on Elections shall verify the eligibility of each nominee.

Section 2: Conduct of Elections

a. The Committee on Elections shall notify the General Faculty, no later than January 15 each year, of elective offices to be filled that year.
b. The committee shall accept completed declarations of candidacy no later than the close of business ten (10) class days prior to the election.
c. The committee shall conduct general elections for elective offices no later than March 1, allowing ten (10) class days from the opening of the online election to the close of the election.
d. The committee shall notify members of the General Faculty of the results of general elections no later than March 22.
e. The committee shall conduct runoff elections for faculty offices no later than April 1, allowing ten (10) class days from the opening of the online election to the close of the election.
f. The committee shall notify the General Faculty of the results of the runoff election no later than April 25. Results will include a list of any individuals elected and policies adopted, as well as an overall participation rate for the election. Requests for vote counts in individual races may be made to the Committee on Elections.
g. In the event of a tie vote, the decision shall be made by lot. Lots are cast by the Committee on Elections. The candidates or their designated witnesses are invited to observe the casting of lots.

Section 3: Election of Candidates

a. Chair of the Faculty, Vice Chair of the Faculty, or Secretary of the Faculty: A candidate who receives a majority of the votes cast in the general election shall be declared elected. When no one receives a majority of the votes in the general election, the two candidates receiving more votes than anyone else will be nominated for the runoff election ballot. That candidate receiving the majority of general election votes shall be declared elected.
b. Faculty Senate, at-Large: If forty or fewer, but more than twenty are nominated, the twenty nominees receiving the largest number of votes in the general election shall be declared elected. If more than forty are nominated, the forty receiving the largest number of votes in the general election shall be candidates on the runoff election ballot provided only that anyone who receives a majority of votes in the general election shall be declared elected. The candidates receiving the largest number of votes in the runoff election shall be declared elected to the positions to be filled.

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

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

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

f. Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure: Names of members of the General Faculty who have been nominated in accord with the provisions set forth in Article V, Section 8, of these Bylaws for membership on the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall be included on the ballot for the general election each year.

g. For all other elections, any candidate who receives a majority of votes will be declared elected. Any unfilled seats will be filled through a runoff election with no more than twice as many candidates on the ballot as there are open seats. If there are more than twice as many candidates as open positions, those with the largest number of votes on the first ballot will be included in the runoff election.

ARTICLE V: General Faculty Standing Committees: Memberships and Terms

Section 1.
The Committee of Eleven shall be composed as follows: ten members of the General Faculty, five of whom are elected by the General Faculty each year for a term of two years; the Chair of the Faculty shall be, ex officio, the eleventh voting member, and shall call the first meeting of the committee, at which meeting the committee shall elect its chair. To this number shall be added one voting student delegate selected annually by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and one voting student delegate selected annually by the Graduate and Professional Student Council in whatever manner those bodies determine. The two student delegates shall be invited to attend all regular meetings of the committee.

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

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

Section 4.
The University Committee on Ethics and Commitment shall be composed of six members who are tenured or continuing members of the General Faculty elected by the Faculty Senate to serve staggered three-year terms, from nominations by the Nominating Committee or by other members of the General Faculty. The Research Integrity Officer serves as an ex officio non-voting member. The committee may, in consideration of individual cases or issues, expand itself by no more than three additional General Faculty members having expertise in the subject matter of the case(s) being investigated.

Section 5.
The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is composed of the Secretary of the Faculty (committee chair) and four General Faculty members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. The Provost or Provost’s designee serves as an ex officio non-voting member.

Section 6.
If a member of a General Faculty Standing Committee (Sections 1-5) resigns or becomes ineligible for membership, this member will be replaced for the remainder of the term of the departing member by the following:

a. If elected, the candidate who received the next highest number of votes in the same election will be offered the vacancy, with ties broken by the Chair of the Faculty. If there is no eligible candidate,
the Chair of the Faculty will fill the vacancy by appointing a member of the General Faculty.

b. If appointed, the Chair of the Faculty will fill the vacancy by appointing a member of the General Faculty.

Section 7.

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

Section 8.

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

Section 9.

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

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

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

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

Section 10.

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

Article VI: University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation

Section 1.

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

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

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

Section 4.
The Undergraduate Council shall be composed as follows:
a. The Undergraduate Council (UGC) voting membership shall consist of: the UGC chair; one member of the General Faculty from each college that offers undergraduate degrees; one member from the Library; and one member from the Honors College. Faculty representatives shall be chosen by the faculty in each academic college in accordance with the processes outlined in the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding, each chosen by election in the college OR the appointment by the Dean, after consultation with that college's version of an advisory council in accordance with the shared governance guidelines and agreements. College representatives serve for three-year terms. In addition, the chair of the University-wide General Education Committee or a designated alternate currently serving on the committee; the chair of the University General Petitions Committee or a designated alternative currently serving on the committee; and one to two student representatives from the Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA) appointed to Undergraduate Council by the president of ASUA, shall serve as voting members of the UGC. ASUA members serve one-year terms that may be renewed. The chair shall be appointed by the Chair of the Faculty, on advice of the Nominating Committee and in consultation with the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, in accordance with the principles detailed in the shared governance guidelines and agreements. The chair shall serve for a term of one year, renewable for up to three years.

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

c. The Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, the Executive Director of Academic/Curricular Affairs, the Registrar, the Director of Advising Resource Center, the Vice Provost of Digital Learning & Student Engagement for the Office of Academic Initiatives and Student Success, the Assistant Director of Academic Policies & Organizations are ex officio non-voting members.
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Section 5.

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

a. The University-wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) voting membership shall consist of the UWGEC Chair and faculty representatives from the Colleges and programs that offer General Education courses, as follows: The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (two voting members); the Colleges of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture, Education, Nursing and Pharmacy (one shared voting member); Eller College of Management (two voting members); the College of Engineering (one voting member); the College of Fine Arts (two voting members); Honors College (one voting member); the College of Humanities (two voting members); the College of Science (two voting members); the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (two voting members); and University of Arizona South (one voting member). A faculty representative for each of the three Foundations programs—English, Mathematics, and Second Language—and the Library shall serve as voting members. Two student representatives, one undergraduate junior or senior, and one will each serve as voting members (two voting members in total). Non-voting ex officio members include a representative of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Each faculty member serves a three-year term; each student serves a one-year term. Faculty representatives shall be chosen by the faculty in each academic college, in accordance with the processes outlined in the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding. Colleges are advised that at least part of the membership should be elected by their faculty, but in order to ensure that certain minority interests are heard, it is reasonable that part of the membership be appointed.

In the event that an academic unit not represented in this list begins offering courses in the General Education program, the UWGEC voting members may adopt a means for ensuring appropriate representation uniform across campus.
representation for that academic unit, through the sharing of an existing voting member.

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

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

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

Section 6.

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

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

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

c. Graduate students. The Graduate and Professional Student Council shall select, according to its own procedures, three members for the Graduate Council. Terms are one year, renewable.
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d. The Dean and the Associate Deans of the Graduate College are ex officio voting members of the Graduate Council.

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

Section 7.

The Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee’s (SPBAC) membership is comprised of twenty-one voting members and thirteen (13) ex officio non-voting members.

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

b. If an elected faculty representative to SPBAC resigns or becomes ineligible to serve, the candidate who received the next highest number of votes in the same election will be offered the vacancy, with ties broken by the Chair of the Faculty. If there is no eligible candidate, the Chair of the Faculty will fill the vacancy by appointing a member of the General Faculty to serve for the remainder of the term.

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

d. The thirteen ex officio (non-voting) members are comprised of individuals with expertise in strategic planning/budgeting by title and by responsibility as follows. Those designated by title are: Senior Vice President and Provost; Senior Vice President Business Affairs and CFO; President, University of Arizona Foundation. The University of Arizona President, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty, will appoint 9 individuals with senior leadership responsibilities drawn from areas that include institutional analysis and budget; student affairs and success; diversity and inclusion; research and health sciences; international and global affairs; communications, marketing, and public relations; and human resources.

Section 8.

The University General Petitions Committee shall be composed as follows:

a. The Undergraduate General Petitions Committee voting membership shall consist of at least six and no more than twelve members of the General Faculty representative of Colleges that offer undergraduate degrees. In addition, the chair(s) of the University General Petitions Committee or a designated alternate currently serving on the committee serves as a voting member on Undergraduate Council.

b. Non-voting members may include others as needed (i.e. advisors, curriculum specialists, or associate Deans) by invitation of the chair(s).

c. The Provost or a designated alternate, the Administrative Director of the General Petitions Office, and the Executive Director of Campus Health or a designated alternate are ex-officio non-voting members.

d. Members of the committee and the chair(s) are chosen in consultation among the Chair of the Faculty, the Provost or a
designated alternate, and members of Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and serve a five-year, renewable term.

Article VII: Grievance Policies and Procedures for Faculty

Section 1.

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

Sources:

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

Section 2: Grievance Principles

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

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

c. The existence of a grievance process in no way diminishes the responsibility of faculty and administrators for the exercise of sound judgment.
d. All grievants shall have clearly defined avenues of appeal and redress that may include mediation and/or an opportunity to present one’s concerns to a faculty committee that reports to the President or his or her designee. The President decides the matter and his or her decision is the final agency decision. The grievant’s rights to relief in the courts shall not be affected by this policy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

s. Issues of misconduct in research, scholarship, or creative endeavor;
   conflict of commitment, and facilities misuse are handled by the
   University Committee on Ethics and Commitment (UCEC) or other
   committees designated under a separate policy. In conducting
   inquiries on those matters, UCEC or other appropriate committees
follow the applicable University policies on research integrity, professional commitment, and proper facilities use.
t. Generally, if a conflict cannot be settled through informal means, a member of the faculty is best served by filing his or her grievance with the single and most appropriate committee or office. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee will direct the faculty grievant to the appropriate office or hearing body.
u. The standard of proof for all findings, conclusions, and recommendations relating to grievances shall be a preponderance of the evidence.
v. No faculty member or administrator can be a decision maker in a dispute in which he or she is a party or in which he or she has a conflict of interest.
w. No faculty member shall forfeit the right to grieve a matter unless he or she has been harmed, has a right to grieve the matter, and is specifically apprised of any time limits regarding contesting the matter.

Section 3: Grievance Resolution Procedures
The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall be composed of the chairs of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT), the Committee on Conciliation, the Committee on Ethics and Commitment, a representative of the Office of Institutional Equity, and a faculty representative selected by the Faculty Senate. The vice chair of CAFT shall also serve on the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee as a non-voting member. The chair of CAFT will function as the ex-officio voting chair of the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.

a. The recommended starting point for resolving grievances is at the head or dean level, whichever is applicable. If, however, the grievant does not wish to follow this route, or this route has not provided acceptable resolution, a grievant has the option of using the Ombuds Program, informal University mediator, or review by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.
b. In most cases, faculty may choose an informal route, (i.e. Ombuds Program or informal mediation). Faculty may request (if appropriate) a review by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee. Grievances alleging discrimination may be filed with either the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee or directly with the Office of Institutional Equity. If the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee receives a grievance alleging discrimination or harassment, the Committee will forward the grievance to the Office of Institutional Equity.

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

- i. There has been a violation, a misinterpretation, or an arbitrary or discriminatory application of University policy, regulation, or procedure which, applied personally to that faculty member, infringes upon his or her privileges, responsibilities, or terms and conditions of employment, (e.g., salary, teaching assignment, equipment access, or other inequities); or
- ii. He or she has suffered an adverse employment decision on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or genetic information; or
- iii. There has been an infringement on his or her academic freedom.

Section 4: Informal Resolution Procedures

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

a. Ombuds Program: The Ombuds Program is a confidential, informal, impartial, and independent resource for effective communication, collaboration, and conflict management. The program provides assistance with a wide variety of faculty issues, concerns, questions, conflicts, and challenges through consultation, coaching, mediation and facilitation, training, and organizational development. The program works on many levels, from one-on-one to small and large groups, from individual to departmental, organizational, and systemic level concerns/issues. If you aren’t sure where to start or what dispute resolution option to choose, the Ombuds Program can help you identify and explore your options for addressing the situation within and outside of the Ombuds Program and connect you with other helpful resources.

i. Ombuds Program Confidentiality: Confidentiality is a fundamental element of the Ombuds Program. As such, the Ombuds Program is not authorized to accept notice of allegations of violations of law or other formal complaints on behalf of the University of Arizona or the Arizona Board of Regents. The Ombuds Program treats all communications, and the identities of all visitors, as strictly confidential to the maximum extent permitted by law unless, in the discretion of the Ombuds, failure to disclose information would create an imminent risk of serious harm. No employee or other University constituent may compel the Ombuds Program to disclose information.

ii. Ombuds Program Informality: The Ombuds Program is an informal and off-the-record resource and as such does not engage in formal processes and is not authorized to make or change policy.
iii. Ombuds Program Impartiality: As the designated neutral of the organization, the Ombuds Program works with all visitors and situations in an impartial manner. Ombuds do not take sides or advocate for any individual or group.

iv. Ombuds Program Independence: The Ombuds Program functions independently of other organizational entities.

v. Ombuds Program Terms of Use: By electing to utilize the voluntary services offered by the UA Ombuds Program, visitors agree to never seek to compel the Ombuds to disclose any information received as part of providing Ombuds services in any other forum, including a formal grievance or lawsuit. In addition, if the Ombuds Program utilizes mediation, facilitation, or another group process the visitors agree (to the extent permitted by law) to: (i) keep any and all communications that take place in the process confidential unless all parties agree otherwise, (ii) waive any right they may have to use communications that take place in the process in any formal grievance or lawsuit, and (iii) participate in good faith towards a mutually satisfactory outcome.

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

Section 5: Grievance Review Procedures

a. Whether or not a grievant has sought Informal Resolution, he or she may request a review by the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall consider the complaint and assign it to the appropriate committee chair (e.g., Conciliation Committee). If the grievant alleges unlawful discrimination not
covered by Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual 6-201(M) or 6-302, he or she may file a complaint directly with the Office of Institutional Equity without first going through the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.

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

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

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

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

2. An allegation of an adverse employment decision on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, genetic information; or

3. An infringement on his or her academic freedom; or

4. Those grievances covered under Section 5, b, iii, 3.

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

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

b. The grievance review procedure will involve the following steps:
   i. Within thirty (30) days of the date of any informal resolution process or within six (6) months of the grievant’s knowledge of the occurrence of the actions which formed the basis for the grievance, the grievant shall make a written request for a formal review to the chair of the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee.
   ii. The complaint, resolution sought, and either the name and address of grievant’s attorney, or a statement that grievant is proceeding without an attorney.
   iii. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee shall review the facts surrounding the allegation(s) and may either decline to forward the grievance for further consideration or forward the case based on the following jurisdictional guidelines:
       1. Alleged discrimination. If discrimination in employment, program, or activity based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, or genetic information is the basis of the grievance, the matter will be referred to the Office of Institutional Equity for consideration in accordance with the procedures established by that office.
       2. The Grievance Clearinghouse Committee may decide to forward the grievance for further consideration to the Committee on Conciliation.
          a. The Committee on Conciliation has jurisdiction to make inquiry and discuss any problem involving any member of the General Faculty in his or her relationship with the University. The committee
may consult and advise but shall not conduct hearings. It is the duty of the committee after careful investigation, to offer advice to the person or persons involved.

b. Legal counsel may not attend or participate in the Conciliation. A grievant may have an adviser from the University community who has no personal knowledge of the matter, who may attend meetings and review written documentation.

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

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

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

3. Other faculty grievances, including infringement on academic freedom and tenure not covered by Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual 6-201(M) or 6-302, will be reviewed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure under this policy.
a. Under this policy, the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure shall review any faculty allegation that a decision affecting his or her employment relation with the University was not determined in substantial compliance with regular University procedures, but only after any administrative appeal mechanism applicable to the decision in question has been exhausted.

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

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

Section 6: Grievance Hearing Procedures

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

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

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

1. A statement of the time, place and nature of the hearing;
2. A statement of the authority and jurisdiction under which the hearing is to be held;

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

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

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

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

v. No later than fifteen (15) days before the hearing date, the grievant and respondent must provide written documentation, including exhibits and a list of witnesses, to the chair of the hearing panel. The chair may require additional written submissions such as a written opening statement prior to the hearing.

vi. The chair of the hearing panel shall send a copy of the written documentation and witness lists submitted by the grievant and the respondent to the panel members within three (3) days after receipt. The grievant’s witness list, exhibits, and other required documentation will be forwarded to respondent, and the respondent’s witness list, exhibits, and other required
documentation will be forwarded to grievant by the chair within three (3) days after receipt of lists from both parties.

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

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

1. No fewer than three (3) faculty members shall constitute a hearing panel. Members shall not participate on a hearing panel when there is a conflict of interest.
2. The hearing, but not the deliberations of the committee, shall be recorded.
3. Unless overriding reasons under law or ABOR policy are given to grievant, respondent, and other appropriate parties, all parties shall have access to all information that is presented during the hearing at no expense to them.
4. The chair of the panel shall keep the parties informed about the status of the grievance.
5. Faculty may choose to have a hearing on a grievance before a panel of their peers without legal counsel present. Alternatively, the faculty may choose to be represented by legal counsel present at his or her own expense in all hearings.
In cases between a faculty member and an administrator, if the faculty member chooses not to be represented by counsel present at the hearing, then the administrator shall not have counsel at the hearing either. In cases between faculty members, either party may choose to be represented by counsel present at the hearing at his or her own expense. Any party may obtain legal advice and assistance in preparation for a hearing, even if a legal advisor will not be present at the hearing itself.

6. Legal advice to the grievance panel:
   a. If neither party is advised or represented by counsel and a University attorney has not been involved in the case on behalf of either party, then a University attorney may provide legal advice to the grievance committee upon request.
   b. Outside counsel may be selected by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure from a list of qualified attorneys provided by the University to provide legal advice to the committee if the University attorney is precluded from providing advice to the committee because of a conflict or for other reasons as determined by the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The role of counsel is to give sound legal advice and assistance to the panel on the matter it is hearing.
   c. At the discretion of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure panel, when the parties are represented by counsel, a hearing officer may be secured under the University’s agreement with Tri-University Outside Counsel. The hearing officer assists the panel in developing findings, conclusions and recommendations during
deliberations and may prepare the written report in consultation with the panel but does not participate in the decision-making process of deliberation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

      i. Irregularities in the proceedings, including
         any abuse of discretion or misconduct by
the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure panel that deprived the faculty member of a fair and impartial hearing;
ii. Newly discovered material evidence which with reasonable diligence could not have been presented at the hearing; or
iii. The decision is not justified by the evidence or is contrary to law.

b. If the faculty member requests reconsideration, the President will either deny reconsideration or issue a final decision within twenty (20) days of receiving a request for reconsideration.
c. The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. § 12-901 et.seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision is served upon the party affected.

Cross-References
• For the composition of grievance committees, see "Bylaws of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona." Article V, Sections 7, 8, 9.
• For the Board of Regents’ policy, see Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 6-201, "Conditions of Faculty Service" and Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 6-301, "General Provisions and Definitions for Conditions of Service for Academic and Service Professionals."

ARTICLE VIII: The Faculty Senate

Section 1: Functions
Among the functions to be exercised by the Faculty Senate are:
a. To recommend curricula and degrees for approval. While matters pertaining to courses, major and minor requirements, the kinds of degrees and requirements for each will originate in the various colleges, the final formulation which is to be recommended to the Board of Regents shall be determined by the Faculty Senate.
b. To formulate and/or recommend for approval policies governing official University catalogs.
c. To establish committees to assist in carrying out functions assigned to the Faculty Senate by the “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty.”
d. To maintain communication and liaison with the President of the University, administrators, faculty, staff, and students.
e. To recommend policy concerning academic conduct of students.
f. To recommend policies concerning promotion, tenure, continuing status, sabbatical leave, and other leaves of absence.
g. To act upon nominations for recipients of honorary degrees, which may be proposed by one or more of the College Faculties.
h. To make recommendations relative to the general University policies and procedures.
i. To discharge responsibilities assigned by the "Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty."
j. To act upon matters brought for consideration in accordance with the “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty” and existing University policy.
k. To execute such other functions as are consistent with the “Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty.”

Section 2: Membership
The voting members of the Faculty Senate shall be comprised of the following:

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

b. Elected members: Elected members of the Faculty Senate will hold
office for two years, beginning on June 1 of the year in which they
are elected, in accordance with the following:
   i. Twenty members shall be elected, prior to June 1 of the odd-
      numbered years, by the General Faculty. These shall be
designated Senators-at-Large.
   ii. A minimum of one member shall be elected prior to June 1 of
      the even-numbered years by each College Faculty. The
      Colleges shall include each academic college as well as any unit
      whose General Faculty membership exceeds the number of
      General Faculty in the smallest academic college. Those
      General Faculty members who are not part of any academic
      college and whose numbers in their individual units do not
meet the above criteria shall conduct an election as if they
constitute a common college. Elected members of the Faculty
Senate in addition to the twenty elected by the General
Faculty and the ones elected by each College Faculty, including
the common college, shall be apportioned among the several
colleges, essentially in proportion to the number in each
College Faculty. Such apportionment is to be established in
accord with the published census of the General Faculty by the
Committee on Faculty Membership.

c. Seven students: four students selected annually by the Associated
Students of the University of Arizona and three students, selected
annually by the Graduate and Professional Student Council in
whatever manner those bodies decide.

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

e. Representative of the Classified Staff: one member of the Classified Staff Council (CSC) of the University of Arizona shall be appointed annually by the Chair of CSC. The member will hold voting membership and be afforded the full privileges thereof.

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

If a Senate seat is vacated due to a Senator’s resignation or inability to serve, two circumstances apply: either (a) there were unelected candidates for the position in the election in which the unable-to-serve Senator was elected; or (b) there were no unelected candidates available in that Senator’s constituency. For all vacancies occurring under situation (a), the Committee on Elections will ask the unelected candidate receiving the next highest number of votes to become the successor. If this individual is unavailable, then the next highest vote recipient will be asked to serve, repeating until no unelected candidates are available. All such successors will serve until the return of the regularly elected Senator or until the end of the vacated term, whichever occurs first, but no less than one full semester in any case.

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

1. The vacated term to be filled is longer than one semester, in which case the Committee on Elections will be asked to conduct a special election in the constituency of the vacated seat. An individual elected in this way will serve to the end of the unexpired term of the vacated seat.

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

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

Section 3: Method of Voting
At meetings of the Faculty Senate voting shall be by viva voce, by a show of hands, by a rising vote, or by ballot as decided by whoever is presiding over the meeting at the time of the vote. Upon request of seven or more members of the Faculty Senate, the vote shall be taken by roll call. Such recorded vote shall be included in the minutes of the Faculty Senate which are distributed to all members of the General Faculty. It shall, however, always be in order to move to vote by ballot. An absent member may send a substitute who shall not vote.

Section 4: Faculty Senate Standing Committees
Each Faculty Senate standing committee, except the Executive Committee, shall consist of seven General Faculty members, a majority of whom must be elected Faculty who are members of Senate. The standing committee members shall be appointed by the Vice Chair of the Faculty, after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, from names suggested by the Nominating Committee or other members of the General Faculty. Student members of standing committees shall be nominated by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and by the Graduate and Professional Student Council. Members of standing committees shall serve one-year terms.

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

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

b. Academic Personnel Policy Committee. This committee receives reports and considers and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to academic personnel policies (e.g., promotion and tenure/continuing status, policy and procedures, statistical report on decisions from the previous year, sabbatical and leave of absence policy, performance evaluation policy and procedures and their relationship to salaries, definition of faculty membership, and governance). The chair of APPC is appointed by the Chair of the Faculty.

c. Research Policy Committee. This committee considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to secrecy, research, conflict of interest, data retention, intellectual property, research ethics, research parks, interaction with industry, patent policy, Arizona Research Laboratory, research institutes, human and animal research, and safety. One faculty member of the Research Policy Committee shall also sit on the Vice President for Research’s
Intellectual Property Committee. The chair of RPC is appointed by the Chair of the Faculty.
d. Student Affairs Policy Committee. This committee considers matters and forwards action items to the Faculty Senate relating to the health, safety, and welfare of the student body, including financial aid, the Student Code of Conduct, Code of Academic Integrity, admission, registration, residency classification, high school and community college relations, recruitment and retention policies, Commencement and matters brought forth from the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. The chair of SAPC is appointed by the Chair of the Faculty.
e. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Committee. This committee considers issues and forwards action items to Faculty Senate that relate to diversity, equity, or inclusion (e.g., policies that foster an environment of civility and mutual respect, issues affecting diversity from an overall university perspective, external requirements on the university affecting diversity, administration of university affirmative action grants and awards, etc.). The chair of DEI is appointed by the Chair of the Faculty.

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

Section 6: Declaration of Observance of Religious Holidays
Any Senator for whom observance of a religious holiday would prevent them from participating in a Senate Meeting on the first working Monday of the month
during the Academic Year shall notify Faculty Leadership at the beginning of that Academic Year so that the relevant meeting can be rescheduled in accordance with the Constitution, Article VII Section 4.

APPENDIX I: 2005 Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding
Guidelines for Shared Governance updated signatures 8/28/2017
(1) Constitution Change: Limit Emeritus Faculty Membership in the General Faculty to a term of 5 years, to be extended in 5-year increments, upon request

Emeritus faculty currently make up about 20% (nearly 800 members) of our General Faculty. This is significantly more than any one college, yet they participate in elections at a rate as much as 30-40 times lower than our other faculty types (about .5%). A small number of emeriti, however, are very active and some hold elected positions. This proposal would give every emeritus faculty member a 5-year term upon retirement, which could be extended in 5-year increments, upon their request.

a. Individuals who hold Emeritus status. Emeritus faculty shall have voting privileges in the first five years of Emeritus status, which will be extended for additional five-year periods at the request of the individual faculty member.

(2) Constitution Change – Clarify how/if voting privileges change when a faculty member’s home college changes.

Rationale: There are situations where tenured or continued individuals move to a non-academic unit that has no P&T committee. In these cases, it can be important that they retain their connection to their original tenure/CS home (for example, to go up for promotion to full). This change would allow them to petition to be able to continue to vote and participate in the governance in their tenure/CS home. The Committee on Faculty Membership would make decisions on these cases.

ARTICLE II. Members
Section 4.
Members of the General Faculty are eligible to vote in matters of faculty governance, to hold offices, and to serve on committees established in accordance with this Constitution. Faculty with administrative appointments vote in their home college. Should any faculty member’s home college change (i.e. due to the transfer of an individual to another unit, or due to a unit reorganization or merger), voting privileges should typically move to the new college. The Committee on Faculty Membership shall make determinations on General Faculty Membership or voting privileges in any cases where there is uncertainty.
(3) Constitution Change – Provide options for Senate/Senators to call an emergency Senate meeting

*Rationale:* This provides additional ways for a Senate meeting to be called by Senate or Senators. For the petition, it excludes the faculty officers and administrators from this process (since they have other options) and includes only elected faculty senators (of which there are currently 61).

**Article VII. Faculty Senate**  
**Section 4. Meetings**  
The Faculty Senate shall meet regularly the first working Monday in each month during the academic year, except on religious holidays observed by members of the Senate. When the first working Monday of the month falls on a religious holiday observed by one or more Senators, such that observance of the holiday would prevent those Senators from participating in Senate, Senate meetings shall be moved to the second working Monday in the month. Other changes to the calendar can be made, as voted upon and approved by the Faculty Senate. Its meetings shall be open to the public, except when the body decides to meet in executive session. The agenda of each meeting shall be set by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. Additional meetings may be called by the President of the University, the Chair of the Faculty, or by majority vote of Senate. If the call cannot be voted on in a Senate meeting, a petition including half of the elected Faculty Senators will suffice. Any such call or petition shall be presented to the Vice Chair of the Faculty and shall state the purpose(s) of the intended meeting. Notice shall be given at least one week in advance of any meeting and shall contain a copy of any substantive proposal to be presented.

(4) Constitution Change – Make governance participation (and responsibility) equitable across faculty types within the General Faculty at all levels.

*Rationale:* There continues to be uneven inclusion of Career Track faculty who are Members of the General Faculty at college and unit levels. Making this change would ensure more uniform and inclusive practice across campus.

**ARTICLE VIII. The College Faculties**  
The general charge of each College is entrusted to its College Faculty, subject to the Board of Regents and the authority vested by the Board in the President of the University. Voting rights and participation in shared governance in College matters shall generally be accorded to General Faculty members as defined in Article II above, and to such other individuals as the College Faculty may decide. General Faculty members should not be excluded from equitable participation in shared governance activities unless otherwise indicated by ABOR or University policy (e.g., tenure-eligible or career track faculty participation on a Promotion and Tenure committee).

(5) Bylaws Change – Require the selection of faculty for shared governance representation to follow uniform processes at all levels and for all purposes, as spelled out in the MOU on Shared Governance Understanding
Rationale: This change is in line with recommendations from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the MOU on Shared Governance. This will require shared governance representatives be elected, appointed by an elected officer or committee, or nominated by an elected officer or committee for appointment by an administrator. This will allow flexibility to ensure adequate diversity and inclusion, but also ensure faculty shared governance representation is driven by elected faculty and not by administrators.

Article VI: University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation.

Section 4.
Article VI: University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation.
The Undergraduate Council shall be composed as follows:
The Undergraduate Council (UGC) voting membership shall consist of: the UGC chair; one member of the General Faculty from each college that offers undergraduate degrees; one member from the Library; and one member from the Honors College. Faculty representatives shall be chosen by the faculty in each academic college in accordance with the processes outlined in the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding, each chosen by election in the college or the appointment by the Dean, after consultation with that college's version of an advisory council in accordance with the shared governance guidelines and agreements. [...]

Section 5.
The University-wide General Education Committee shall be composed as follows:
The University-wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) voting membership shall consist of the UWGEC Chair and faculty representatives from the Colleges and programs that offer General Education courses, as follows: The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences (two voting members); the Colleges of Architecture, Planning and Landscape Architecture, Education, Nursing and Pharmacy (one shared voting member); Eller College of Management (two voting members); the College of Engineering (one voting member); the College of Fine Arts (two voting members); Honors College (one voting member); the College of Humanities (two voting members); the College of Science (two voting members); the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (two voting members); and University of Arizona South (one voting member). A faculty representative for each of the three Foundations programs--English, Mathematics, and Second Language--and the Library shall serve as voting members. Two student representatives, one undergraduate junior or senior, and one will each serve as voting members (two voting members in total). Non-voting ex officio members include a representative of the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Each faculty member serves a three-year term; each student serves a one-year term. Faculty representatives shall be chosen by the faculty in each academic college, in accordance with the processes outlined in the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding. Colleges are advised that at least part of the membership should be elected by their faculty, but in order to ensure that certain minority interests are heard, it is reasonable that part of the membership be appointed. [...]

Section 6.
The Graduate Council and its officers shall be composed as follows:
Faculty. Faculty members of the Graduate Council shall be chosen by the faculty in each academic college, in accordance with the processes outlined in the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding. according to a process approved by the faculty in each college. [...]

(6) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE
Constitution – Designated Campus Colleague faculty may not be members of the General Faculty, per ABOR policy. Replacing "Individuals" with "Employees" will exclude DCC faculty from the General Faculty, thus bringing our criteria into alignment with ABOR Policy.

**Rationale**: ABOR prohibits Volunteer Faculty (which is what they call our DCC Faculty) from being Members of the General Faculty or participating in campus-level shared governance activities. The effect of this change will mean that DCC faculty will not be eligible for General Faculty Membership. ABOR does not prohibit volunteer faculty from participating in governance at the unit level. This proposal was brought forward through and endorsed by the Committee on Faculty Governance. This is a housekeeping change, since it must be made, due to ABOR Policy.

**ARTICLE II. Members**

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

- **Employees** who hold at least half-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty appointments,
- **Employees** who hold at least half-time continuing or continuing-eligible appointments,
- **Employees** who hold at least half-time multi-year career-track faculty appointments with multi-year contracts,
- **Employees** who have held at least half-time year-to-year career-track faculty appointments for three (3) of the past four (4) years and who currently hold lecturer or ranked professorial titles that do not include an adjunct or visiting modifier.

(7) **VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE**

Constitution – Make wording changes to align with changes made to Section II (on General Faculty Membership)

**Rationale**: Changes need to be made here in order to bring this text into alignment with changes in Section II, Membership in the General Faculty (made in order to be in alignment with ABOR Policy).

**Article II. Members.**

**Section 5.**

**Faculty Shared Governance**

In matters of faculty governance, the elected and at-large representatives to Faculty Senate represent not only members of the General Faculty, but also those career-track, visiting, and adjunct faculty who do not meet the criteria for membership in the General Faculty. These include:

Designated Campus Colleague (DCC) faculty **Employees** with career-track lecturer or ranked professorial titles who have not held at least half-time or more year-to-year appointments for three (3) of the last four (4) years, and **Employees** who have faculty appointments that do not qualify for membership in the General Faculty (e.g., instructors, or those with adjunct, global, visiting, or courtesy/secondary faculty appointments).
(8) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE

Constitution – Make changes to ARTICLE II Section 1 to clarify that individuals must be on multiyear contracts to be eligible for Membership in the General Faculty and remove "adjunct," "visiting," and "at least half time."

*Rationale:* Because adjunct and visiting faculty are not defined as career track in UHAP we do not need to spell that out here. The word "contract" was removed in a previous version, causing confusion. Adding it back should help. Because those on multiyear contracts must be half time or greater, spelling that out is unnecessary here.

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

- Individuals Employees who hold at least half-time tenured or tenure-eligible faculty appointments,
- Individuals Employees who hold at least half-time continuing or continuing-eligible appointments,
- Individuals Employees who hold at least half-time multi-year career-track faculty appointments with multi-year contracts,
- Individuals Employees who have held at least half-time year-to-year career-track faculty appointments for three (3) of the past four (4) years and who currently hold lecturer or ranked professorial titles that do not include an adjunct or visiting modifier, and
- Individuals who hold Emeritus status.

(9) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE

Constitution – Clarify how Faculty Senate calls a meeting of the General Faculty

ARTICLE IV. Meetings of the General Faculty
Section 1.
Meetings of the General Faculty, limited to the purpose(s) stated in the call, shall be held:
On the call of the Chair of the Faculty.
By majority vote of the Faculty Senate.
On written petition from members of the General Faculty, as specified in the Bylaws Article III, Section 1.

*Rationale:* This makes clear the mechanism through which Senate approves a “call.” It does not change the process.

(10) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE

Bylaws – Ensure the functions of the Parliamentarian are covered, should one not be appointed by the Chair

*Rationale:* The Chair of the Faculty has not appointed a parliamentarian for more than 6 years. While that is the prerogative of the Chair, not having this function covered by another individual has, at times, been an issue and caused delays that otherwise might have been avoided.
Assigning this work to the Secretary of the Faculty (in the absence of a parliamentarian) would seem to make sense, since the Secretary does not typically preside over Senate or General Faculty meetings, but would attend them.

Article II, Section 2. Officers.
A Parliamentarian, who shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Chair of the Faculty, shall serve the needs of the General Faculty and the Faculty Senate. In the absence of a parliamentarian (due to resignation, unfilled appointment, or any other reason), the Secretary of the Faculty shall fulfill this role.

(11) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE
Make the Constitution and Bylaws gender neutral throughout

*Rationale:* We made this change in UHAP (chapters 3 & 4) some years ago. Doing the same in the Constitution and Bylaws would send a positive signal of inclusivity.

(12) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE
Bylaws – Update language about petitions for a meeting of the General Faculty.

*Rationale:* The Membership in the General Faculty has increased in the last 5 years (from about 2000 to nearly 4000) and is expected to continue to change over time. It makes sense to use a percentage instead of a particular number. In order to ensure it is clear how many members of the General Faculty 5% represents, current information on the Census of the General Faculty will be added to the Faculty Governance website (i.e., General Faculty membership totals by college and overall). Currently, 5% is equivalent to 178 members.

ARTICLE III: Meetings
Section 1.
Petitions in written or digital format of five percent (5%) or one hundred (100) members of the General Faculty, whichever is smaller, shall be sufficient to call a Meeting of the General Faculty. Such petitions, presented to the Chair of the Faculty, shall state the purpose(s) of the intended meeting. Petitions shall be collected through the Faculty Center and shall be validated by Faculty Center staff using the Census of the General Faculty.

(13) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE
Bylaws – Remove the President of the Arizona Alumni Association (no longer a position at UA) from the Naming Advisory Committee

*Rationale:* This position no longer exists at the University.

Article VI: University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation.
Section 3.
The Naming Advisory Committee consists of the Vice Chair of the Faculty (committee chair), President of the UA Foundation, President of the Arizona Alumni Association, President of the Associated Students of the University of Arizona (ASUA), President of the Graduate and
Professional Student Council (GPSC), Provost of the University, President of the Classified Staff Council (CSC), chair of the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC), a representative of the Dean’s Council (elected by the Deans), and a representative from the Faculty Senate (appointed by the Chair of the Faculty). Members serve annual terms.

(14) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE

Bylaws - Remove the President of the Arizona Alumni Association (no longer a position at UA) from the SPBAC

*Rationale:* This position no longer exists at the University

**Article VI: University-wide Committees with Shared Governance Participation.**

**Section 7.**

The Strategic Planning and Budget Advisory Committee’s (SPBAC) membership is comprised of twenty-one voting members and thirteen (13) *ex officio* non-voting members. Eleven of the voting members are faculty: the Chair of the Faculty; six faculty elected by the general faculty for staggered, three-year terms; three faculty selected by the Chair of the Faculty in consultation with the President for three-year rotating terms; and a SPBAC chair. The SPBAC chair is appointed by the President in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty for a two-year term. The President and Chair of the Faculty may also select a SPBAC co-chair from the existing SPBAC membership; under such circumstances, the co-chairs have one shared vote. SPBAC chairs must have served at least one year on the committee prior to appointment as chair. SPBAC chairs may be re-appointed for one additional term, with the consent of a majority of SPBAC voting members.

If an elected faculty representative to SPBAC resigns or becomes ineligible to serve, the candidate who received the next highest number of votes in the same election will be offered the vacancy, with ties broken by the Chair of the Faculty. If there is no eligible candidate, the Chair of the Faculty will fill the vacancy by appointing a member of the General Faculty to serve for the remainder of the term.

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

The thirteen (13) *ex officio* (non-voting) members are comprised of individuals with expertise in strategic planning/budgeting by title and by responsibility as follows. Those designated by title are: Senior Vice President and Provost; Senior Vice President Business Affairs and CFO; President, University of Arizona Foundation; and President, Alumni Relations. The University of Arizona President, in consultation with the Chair of the Faculty, will appoint 9 individuals with senior leadership responsibilities drawn from areas that include institutional analysis and budget; student affairs and success; diversity and inclusion; research and health sciences; international and global affairs; communications, marketing, and public relations; and human resources.
(15) VOTE on HOUSEKEEPING CHANGE

Bylaws – Change membership requirements on Senate Standing Committees to be in line with our practice

Rationale: The current wording says "Members of the Faculty Senate," which could include the President, Provost, etc. We don’t think that was ever the intent and we have always only included elected faculty who are members of Senate in this count. This change is to put this language in step with practice.

Article VIII. Senate
Section 4: Faculty Senate Standing Committees
Each Faculty Senate standing committee, except the Executive Committee, shall consist of seven General Faculty members, a majority of whom must be elected faculty who are members of Senate. The standing committee members shall be appointed by the Vice Chair of the Faculty, after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, from names suggested by the Nominating Committee or other members of the General Faculty. Student members of standing committees shall be nominated by the Associated Students of the University of Arizona and by the Graduate and Professional Student Council. Members of standing committees shall serve one-year terms.