

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
OCTOBER 3, 2022**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/107812>

The recording of this meeting may be accessed electronically at:

<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=42961c04-09f9-4965-aa16-af24000b344c>

Visit the faculty governance webpage at:

<http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/>

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Vice Chair Mona Hymel, called the second regular Faculty Senate meeting of the semester to order at 3:02 PM in Law 164 and via Zoom. Secretary Tessa Dysart was present. A brief presentation regarding [Hybrid Senate Tech Rules](#) was shared.

**Present:** Senators Alfie, Bourget, Cai, Casey, Cheu, Citera, Cooley, Cui, Domin, Duran, Dysart (Secretary), Fellous, Fink, Folks, Goyal, Guzman, Hammer, Harris, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Ijagbemi, Irizarry, Jones, Knox, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Neumann, O'Leary, Pace, Robles, Rocha, Ruggill, Russell, Senseney, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, S. Smith, Spece, Stegeman, Stephan, Stone, Su, Tropman, Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Zeiders, Zenenga, Ziurys

**Absent:** Senators Behrangi, Bolger, Brummund, Dial, Downing, Gerald, Gordon, Lucas, Ottusch, Pau, Rodrigues, Schulz, Vedantam, Wittman

**2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 \(00:02:26\)](#)**

Due to a need for corrections, Vice-Chair Hymel moved **[2022/23-6]** to postpone approval of the September 12, 2022, minutes until the November Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/23-6]** passed with thirty-seven in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions. **[Motion 2022/23-6]** is detailed at the end of these minutes.

**3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY [SENATE AGENDA FOR OCTOBER 3, 2022 \(00:08:28\)](#)**

Senator Stegeman moved **[Motion 2022/23-7]** to approve the amended Faculty Senate agenda with Senator Casey's movement **[Motion 2022/23-7A]** to make a friendly amendment to move old business item number 7F (Sun Tran Resolution by ASUA – ASUA President, Patrick Robles, and Co-chairs of SAPC, Diane Ohana and Cheryl Casey) to the next month's agenda. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/23-7]** passed with forty-one in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions. **[Motion 2022/23-7]** is detailed at the end of these minutes.

4. **OPEN SESSION: STATEMENTS AT THE PODIUM AND VIA ZOOM ON ANY TOPIC, LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES - MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPEAKERS IS FOUR. NO DISCUSSION IS PERMITTED, AND NO VOTES WILL BE TAKEN (00:11:32)**

**Open Session Statement: Marcia Klotz, Assistant Professor in English and Gender and Women's Studies, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (00:12:11)**

I'm here on behalf of UCWAZ, our wall-to-wall campus Union that represents faculty, staff, and students. We just want to take this opportunity to say hello to the Faculty Senate and to let you know we have recently held elections and we now have an executive committee. Sandy Soto will be serving as our new President, Katie Zeiders who is right here in the room with us will be the Vice President, and I (Marcia Klotz) will be serving as the Faculty Representative. So, if you have any questions or issues you would like to bring to the Union, please get in touch with me. I love to talk to people, and I'd love to hear from you if you have something you would like to say. If I can get on chat, I will put my contact information, so you know how to reach me.

I would also like to announce two petitions that we've recently launched and that I'm hoping you would all be willing to sign. The first asks the University to set a minimum wage of twenty-five dollars per hour for all campus workers by the twenty, twenty-five. At present, about a quarter of the employees on our campus earn less than that. Given that inflation in Arizona hovers around ten percent, which is higher than anywhere else in the country and a single bedroom apartment in Arizona requires income of about twenty-one fifty an hour, I think it's only reasonable that our university deliver people a wage that they can not only live on but thrive on.

We have a second petition as well, that's calling for multi-year contracts and better working conditions for non-tenure track faculty. Many of our colleagues work on year-to-year contracts and often hold teaching loads at four classes per term. We have even heard reports that some of our colleagues have been pressured to raise that load to teaching five courses per semester.

In both instances, our sister institution ASU is much more generous than we are. They just set a minimum wage for their campus workers of twenty-one dollars an hour, and they pay a salary of sixty thousand dollars for contingent faculty, where ours hovers around forty-four thousand, five hundred.

Again, if I can figure out how to get on chat here, I will put up some links to those two petitions and while you're on the site, I'm hoping you will also join the Union if you haven't yet done so. That's it for me, thank you so much.

**Open Session Statement: Matthew Abraham, Professor of English, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (00:15:12)**

Good afternoon, I'm Matthew Abraham, Professor of English in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

For several of you, will have received the letter that was sent by the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression. It was sent to President Robbins on September 22nd. Some of you may also be aware that there was a story last week, in Inside Higher Ed about this list of Faculty who were marked ineligible by the Faculty Center last year for being considered for the general ballot for the Committee of Academic Freedom and Tenure, and as many of you know, by virtue of what it says in Article Five, Section Nine of the Faculty Bylaws, CAFT is put together a little different than other committees on campus.

The nominating committee presents a slate of candidates to President Robbins and to the Faculty Chair, and according to bylaws, at least, the President and the Faculty Chair are supposed to provide feedback to the nominating committee with the ultimate power to decide, left to the nominating committee. However, a practice has evolved over many, many years of basically, the nominating committee seeding its power in this very important process to the President of the Faculty Chair, and somewhere over this time, the Faculty Chair and the President's choices have been deemed final. And why has the nominating committee not then received those preferences, as just that, feedback? Well, this is, you know, one of the things surrounding this controversy that I would like to ask Faculty Senators to consider. And as many of you know, the Committee of Eleven is looking into this situation, a subcommittee. And you know, I really am not interested in naming names or casting blame, you've seen the email production by virtue, that I've received through an open records request, public records request that I submitted in January that was fulfilled in July. That's available for people to look at and draw their own conclusions. I'm not interested in squabbling with Faculty Center staff, with whom, I have had very good relationships for almost a decade.

I would like to take a step back and take a systemic approach, and to provide a systemic analysis. How did the Faculty Center receive the information it did to redline, blacklist, whatever word you want to use.

Professor Maggert, Professor Lynn, and myself, I understand that my name apparently got to the President of the Faculty Chair but I think, by virtue of the negative informational feedback, I have zero chances of getting on CAFT. I'll just close by saying, let's not forget how important a role with the Committee of Academic Freedom and Tenure plays in this University with respect to grievances, academic freedom, complaints, etcetera. So, it's just too important of a committee to let this opportunity go by without a systemic analysis. Thank you.

**Open Session Statement: Susan Eckert, Head of Collections at the Arizona State Museum (00:19:00)**

Good afternoon. I am Suzanne Eckert, Head of Collections at the Arizona State Museum.

As faculty housed full time in Research, Innovation and Impact, I am here to urge the Faculty Senate to consider RII's request to be provided with its own faculty representative.

As Head of Collections, I am responsible for the management of over 5 million objects in the museum. I enable research by faculty and students on campus, and by visiting or distant

academics from around the world. In this regard I am no different from some faculty, for example librarians, who have a faculty representative.

I also teach students. I design courses and grade papers. In this regard I am no different from any other teaching faculty.

I also perform research in archaeology. My research is published in peer-reviewed journal articles and books. In this regard I am no different from any other research faculty.

I conform to the same standards and policies as every other faculty at this University. I recently successfully went up for promotion to full, where I filled out the same forms, went through the same internal and external review process, and waited nervously for the results just as every one else who have gone through this process.

Fundamentally, RII is responsible for advancing transformative excellence in research across campus. We do so by enabling the research success of others by supporting university research centers, institutes, museums, and core facilities. We do so by providing research development, stewardship, compliance, and safety services. In this regard, I and my fellow RII faculty are very different from most other faculty on campus.

It does a disservice to the faculty in RII to include us in the Common College as our needs and insights are specific to RII. The Common College is not, nor should it be, an “et cetera” category for all the faculty not in large colleges. Our needs in RII are different, but should be valued, listened-to, and considered as equal to those of other units represented in the Faculty Senate. RII faculty deserve involvement in faculty governance.

Thank you for your time.

**Open Session Statement: Joel Smith, Assistant Professor of Practice, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (00:21:26)**

Good afternoon, my name is Joel Smith, and I'm a second year Senator at-large and a Professor of Practice with the new Gen Ed, based in the Honors College. As such, I'm part of the Common College, like RII.

I try to represent the following voices: faculty on the career-track, in smaller units, junior faculty, union members, but also the general faculty as a whole.

Let's not forget that 20 of us are elected by the entire general faculty, whereas 31 are elected by college constituencies. So when we're talking about RII gaining a seat, it would be just 1 of 52.

Last meeting, the Secretary laid out the definition of general faculty: we do not all have the same workload distributions. Most carry out research, but some do not. Most have PhDs, but some do not.

This fall, new senate leadership has been elected to improve shared governance and communication at the UA. Yet how can we fulfill our duties unless we as a Senate model such qualities?

After a decade in the Writing Program, I'm now with Gen Ed, so I have perspective-taking on my mind. I'd like to take two perspectives—that of an activist, and that of a parent.

As an undergrad at Berkeley, I took a Gen Ed course in Peace & Conflict Studies and learned several lessons that could benefit our Senate.

Here's one: in MLK's canonical "Letter from a Birmingham Jail," he writes that any nonviolent campaign has "four basic steps: collection of the facts to determine whether injustices exist; negotiation; self-purification; and direct action."

Change-makers often jump straight to "direct action." I want us to think about self-purification as a group, not in a narrow, anti-democratic sense. We need to learn to listen to each other.

Now for the parenting part: some parents have an authoritarian style and force their children to listen; far better is an authoritative approach, where parents listen to their children, even if they don't always accept their viewpoints.

Practically speaking, we need an email list-serve to communicate and build trust between meetings. As a digital native, I also suggest we create a Microsoft Teams group chat for Senators. Especially while meetings are hybrid, we need other spaces to share ideas.

Lastly, the pressing issue of RII representation requires us to listen. If we have 46 colleagues who want their own representative, much like the Library, and the policy is in our bylaws, then we must listen and act without delay. Thank you.

**5. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson  
(00:24:18)**

As we begin our second session of Faculty Senate for this academic year, the issues before us today reflect a community in transition.

On the hand, we see evidence of our shared values and solidarity in a number of the agenda items. We will hear about movement towards a long, overdue childcare center, a student-led initiative to negotiate with the City of Tucson to continue free public transportation that can be supported enthusiastically, and the new CatCloud App which will help our students' success. Another set of issues shows representatives working hard to reform the processes of governing the University.

We will continue the process of contributing to administrative reform as the Committee of Eleven picks up a mandate from 2019 to improve administrative review. Our parliamentarian will present a thoughtful set of rules for voting in hybrid format. There are then contentious issues that the Senate will hear more about today and will be handled at greater length.

The initiative to grant a senate seat to the Research Innovation and Impact support unit based on the 2017 clause in the bylaws will be presented to you again today by the Secretary. An initiative to add seats to the senate for support units has revealed the need for a review of proportional representation in the senate. This complicated issue proposed by Dean Cheu of RII will erode proportional representation in the senate away from traditional academic units (which have no more than three representatives for up to six-hundred faculty), in favor of support units created by administrative fiat with as few as seven faculty members. This is based on a 2017 clause of our bylaws that codifies the disenfranchisement of hundreds of our career track colleagues. After more debate today I will propose that we refer this matter to the Academic Policy Personnel Committee (APPC) for recommendations to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.

Under new business we will have two more contentious issues. The first concerns a dean's role in shared governance at the college level and has come to us in the form of a letter from the representatives of the College of Medicine Tucson. Does a dean have the authority to disband an elected faculty committee? It's a question that the Senate must consider and perhaps send to another committee for recommendations.

Finally, many of you will have heard of a widely publicized complaint by several of our colleagues about the processes by which nominations for our Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) are handled. Individuals with grievances have circulated materials, the Nominating Committee has reviewed its procedures, the Committee of Eleven is conducting an investigation, and we will report back to you with proposed reforms with hopes to meet a deadline of the end of the semester.

There will be a number of general faculty committees to produce white papers on a number of important topics. These committees will be led by engaged faculty advocates, small and nimble, and will not be ponderous time sinks, as so many committees are, but rather conversation starters. The committee on Career Track Faculty will be chaired by Jennifer Casteix of College of Science. The committee on General Education will be chaired by Mark Stegeman of the Eller College of Management. The committee on Donor Influence will be chaired by David Gibbs of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The Committee on Academic Freedom and the Committee on Budget have yet to be assigned chairs. Please feel free to forward names to me for these chairships and committees.

**6. Reports from the President, Provost, Faculty Officers, APPC, RPC, SAPC, DEI, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UArizona Staff Council, Gen Ed Office with UWGEC (00:31:23)**

- The Provost reported the Faculty Workload tile has gone live and will assist with processes in promotion and annual reviews. This can ensure there is an ongoing record of the agreement between each individual faculty member and their direct workload assignments being split around core categories of work. When dossiers come up for promotion, there is a common and agreed upon understanding with the individual faculty

member and the department head that is recorded and documented, preventing disagreements. If there are any conflicts with one's direct supervisor, it is suggested to go to the Dean for resolution.

- Nominations are being accepted for [Honorary Degrees and Faculty Awards](#). The Faculty Development Communities for Promotion Mentoring Program provides resources for those seeking a promotion.
- The Strategic Priorities Faculty Initiative (SPFI) Program has the goal to ensure highly diverse faculty can have opportunities to be brought into higher ranks through targeted hiring. Thus far, the program has been successful and yielded high retention rates.
- The Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) Faculty Seed Grant has allowed for funding of six projects with a total of one-hundred and forty thousand dollars.
- The Search Committee is looking to fill the position for the Dean of the Graduate College, an opportunity for anyone who has been very active in administering graduate education. This is an internal search therefore, one must login through the firewall before searching for the position.

7. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA - [MS in Innovations in Aging GIDP](#) - Chair of the Graduate Council, Ron Hammer (00:37:33)**

The MS in Innovations in Aging GIDP comes to the Faculty Senate as a seconded motion. **[Motion 2022/23-8]** passed with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, one abstention, and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

8. **DISCUSSION AND ACTION ITEM: [RII Senate Seat Discussion](#) – Secretary Tessa Dysart & Associate Vice President, University Research Institutes, Elliot Cheu (15 minutes) (00:40:05)**

- Secretary Dysart stated the Committee on Faculty Membership has met and agreed that the research faculty meets and exceeds the language of Article VIII, Section 2 for membership in the Senate. RII's membership consists of over forty members of the general faculty, while the two smallest colleges have twenty-eight (College of Applied Science) and eight general faculty members (College of Veterinary Medicine).
  - Historically, this does not require a vote, the library under the Faculty Senate's precedent received their seat without any further action.
  - Secretary Dysart stated if Article VIII of the Bylaws should be changed, it should be delegated to the Bylaws Committee, not APPC, as it is out of APPC's jurisdiction. But, until the provision is changed, the current language entitles research faculty to a seat in the Senate without any further action.
- Associate Vice President, University Research Institutes, Elliot Cheu stated that there is currently no representation in the Faculty Senate for research faculty in RII even though their work is equally valuable in supporting the institution. Dean Cheu stated if another college was created, that faculty would be given voting rights with a later conversation about apportionment. Dean Cheu stated the Common College is not the way to allow units that meet the language in Article VIII, Section 2 to vote. Dean Cheu stated the bylaws are clear—any unit that has more faculty than the smallest college (which is

currently Veterinary Medicine) shall be represented as a college, RII meets those criteria.

- Senator Ziurys stated the purpose of the Faculty Senate is to represent the faculty and they are not opposed to representation from those in RII, they just want to make sure representation is well-balanced across all Faculty. Senator Ziurys also stated currently admitting another member on a smaller unit doesn't seem right and is not the spirit of the Senate, therefore, she supports the Chair of the Faculty's statement to look at this carefully and ensure it is done right.
- Senator Fellous asked how representation would work if there was a case where faculty had a representative in the College of Science and is also a part of RII.
  - Secretary Dysart stated general faculty are only coded to vote in one college and typically that is within one's tenure home. The system does not allow more than one voting home. Questions on this matter are directed to the Committee on Faculty Membership. Secretary Dysart stated the faculty of RII are coded to vote with the Common College, which is also their voting home, although they meet the standard in the Bylaws to receive their own seat and to be moved out of the Common College to their new voting code. There are currently about sixty-six faculty in the common college, the large majority includes RII, Honors College, and others across colleges.
  - Senator Fink said he is interested in hearing the position of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC) Chair, John Milbauer, on the comments made by the Secretary of the Faculty that this matter is not under the purview or consideration of the APPC.
  - APPC Chair, John Milbauer, stated the matter is very much in line with the charge for APPC. The purview includes definition of faculty membership and governance issues. The smallest college is Veterinary Medicine with eight faculty, it is misleading because the number does not include career-track who haven't had three-year appointments since the college is less than three years old. APPC Chair Milbauer stated he is in favor of proportional representation and APPC can discuss these matters in their next meeting. There are numerous ways to change the Constitution and Bylaws through numerous sources listed in governing documents, Article X. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is only one avenue. Proposals to change Bylaws can come from Faculty Senate and from General Faculty depending on the numbers involved. Shared governance needs to be more shared and not limited to territorial arguments about who does what.
- Senator M. Witte stated the Common College has not filled its Faculty Senate seat during the last two General Elections. RII is an administrative unit, and individuals have voting rights based on their faculty status, not because they are in RII specifically. Senator M. Witte stated Dr. Abraham's compassionate plea goes far beyond what he is asking for, a simple change to bylaws and requires mechanisms that Dr. Milbauer pointed out and also generally looking into shared governance. Dean Cheu is a dean and tenured faculty member in the College of Science and will not partake in voting in RII. Senator M. Witte mentioned that in a conversation with Dean Cheu, he stated that



he would like his administrative role to be represented, and she finds this statement concerning. Opening the floodgates to administrative units where people make a vote because of their “administrative role,” rather than their faculty role is a great concern, shared with fellow Senators. There is a desire for faculty to be more represented with a comprehensive look at the entire structure.

- Voting rights based on administrative roles rather than faculty roles appear to be prevalent. Senator Hammer stated these concerns are beyond the scope of what is currently in the Bylaws and the problem that arises with faculty, not administrators, who reside within an administrative unit. This body is the Faculty Senate, not Faculty House who would have an inclusive House of Representatives according to proportion. Disproportionate issues are prevalent, and the Bylaws should be followed until changed.
  - Dean Cheu said, in reference to Senator M. Witte’s statement, it wasn’t his administrative role he wanted represented, but his role was to develop a community for RII by creating a culture of excellence and inclusion. The way faculty is organized in RII is in a very collaborative and shared governance way, Dean Cheu stated he is charged to help with development and does not attend the meetings nor represent himself.
- Senator M. Smith stated it is common practice for other committees to review and make preparatory recommendations in advance of the Constitution and Bylaws committee’s consideration. Senator M. Smith stated her suggestion for making decisions based on the current Constitution and Bylaws until there is an ability to review relevant information and make changes; APPC is a group that would be appropriate to contribute to these reviews.
- Senator Simmons stated it is the Faculty Senate’s duty to represent the faculty according to the Bylaws. The Bylaws clearly state that RII get voting rights.
  - Secretary Dysart referred to the current wording of the Bylaws. The College of Veterinary (Vet Med) has about twenty-three Faculty that are career track that may, at some point, get voting rights as part of the general faculty, but the bulk of Vet Med faculty is not at .5 FTE which doesn’t make them members of the general faculty.
- Senator Bourget said the body that the Faculty Senate has an important role in Academic Affairs, and this aspect needs to be considered with Faculty Senate representation. Senator Bourget stated she was a Senator when the change was made to the Bylaws before the College of Veterinary Medicine (Vet Med) was in existence. Senators’ understanding at the time was that the Common College would encompass those faculty who were not represented in academic colleges. The fact remains that the Faculty Senate Common College has two seats that have not been filled in over two years, negating the need for this conversation.
- Chair Hudson said that the faculty membership in Vet Med is sixty-five, which indicates the footprint of a viable academic college; every member of whom contributes to the challenge of a successful academic program. The number is not seven, instead, it is somewhere in the high fifties, like the College of Pharmacy or sixty-five, like the new College of Veterinary Medicine which is supported by a line item in the State budget. The inherited definition of General Faculty is not only narrow, but also fails to be

inclusive by only recognizing and enfranchising seven of those sixty-five faculty who work in the College of Veterinary Medicine. If increasing the numbers of seats in the Senate is done for smaller units, reasonable apportionment should be assessed for the large traditional colleges.

- If enfranchisement with RII faculty were in crisis and colleagues did not have the opportunity to vote or run for its Faculty Senate seat, a Special Election would be held, but there is no urgency at this time.
- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-9]** that “the Academic Personnel Policy Committee consider the matter of representation for academic support units based on the 2017 bylaws and recommend action to the Faculty Senate after a holistic discussion by January 2023.”
  - Secretary Dysart raised a point of order to **[Motion 2022/23-9]** for being contrary to bylaws and exceeding the jurisdiction of APPC. In addition, Secretary Dysart raised a point of order that the Senate has no power to vote on RII receiving a Faculty Senate seat since RII meets the clear language of the bylaws. Vice Chair Hymel requested assistance from the Parliamentarian who deemed Chair Hudson’s motion in order. **[Motion 2022/23-9]** was seconded. Motion passed with twenty in favor, eighteen opposed, and seven abstentions.
  - Senator M. Witte moved **[Motion 2022/23-10]** to end discussion on **[Motion 2022/23-9]**. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/23-10]** passed with forty-one in favor, four opposed, and two abstentions and is detailed at the end of these minutes.
  - Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-11]** for a [roll call vote](#). Motion was approved. **[Motion 2022/23-9]** is detailed at the end of these minutes. **[Motion 2022/23-11]** is detailed below.
    - Addis – No response, Alfie – No, Behrangi – No response, Bolger – No response, Bourget – Yes, Brummund – No response, Cai – Yes, Casey- No response, Citera – No, Cooley – No, Cui – Ex-officio, Dial – Absent, Domin – No, Downing – Absent, Duran – No, Dysart – No, Fellous – Yes, Fink – Yes, Folks – Abstain, Gerald – Absent, Gordon – Absent, Goyal – Absent, Guzman – Yes, Hammer – No, Harris – No, Hudson – Yes, Hymel – Yes, Ijagbemi – No response, Irizarry – Abstain, Jones – Abstain, Knox – No, Lamb – No response, Leafgren – No, B. Lee – No response, J. Lee – Yes, Little – Yes, Lucas – Absent, Neumann – No, O’Leary – Yes, Ottusch – Absent, Pace – No, Pau – Absent, Robles – No response, Rocha – No, Ruggill – Abstain, Russell – Yes, Schulz – Absent, Senseney – Yes, Simmons – No, Slepian – Abstain, M. Smith – Yes, J. Smith – No, Spece – Yes, Stegeman – Yes, Stephan – No, Stone – Yes, Su – Abstain, Tropman – No, Vedantam – Absent, Williams – Abstain, M. Witte – Yes, R. Witte – Yes, Wittman – Absent, Zeiders – Yes, Zenenga – Absent, Ziurys - Yes

- Senator M. Witte moved [**Motion 2022/23-12**] to move agenda item E (UHAP Updates on Section Five – Chair of the Committee of Eleven, Wolfgang Fink) before agenda item B (Child Care Center – Vice President for University Initiatives, Celina Ramirez, and Secretary of the Faculty, Tessa Dysart). Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with thirty-one in favor, none opposed, and none abstained. [**Motion 2022/23-12**] is detailed at the end of these minutes.

**9. DISCUSSION ITEM: UHAP Updates on Section Five - Chair of the Committee of Eleven, Wolfgang Fink (01:37:01)**

- The Committee of Eleven initiates, promotes, and simulates study and action looking for solutions to situations and issues that affect the faculty and the University. The Committee makes reports to the General Faculty on Faculty. Over three years ago, responding to concerns of the Committee of Eleven has proposed changes to UHAP 5.2, which regulates the annual review of administrators including deans and department heads. Over three years ago, responding to concerns brought by the General Faculty regarding the lack of annual review for compliance and accountability for administrators, including deans and department heads, the Committee of Eleven examined and considered provisions to the governing document for annual reviews of administrators, UHAP 5.2.
- The committee produced a set of changes/revisions to UHAP 5.2 that were subsequently presented to the Senate and Dean’s Council. With the onset of the COVID-19 Pandemic, the plan for UHAP 5.2 was put on hold and revisited in academic year 2021-2022. The committee finalized suggested changes and presented this to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Dr. Andrea Romero.
- This item is being brought to discussion with the intent of presenting this in the November Senate meeting. Main items of proposed changes deal with the possibility of dismissal, the make-up of review committees, the review assessments to be made public, review committee or its subcommittee will prepare a non-confidential executive summary of the review to be shared with the faculty and staff, propositions to the comprehensive evaluation criteria, and a proposal for an annual report to presented to the Faculty Senate, listing the reviews performed each academic year.
- Senators were asked for discussion and feedback before the November Faculty Senate meeting to allow for votes in the next meeting.
- Regarding the annual performance review, Senator Bourget asked about the privacy and confidentiality aspect regarding HR standards and stated annual reviews may be excessive in the second and third years.
  - Senator Fink stated a non-confidential Executive Summary will be made public and doesn’t include all details.
- Senator Ziurys stated the approval of the UHAP 5.2 changes is a step in the right direction and the annual review being less comprehensive and more focused which gives a different perspective from reviews by administrative superior officers. Senator Leafgren stated the annual reviews may be difficult while also carrying out normal job duties due to the review being extensive.

- Senator Fink stated annual reviews are already policy, Committee of Eleven wants to ensure they get enforced.
- Senator Bourget stated that there is already provision for Faculty and Staff to give input into the annual reviews of administrators, but an issue is, it isn't done in every college. If current standards are implemented, it can be a step in the right direction.
- Senator Simmons stated the issue is that at Department Head level, the proposed changes make it 100% elected faculty when it used to be a majority of elected faculty, removing the opportunity for staff to formally be a part of the process.
  - Senator Fink stated in the proposed changes, there is no exclusion of staff, it includes the certainty that staff will be consulted but it is the faculty that will drive the ultimate review. Two to three years is an extended period where there is an ability to negatively affect the rating and ranking of a department to make it irreparable. It is important to continuously evaluate performance. The infrastructure is not being changed, the way of constituting existing committees is what is being changed, rather than being appointed, members will be elected.
- Senator Harris stated her agreement with the annual review criteria and stated with increased responsibility there should be increased transparency.
- The Provost stated her suggestion for presenting a summary of current processes to the Faculty Senate.
- Senator O'Leary asked if the issue is that the UHAP policy for annual reviews is not being carried out by every college or unit.
  - The Provost stated she is unsure if there is data on that.
- Senator M. Witte stated there is every possible permutation in conversation and there is a need for a clear and transparent process to be done by an administrator where staff and student input is allowed.

**10. INFORMATION ITEM: CHILD CARE CENTER - Vice President for University Initiatives, Celina Ramirez (01:55:22)**

- Vice President, University Initiatives, Celina Ramirez reported on efforts to create a childcare center to serve campus.
- There are three times as many children as childhood slots and five times as many children as high-quality slots.
- Priorities for the Childcare Center include affordability, proximity, faculty research, and student learning opportunities.
- The working group for this development includes an array of faculty. Data is currently being reviewed from a campus-wide survey, recommendations such as tuition, size, cost to the University, modeled services, etc. will be provided to the Senior Leadership Team.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

**Tessa Dysart, Secretary of the Faculty**

## Recording Secretary, Jasmin Espino

### **Motions of October 3, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2022/23-6]** Motion to postpone the approval of the September 12, 2022 minutes until the November Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed with thirty-seven in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

**[Motion 2022/23-7]** Motion to approve the Faculty Senate agenda with the friendly amendment to table old business item number 7F on SunTran until the November Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-one people in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

**[Motion 2022/23-7A]** Motion to make a friendly amendment to move old business item number 7F (Sun Tran Resolution by ASUA – ASUA President, Patrick Robles, and Co-chairs of SAPC, Diane Ohana and Cheryl Casey) to the next month’s agenda.

**[Motion 2022/23-8]** Consent agenda for MS in Innovations in Aging GIDP which comes as a seconded motion. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained.

**[Motion 2022/23-9]** Motion that the Committee on Academic Personnel Policy consider the matter of representation for academic support units based on the two thousand and seventeen bylaws and recommend action to the senate after a holistic discussion by January, two thousand twenty-three. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with twenty in favor, eighteen opposed, and seven abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-10]** Motion to end discussion. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-one in favor, four opposed, and two abstained.

**[Motion 2022/23-11]** Motion for a roll call vote. Motion passed with more than the required seven votes.

**[Motion 2022/23-12]** to move agenda item E before agenda item B. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with thirty-one in favor, none opposed, and none abstained.

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456

### **Attachments within the Minutes**

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: [Approval of the Minutes of September 12, 2022](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 3: [Approval of the Faculty Senate Agenda for October 3, 2022](#)
3. Page 7, Item 6: [Honorary Degrees and Faculty Awards](#)
4. Page 7, Item 7: [Consent Agenda – MS in Innovations in Aging GIDP](#)

5. Page 8, Item 8: [Discussion and Action Item: RII Senate Seat Discussion](#)
6. Page 12, Item 9: [Discussion Item: UHAP Updates on Section Five](#)