

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MAY 2, 2022**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

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

Visit the faculty governance webpage at:

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Melanie Hingle, called the final Faculty Senate meeting of the semester to order at 3:04 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle welcomed all Faculty Senators, guests, and Observers. Hingle instructed all Panelists and invited guests to remain muted and to raise their Zoom hand to speak.

Present: Senators Addis, Alfie, Behrangi, Bolger, Bourget, Brewer, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Diroberto, Downing, Durán, Fink, Folks, Gephart, Gerald, Gordon, Hammer, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Ijagbemi, Jones, Kline, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Lucas, McDonald, Milbauer, Murphy, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Robbins, Rodrigues, Rosenblatt, Russell, Schulz, Sen, Simmons, J. Smith, S. Smith, Stone, Su, Summers, Vedantam, Witte, R. Witte, and Ziurys. M. Stegeman served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Devereaux, Dial, Domin, Goyal, Haskins, Knox, Reimann, Slepian, Valerdi, Vega, and Zenenga.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE AGENDA FOR MAY 2, 2022

Hammer moved [**Motion 2021/22-51**] to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. The agenda was approved as presented.

3. ACTION ITEM: SENATE ELECTIONS FOR UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT, COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD, SHARED GOVERNANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE, GRIEVANCE CLEARINGHOUSE COMMITTEE, SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (VOTES WILL BE UTILIZED THROUGH QUALTRICS SURVEY DURING THE MEETING)

Hingle instructed Faculty Senators to vote during the meeting, and results of the election would be shared at the end of the meeting. Secretary Brewer announced the results at that time:

Committee on Conciliation

*Diaz, Duarte (26)
*Zwinger, Lynda (25)
*Classen, Albrecht (24)
Romero, Elaine (21)
Abraham, Matthew (16)

Committee on Ethics and Commitment

*Lanza, Fabio (36)
*Taylor-Piliae, Ruth (34)

Grievance Clearinghouse Committee

*Dial, Sharon (38)

University Hearing Board

*Chertudi, Mikel Andres (31)
*Hoch, Kristie (30)
*Werchan, Henry (26)
*Jolie, Ruth Burgett (25)
Jolie, Edward A. (19)

Senate Executive Committee

*Simmons, Caleb (30)
*Ziurys, Lucy (24)

Shared Governance Review Committee

*Downing, Ted (21)
*Simmons, Caleb (21)
A coin toss will be scheduled to break the tie.

**Elected*

4. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 4, 2022

Hingle moved [**Motion 2021/22-52**] to approve the minutes of April 4, 2022. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2021/22-52**] passed with one abstention, and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

5. OPEN SESSION: STATEMENTS AT THE PODIUM ON ANY TOPIC, LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES – MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPEAKERS IS FOUR. NO DISCUSSION IS PERMITTED, AND NO VOTES WILL BE TAKEN.

Senator Hudson thanked Faculty Center staff Jane Cherry, Sabrina Smith, and Nicholas Rivas for all their hard work and support of shared governance this year. Hudson thanked all outgoing Faculty Senators and outgoing Faculty Officers Jessica Summers, Melanie Hingle and Michael Brewer for their work. Hudson also thanked Parliamentarian Mark Stegeman, adding that she and Hymel have asked Stegeman to stay on as Parliamentarian while he transitions to a College Representative Faculty Senator role. Roberts Rules does not prohibit such an arrangement, and Stegeman has come up with a protocol for how his dual role will be handled and will share the plan with the new Faculty Senate.

Senator Ziurys thanked the outgoing Faculty Officers and Faculty Senators. Ziurys pointed out an ever-increasing concern among the faculty and Regents Professors of the ever-increasing bureaucratic burdens that have been placed upon the faculty by administration for a series of training courses and conflict of interest forms. A conflict of interest form will be necessary for peer review, to assign a paper, or submit grant proposal. This sort of bureaucratic process detracts from the obvious mission of the faculty; teaching, research, and other scholarly activities, is an immense waste of time, and is degrading the faculty into a role of kindergarten students who have to constantly be busied with meaningless tasks. The future Faculty Senate should discuss bureaucratic burdens placed on faculty. Thank you.

Senator Witte said the University of Arizona's mantra is *Wonder Makes Us*, but how do we actually encourage and display that wonder across campus? Our Questionarium Project goes to the heart of that curiosity connectivity. As a spin off of the NIH funded curriculum Witte's medical and other ignorance, which focuses on encouraging and sharing questions among diverse, multi-level student researchers and faculty mentors. Witte would like to spread question gathering cross campus to stimulate and eventually match faculty and student questioners in a type of mating game or speed dating style. In a 2013 Ted-X Bloomington Talk, Witte described the questionarium as a key space in the Envision Ignorance University dedicated to all we have yet to learn and discover. We have used the questionarium platform as a mixer, a collaboration tool, a research and action agenda developer for entrepreneurs at the Karolinska Institute for burka-clad high school teachers in Kuala Lumpur, for the helicopter pilots transporting distress neonates across the Italian Riviera, the Chorale Music Society, and next July, at the Cokethorpe Prep School commencement celebration in Oxfordshire, UK. Witte asks each Faculty Senator, as she did with Committee of Eleven and College of Medicine Dean's Research Committee members before, to submit in the Chat or email her at lymph@u.arizona.edu, a favorite, most important question you are currently working on in your discipline. A simple sentence, no discussion, ending with a question mark. For example, Einstein's would be, "What time is it, really?" Nobelist Joshua Lederberg submitted his questions to our questioning summer high school students, "Are bacteria really cells?" A foundational question for molecular biology and the human genome project. Witte's own lifetime questioning clock includes what stimulates and what inhibits lymphatic vessels' growth, and overarching, her question is how do we nurture curiosity in ourselves and in our students. Please take the remaining time to enter in the Chat or email your own wonder just so that we can share and build in the future. Thank you.

Professor David Gibbs from the Department of History spoke to the University of Arizona Center for Philosophy of Freedom and its offshoot the Department of Political Economy and Moral Sciences (PEMS). Gibbs has spoken multiple times on the issue specifically of his concerns that the donors who have helped to create these institutes and lavishly funded them, have been influencing the hiring of faculty in an ideological direction. Gibbs prefaced that he has nothing against Libertarian ideology and shares some of it himself, the issue is inappropriate, ethically questionable influence. New documents have been released under the Arizona Open Records Act, which contain very dramatic and unambiguous evidence/proof, of direct donor influence on hiring in ways that are clearly incorrect. Gibbs reads a 2009 email from Freedom Center Director, David Schmitz, to a University administrator, "Jim Pearson from the Thomas W. Smith Foundation confirms that I've run McKenna's name by him by phone, which explains why I have no record." Evidently, Schmitz didn't want to keep a record of the approval with the donor. McKenna was hired at that time, but the Smith Foundation checked the name before authorizing its funds for the faculty salary, These actions define donor approval and donor influence. There is no reason to think that donors know anything about philosophy or have credentials in this area, and clearly goes against the basic standards of how the process is supposed to work. Donors are not supposed to influence hiring decisions in any manner. In addition, there are multiple statements by University administrators over a period of years that flat out deny this process occurs. In 2011, the *Tucson Weekly* quoted a high-level administrator, "I've looked into this and can report there has been no donor influence over the hires we've made at the Freedom Center." In 2019, an external review of the Freedom Center essentially repeated this claim, which is factually incorrect, and raises a number of issues. First is the inappropriate donor influence and violation of basic academic standards of how hiring is supposed to work and how donations are supposed to be used. Secondly, if factually incorrect statements are made before both faculty and the Arizona public, we should not forget that this is a State University and have obligation to the public. As a faculty member with thirty-two years' experience at the University of Arizona, Gibbs is generally unhappy with the state of affairs, and thinks all should be unhappy as well. These issues raise basic questions as to how the Freedom Center and its offshoot PEMS has been run, and whether or not the administration is able to administer it correctly. Gibbs proposes that as soon as possible, the Faculty Senate appoint an independent committee of faculty to do a proper evaluation of donor influence and to make recommendations to correct this problem. Thank you.

6. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – PROPOSAL DOCTOR OF PHYSICAL THERAPY; PROPOSAL MASTER OF PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT PRACTICE – CHAIR OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL, RON HAMMER**

Both proposals come to Faculty Senate as seconded motions from Graduate Council. [Motion 2021/22-53] Proposal Doctor of Physical Therapy and [Motion 2021/22-54] Proposal Master of Physician Assistant Practice carried and are detailed at the end of these minutes.

7. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – BS IN NUTRITION AND HUMAN PERFORMANCE – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, MOLLY BOLGER**

The proposal comes to Faculty Senate as a seconded motion from Undergraduate Council. [Motion 2021/22-55] carried and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

8. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA: NAME CHANGE NORTON SCHOOL OF HUMAN ECOLOGY – DIRECTOR, CURRICULAR AFFAIRS, LIZ SANDOVAL**

[Motion 2021/22-56] comes as a seconded motion from Curricular Affairs. [Motion 2021/22-56] carried and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

9. **REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, APPC, RPC, SAPC, DEI, GRADUATE COUNCIL, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UARIZONA STAFF COUNCIL**

Hudson asked Folks for details about the medical program with Western Australia University mentioned at the last ABOR meeting. Folks said there is a discussion underway to offer a dual medical degree between the University of Western Australia and the University of Arizona. Folks clarified that a dual degree process would not ordinarily be under ABOR's purview, but was routed that way due to the tuition and fees component.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM: UPDATE ON THE CAREER-TRACK AD HOC SENATE COMMITTEE – CO-CHAIRS BILL NEUMANN AND KASI KIELBAUGH**

Neumann gave an overview of the history of the *ad hoc* committee, which was established in 2013. At the time, the Non-Tenure Track Task Force as it was called, undertook twenty-three different issues associated with contracts, reviews, promotions, career advancement, and how this population engages with the University and shared governance. Neumann thanked the Provost and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for helping move many of the initiatives forward. In terms of shared governance, over 1,200 Non-tenure eligible faculty were originally represented by one APAC representative in Faculty Senate, have now joined the General Faculty. The committee worked diligently to bring Career-track faculty as a broad designation for Non-tenure eligible faculty in the ranks of Instructor, Lecturer, and three Professorial titles of clinical research and Professor of Practice. Previously, only faculty with multi-year contracts were eligible to vote. A change to the Faculty Constitution now allows Career-track faculty voting eligibility based on three out of four years of service, expanding enfranchisement to Career-track faculty over the past ten years. Over 100 unique titles were condensed into three tracks for Instructor, Lecturer, and Professorial titles. More consistent criteria for promotion within units for Lecturer, Instructors, and Professorial tracks as they move from the unit to the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs office. A number of faculty had "adjunct" or "visiting" modifiers added to their titles, which was limiting their rights in terms of annual reviews and promotions. This group of faculty were full-time, permanent employees, and with the help of senior leadership support, have been moved into other titles so they can benefit from the rights and protections that give them the ability to move forward. In conjunction with Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University, ABOR changed the policy where the number of multi-year contracts for Career-track faculty was raised from 15% to 30%, allowing for institutional flexibility and managing in-house advancement for this particular group of faculty. Multi-year contracts at UArizona fall in the 4% range. Equity and opportunity advances led to a review of salaries and workload that resulted in raises for many of the lowest paid Career-track faculty on campus and supported efforts leading to the Provost's campus-wide Career-track salary equity study. Senator Brewer started efforts with the *ad hoc* committee in 2013, and many thanks go to Amy Fountain, Mika Galilee-Belfer, and Kasi Kiehlbaugh for their continued efforts and expertise. An annual report will be forthcoming. McDonald was contacted by a colleague who asked about the inequity for Career-track faculty not being able to appeal a negative promotion decision and asked for elaboration. Neumann said that this particular issue was not brought to the committee's attention, but would defer to the Provost or Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs for follow up. M. Witte applauded the efforts made for Career-track faculty, but no efforts have been made for Tenure-track and Tenured faculty. Witte asked for the number of Career-track faculty that have been enfranchised in comparison to the number of Tenure-track faculty. Neumann didn't have the exact number but said it may be in the 700-800 range. Folks provided the numbers in Chat: ~1,100 Career-track/~1,530 Tenure-track faculty, and Brewer added that the number denotes General Faculty. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs posted links in Chat directing Faculty Senators to the requested information on the Faculty Affairs website. Hudson asked why only 4% of faculty have multi-year contracts. Neumann confirmed and said the reason is delegated to the units to determine

contracts. Ziurys stated that the posted report reflects that hiring of Tenure-track faculty decreased to 11% of all faculty hiring in 2021.

11. ACTION ITEM: DOCUMENTS DESCRIBING IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR SHARED GOVERNANCE, FACULTY AND ADMINISTRATORS – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MELANIE HINGLE

Hingle moved **[Motion 2021/22-57]** that Faculty Senate approves the presented documents describing shared governance agreements to become our Guiding Principles and Implementation Plan replacing the existing 2005 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Motion was seconded. Downing moved **[Motion 2021/22-58]** to amend **[Motion 2021/22-57]** for the Faculty Senate to compliment the Shared Governance Review Committee for its ongoing work to draft a proposed faculty-administration agreement or MOU, and the MOU agreement be referred back to the committee to identify successful shared governance agreements and other institutions of higher education, including but not limited to the following sections: 1) a definition section, 2) a linkage of the agreement to the current University policy architecture, 3) operational statements on academic freedom, 4) intellectual property rights, 5) conflict resolution, 6) adjunct faculty role retention, 7) faculty work assignments, 8) notification of vacancy processes for evaluations, 9) recall of administrators, and, 10) election processes. A revision of the outline components can be presented to the faculty for discussion by January 2023. Hingle explained that many of the proposed amendments Downing has identified are already in policy, the Shared Governance Review Committee agreed to minimize details in the documents themselves, thereby streamlining verbiage. The policies are referenced in the documents. Downing rebutted that the reason for the motion is that the way the policy architecture exists, when looking at the MOU, it's imprecise as to how the MOU fits within the overall structure of policy at the University, beginning with UHAP. Downing looked at other Universities to see how they organize their agreements between the faculty and administration to prevent conflicts and disputes. The faculty need an unambiguous idea of what the agreement is applying. The document is a good beginning but hasn't reached the standard you would expect from an agreement at a major University. Hingle said the intention was not to have static documents that didn't address the issues raised, but more to first have principles in place that can be continuously worked on. M. Witte said parliamentary procedure should be followed instead of back and forth conversation. Witte moved **[Motion 2021/22-59]** to table the document until September for further discussion. Ziurys seconded. Hammer agreed with Downing that the document is a good start, but feels having an agreement in place is needed. Ziurys said the document is flawed without a definition of shared governance, among other things, and is not ready to be voted on. Simmons feels the newer document is more relevant to upholding standards than the previous document, and urges to have something in place today for the revision process to continue. Hurh asked hypothetically if faculty governance was achieved in the UAGC decision, would the new MOU have constrained the administration to take another step to involve faculty before decisions were made. Downing reiterated that a well thought out document was achieved at Arizona State University and has been in existence for over twenty years. Hudson, who worked on the document as part of the Shared Governance Review Committee and will eventually have to sign the document, received complaints from her constituents in her college, but agrees with Downing to send it back to the committee with specific instructions rather than tabling it. Simmons agreed. Witte withdrew **[Motion 2021/22-59]** and supports Downing's motion. Ziurys seconded. Downing clarified that his motion states the word "including," and that the committee itself may instruct the Faculty Senate or any other entity to add to the document. **[Motion 2021/22-58]** failed. **[Motion 2021/22-57]** passed, and both are detailed at the end of these minutes.

12. INFORMATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: UAGC UPDATE AND UAGC FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION – PRESIDENT ROBERT ROBBINS, VICE PROVOST, GAIL BURD, AND PROVOST LIESL FOLKS

Robbins opened by explaining that UAGC was notified of temporarily losing its veteran's funding for its eligible students, a decision that was reversed retroactively a week ago so it could continue its veteran's funding from the Veteran's Administration for its eligible students. Zovio filed its 10K, and Senior Vice Provost Burd and others are working on issues with accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) and WASC. If UAGC were to come into UArizona, what would be the most beneficial model. Burd added that UAGC is student-centered, and a non-profit, private institution established in Arizona, working with KPI's and shared governance agreements with their OPM to provide those services. Services are controlled by the agreement. Zovio, who is providing the OPM services has accommodated and changed many of its top personnel, notably the past chair and several serving under him. Additionally, some of the practices that happened prior to 2017 that were noted in the California Attorney General case have been rectified in the sense that UAGC is requiring different practices on the part of the OPM with regard to accepting students. Students must complete their Free Application for Federal Student Aid prior to admittance. Students who have never taken college credit courses are put into a program that helps them learn how to succeed. The Board is looking at how the OPM is functioning and a good relationship has been established in order to make sure that the needed services provided. The UAGC student population is a different population from the UArizona student population. UArizona's students typically are eighteen-year-olds, and UAGC is supporting adults who may have families and are working. This type of student typically takes one course at a time. Burd said she has undertaken a true understanding of the leadership and practices at UAGC as she has helped them to develop the agreement. UAGC is committed to working hard to develop practices that are in concert with UArizona's principles and values and Burd fully supports UAGC's integration

into UArizona. Robbins added that there are 36M people in this country with some college credits and no degree, which represents the student population of UAGC. UAGC is working to identify through data analytics the students who are most likely to fail who have twelve to fifteen hours of college credits coming into the institution. Hudson asked Burd when presenting an optimistic picture of UAGC, if she is speaking as a Board member with fiduciary duties to UAGC or speaking as Senior Vice Provost of UArizona with fiduciary duties to UArizona. Burd responded her support is first and foremost to UArizona always and secondly is serving on the Board of UAGC. All UAGC Board members are working in one direction, and that is to support UAGC coming into UArizona. One group is working together to make a very strong movement of UAGC into UArizona. Not every student is able to come to UArizona and succeed, and having another type of program available is beneficial to many students. Hudson asked when faculty will exercise shared governance at UArizona over the singular entity, since there has been none as required by law. Burd responded that the Vice Chair of the Faculty is serving on the Steering Committee, as well as a faculty member from UAGC. The Steering Committee is working with both entities and a recommendation will be announced. No shared governance can take place until the legal and fiduciary work is complete to garner a recommendation. Hudson stated that shared governance is procured through its elected representatives, and appointing faculty member to a Task Force is explicitly bypassing shared governance. Downing asked Robbins as President and administrator of one of the largest state Universities, does the 36M students without degrees take priority over UArizona and the Arizona system itself. Robbins responded his priority is people in the Arizona system, but conveyed that the hypothetical choice is not an "either/or." Robbins serves the people in the system, yes, but that doesn't preclude offering what UArizona can provide in terms of educational offerings to another type of student. Ziurys asked Burd if D2L was going to be revised with another system. Burd responded that it was speculation, but an RFP is underway to look at what is available and is in no way connected to UAGC. M. Smith explained to Burd that information and statistics have been requested pertaining to applied curricula leading to employment in specific disciplines and none has been provided. Hurh asked how resources are flowing between both entities and if there has been any shift of resources, and if so, what amount. Robbins responded that there was a \$20M payment from UAGC to UArizona for a signed services agreement, and Burd added that the funds were for using UArizona's marks and brand. Ziurys requested Hudson to clarify shared governance in this transaction. Hudson said that Helm mentioned that SPBAC was involved in making recommendations in 2020. The Faculty Senate was surprised at the initial agreement, and learned after the fact that Non-disclosure agreements (NDA) were signed by those involved in making recommendations. Questions remain whether SPBAC made forthcoming recommendations under the NDA's because hypotheticals instead of actual information about the companies was given. A Task Force that is hand-selected may be perfectly acceptable, but is not shared governance, and should be comprised of faculty who are committed to constituents. Hudson moved **[Motion 2021/22-60]** *"We, the Faculty Senate at the University of Arizona, herewith disagree with the past and ongoing integration efforts of UAGC as an operating branch of the University of Arizona, disavow the consequences which harm the University of Arizona's academic mission, operations, reputation, and financial health, call for the discharge of student loan debt incurred by students at UAGC, and strongly urge an orderly unwinding consistent with Arizona statute, of the UAGC affiliation with the purpose of divorcing the University of Arizona and the University of Arizona Foundation entirely from UAGC and Zovio."* Downing seconded the motion. Simmons asked Summers for clarification on her comment in Chat, *"If shared governance is to be engaged, Senate should appoint an ad hoc committee to work with the steering committee in order to maintain transparency and communication in the UAGC plan development. Hudson's motion essentially shuts down information access by condemning the process before it even begins"* Summers replied that Faculty Senate's concern for having a process of shared governance being gauged in the development of plans is absolutely well-founded and rooted in the traditions of shared governance, but believes that before the process gets started, this motion essentially shuts down access to those processes. A Faculty Senate *ad hoc* Committee should be formed to work with the Steering Committee. Simmons feels there are a lot of distressed emotions tied to the Resolution with the way things have unfolded, and urges senior leadership to continue to engage with Faculty Senate on this issue of integration. Simmons cannot agree or disagree with ongoing integration efforts because he feels that he, as well as many others, know very little about how this is going to work. Coming from a similar background as the UAGC students, abandoning them at this point is not an option, and more information is required to make a fully informed decision. Burd responded that Hingle has provided a list of elected faculty and Faculty Senate representatives to sit on the six ad hoc committees to figure out the academics, institutional structure, student success, oversight and compliance, risk management, and continuous improvement, which is where the faculty are needed to make decisions on how to bring in UAGC as an independent/isolated entity currently and work to see what kinds of relationships and work UArizona would do to increase communication and efficiencies for the aforementioned six areas. McDonald said he needed a better understanding of the consequences and would like clarification on one point of argument. If this Resolution were to pass, and the University separated its relationship with the entities, what is the financial liability consequence to the University. Robbins responded that the University has no relationship with Zovio. If this motion passes, then it will put the University at risk because a TPPPA with the Department of Education. UArizona would be at financial risk for students and teaching them out because, essentially, we are taking responsibility for the students. Robbins estimates the liability would be in excess of \$100M. M. Witte stated that she agrees only partially with Hudson's Resolution for a variety of reasons, and agrees with Simmons on the unknowns. Possibly further discussion can take place at a future meeting. Chair of APPC Dysart said that Summers and Hingle have the power to appoint committees in their elected roles. There may be long-standing legal implications with Hudson's motion because Faculty Senators have not had

enough time to digest its implications. Dysart moved to table the motion in order for the incoming Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty to constitute a committee to look at the legal implications over the summer with the new Faculty Senate and leadership to address concerns in the fall. Hudson called for Point of Order and asked Presiding Officer Hingle if Dysart is a Faculty Senator. Dysart replied that she is not a Faculty Senator, and she retracted her statement and motion because only Faculty Senators have permission to conduct business in Faculty Senate. Hudson amended the Resolution per M. Witte's suggestion to read, "*We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona herewith disagree with the past and ongoing integration efforts of UAGC as an operating branch of the University of Arizona, disavow the consequences which harm the University of Arizona's academic mission, operations, reputation and financial health and call for a full risk assessment of a full unwinding of the deal by September 2022.*" Ziurys said that UArizona has a contract with Zovio until June 30, 2036. Zovio's predatory practices on students alluded to the Senate *ad hoc* Committee calling the organization an absolute scam. Deceptive advertising, predatory recruiting, high prices, weak educational offerings, two lawsuits it lost, is UAGC's history. Simmons supports charging an *ad hoc* committee. Robbins clarified that UArizona does not have a contract with Zovio – never has, never will. The California Attorney General's case was against Zovio, not UAGC, not the University of Arizona. Since 2017, no evidence was ever found of ongoing malicious practices that Ziurys mentions, therefore, that information is erroneous. Milbauer reminded the body that the Faculty Senate had a Global Campus Senate Advisory Committee (GCSAC) that issued a report in December 2020 that he provided in Chat. Before another *ad hoc* committee is tasked, please read the report. McDonald moved **[Motion 2021/22-61]** to table the Resolution until September based on work being done in real time, new incoming Senators, to obtain more information, and confer with constituents' opinions. Summers seconded the motion. Fink asked how one tables something in full motion when September will be too late to obtain information, form an opinion, nor appoint a committee. Simmons pointed out the Resolution stops nothing from moving forward and is ineffective. Hudson said after two years, requested information has been ignored. The *ad hoc* committee's work was ignored, and it would have prevented the liability we are currently experiencing. Information is obtained from people with conflicts of interest and no outside source of information. Summers called the question. Hingle stated that the vote is for tabling the Resolution. Parliamentarian Stegeman reminded Hingle that cutting off discussion is not advisable. Downing feels tabling has a consequence, and in this case it's a lump in someone's throat for up to \$100M for damages. A statement from Faculty Senate as to how it feels being ignored multiple times is important and feels tabling will do more damage. Hingle reminded the body that the motion to table was on the floor. M. Witte is against tabling because Faculty Senate is expressing its moral indignation and scolding indicates that the people who made the decision that the process was wrong and we disagree with the decision. Ottusch said he agreed with the first version of the Resolution absent the full risk assessment addition because it's important to voice our disagreement with what has transpired. Burd's work is appreciated on UAGC, but it's also fair to say that Faculty Senators disagree with the acquisition. The risk assessment would be a good thing to address in the fall. A symbolic vote on how Faculty Senators feel versus working on something specific should be separated. **[Motion 2021/22-61]** to table until September failed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Hudson clarified the amended **[Motion 2021/22-60]**, "*We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona herewith disagree with the past and ongoing integration efforts of UAGC as an operating branch of the University of Arizona, disavow the consequences which harm the University of Arizona's academic mission, operations, reputation, and financial health and call for a full risk assessment of a full unwinding of the deal by September 2022.*" Motion passed 19:15, with six abstentions, and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

Hingle thanked outgoing Faculty Senators Brewer, Devereux, Diroberto, Gephart, Haskins, Helm, Hingle, Hurh, Jones, Kline, Lee, McDonald, Milbauer, Murphy, Rafelski, Reimann, Rosenblatt, Sen, Summers, Valerdi, and Vega.

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Michael Brewer, Secretary of the Faculty
Jane Cherry, Recording Secretary

Appendix*

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

1. **Faculty Senate Minutes April 4, 2022**
2. **Proposal for Doctor of Physical Therapy**
3. **Proposal Master of Physician Assistant Practice**
4. **BS in Nutrition and Human Performance**
5. **Name Change Norton School of Human Ecology**
6. **Report from the President**
7. **Report from APPC**
8. **Report from SAPC**

9. Report from SPBAC
10. Report from UArizona Staff Council
11. Report from the Gen Ed Office with UWGEC
12. Civic Learning Addendum
13. Implementation Plan
14. Guiding Principles
15. UAGC Resolution proposed by Leila Hudson

Motions of May 2, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2021/22-51] to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-52] to approve the minutes of April 4, 2022. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-53] Seconded motion from Graduate Council Proposal Doctor of Physical Therapy. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-54] Seconded motion from Graduate Council Proposal Master of Physician Assistant Practice. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-55] Seconded Motion from Undergraduate Council BS in Nutrition and Human Performance. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-56] Seconded motion from Curricular Affairs Name Change Norton School of Human Ecology. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-57] Motion to approve the Implementation Plan and Guiding Principles for Shared Governance. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-58] Motion to amend the **[Motion 2021/22-57]** for the Faculty Senate to compliment the Shared Governance Review Committee for its ongoing work to draft a proposed faculty-administration agreement or MOU, and the MOU agreement be referred back to the committee to identify successful shared governance agreements and other institutions of higher education, including but not limited to the following sections: 1) a definition section, 2) a linkage of the agreement to the current University policy architecture, 3) operational statements on academic freedom, 4) intellectual property rights, 5) conflict resolution, 6) adjunct faculty role retention, 7) faculty work assignments, 8) notification of vacancy processes for evaluations, 9) recall of administrators, and, 10) election processes. from Undergraduate Council Change of Schedule Policy Revision. Motion was seconded. Motion failed.

[Motion 2021/22-59] Motion to table the document until September for further discussion. Motion was seconded. Motion was withdrawn.

[Motion 2021/22-60] Faculty Senate Resolution *"We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona herewith disagree with the past and ongoing integration efforts of UAGC as an operating branch of the University of Arizona, disavow the consequences which harm the University of Arizona's academic mission, operations, reputation, and financial health and call for a full risk assessment of a full unwinding of the deal by September 2022."* Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-61] Motion to table the Resolution until September based on work being done in real time, new incoming Senators, to obtain more information, and confer with constituents' opinions. Motion was seconded. Motion failed.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456