

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
JANUARY 23, 2023**

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/>

The recording of this meeting may be accessed electronically at:

<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=daa0a714-c810-41d6-98e5-af94001a8c4b>

1. CALL TO ORDER

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the January 23, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting of the semester to order at 3:03 PM in Law 160 and via Zoom. Secretary Tessa Dysart and Parliamentarian Stegman were present.

Present: Senators Alfie, Behrangi, Bourget, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Hui, Dial, Downing, Duran, Dysart, Fellous, Fink, Folks, Gordon, Guzman, Hammer, Harris, Hudson, Hymel, Ijagbemi, Irizarry, Jones, Knox, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Lucas, Neumann, O’Leary, Ottusch, Pace, Pau, Robbins, Rocha, Ruggill, Russell, Schulz, Senseney, Simmons, Slepian, M. Smith, J. Smith, Space, Stegeman, Stone, Su, Tropman, Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders, Zenenga, Ziurys

Absent: Senators Addis, Cai, Domin, Gerald, Goyal, Haskins, Lamb, Murguesan, Nichols, Robles, Sadoway, Stephan, Vedantam

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA](#)

Hymel noted difficulty approving the Faculty Senate Minutes. There was a discussion with Hymel, Chair Hudson, and the Faculty Center Staff Supervisor Marilyn Taylor regarding the minutes. Secretary Dysart noted that she was not informed of the meeting, and no one approached her about the minutes or requested any changes.

- Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-33]** to make a friendly amendment to remove Consent Agenda Item: Approval of the minutes of the September 12, October 3, November 7, and December 5, 2022 Faculty Senate meetings from the Consent Agenda. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/23-33]**.
- Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-34]** for a roll call vote. Motion was approved.

Addis	Absent
Alfie	Yes
Behrangi	Yes

Bourget	No response
Brummund	Abstain
Cai	Absent
Casey	No
Citera	Yes
Cooley	No
Cui	No
Dial	No response
Domin	Absent
Downing	Yes
Duran	Abstain
Dysart	No
Fellous	Yes
Fink	Yes
Folks	Abstain
Gerald	Absent
Gordon	No response
Goyal	Absent
Guzman	Yes
Hammer	No
Harris	Yes
Haskins	Absent
Hudson	Yes
Hymel	Yes
Ijagbemi	No
Irizarry	Abstain
Jones	Abstain
Knox	No

Lamb	Absent
Leafgren	Yes
Lee	Yes
Little	Yes
Lucas	Yes
Murugesan	Absent
Neumann	No
Nichols	Absent
O'Leary	No
Ottusch	No
Pace	No
Pau	Yes
Robbins	Abstain
Robles	Absent
Rocha	No
Ruggill	No
Russell	Yes
Sadoway	Absent
Schulz	No
Senseney	Yes
Simmons	No
Slepian	No
M. Smith	Yes
J. Smith	No
Spece	Yes
Stanescu	Abstain
Stegeman	Abstain
Stephan	Absent

Stone	Yes
Su	No
Tropman	No
Vedantam	Absent
Williams	No
M. Witte	Yes
R. Witte	Yes
Wittman	No
Zeiders	Abstain
Zenenga	No
Ziurys	Yes

- **[Motion 2022/23-33]** passed with twenty-three in favor, twenty-two opposed, and nine abstentions. Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-35]** to approve the Agenda. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/23-35]** passed with forty-eight in favor.

3. 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.

Senator M. Witte addressed the Faculty Senate concerning her disapproval of Faculty Senate minutes. **[00:37:03]**

The Faculty Senate represents the undiluted voice of the Faculty. That voice should not be condensed, muted, slanted, reorganized, redacted, unbalanced, or otherwise distorted. Minutes should be a factual, detailed report of the recorded litany of diverse voices and views presented, edited only by Faculty Senators, distributed directly via General Faculty listserv, and available to the public. For the first time in my more than 40 years as Senator, Minutes prepared by the Secretary have failed approval and successively for September, October, and November 2022. Senate also voted to restore the format to the factual, detailed Minutes regularly approved prior to those dates. Of considerable concern, it is my understanding that after that meeting, Secretary Dysart contacted the Provost's office to complain, leading to a directive from that office removing Faculty Center senior staff Jane Cherry from her customary role in drafting Minutes. Further, the Secretary has been circulating her draft Minutes including for December 2022 for pre-editing by the Senate Executive Committee members and possibly others and in a last-minute restricted rush to Senators. These are serious irregularities.

First, we should move on to our other important business on today's agenda and simply accept not rush to approve continuously flawed Minutes and await new minutes prepared in the customary manner with Jane Cherry restored to drafting. Going forward, each Senator, as the critical thinkers we encourage in our students and ourselves, should exercise due diligence in reviewing the original rejected minutes along with the latest "corrections" and December's, all of which, in my view, remain "unapprovable" with serious omissions and distortions (e.g. most Senator "statements" anonymized, disproportionate space for the views of the Secretary, who "explains", "clarifies" and reminds, and her supporters," flamboyant" attachments, et al). This controversy about the Minutes and their handling by the current Secretary should not be taken lightly. It is a frontal attack on the Faculty's collective voice and exercise of free, responsible speech on this campus. This is not a "cat fight".

Senator Simmons addressed the Faculty Senate in regard to the lack of Faculty representation in WSCUC meetings. **[00:40:41]**

Rules of the Senate should apply to all equally. After the past election, there were good feelings about faculty participation. There were a record number of participants voting. This past week, there was a different experience when the WSCUC accreditation team came and had an open meeting for all Faculty Members. Out of about 2,300 faculty members, only about ten showed up. Senators are elected to be the voice of the Faculty and only two Senators were present at the meeting. It is important to make voices heard, Simmons encourages active participation from the Faculty Senate and all of its members moving forward.

4. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY - CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON [00:42:08]

Since we last met, the subcommittee of the Committee of Eleven submitted a thorough review of our Nominating Committee and I want to thank them and the Nominating Itself for proposing the reforms in Item Six A: Reform of Nominating Committee Procedures.

The highest priority for me, in light of the upcoming election, is to authorize the Nominating Committee's request to place all eligible, self-nominated candidates for Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure (CAFT) on the upcoming election ballot so that the voters, rather than the committee, will reduce the slate to the number prescribed by the bylaws (eight candidates) which will then proceed to the final ballot. If there is additional time, there will be information presented about a call for adherence to bylaws, another for disclosure of stipends amongst our elected representatives, and the last, a call on the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC) to devise a process and criteria for removing elected representatives and committee chairs.

I hope to hear from the President's office about the requests for the Meixner family's health care, email account, and scholarships. The General Faculty Committee on Safety for All (GRCSFA) security committee will release its report by next week.

I continue to have, and voice concerns about the pace and parameters of the UAGC integration project. The UAGC integration team, headed by administrative appointees well known to us, our colleagues Tessa Dysart and Caleb Simmons, is inviting participation by elected faculty representatives. Reluctantly and grudgingly, I agree that it is time for a fuller discussion of what our administration envisions for us and how to prevent this momentous move from further harming the University of Arizona's integrity and dividing us. My mention of questions about conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment, and UAGC's predatory practices in that meeting caused a Vice President to accuse me of harassment and bullying, and threaten me with a formal violation of the controversial UHAP "collegiality" clause. I was told effectively to behave myself especially because of the presence of a UAGC Provost in the meeting. Shared governance is about accountability, including at the personal level, not performance and rubber stamping.

Following the statement, Senator Ziurys asked for elaboration of the statement regarding being attacked for making comments. Hudson replied by stating she attended a meeting with UAGC task force leads in the previous week and expressed her concern about conflicts of commitment and conflicts of interest and advised that everyone disclose possible conflicts of commitment or conflicts of interest with the University.

- She was met with accusations of defamation then rephrased her question to mitigate and change predatory practices with UAGC's history. Hudson stated she was shamed and chided for being rude especially because a Provost from UAGC was present in the room. Subsequently, Hudson received an email regarding the accusations of bullying and harassment and was subject to complaint under UHAP collegiality clause 7.01. Hudson stated she was only allowed to participate as long as she was able to behave.
- Dysart stated that she and Caleb Simmons were in the meeting. She stated that Hudson told the other participants that they were violating state law and that they were engaging in conflicts of interest and that Hudson's comments were not stated as concerns, they were presented as statements of fact. Dysart suggested that Hudson supply evidence where a conflict of interest occurred because they are very serious accusations. Dysart has requested a letter from the Office of General Counsel whether Senator participation is a conflict of interest, the letter will be produced soon and will also include outlines for what is constituted as a conflict of interest while participating on University committees.
- Senator Harris stated this issue is consistent with academic freedom, by definition, part of the faculty's job is to bring up areas where conflict of interest can be seen, opinions should be able to be raised without being told one is not being collegial. Senator Harris concluded by stating the Collegiality Clause is a problem.
- Senator Spece stated getting an opinion letter from the University Counsel is not a way to define proper behavior by a professor. Senator Spece suggested the Faculty Senate have an ad-hoc committee, or the committee as a whole, to investigate this and that it is most troublesome that someone from the new entity of UAGC was chiding the Chair of the Faculty.
- Senator Downing stated ABOR policy explicitly recognizes, as part of academic freedom, that Faculty has the right to speak out about potential violations of policy which is the idea behind the Faculty Governance Law. Downing stated this is protected under

academic freedom which is also protected under ABOR 6-914; a false accusation of harassment could be considered an improper personnel action and subject to sanctions against the instigating person.

- Senator Hammer stated there is no Collegiality Clause in UHAP 7.01, the issue of collegiality concerning promotion and tenure has previously come up and it should not be considered as a marker for how colleagues are evaluated. Hammer stated there is another outlook on the ability for senators or individuals of the faculty to express academic freedom by participating in work groups for a particular issue; there is a Conflict of Interest Committee at UArizona which evaluates conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment.
- Senator M. Witte stated she was the co-author of documents concerning conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment documents and was present at the time of voting against a civility clause from the Provost office, and for collegiality. M. Witte stated there should be discussion on conflicts of interest with regards to the role one serves, such as a Provost also serving as a Professor, there should be consideration that in some ways, the combination of roles can cause serious conflict.

5. ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA - Military Excused Absence Policy Proposal and Benchmarking; Undergraduate Leaves of Absence Policy Proposal and Benchmarking; Proposal Graduate Minor Global Health; Proposal MA Bioethics; Request to Rename Division of Public Health Practice and Translation to the Department of Public Health Practice, Policy, and Translational Research - Chair of Undergraduate Council, Claudia Stanescu and Co-chairs of the Graduate Council, Ron Hammer and Hong Cui [00:58:31]

Five proposals come to the Faculty Senate as seconded motions from Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council. **[Motion 2022/23-35]** Military Excused Absence Policy Proposal and Benchmarking, **[Motion 2022/23-36]** Proposal Graduate Minor Global Health, **[Motion 2022/23-37]** Proposal Graduate Minor Global Health, **[Motion 2022/23-38]** Proposal MA Bioethics, and **[Motion 2022/23-39]** Request to Rename Division of Public Health Practice and Translation to the Department of Public Health Practice, Policy, and Translational Research carried with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained and are detailed at the end of these minutes.

6. ACTION ITEM: REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA - Approval of the minutes of the September 12, October 3, November 7, and December 5, 2022 Faculty Senate meetings [00:59:22]

Hymel moved **[Motion 2022/23-40]** that the Faculty Center Staff revise the minutes from the start of the year (September 12, October 3, November 7, and December 5, 2022) and moving forward, for the rest of the year to conform to and be consistent with the format used in the 2021-2022 academic year. After the minutes have been revised, they will be, in accordance with the Constitution, submitted to the Secretary for review before distribution to the Senate. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-one in favor, nine opposed, and nine abstentions.

- Hymel stated there is a list containing several compiled changes and corrections that need to be made.
- Senators will be able to view the minutes before approval.

- Secretary Dysart stated she was not aware of the list of corrections communicated with Hymel via email. Dysart stated it would have been useful to have this information during the time minutes were being edited; it is appalling to find out about these corrections after the fact. Many details have been added and the process of approving minutes has been extremely time-consuming.
- M. Witte moved [**Motion 2022/23-41**] to end discussion. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with a two-thirds majority vote, thirty-eight in favor, four opposed, and seven abstentions.

7. Old Business

A. Reform of Nominating Committee [01:15:08]

- Chair Hudson presented a resolution authorizing a one-time change to the Nominating Committee procedure on the upcoming election ballot. Faculty Senators have access to the investigative report of the Subcommittee of Eleven, which recommends the Nominating Committee closely following the Bylaws in including candidates on the ballot for the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The Nominating Committee proposed a number of changes in order to become an inclusive, reluctant committee for Shared Governance, rather than an exclusive gate-keeping committee.
- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2022/23-42**] that the Faculty Senate authorizes the Nominating Committee to advance the names of all self-declared candidates, for the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure for the 2023 General Election ballot, in order to obtain non-binding guidance from the General Faculty concerning which names to place on a second and binding ballot in the runoff election (Pursuant to the committee's responsibilities under Article 5, Section 9A of the Faculty Bylaws). This allows all thirteen, self-declared candidates for CAFT to be placed on the first ballot. Then, at its discretion, the Nominating Committee will choose the eight winners of that vote to advance to the run-off ballot thereby, eliminating their exclusive gatekeeping responsibilities and turning it over to the general faculty. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.
 - Senator Hammer stated he is uncertain what the purpose of the Nominating Committee is if this rule is to be followed. Hudson stated there will be a year until the next general election to make Bylaws changes and look at the Committee's role. Hudson stated the Nominating Committee and Committee of Eleven's role and intention is to prevent the presented issue of excluding faculty from the ballot and to shift the Nominating Committee from gate-keeping practices; the election will function as the narrowing device.
 - Senator Fink questioned whether there will still be an internal process for the Nominating Committee to select names after the runoff election gathers eight finalists. Hudson verified there will be an internal process for the committee and the purpose of this process is to respect the committee's desire to refrain from making the choice of who to eliminate without the data from the General Election.

- Senator Simmons questioned how this process aligns with the Nominating Committee's operating guidelines, specifically concerning the typical process to select names and present them to the Chair of the Faculty and the President. Senator Zeiders stated this is in line with the Nominating Committee's views to allow Faculty to select individuals who should be on the CAFT ballot. Zeiders clarified the Bylaws state that the Nominating Committee must narrow down the names to twice the number of seats open for CAFT, there are currently four seats open which means the committee needs to narrow the list down to eight candidates. The President and Chair of the Faculty only provide some consultation and do not complete the narrowing process. In previous years, the Chair of the Faculty and the President selected names without the committee's input. Currently, the Nominating Committee believes it is up to Faculty to vote on who should move forward.
- Senator Fink gave a brief synopsis of the Committee of Eleven report; there was systemic failure across the board, therefore, no particular party was deemed responsible. There were certain Bylaws not particularly followed, and persons provided input where they shouldn't have. The former Chair of the Faculty and the President offered input in a way that is not substantiated by the Bylaws since they should only serve as advisory and not definitive decision makers. Fink suggested referring to the Committee of Eleven's report for additional information and items.

B. Senate Voting Resolution - Parliamentarian Mark Stegeman [01:29:18]

- This resolution has been postponed to a later meeting.

C. Action Item: [Research Policy Committee Recommendation on F&A](#) - Chair of Research Policy Committee, David Cuillier [01:29:35]

- The Research Policy Committee has been working on its recommendations since Spring 2022, gathering input from Faculty Researchers, College Budget Officers, and staff within central administration. The committee reviewed distribution of Facilities & Administration funds and recommended that PIs receive a share of the funds to invest in their future research and activities.
- There are six recommendations from the committee including allowing researchers to spend funds freely under University guidelines. This would allow PIs to have the ability to control their own accounts including the accumulation of a balance to potentially make larger purchases in the future such as equipment. Also included in the recommendations is the issuing of payments quarterly instead of annually. The minimum distribution should be set at fifty-dollars. PIs should receive a minimum distribution of five-percent instead of the current two-percent. If the PI departs from the University, their account should be distributed to their research program colleagues that have taken part in the PI's research, this avoids transferring of funds to the College or central administration.

- Senator O'Leary questioned whether the committee produces guidance or recommendations for co-PIs. Cuillier stated there was no specific discussion or feedback on this but the committee will return with further information.
- Senator Fink stated the topic is automatically addressed since co-PIs will already encounter research expenditures. The minimum five-percent distribution will derive from what the respective co-PI will have expended. With regards to the minimum, five-percent distribution, the funds should not come from the colleges but should come from the Central Administration's strategic allocation budget.
- Senator Simmons moved **[Motion 2022/23-43]** to approve the Research Policy Committee's recommendations on F&A. Motion was seconded. Motion was passed with fifty in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

D. Possible Action Item: [Constitution and Bylaws Changes](#) - Secretary of the Faculty, Tessa Dysart [01:38:18]

- Secretary Dysart received communications back from the President about the revised Constitution and Bylaws. The President requests further action on the documents. Secretary Dysart will meet with Senior Vice President and Chief of Staff of the University, Jon Dudas and Vice President, Executive Office of the President, Craig Henderson for additional guidance. Dysart encouraged the Faculty Senate to view the shared version of the Constitution and Bylaws, letter from the President, and three voting reports

E. Faculty Senate Seat for RII - Chair of APPC, John Milbauer, and Secretary of the Faculty, Tessa Dysart [01:39:42]

- RII's request for Senate representation was sent to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee (APPC) for discussion.
- Chair Milbauer shared that APPC supported RII's request for a Senate seat.
- Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-44]** that RII receive a Senate seat and there be a special election commencing before March 1, to fill the seat for a one-year term. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with forty-three in favor, two opposed, and two abstentions.
 - Senator Ziurys questioned the difference in distinction for Common College seats and RII seats. Senator Dysart clarified the voting codes will be distinguished by college, similar to all others.

F. Update on General Education proposal - Executive Director of Undergraduate Education, Susan Miller-Cochran [01:47:51]

- Two documents were shared in the agenda providing an update on the status of General Education. The [Crosswalk](#) maps curriculum with requirements from ABOR policy 2.2.10 for General Education. The task force on American Institutions and Civic Learning constructed a [document](#), primarily focusing on learning outcomes and beginning discussion on integration into the current General Education curriculum.

ABOR will be considering the Crosswalk at their meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs and Educational Attainment on January 26, 2023.

- Chair Hudson asked if there is anticipated approval from ABOR. Miller-Cochran responded she anticipates that ABOR will be in favor of the curriculum; there has been close attention paid to the elements of the policy to ensure ABOR's requirements are being met while also encompassing the Faculty's input. One of the areas that Faculty input is most evident is in American Institutions and Civic Learning. There is a lot of conversation anticipated regarding Civic Learning.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman questioned whether the item for ABOR is informational only as current proposals have not gone through voting in the Faculty Governance process. Miller-Cochran answered yes, it is up for review and discussion by the committee. Further information may come forward to revisit the curriculum.
- Senator O'Leary stated the Higher Learning Commission made reference to the differentiation between learning objectives and learning outcomes. The American Institutions and Civic Learning document reads as objectives not outcomes.
- Miller-Cochran stated she will ensure O'Leary's comment is brought before the task-force.

8. New Business

A. Accreditation change from HLC to WSCUC - Secretary Tessa Dysart, Senator Caleb Simmons, and Provost Liesl Folks [01:57:56]

- Dysart shared the Arizona Revised Statutes on Shared Governance, which sets out the role of shared governance at the state universities. At UArizona, the Shared Governance MOU states that shared governance is realized through the faculty senate and SPBAC, but it also includes input from all stakeholders on campus including faculty, staff, students, and administrators. Although many people in the working groups assisting with the UAGC integration may not have been thrilled with the accelerated timeline, we understand the reason behind it. It is important that faculty participate in the integration. Several elected faculty and administrators have requested that the Chair of the Faculty suggest members for these working groups, and she has refused. Hopefully, more Senators will participate in the working groups to share concerns and opinions from faculty and staff.
- The Oversight and Compliance Working Group's current objectives include a Substantive Change Proposal; Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS); Office of Postsecondary Education Identification (OPE ID); Organizational structure, review and update of policies; Federal and ABOR reporting; and risk management.
- Simmons said that UA-UAGC Academic Working Groups include Academic Programs; Admissions, degrees, transcripts; Transfer pathways, articulation, SARA; LMS; Faculty and Faculty Council. Central Administration does not oversee any working groups. As Faculty Representatives, the main objective is to align the missions of UAGC in conjunction with the University of Arizona and ensure that UAGC's curricula meets UArizona's standards. The Seeking Accreditation Proposal is ready for review and working group members are helping to review it.

- Hymel moved **[Motion 2022/23-45]** to extend the meeting by ten minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-six in favor, two opposed and no abstentions.
- Provost Folks thanked everyone who gathered documentation for the report to WSCUC, and took time to meet the reviewers who visited the campus in the past week. There is no official report to be shared although, the reviewers commended the UArizona for several specific operations:
 - The General Education refresh;
 - The research infrastructure improvements made in the last few years;
 - Use of data and analytics and assessment tools for supporting student success;
 - The living strategic plan and alignment with budget;
 - Support for student academic success;
 - Retention for undergraduate research and engagement;
 - Commendation for the community.
- WSCUC gave five recommendations for improvement of operations
 - To continue to ensure there are program learning outcomes for every program with appropriate assessments.
 - To continue to grow the commitment to continuous improvement.
 - To develop and implement a strategic plan for inclusion across the University.
 - To continue to strengthen the Shared Governance Process.
 - Deepen the use of digital platforms for urgent communications on campus, and strengthen the tracking of student complaints.
- Senator Downing questioned why the Faculty Senate, with its obligations to academic and educational integrity, was left out of the process and intention to change accreditors. There was no opportunity for the Faculty Senate to lead and deliberate about the critical issue of Accreditation. Downing asked how representatives were selected to represent Faculty during the WSCUC meetings.
 - Provost Folks responded she did not choose the representatives of the Faculty Senate at the meeting. WSCUC set its own agenda which is only facilitated by UArizona with regard to providing meeting space. An Open Session with Faculty was held to allow everyone to address concerns. Folks asked Chair Hudson to provide names of those who were interested in Accreditation because there has been a struggle to muster an interest in the particular matter.
- Downing said there was no information provided to the Faculty Senate and the meeting was held between Senate Sessions which is viewed as an attempt to avoid Shared Governance. Ziurys concurred with Downing.
- Senator Bourget questioned the strict deadline for the change of accreditors and said there is not enough time to engage in another accelerated process.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Tessa Dysart, Secretary of the Faculty
Jasmin Espino, Recording Secretary

Motions of January 23, 2023 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2022/23-33] friendly amendment to remove Consent Agenda Item: Approval of the minutes of the September 12, October 3, November 7, and December 5, 2022 Faculty Senate meetings from the Agenda. Motion was seconded. A motion for a roll call vote was made.

[Motion 2022/23-34] for a roll call vote. Motion was approved.

Addis	Absent
Alfie	Yes
Behrangi	Yes
Bourget	No response
Brummund	Abstain
Cai	Absent
Casey	No
Citera	Yes
Cooley	No
Cui	No
Dial	No response
Domin	Absent
Downing	Yes
Duran	Abstain
Dysart	No
Fellous	Yes
Fink	Yes
Folks	Abstain
Gerald	Absent
Gordon	No response
Goyal	Absent
Guzman	Yes
Hammer	No
Harris	Yes

Haskins	Absent
Hudson	Yes
Hymel	Yes
Ijagbemi	No
Irizarry	Abstain
Jones	Abstain
Knox	No
Lamb	Absent
Leafgren	Yes
Lee	Yes
Little	Yes
Lucas	Yes
Murugesan	Absent
Neumann	No
Nichols	Absent
O'Leary	No
Ottusch	No
Pace	No
Pau	Yes
Robbins	Abstain
Robles	Absent
Rocha	No
Ruggill	No
Russell	Yes
Sadoway	Absent
Schulz	No
Senseney	Yes
Simmons	No

Slepian	No
M. Smith	Yes
J. Smith	No
Spece	Yes
Stegeman	Abstain
Stephan	Absent
Stone	Yes
Su	No
Tropman	No
Vedantam	Absent
Williams	No
M. Witte	Yes
R. Witte	Yes
Wittman	No
Zeiders	Abstain
Zenenga	No
Ziurys	Yes

[Motion 2022/23-35] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Military Excused Absence Policy Proposal and Benchmarking. Motion carried with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained

[Motion 2022/23-36] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Undergraduate Leaves of Absence Policy Proposal and Benchmarking. Motion carried with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained

[Motion 2022/23-37] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal Graduate Minor Global Health. Motion carried with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained

[Motion 2022/23-38] Seconded motion from Graduate Council Proposal MA Bioethics. Motion carried with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained

[Motion 2022/23-39] Seconded motion from Graduate Council Request to Rename Division of Public Health Practice and Translation to the Department of Public Health Practice, Policy, and

Translational Research. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-eight in favor, none opposed, and one abstained

[Motion 2022/23-40] Faculty Center Staff revise the minutes from September 12, October 3, November 7, and December 5, 2022. Minutes shall conform to the format used in the 2021-2022 academic year. After revision, they will be submitted to the Secretary for review before distribution to the Senate. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-one in favor, nine opposed, and nine abstentions.

[Motion 2022/23-41] to end discussion on Motion 2022/23-40. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with a two-thirds majority vote, thirty-eight in favor, four opposed, and seven abstentions.

[Motion 2022/23-42] that the Faculty Senate authorizes the Nominating Committee to advance the names of all self-declared candidates, for the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure for the 2023 General Election ballot, in order to obtain non-binding guidance from the General Faculty with concerning which names place on a second and binding ballot in the runoff election (Pursuant to the committee's responsibilities under Article 5, Section 9A of the Faculty Bylaws). This allows all thirteen, self-declared candidates for CAFT to be placed on the first ballot. Then, at its discretion, the Nominating Committee will choose the eight winners of that vote to advance to the run-off ballot thereby, eliminating their exclusive gatekeeping responsibilities and turning them over to the general voters. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2022/23-43] Research Policy Committee's recommendations on F&A. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with fifty in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

Text of the recommendation:

The RPC unanimously agreed on the following six recommendations (in no particular order):

1. Flexible spending: The RPC recommends that PIs be able to spend their funds in any way allowable by the university. Faculty overwhelmingly said PIs should be able to spend their F&A on "anything," and budget officers generally agreed. While we understand the intent is to cover research costs and incentivize more research, we trust PIs to best decide how that be carried out, just as we trust central administration in how it distributes its share of F&A.
2. Quarterly payments: The RPC recommends that payments be issued quarterly, unless PIs request annual distribution, respectively. We learned that budget officers tend to support annual distribution, as proposed by the Provost. We know of colleges, however, that already distribute F&A quarterly and we recommend that be instituted campuswide.
3. Minimum distribution: The RPC recommends minimum distributions set at \$50, and residuals will be provided to departments. Faculty generally indicated that a minimum

cutoff made sense, noting Garth Perry's analysis that half of disbursements campuswide would be small, at \$50 or less. Budget officers also expressed interest in a cutoff, some at \$50 and others at \$100, \$250, or most commonly noted, \$500. We believe that \$50 is a reasonable cutoff to avoid unreasonable burden on college budget officers.

4. Accumulated balances: The RPC recommends that PIs be given the authority to control their F&A accounts without micromanaging, including large accumulation of balances, and that PI F&A accounts be excluded from colleges' AIB budget formulas. We understand that university officials are sensitive to excessive accumulations and hoarding – they want money to be spent and used. That is why, we are told, colleges are penalized for excessive end-of-year balances. Faculty are best positioned to know their needs and what they might want to save up, perhaps for big-ticket research equipment. We do not believe their F&A accounts should be time-limited, capped, or swept. However, we understand it is not fair to colleges to be penalized for PI choices. Therefore, we support giving PIs discretion while not penalizing colleges in their annual budgets.

5. PI distribution: The RPC recommends that PIs campus-wide receive 5% of F&A, not 2% (and that the extra 3% come from central administration's 48% strategic budget allocation, not from college or RII distributions). When we surveyed faculty, we received feedback that 2% was too low, and several recommended 5%. Indeed, if half the grants on campus would generate payouts of less than \$50 to PIs, then we believe 5% would increase the chance of more impactful distributions. Before AIB, seven of 20 colleges provided distributions greater than 2%, including Engineering (7.5%), Nursing (6.25%), and the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture (8.25%) (see spreadsheet). We believe a 5% distribution is fair in compensating PIs for their unanticipated grant expenses and investing in their infrastructure to accommodate future sponsored research.

6. Line of succession: The RPC recommends that if a PI departs the university, that their F&A account should be distributed to their research program and/or co-researcher at the university, or if that is not possible, to their department. If a PI leaves the university, the F&A account should stay at the university and not follow the PI to a new job. In those cases, the PI should be able to designate who should inherit the account, ideally a colleague or Co-PI/Co-I working in aligned research. However, in those cases where this is not possible, the funds should be distributed to the PI's department.

[Motion 2022/23-44] that RII receive a Senate seat and there be a special election commenced before March 1st within RII to fill the seat for a one-year term, to then be voted on with regular, college-based vacancies on the normal schedule. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with forty-three in favor, two opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2022/23-45] to extend the meeting by ten minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-six in favor, two opposed and no abstentions.

FACULTY CENTER

1216 E. Mabel

PO Box 210456