

The University of Arizona®
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
1216 E. Mabel St. (PO Box 210456)
621.1342
facultycenter@email.arizona.edu
Minutes: March 6, 2023
3:00-5:00 p.m.
VIA ZOOM

Present: M Hymel (Chair), C Casey, H Cui, J Curry, J Dudas, T Dysart (Secretary),
W Fink, L Folks, J Frumkin, R Hammer, L Hudson, L Irizarry, D Ohala,
M Stegeman (Parliamentarian), C Simmons, C Stanescu, and L Ziurys

Absent: B Brummund, D Cuillier, J Jones, J Milbauer, C Rankin, P Robles,
C Rocha, and P Zenega,

Call to Order

Chair Hymel called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

The meeting agenda was approved.

Approval of the Minutes of February 20, 2023

The minutes of February 20, 2023 were approved with one correction.

UPDATES

President of the University – Jon Dudas

- Dudas reported that the new incoming ABOR Chair will be Regent Fred Duval for a two-year term. After Duval's term is over, his successor will likely be Regent Mata, followed by Regent Herbold. Duval's priorities center around the Promise Scholarship that specifically guarantees students of a certain level of income a scholarship to Arizona schools. Each individual school brands and markets ways to give dollars to students. Duval is also focusing on mission differentiation between the three in-state Universities.
- UArizona currently has a high accessibility rate, but it is also the school of choice for underserved markets in Southern Arizona. Hymel asked if Promise Scholarships would hinder students' ability to acquire other financial aid. Dudas responded not in practice, but in name. Students would not necessarily receive less financial aid, but the Promise Scholarship would be assessed in comparison to what may be lacking for readjustment to cover fees and tuition for the student. If Promise Scholarships deter additional State monies, another system will be considered.
- The Regents are looking closely at UArizona's Constitution and Bylaws and relative actions of the Faculty Senate approving its minutes. Constitution and Bylaws are ultimately approved by ABOR to make sure they are substantively consistent with ABOR policy.
- Dudas mentioned the previous Faculty Senate meeting and subject matter that is and is not deemed appropriate at said meetings. The Regents, among many others, have expressed concern. Attacking Senator's affiliations is deemed unprofessional and irrelevant.
- Hymel asked for clarification on the annual Regents' Faculty Breakfast mentioned at the previous meeting. Dudas replied that the Regents choose the topic for discussion to be

weighed in on by the invited faculty, but Regents reported that the topic was disregarded at the UArizona event. Disruptive and unprofessional Faculty Senate meetings, as well as these and other issues, are resulting in negative consequences for the University.

Provost – Liesl Folks

Folks stated that currently UArizona is running the risk of not having a functioning Faculty Senate body. Robust discussion is always welcome, but ad hominem attacks are prevalent and not well-received. Many Faculty Senators do not want to voice their opinions because they fear being silenced or for fear they will have their professional integrity impugned. The first rule for having a robust, intellectual debate is to avoid impugning people's motives and engaging in ad hominem attacks. Folks would like to move back to inviting many voices to be heard and not the same voices repeatedly.

Chair of the Faculty – Leila Hudson

Hudson reported on the resignation of the General Faculty Committee for Security for All. The Committee requested that its letter of resignation be sent to all Faculty Senators. While the letter makes some important points, if there is concern about silencing in Faculty Senate, that is part of a larger context in which people are increasingly concerned about hard and soft retaliation for themselves and their families. In the larger University environment, there is reasonable concern for stonewalling in the face of administration's directive for the Committee to work with PAX and PAX being unresponsive to the Committee. A discussion in Faculty Senate will be scheduled for the next meeting. Ziurys reiterated the need for discussion in Faculty Senate. Folks assured that there would be no retaliation impugned on any Committee member.

Secretary of the Faculty – Tessa Dysart

- Dysart reported that once the minutes are approved from the previous meeting, the Resolution that passed will be forwarded to the President's Office to move the revised Constitution and Bylaws through the system. Included are a handful of changes from Faculty Senate.
- Dysart requests adequate time at the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the last Honorary Degree.
- As far as the Chair's remaining Resolution concerning removing Officers, it is important to look at other in-state Universities to see what provisions they have put in place. APPC can draft language, but ultimately is under the purview of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee.
- Folks shared the timeline for Faculty Senate approvals. Casey expressed frustration with Faculty Senators not being familiar with the documents on the agenda that are being voted on.

IT Liaison – Jeremy Frumkin

- Frumkin reported that the foremost issue on faculty's minds is the security and consolidation centralization efforts going forward. Efforts are being made to ensure research is not disrupted, but enhanced on how it is supported. Messaging will be forthcoming. Fink mentioned that President Robbins agreed to Senator Downing's request for a risk assessment group to be instated. Will time be given to this group to do its assessment before any decisions are made? Frumkin responded that he is not the person to answer that question but will certainly relay it to the team.
- Dudas responded that due to security audits from the state, the on-campus' federal law enforcement agencies are in place and many colleges and units have broken down

because of a lack of IT security. A better explanation of this endeavor needs to be explained to campus.

- Fink asked if researchers or units would be bearing the additional cost. Frumkin said it's difficult to say; there may be no additional costs because in some cases with the audit findings, proper security measures were not being taken. Wherever possible, the institution will absorb those costs and not burden the researcher. Looking at individual projects, unique requirements may be necessary that go beyond the institution's capability and negotiations may be necessary.
- Cui asked about the general steps taken on information gathering and risk assessments. Frumkin said that IT Directors and Dean-appointed liaisons to fill out "toolkits," or information packets that allow UITS to obtain an inventory of IT throughout the institution. A team is working alongside UITS to look through the data, make analyses, compile, and normalize and will subsequently report out on the findings. A series of audits have uncovered significant security absences. To that effect, there are strategies to go about this cost effectively and securely in ways that can automated as much as possible to reduce human error.
- Ziurys asked about infrastructure. Frumkin said that research cannot be generalized. Messaging will go out addressing this issue and discussions about an approach to gather requirements properly in order to not hamper or disrupt ongoing research, but to enhance security and efficiency through infrastructure. Specific plans for each unit will be considered.
- Frumkin stated that what he sees differently than in years past is the absence of an assumption of goodwill by colleagues in terms of getting the work done for the betterment of the University. A cloud of doubt surrounds the work presented, therefore, lack of trust in the committees' work fosters notions that items need to be revisited and looked at more than one time. Perhaps a facilitator is in order to get back on track to be a better functioning body. Healthy discourse and dialogue are always welcome, and we can set the tone with expectations for good behavior so others will follow.

Undergraduate Council – Claudia Stanescu

Stanescu stated that the proposal for BS in Computer Science and Engineering may be moved to the Non-consent agenda for discussion. The subcommittee had questions regarding how students currently enrolled in the BS in the College of Science would see this new program and if it would cause confusion on what path to take. Deans from the College of Science and College of Engineering discussed how to use courses that may seem similar to each other and how they will be used in both programs. A memo was sent and shared with the Council. College of Science expressed opposition to the name "Computer Science and Engineering." College of Engineering shared the names of peer institutions using the same program name within the field of Engineering. The Council has had numerous discussions and guests speaking to this issue. The program passed unanimously.

Review agenda for March 13, 2023 Faculty Senate meeting

Items were added and time allotments were prescribed for each item.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.