

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 5, 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/>

The recording of this meeting may be accessed electronically at:

<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=d17bc874-32f2-4eda-824b-af63000a30fc>

1. CALL TO ORDER

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 PM in Law 160 and via Zoom. Secretary Dysart was present. Vice Chair Hymel mentioned following time limits closely with a one-minute and three-minute warning given, these limits are in place to ensure the allotted time limits on the agenda are followed. Rules also include raising hands and only speaking when recognized by a chair. Senators have the ability to speak twice on an item. The Parliamentarian has been instructed to interrupt proceedings when a parliamentary issue occurs.

Present: Senators Alfie, Bolger, Bourget, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Cui, Dial, Domin, Downing, 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, Ottusch, Pace, Pau, Rankin, Robbins, Robles, Rocha, Rodrigues, Ruggill, Russell, Schulz, Senseney, Simmons, Slepian, S. Smith, J. Smith, Stephan, Stone, Su, Tropman, Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders, Zenenga, Ziurys. M. Stegeman served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Addis, Behranghi Cai, Gerald, Gordon, Haskins, Lamb, Lucas, Murugesan, Nichols, Sadoway, Spece, Vedantam

INTRODUCTION (00:12:27)

Prior to approving the minutes, Vice Chair Hymel informed the Faculty Senate that minutes will remain in a simplified form, and statements and reports will be attached as appendices. The minutes will be in the form of a single PDF with all attachments being included. This ensures continued availability of documents as links may expire.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE **AGENDA: VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL**

- Senator R. Witte moved [**Motion 2022/2023-21**] to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion carried passed with forty-four in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.
- Senator M. Witte stated she is unclear of the comment made by the Chair and believes the minutes should be filed due to critiques for each set of minutes. These critiques include not including open statements, improper signing, and eliminating discussion. Senator M. Witte stated these issues need to be corrected due to incompleteness.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated the vote for the Agenda includes voting to approve a later motion which will include a detailed Faculty resolution on the minutes which will be presented by the Parliamentarian. If these are approved, they will be filed in the manner prescribed, assuming the proposal passes.

3. **ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 12, OCTOBER 3, AND NOVEMBER 7, 2022 FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS (00:16:47)**

- Senator O' Leary asked at what level will comments and responses be included in minutes. Senator O'Leary stated in a previous Faculty Senate meeting, she questioned Susan Cochran-Miller in regards to the Civics General Education requirement and its inclusion.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated Agenda Item 8C will clarify these issues.
- Senator M. Witte stated she asked for the minutes to be filed, not approved due to bias in language and selection of who was quoted, shortness, and important information being left out.
- Secretary Dysart stated she did not intend for the September and October minutes to be included on the agenda, it was only intended for the agenda to include November's minutes in order to prevent continued redrafting. Changes included adding timestamps for each discussion item to avoid selectively choosing speakers and leaving others out. It is intended to include the content of the discussion by including names of those who make presentations but not names of those who ask questions. Secretary Dysart stated her suggestion for approving the November minutes and to later revisit September and October minutes.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated if there are any changes to the minutes, to communicate with Secretary Dysart.
- Vice Chair Hymel moved past approval of the September 12, October 3, and November 7, 2022 minutes and classified them as unresolved.

4. **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 (00:24:23)**

A. Open Session Statement: Senator Theodore Downing. (00:24:40)

Senators: It's the Arizona Board of Regent policy (ABOR) to opposes legislation that would eliminate or substantially alter their exemptions from State laws for rulemaking, procurement, and personnel rules. Yes, the ABOR exemption is chiseled in law. Such exemptions prevented us from getting the 10% pay increase given to our fellow state employees this year.

So please constrain your collective angst from the Regents for giving our President a \$97k bonus for completing his annual, so-called "at-risk compensation goals." They also approved an additional \$135k in new incentives for this year – payable if he shifts the advances molecular immunotherapies program to Phoenix, outsources our information technology support units, and absorbs UAGC into the UA. ABOR did not mention faculty oversight and shared governance.

I favor incentives – provided they are beneficial and harmonious to our core institutional values. Currently, they aren't. The President's compensation goals collide with the Senate, general faculty, staff, and students' values. They conflict with the institution and public it serves. Unfortunately, pursuit of these incentives restricts his management latitude and accountability. "He's just doing his job." If comparable incentives have been set for other administrators, they must be disclosed. Such contradictions needlessly transform a potential for creative collaboration and shared governance into conflict, supporting closed, hierarchical, and unaccountable governance instead.

B. Open Session Statement: Senator Caleb Simmons (00:26:56)

Fellow Faculty Senators and observers, I reluctantly stand before you to bring light to yet another troubling situation regarding shared governance at our university.

Last month we heard from our chair about several breaches in shared governance, including an administrator disestablishing a shared governance committee. Chair Hudson drew upon her own research background to compare these actions to authoritarian regimes in the Middle East.

I was at the time and remain shocked because the Chair was in the process of removing faculty from the Membership Committee, a shared governance committee, to reconstitute it with member that would in her words "bring much needed fresh eyes." The fresh eyes were only necessary because the faculty in place hadn't aligned with one of her initiatives.

I want to provide you with a timeline of the events; so, the flagrant abuse of power is clear:

April 13: Two members of the committee (Dan McDonald & Dana Narter) were asked if they would like to return for the next year by the previous Chair of the Faculty. The third member (Judd Ruggill) was also asked but was in the middle of a two-year term already. All agreed to continue to their service.

June 1: Chair of the Faculty began term and began reconstituting committees.

June 29: Chair of the Faculty was informed via email that the Committee was meeting soon to start discussing important matters, and the committee continued their work, meeting in July.

July 15-22 Letters for those not reappointed to standing committees were sent by the Chair of the Faculty thanking them for their service (July 22). Appointment letters were sent to all new members of standing committees. Membership Committee was not reconstituted, and no new members were appointed.

October 3: Discussion of RII senate apportionment status and Chair of the Faculty's motion to send matter to APPC was approved.

October 4: Secretary of the Faculty informed the Chair of the Faculty that according to the Constitution (Art. V, Sec. 2), the membership committee determines apportionment matters:

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

After receiving this email from the Secretary of the Faculty, the Chair of the Faculty sent letters dismissing all members of the membership committee without consultation with Senate Executive Committee, as required by our Constitution and Bylaws.

After repeated attempts by the committee members who were dismissed and members of the Senate Executive Committee urging the Chair to reverse course, we were informed at the last Senate Executive Committee meeting (Nov 21) that her decision was final.

This final decision is not only troubling, but there are deeper issues in the process whereby the decision was made. Not only did the Chair of the Faculty directly attempt to circumvent our constitution and bylaws by making a unilateral decision to remove these volunteer faculty from their committee service when they didn't align with her goals, but when challenged has ignored the advice of the Senate Executive committee who is constitutionally required to be involved in the decision.

How can we as the faculty hold administrators accountable for not thoroughly including shared governance in decision making and casting off our advice, when our own elected leaders are doing the same? It would be the height of hypocrisy, and if the Chair of the Faculty does not reverse course immediately, the faculty senate needs to take up this matter in our next meeting."

C. Open Session Statement: Keith Maggert, Associate Professor, College of Science. (00:29:41)

Hello and Good Afternoon. I am an associate professor moving from the College of Medicine to the College of Science. This is a good move for me – terrific even – but it is not without a darker side. For over three years, my department head has been retaliating against me for blowing the whistle on her illegal and unethical behaviors.

I sought relief with the grievance system, and was in a Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure hearing. I was exonerated by the CAFT, though relief was forestalled when the President abruptly overruled the CAFT to side with my department head.

I'd just like to move on, but I can't.

I do not know what it is – the whistleblowing, the CAFT, or the Provost's feelings about my kind of people – that extends the retaliation. You the Senate, has been sent the descriptions and documents. The University is silencing and sidelining me by denying me a seat at the table. According to those E-mails, the Program Coordinator at the Faculty Center lied to the Nominating Committee when she stated that I am ineligible to serve on faculty committees.

My ineligibility?

That I am "problematic" to the University.

Perhaps I'm problematic because I witnessed illegal and unethical activity.

Perhaps I'm problematic because I said something about it.

Unknown to me, I was walking a path from whistleblower to a "kind of person" to problematic to ineligible.

Maybe this was all done by the Program Coordinator at the Faculty Center alone.

Maybe it was encouraged or directed by an administrator who oversees her.

Maybe it was done on direction of the Office on General Counsel.

I don't know. But any way once slices it, a University agent retaliated against me and my colleagues. Yet, strangely, the administration is silent. Maybe they're silent because that's the easiest response to any crisis one encounters. Maybe they're silent because they're okay with it. Retaliation is okay. Silencing some kinds of faculty is desirable. Or, maybe they're silent because they are involved. And they're willing to let the Program Coordinator shoulder the burden alone. That's as bad as the blacklist, and she ought not be a scapegoat.

If the administration has NOTHING to do with this blacklisting, they should be demanding action.

If they have SOMETHING to do with it, however, it is we who should be.

D. Open Session Statement: Eric Lyons, Associate Professor, School of Plant Sciences. (00:32:15)

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Eric Lyons and I am a professor in the school of Plant Sciences with adjunct appointments in the School of Information and Biosystems Engineering. I am also the lead PI of CyVerse, a \$115M 15 year project funded by the National Science Foundation. Through CyVerse, an additional \$70M - \$80M of research awards have been brought to UArizona from nearly all major US federal agencies.

I'm here to ring the alarm on UA's CIO Barry Brummund's mandate to centralize nearly all computing under his office. This mandate was announced in October of this year that touches nearly EVERY part of the University: UITTS will install management software on your laptops and desktops and nearly all research servers will be decommissioned and moved to Amazon. As faculty, will have to cover these costs for a project like CyVerse, this will result in a \$9-12M annual bill, effectively killing this project.

Importantly, there are no exceptions and these costs will result in projects being unable to deliver on their contractual obligations, absolutely destroy our competitive edge in getting new research awards in the future,

increase the likelihood that high-profile and successful professors at UA will leave for other Universities, and decrease our ability to recruit new research talent in the future.

This mandate has happened without any **faculty input** or any risk analysis. Of particular concern is the timeline mandated by CIO Barry Brummund, which requires all units on campus to submit plans by February 2023 with full implementation by June 2025. Our IT staff are excellent, and Brummund has not provided any plans or guidance to his staff. In fact, Senior UITS leadership is currently hiring people to fill critical roles for this project as we speak. They are literally trying to build the plane while flying. Brummund defends his plan by stating that this mandate is coming from ABOR, however the most recent ABOT meeting notes make no mention of it.

Given the scale of the proposed mandate, the incredibly insane timeline, and the impact it will have on university operations, research, and teaching, I am requesting that the Faculty Senate investigate this immediately. This mandate affects all of us and CIO Barry Brummund has not been transparent and has not included faculty representation in any stage of this process.

E. Open Session Statement: Secretary Dysart (00:34:41)

In a few weeks nearly all of the first-year students at the law school will gather in one of these outside classrooms to take an introductory course in Constitutional Law. This is a course that I have taught, both here and at my previous institution. And while this course doesn't cover the sexy topics in Constitutional Law, like the First Amendment, it is a class that I love to teach. Why? Well, it is because it is the structure of our government that protects rights.

And as I walk my students through the constitutional design of the different branches of government and we discuss the power delegated to those branches, I remind them that as they think about how much power they want Congress, the president, or the Supreme Court to have, they should imagine their least favorite people in those offices, not their favorite. And now I say the same to you.

As Senators and frequent observers know, I have been critical of this body for selectively following our governing documents. Some members of this body have been outraged when we hear of irregularities with the nominating committee, in contravention of our governing documents, but then claim we shouldn't follow these same documents when a unit meets our requirements for membership.

Our failure to give research faculty a seat on this body and the dismissal of the faculty membership committee that Senator Simmons spoke about earlier are the two most egregious examples, but I could cite others. We need to remember as a body that our actions set precedent for future senates. How would you have responded if the previous officers took these actions? How would you like a senate full of senators that you don't trust or align with to act? Wouldn't you want them to follow the careful rules set out in our governing documents, which were approved by a vote of the whole faculty? I hope so. Structure protects rights and orders behavior. And while there are part of our documents and do need updating and clarifying, until that action happens, we are bound by our documents as written.

I hope as our law students start learning about structure, we can follow suit and respect our governing documents.

5. STATEMENT FROM CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON (00:37:18)

I want to use my time here today to focus sharply on our responsibilities in the wake of Thomas Meixner's murder. Draw your attention to the resolution at the end of your agenda today on health care for the Meixner's family. I'm sure you've all read it, along with Mrs. Meixner's statement, urging us to bear down in caring for each other. We have learned that a harsh future awaits those who lose a family member to workplace violence at this university. With worker's compensation, providing one quarter of a deceased worker's salary, those especially, cannot qualify for life insurance in this incredible hardship. COBRA healthcare premium payments, and even accelerated retirement health care benefits will consume most of those worker's compensation payments. The Meixner family, like other families, to whom such misfortunate, hopefully will not be in danger of losing their family home. I hope

today, we have a unanimous vote, encouraging the President to do whatever is necessary and whatever is within his power on their health care payments.

I now turn the rest of my time over to Christopher Castro, the acting Department Head of Hydrology to talk about the needs of the Department that Dr. Meixner headed.

- Interim Department Head Castro thanked the Faculty Senate for the support of the Department of Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences. Castro stated he will be reading a statement titled, "What is the Future of Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of Arizona." Castro stated he is aware that the Faculty Senate is concluding its initial, preliminary findings of the investigation and the Department will be prepared to respond at that time. The statement as follows:
 - Water challenges consistently rank at the top of global risk assessments for being both highly likely and extremely costly and damaging. Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences is the only program in the world that combines the study of the entire terrestrial water cycle. We're one of the global leaders in this area, we have two of the top five programs in UArizona. By U.S. News and World Report, we are in the top fifty programs. We have been recognize as one of the top three in the world for the past five years. We have been funded by major Federal agencies and are recognized as leaders through our outreach efforts.

We are in the position to take advantage of increased funding and infrastructure on natural hazard mitigation moving forward. It is integral to statewide efforts to better understand and manage limited water resources. That is critically important as one of the most water stressed regions in the nation. We need institutional support. We suffered the loss of Tom, and together, with a pre-existing lack of support for re-filing in key areas, we have significant gaps that propose an existential threat to our unit. There's circumstances surrounding them, left many in the department and community, feeling unsafe in the Harshbarger Building. To ensure healthy recovery and continued survival of the department, we have asked upper administration for the following

- Identification of permanent space, that will house Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences with a sufficient teaching lab and office space; allowing the department to grow beyond its limits of Harshbarger and address the psychological well-being of the department.
- Full support for cost of psychological treatment of affected department students and staff.
- Permission to initiate a search for an assistant professor in Geochemistry to fill Tom's position.
- Permission to initiate a search for a Department Chair at the full professor rank.

These requests are focused on what we, as a Department, feel is necessary to prevent the loss of a Department with two top performing programs, and they are intended to all immediate requests that the Meixner family receive financial support as to the acknowledgement from the late department Chair who dedicated his life and faithful service to the University.

6. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – UG MINOR CONSCIOUSNESS STUDIES; UG MINOR DIGITAL RETAILING; TRANSFER OF OWNERSHIP OF IDSTBA FROM CLAS TO HUM; - CHAIR OF UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, MOLLY BOLGER, AND CHAIRS OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL, RON HAMMER AND HONG CUI (00:42:49)**

- All proposals come to the Faculty Senate as seconded motions. Consent agenda items **[Motion 2022/2023-22]** Undergraduate Minor Consciousness Studies, **[Motion 2022/2023-23]** Undergraduate Minor Digital Retailing, **[Motion 2022/2023-24]** Transfer of ownership of Interdisciplinary Studies, Bachelor of Arts from College of Latin American Studies to College of Humanities, which carried with forty-five in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

7. **OLD BUSINESS (00:44:53)**

A. **ACTION ITEM: UHAP 5.2 REVISIONS - CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, WOLFGANG FINK**

- Faculty at large has requested changes to UHAP 5.2 which regulated annual reviews. There were delays due to the pandemic, but there are now finalized, proposed changes after advice from the Faculty Senate meeting in October. Feedback for proposed changes include the make-up of review committees for Deans and Department

Heads, the review of assessment will now be publicly disseminated, annual evaluations reported to the Faculty Senate, ensuring evaluations take place in a timely manner, and a provision for the possibility of dismissal of administrators following negative annual evaluations.

- There has been a resolution created, Senator Fink moved **[Motion 2022/2023-25]** to vote that the Faculty Senate endorses Committee of Eleven's proposed changes to UHAP 5.2, which is the annual performance reviews of administrative personnel, and supports advancing them to the next step in the policy making process. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/2023-25]** was approved with thirty-eight in favor, five opposed, and four abstentions.
 - Senator Schulz asked whether there has been a more recent presentation made to the Dean's Council since there have been changes made since the last presentation in 2019 from Steven Schwartz.
 - Senator Fink stated the presentation has not been repeated as there was a thirty-day review period issued, the period has now been exceeded by one-hundred percent, it is day sixty of the review. There was ample opportunity to provide feedback and the feedback received has been taken under advisement.
 - Senator Schulz stated if the document has changed since the last review, the proposal may benefit from such consultation.
 - Chair Hudson stated their agreement with this response and stated this should be brought back to the review of the Dean's Council.

B. REFORM OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE PROCEDURES - CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON (00:52:03)

- The question of committee formation has become a popular point of new sessions in the Faculty Senate. There is an understanding of unhappiness and confusion with the handling of the Faculty Membership Committee. Chair Hudson stated she is still waiting for an imminent report from the Committee of Eleven regarding the past practice of how committees have been formed in Shared Governance in the past. There is currently work being done regarding questions of the Nominating Committee, the history of Committee formation, and Shared Governance, but until then, Chair Hudson is reluctant to speak on what has been learned about the practice of Committee formation. This is partially due to confidentiality of ongoing grievance procedures and awaiting the report from the Committee of Eleven. Numerous lapses have been observed regarding the practice of Committee formation, committees have been formed in order to bypass bylaws and sometimes Faculty interest.
- Chair Hudson stated her understanding of Professor Maggert's Open Session statement and stated the Nominating Committee is under the leadership of Chair Amy Kraehe; there have been many changes to the process including the committee highlighting inclusivity and recruitment of faculty for the crucial service of shared governance. There have been many changes within the new leadership, specifically regarding gate-keeping, which could be deployed to exclude people.
 - Senator Harris stated there have been problems with the selection process, especially within the CAFT Committee regarding gatekeeping. Senator Harris asked if these Faculty who have had grievances in the past will be able to adjudicate these again.
 - Chair Hudson stated she has no comment on that matter at this point because her concerns are not extended in regard to suggested issues regarding CAFT, although she is still awaiting the results of the investigation. The Nominating Committee has taken steps to ensure members of the General Faculty who are interested in serving, have a fair chance to stand for elections as described by the Bylaws.
 - Senator Ziurys stated there was some type of blacklist and whether the list will be made public.
 - Chair Hudson stated, people who felt there was a form of exclusion on a blacklist have been heard, there have been extensive communications on the subject in addition to speeches made in Open Session. By not knowing what the Committee of Eleven will yield in their investigation, Chair Hudson is unable to confirm the existence of a blacklist. If such a list is unveiled, this would be shared with the Faculty Senate.
 - Senator Harris stated past CAFT hearings regarding grievances have been biased; it seems as if people who have had previous grievances should be allowed to re-grieve.
 - Chair Hudson stated their suggestion for awaiting the outcome of the Committee of Eleven investigation.

- Senator Ziurys stated her agreement for the comment regarding re-grieving; if cases were not handled properly in the past, it is only fair that they be retried to serve justice.
 - Chair Hudson stated she anticipates the report being done before the end of this semester, once the report is reviewed, discussion can be held in January 2023.
 - Senator Zeiders stated she serves on the Nominating Committee and assisted with documenting issues that were brought to the attention of the Nominating Committee and Committee of Eleven. Under the new leadership of Dr. Amy Kraehe, the Nominating Committee is operating in-line with the Faculty Bylaws. In addition, the committee has implemented new procedural steps that ensure the Faculty Center staff and administration are not driving or influencing the decisions of the committee. These procedural steps include the implementation of an Executive Session in which only voted Faculty members of the Nominating Committee are present, and able to participate. Additionally, the committee is working with a new Faculty Center staff member who is committed to working within the guidelines of Faculty Bylaws. The information and critical assessment from the previous Nominating Committee is taken very seriously, and new committee members are committed to ensuring that all faculty have the opportunity to participate in Shared Governance at the University of Arizona.
 - Senator Simmons stated having rules and following those rules is important and there needs to be a culture created where people are aware of the bylaws, and they are executed.
 - Chair Hudson stated that based on what the Committee of Eleven has been charged with, there will be a new culture of endorsing and recognizing the bylaws so every committee is aware of the bylaws permitted to the committee's function.

C. SENATE VOTING RESOLUTION - PARLIAMENTARIAN, MARK STEGEMAN (01:02:39)

The voting resolution has been distributed to the Faculty Senate body, there have been a small number of comments received which will be incorporated into the text. It is highly recommended that the resolution is read so there is preparation for a vote in the January 2023 Faculty Senate meeting. The resolution concerns three out of the five procedures under Robert's Rules. The five procedures include: a counted show-of-hands, uncounted show-of-hands, roll-call vote, secret-ballot vote, and unanimous consent which has not been used by the Senate. Such procedures can expedite certain processes.

8. NEW BUSINESS (01:05:07)

A. REPORT FROM THE DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION COMMITTEE - CHAIR OF THE DEI COMMITTEE, PRAISE ZENENGA AND COMMITTEE MEMBER JOHN SENSENEY (01:05:22)

- There was a report circulated in November 2022, this morning, the President responded with an email that responded to some of the issues raised in the report. The DEI Committee reviewed several statements, demands, and recommendations issued by various constituencies affected since 2016.
- There were consistent themes, issues, barriers, and problems found which have been repeated for several years. The Committee noted, with concern, the incident which occurred on September 30, 2022 is not isolated and fits into a larger pattern, it is a manifestation of issues that have been occurring for over a decade.
- The Committee is particularly concerned that the Central Administration has not adequately addressed Regents Professor Rebecca Tsosie's past DEI Assessment presented to President Robbins and incoming Provost Folks. The assessment included recommendations based on detailed articulation of both best practices and defective practices. The concern is to address structural problems rather than focus on specific issues.
- In light of the DEI Assessment, and the President, Provost's, and Senior Leadership team's completion of the UCF Institute Training arranged by Regents Professor Rebecca Tsosie and Associate Professor Nolan Cabrera, the Committee is still extremely concerned about the recurrent of unresolved DEI structural issues, triggered by matters that occur on nearly an annual basis.
- There have been demands brought by several student groups since about 2016, there are five common issues that reoccur, these are expounded and elaborated on in the report.
 - Financial and Human Resources have been channeled to issues of diversity and inclusion.
 - Human Resources must be increased including the increase of diversity and training for Human Resources staff.

- Academic Support and Training where DEI issues can be incorporated into the curriculum to avoid micro-equations.
- In terms of campus representation, there was a call brought by students of marginalized groups to be represented in the Senior Leadership Team (SLT).
- Administrative Accountability as there is a concern for the lack of apologies being issues for microaggressions especially on campus, students would like to see improvement on this.
- Senator Zenenga asked for answers regarding the plan and commitment to address these pertinent DEI issues, and whether the President and Provost would be able to share actions taken from the past two months to address the issues. Senator Zenenega stated his acknowledgment for the communication sent out by the President and stated not all issues were addressed.
- Senator Senseney stated his thanks for the President's communication sent earlier that morning and invited Senators to support the committee in their approach to resolve these issues. Senator Senseney stated the committee's recommendations to resolve the issues:
 - Engagement which entails commitment and involvement, including all stakeholders such as senior leadership teams, faculty, staff, students, and communities.
 - Facilitation of dialogue to discuss policies, structure, best practices in an environment of civility and mutual respect, and issues affecting diversity from an overall University perspective.
 - A proposed summit that unites people across campus to reflect on past happenings and ways to move forward.
 - Internal DEI hires for all top positions; looking for qualified and trained personnel from within, someone with institutional knowledge and an understanding of the issues UArizona faces and needed resolutions for those issues.
 - In terms of suggested solutions, resources should be channeled toward the creation of de-escalation teams and practices. Senator Senseney acknowledged the pilot process response team the University is currently exploring.
 - In place of the current structure that gives The Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODI) responsibility but no authority, there should be an ODI separate from SLT which will function as an independent voice, create better structures, and be a system that allows students, staff, and faculty to come forward to talk about issues without feeling threatened or endangered.
 - Allocating resources toward researching the structure of institutions with successful DEI units. Creation of structures and systems and an environment that allows proactiveness versus reactive.
 - Senior Administrators return to their commitment of DEI training, particularly the program offered by the USC Equity Institute and redouble their efforts to learn from institutions that are more advanced than the UArizona on these issues.
- The DEI Committee is willing to work with other Faculty Senate Committees including the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, and the Student Affairs Policy Committee to come up with a de-escalation white-paper in the Spring 2023 semester. The committee plans to work with the Provost, as recommended, and to be constructive and break down past cycles in order to come up with long-term solutions.
 - ASUA President Robles thanked the presenters from the DEI Committee for their report and echoed the sentiments that were shared. ASUA President Robles stated students are feeling a great amount of concern about the direction of cultural issues and the changes that are occurring in ODI. ASUA President Robles' constituents question why such serious structural changes are taking place such as the decision to move ODI under the Dean of Students Office involving cultural offices.

B. POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES – SECRETARY DYSART (01:16:00)

- The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is still awaiting final documents from the President's Office, but there are three items that may be voted.
- First, the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council and the Classified Staff Council no longer exist, they are now the UArizona Staff Council which wasn't fixed consistently throughout the bylaws.
 - There is one notable change on the Naming Advisory Committee. Previously CSC and APAC both had seats on the Naming Advisory Committee, the Bylaws and Constitution committee decided it didn't make sense to have

two representatives and the committee is made up largely of Chairs. There was a discussion with Senator Jeffrey Jones who holds the position of the Chair of the UArizona Staff Council, he agreed it made the most sense to have one representative.

- Under Article 10, Section 1 of the Constitution, it states, “Revisions to allow for minor corrections for administrative or clerical updates to the Constitution or Bylaws that do not materially change intent, may be approved by the Faculty Senate, and not require a vote of the General Faculty unless the Senate determines otherwise.”
- Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/2023-26]** to approve Item One: Bylaws Housekeeping Changes as detailed in her report. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/2023-26]** was approved with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions. Senator Simmons moved **[Motion 2022/2023-27]** that there are non-material changes in Item One: Bylaws, Housekeeping Changes and they do not need to be voted on by the General Faculty. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/2023-27]** passed with forty-four in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.
- Second, Secretary Dysart stated she does work with workforce solutions to code Faculty for Voting when they become a part of the University. There is fluctuation in who constitutes general faculty which usually occurs at the beginning of the semester. In previous elections, there were numerous changes to the list. To eliminate those issues, the Committee recommends a cut-off date, seven days before the election to establish a list of Voting Faculty. There will be an email sent out from the Faculty Center email notifying the General Faculty that they are able to check their voting status on UAccess Analytics with enough notice. These details are included in Article IV, Section 2, under Item Three: Bylaws Change.
- Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/2023-28]** to approve a change to Constitution and Bylaws Change for Article IV, Section 2, detailed in Dysart’s document. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/2023-28]** passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.
- Item Two will be sent to the General Faculty to approve.
- The Provost raised concerns about the final issue, so it will return to the Committee to discuss and be presented again to the Senate.

C. [GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MINUTES](#) - PARLIAMENTARIAN MARK STEGEMAN (01:33:08)

- The Constitution and Bylaws both refer to the distribution of minutes to the General Faculty and it is unclear if this is currently happening. Parliamentarian Stegeman recommended that the Faculty Officers should develop a process to ensure the minutes are distributed to the General Faculty by email.
 - Secretary Dysart reminded him that the Senate has yet to approve minutes this year, so they cannot be distributed.
- There are three main ideas in the resolution, first, while abiding by Robert’s Rules, it is appropriate to include more than the minimum specified in Robert’s Rules, details are acceptable to include but should typically constitute most half of the total text. The Senate has the discretion to specify what will be included in the minutes. Also mentioned is the possibility of including the names of senators who have made certain points. The maker of the motion is always in the minutes, therefore, it is logical to allow someone who is opposed to the motion to be included in the minutes. There is a proposal to include major advocates in the record, rather than engaging in the consuming process of a roll call vote. Since minutes are distributed to the General Faculty, it can better inform them, for subsequent voting purposes, to include names of Senators and their positions on certain issues.
 - A Senator [unidentifiable from the recording] stated their agreement for the majority of the proposal, Robert’s Rules and other forms of formality are in place to provide a basic model, although they can be very skeletal. The purpose of the minutes is to serve as an operational document, providing information about current issues. The Senator suggested attaching a complete transcript as a complete record of the recording to satisfy all of the goals.
 - Senator Tropman questioned whether there would be a requirement to vote on each instance a Senator requested their name included in the minutes.
 - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated this would not be a requirement, and this would be at the discretion of the Faculty Center with guidance from the Officers to construct minutes. If the Senate wanted to dictate the outcome, they would have the option to specify that.
 - Senator Simmons stated his agreement with having two separate documents with one serving as a shorter document with action items, and the other being a more detailed document. Simmons stated there has to be

assurance that there will be long term availability of recordings for Faculty Senate meetings. Simmons moved **[Motion 2022/2023-29]** to make a friendly amendment to the Resolution of the Minutes on the Meetings of the Faculty Senate. The friendly amendment includes adding timestamps to the minutes. Motion was seconded and passed with a majority vote.

- Senator R. Witte moved **[Motion 2022/2023-30]** to extend the discussion for five additional minutes, motion was seconded, and motion carried with a two thirds majority vote.
- Senator M. Witte stated her request for her comments from previous Faculty Senate meetings to be included in the past minutes. Senator M. Witte stated complete and inclusive minutes are very important, the Faculty is not exhausted by getting a monthly email which contains a four to five page document.
 - Senator M. Smith shared their agreement with Senator M. Witte's comments and stated that it is foundational and an important part of the Faculty Senate's ability to represent constituencies by listing the two-minute presentations with detail of the presenter and topic.
- Senator Ziurys stated her disagreement for having two versions of the minutes as the second version will be disregarded. It is important to have a complete set of minutes and include controversial topics for constituencies to be able to view and understand what took place in each meeting.
- Senator Stegeman moved **[Motion 2022/2023-31]** to adopt the Resolution on the minutes of the meetings of the Faculty Senate with the friendly amendment of adding timestamps to the minutes. Motion was seconded and passed with thirty-seven in favor.

Text of the Resolution concerning the process for Faculty Senate minutes:

Purpose: "The Faculty Senate resolves that its minutes shall comply with all requirements of Roberts Rules [henceforth RR] (§48, 12th ed.). The Senate also acknowledges the general guidance in RR (§48.2): "In an ordinary society, the minutes should contain mainly a record of what was done at the meeting, not what was said by the members." The resolution for the minutes captures feedback from previous Faculty Senate meetings.

Resolution: It is appropriate to include more than the minimum, per guidance specified in Robert's Rules, this includes the possibility of adding names of Senators by request, for the purpose of accountability, and to follow the logic of naming both the maker and opposer of the motion. The Senate has discretion to specify what is included in the minutes, by motion. Instructions on how to access the recording of the meeting should be detailed in the minutes. The implementation of this guidance should respect the following general principles:

1. For controversial or major issues, it is appropriate, for the purposes of transparency and informing the General Faculty, to add detail beyond the minimum requirements of RR.
 2. Such detail should typically constitute at most held of the total text of the minutes and may include: major points that arose in discussion; the names of Senators leading the advocacy for those points; substantive motions made and later withdrawn; significant comments by visitors who are not members of the Senate, brief summaries of substantial presentations; etc.
 3. In specific cases, the Senate as a whole has broad discretion over what is included in the minutes, beyond the minimum required by RR. This discretion, which should typically be exercised through unanimous consent or adopted motions, could include requiring that: (a) particular points or minutes; (b) a particular speaker's verbatim comments be included within the text or as an appendix to the minutes; (c) specific points from discussion, or other items beyond those required by RR, *not* appear in the minutes.
 4. The Senate may give such guidance concerning the prospective minutes for a meeting in progress, including concerning an agenda item that has just been completed, or later when minutes for a past meeting are discussed or adopted.
 5. In cases where there is no roll call vote on a specific motion, special consideration should be given to Senators who request that the minutes note their support of, or opposition to, that motion. Whether such requests are honored is, however, ultimately a decision for the Senate as a whole.
- If recording of a Senate meeting is to be preserved and made available to the General Faculty, then the minutes should include information about how to access the recording.

D. RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE, RECOMMENDATION ON F & A - CHAIR OF RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE, DAVID CULLER (01:50:11)

- The [report](#) is linked to the agenda and includes information gathered over the past several months, including a survey of the Faculty and College Budget Officers. Additionally, there is data regarding how facilities and administration indirect costs are distributed. There are six recommendations included in the report, feedback is welcome before the next Faculty Senate meeting where there will be a vote held.
 - The Research Policy Committee believes there should be flexibility on how F&A distributions are spent similar to how colleges, departments, and central administration are given flexibility.
 - Researchers should be allowed quarterly distributions and not just annual distributions as this can create advantages to their research.
 - There should be a minimum distribution set, the administration suggested fifty-dollars as anything under this number can be viewed as time-consuming and costly.
 - Administration should not be managing accumulated balances that PIs are trusted to manage. There may be a need to save up for several years for a large piece of equipment. If possible, the accumulations should not be included in the formulas that count against colleges as it is not a part of their budget.
 - There is a suggestion that the distribution to researchers should be five-percent, not two-percent. Seven of the twenty colleges provided distributions higher than two-percent before AIB. This will create meaningfulness to research funding. The additional three-percent should come from the central administration's cut. If a PI departs from the University, the funds should go back into the unit to continue research rather than allocated back to Central Administration or the College.
 - Staff Council Representative Rocha asked who will be responsible for the transfer of funds and whether they will come from sponsored projects or if the Department will be responsible for putting the FNA on the PI's accounts.
 - RPC Chair Cuillier stated it is his understanding that it will be the College's handling which is why College Budget Officers were surveyed.

E. FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION FOR HEALTHCARE FOR MEIXNER FAMILY - CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON (01:55:54)

- This resolution is supportive of the President's personal position to potentially help him in assisting the Meixner family. The family was informed that the Faculty Senate can vote on this resolution as a symbolic gesture and there is no power to enforce it.
- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2022/2023-32**] the Faculty Senate Resolution: We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona, request that the President of the University of Arizona in cooperation with the Arizona Board of Regents, the University of Arizona Foundation and/or the Arizona Legislature solicit, procure or allocate from the general funds of the University, the University of Arizona Foundation, or through a budget line item of the legislature, sufficient funds to pay for the Meixner family's (Mrs. Meixner and her eligible dependent children) COBRA or a viable alternative for sufficient healthcare and retirement health benefits until Mrs. Meixner becomes eligible for Medicare benefits and additionally for the premiums for necessary supplemental coverage to Medicare for Mrs. Meixner thereafter. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2022/2023-32**] passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.
 - Senator Downing pointed out that the State Legislature and the Board of Regents have made provisions similar to this one for first-responders in particular situations; it is not unprecedented. This may assist the President in discussing this topic with ABOR and the State Legislature.
 - Senator Fink stated to his knowledge, COBRA is time-limited and only follows a short period of time after departure from a job. It is important that Mrs. Meixner is given adequate support so she may safely enter into Medicare.
 - A Senator (unidentifiable from the recording – (01:58:51)) made a friendly amendment to the language which includes changing the language from "COBRA" to "COBRA or a viable alternative" The friendly amendment was seconded.
 - Senator Simmons made a friendly amendment which includes adding "sufficient healthcare" to the language of the resolution. The friendly amendment was seconded.

9. 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

- The President thanked the DEI Committee for their report and is looking forward to working with all of the stakeholders; there will soon be an announcement. The President shared his appreciation for the Faculty Senate Resolution for Healthcare for the Meixner Family, and stated he wants to assist the family. There was a meeting held with the individuals who were directly affected in the Department of Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences, the meeting was heartbreaking. There are limitations which the lawyers have more knowledge on pertaining to gift clauses, and other items. The Regents who attended the Faculty breakfast appreciate the enlightened meeting with the Senators. The President is committed to helping all people affected by this tragedy.
- Senator Zeiders stated there have been questions that have come up in CALS for the Graduate Council in regard to the new procedure in place for disclosure of felonies in graduate applications and what the process will be. There is concern of who decides and reviews these disclosures.
 - Senator Hammer stated he will ask Vice Provost for Graduate Education, Andrew Carnie for more detail, it is still at the beginning of its process. The Graduate programs and Faculty would like to know if there is any increase in risk that may be associated, this is not to hinder anyone to have “minor felonies.” Andrew Carnie, the current Dean of the Graduate Faculty, described the proposed procedure to the Graduate Council but did not go into great detail. This is a Graduate College Policy and does not depend on the vote from the Graduate Council or the Faculty Senate.
- Senator Downing stated the Law School did a review of collateral sanctions and it is important to be careful to not create another limit on top of the existing six-hundred. There is a great deal of information regarding collateral sanctions and as a University it is important to not stop on grounds and prevent people from having a chance to re-enter the institution.
 - Senator Hammer stated there is already a process in place for Undergraduate applications and there was no such process in place for the Graduate College, this is intended to implement similar processes at the Graduate level.

10. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

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

Motions of the December 5, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2022/2023-21] Motion to approve the December 5, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-four in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

[Motion 2022/2023-22] Consent agenda seconded motion from Undergraduate Minor in Consciousness Studies. Motion carried with forty-five in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

[Motion 2022/2023-23] Consent agenda seconded motion from Undergraduate Minor in Digital Retailing. Motion carried with forty-five in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

[Motion 2022/2023-24] Consent agenda seconded motion for Transfer of ownership of Interdisciplinary Studies, Bachelor of Arts from College of Latin American Studies to College of Humanities. Motion carried with forty-four in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

[Motion 2022/2023-25] Motion to vote that the Faculty Senate endorses Committee of Eleven's proposed changes to UHAP 5.2, which is the annual performance reviews of administrative personnel, and supports advancing them to the next step in the policy making process. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-eight in favor, five opposed, and four abstentions

Proposed changes to UHAP 5.2

Faculty Constitution Article V, Section 3 provides: *"The Committee of Eleven shall: a. Initiate, promote, and stimulate study and action dealing with and looking toward solution of situations and problems of interest and concern to the faculty and to the University. b. Make reports to the General Faculty or the Faculty Senate. c. Speak for the General Faculty as and when authorized by the General Faculty."*

Over 3 years ago and responding to concerns brought by the General Faculty regarding the lack of annual review compliance and accountability for administrators (including Deans and Department Heads), the Committee of Eleven (C11) examined and considered revisions to the governing document for annual reviews of administrators (i.e., UHAP 5.2). After careful deliberations, C11 produced a set of changes/revisions to UHAP 5.2 that were subsequently presented in the Senate and to the Deans' Council by then-Chair of C11 Dr. Steven Schwartz. With the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the planned revision to UHAP 5.2 was put on hold and never voted on in the Senate. In Academic Year 2021-2022, however, C11 picked up where C11 left off in 2019, finalized the suggested changes, and subsequently presented them to Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Dr. Andrea Romero. We are now bringing them to the Senate floor for discussion with the intent of putting these to a Senate vote in the November Senate meeting.

I remain collegially yours

Dr. Wolfgang Fink Chair of C11 on behalf of C11 Faculty Senator

1 Tracked proposed changes to the ORIGINAL version of UHAP 5.2 as it
2 currently stands:

3 [https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/annual-performance-reviews-
4 administrative-personnel](https://policy.arizona.edu/employment-human-resources/annual-performance-reviews-
4 administrative-personnel)

5 This Section applies to annual performance reviews of administrative
6 personnel including but not limited to Deans, Assistant Deans, Associate
7 Deans, Vice Deans, Department Heads and Directors, and division-level and
8 university-level administrators.

9 Administrators of the University are evaluated with respect to all personnel
10 matters on their leadership in developing collaborations and managing
11 resources to build capacity, improve performance, foster a collegial, inclusive
12 and supportive working environment, and advance innovation. Annual
13 performance reviews are intended

14 1. To involve administrative personnel in the formulation of objectives and goals
15 related to their college, department, or program and their own professional
16 development;

17 2. To assess actual performance and accomplishments in each area of an
18 administrator's responsibility;

19 3. To promote an administrator's effectiveness by articulating the types of
20 contributions the administrator might make to the University community that
21 will lead to greater professional development, recognition and rewards;

22 4. To recognize and maximize administrators' special talents, capabilities and
23 achievements, including the achievements of those they supervise;

24 5. To recognize efforts that ensure equal opportunity in hiring and retaining staff,
25 faculty, and professionals, and in recruiting students;

26 6. To advance innovations that better enable units to achieve their strategic goals;

27 7. To identify weaknesses and other matters of concern that need to be addressed;
28 and in cases where no change is seen in performance for at most two years in a
29 row, to recommend to the direct supervisor appropriate action and/or change up
30 to and including dismissal from the administrative position/role; and

31 8. To provide written records to support the continuation or termination of the
32 administrator.

Formatted: Numbering: Continuous

Deleted: all

Deleted:

Deleted: <#>To identify weaknesses that will be
addressed during the next evaluation period;¶

Deleted: and

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Deleted: personnel decisions

39

40 5.2.01 Annual Performance Review Process

41 Each administrator's performance will be evaluated in writing on a scheduled
42 basis at least once every 12 months. The administrator's performance will be
43 evaluated with respect to the criteria set forth in Section 5.2.02.

44 Administrative personnel who also hold non-administrative (i.e., faculty or
45 other) positions will be evaluated on their non-administrative duties
46 according to the same conditions of service as others holding similar
47 positions in their unit.

48 The administrator's immediate supervisor will conduct the performance
49 review, which ~~shall include peer review and input from those within the unit~~
50 whom the administrator directly ~~or indirectly~~ supervises. Such input may be
51 obtained by the use of a faculty or staff survey developed by the University
52 with additional items developed by an administrator's supervisor in
53 collaboration with the unit. Each performance review will be in writing and
54 contain, at a minimum, a discussion of the administrator's (a) past and
55 present performance with respect to assigned duties; (b) leadership
56 development; and (c) progress towards achieving the strategic goals of the
57 unit.

58 The following procedures are involved in the annual performance review of
59 administrative personnel:

60 ~~1. The evaluation shall be initiated yearly on the anniversary of initial~~
61 ~~appointment by the administrator's supervisor. The evaluation shall be~~
62 ~~by a committee that is chaired by the supervisor or a delegate and shall~~
63 ~~include faculty, staff, and senators from the administrator's unit. In the~~
64 ~~case of Deans, a majority of the members of this committee shall be~~
65 ~~elected by general faculty members of the College with the remaining~~
66 ~~members appointed by the Chair of the Faculty. In the case of~~
67 ~~Department Heads and Directors, the members of this committee shall be~~
68 ~~elected by general faculty members of the Department and will include~~
69 ~~faculty governance representatives whenever possible.~~

Deleted: will

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Tab stops: Not at 0.5"

Formatted: Not Highlight

Deleted: a majority of

Formatted: Not Highlight

72 2. Input from faculty and staff and other individuals ~~from within the~~
73 administrator's unit is gathered ~~confidentially~~ along with other
74 information on performance to provide benchmarks for the review. Deleted: comprising

75 3. Using the performance expectations and benchmarks set out for the
76 evaluation period, the administrator will write a self-assessment,
77 reflecting on each of the criteria on which the administrator is to be
78 evaluated.

79 4. The administrator's supervisor ~~and the review committee~~ will prepare a
80 written assessment of the administrator's performance over the
81 evaluation period on the basis of those written criteria and benchmarks,
82 the administrator's self-assessment, and feedback from staff and faculty
83 (if there are faculty in the unit as well as staff). If the administrator has
84 assigned research, teaching, or other non-administrative duties, the
85 administrator's supervisor for these assignments will evaluate these
86 duties as well ~~with input from the review committee for the unit~~.

87 5. The administrator's supervisor will provide the administrator with the
88 performance review and will meet with the administrator to discuss the
89 review and future expectations, typically by May 15, if possible.

90 ~~6.~~ The administrator may add ~~a response to~~ the written performance review
91 before the administrator signs the document and returns it to the
92 administrative supervisor. The signed performance review will become a
93 part of the administrator's individual personnel record. Deleted: comments

94 ~~7.~~ ~~The review committee or its subcommittee will prepare a non-confidential~~
95 ~~executive summary of the review to be shared with the faculty and staff~~
96 ~~supervised by the administrator under review.~~ Formatted: Not Highlight
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

97 8. ~~An annual report will be presented to the faculty senate listing the~~
98 ~~reviews performed for each academic year.~~ Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Highlight
Formatted: Normal, Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.38 li
Formatted: Font: (Default) Verdana, Font color: Dark Gray

99

100 **5.2.02 Annual Performance Review Criteria**

101 Administrators are assessed on their leadership in building trust, fostering
102 collaboration, managing resources, ~~encouraging innovation, fostering a~~
103 ~~collegial, inclusive and supportive work environment~~, and achieving results.

104 Written evaluation criteria will include consideration of administrators'
105 leadership skills, including their effectiveness in communicating and

108 responding to coworkers, forging partnerships and building consensus,
109 acquiring and managing resources, , and advancing innovations in research,
110 teaching, outreach, and other aspects of their unit's mission. The unit's
111 progress will be assessed using performance benchmarks developed in
112 collaboration with the administrator's supervisor and the faculty, staff and
113 others in the unit. These benchmarks will be aligned with the University's
114 strategic plan and may include but are not limited to the following:

- 115 • ~~Participation, performance, and perception of faculty, staff, and other individuals~~
116 ~~in the administrator's unit;~~
- 117 • ~~Quantifiable measures of productivity of reporting staff. For example in the case~~
118 ~~of Deans, the success of assistant, associate, and vice deans in advancing the~~
119 ~~goals for which they are responsible. If this cannot be quantified in a positive~~
120 ~~way, direct action shall be taken by the Dean to alter their administrative staff;~~
- 121 • ~~Evidence of fulfillment of fair and rigorous reviews of faculty as required by~~
122 ~~ABOR;~~
- 123 • ~~Success of collaborations with internal and external partners;~~
- 124 • Business and community boards and outreach initiatives as appropriate to the
125 mission of the unit;
- 126 • Increases in donations, research revenues, technology transfer, and other types
127 of external funding;
- 128 • Management of resources within the unit;
- 129 • Efforts to recruit and retain diverse and outstanding faculty, staff, and students
130 as appropriate to the mission of the unit;
- 131 • Measures of teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes, where relevant;
- 132 • Increases in undergraduate and graduate ~~student enrollments and retention,~~
133 including those from underserved backgrounds;
- 134 • Increases in online enrollments, where applicable;
- 135 • Improvements in time to degree and graduation rates where relevant;
- 136 • National and international recognition for research, scholarship, ~~innovation,~~
137 ~~entrepreneurship,~~ and creative achievements that are relevant to the mission of
138 the unit;
- 139 • Clinical performance, where relevant;
- 140 • Performance on professional licensing examinations in units that train medical
141 residents; and
- 142 • Success in meeting accreditation requirements, as appropriate and relevant.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Not Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Deleted: <#>Input from faculty, staff, and other
individuals in the administrator's unit;¶
<#>Feedback from

Deleted: <#>collaborators

147

148 5.2.03 Appeals of Annual Performance Reviews

149 Administrative personnel who disagree with their annual performance
150 reviews may appeal their review to the administrative head at the next level
151 within 30 days after receipt of the written annual performance review. The
152 appeal must state with specificity (a) the findings to be appealed; (b) the
153 points of disagreement; (c) the facts in support of the appeal; and (d) the
154 corrective action sought.

155 The administrator reviewing the appeal will consider the facts in support of
156 the appeal and develop any additional facts deemed necessary. The decision
157 on an appeal will be completed in writing within 30 days, with copies
158 provided to the employee seeking the appeal and the employee's supervising
159 administrator.

160 If an administrator also holds a non-faculty appointment and disagrees with
161 the review related to that appointment, the administrator may appeal the
162 review to the next administrative level. If an administrator also holds a
163 faculty appointment of more than 25% of the administrator's total workload
164 assignment and disagrees with the review of the administrator's
165 performance as a faculty member, then the administrator may appeal the
166 review according to the same procedures provided for faculty in **Section**
167 **3.2.03.**
168

[Motion 2022/2023-26] Motion to approve Constitution and Bylaws Change, Item One: Bylaws Housekeeping Changes. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

I. Bylaws Housekeeping Changes

Replace references to Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC) and Classified Staff Council (CSC) with UArizona Staff Council (UASC), the successor body to APAC and CSC. This will involve the following changes (designated as tracked changes):

A. Article VI, Section 1

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

B. Article VI, Section 3

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

C. Article VIII, Section 2 (note, section will need to be re-lettered after change)

- d. Representatives of the UArizona Staff Council: two members of the UArizona Staff Council (UASC) shall be appointed annually by the Chair of UASC. One Year-to-Year Appointed Professional: one member of the Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC) of the University of Arizona shall be appointed annually by the Chair of APAC. The members will hold voting membership and be afforded the full privileges thereof.
- e. ~~Representative of the Classified Staff: one member of the Classified Staff Council (CSC) of the University of Arizona shall be appointed annually by the Chair of CSC. The member will hold voting membership and be afforded the full privileges thereof.~~

[Motion 2022/2023-27] Motion to approve that there are non-material changes in the Constitution and Bylaws Change, Item One: Bylaws, Housekeeping Changes and they do not need to be voted on by the General Faculty. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-four in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

[Motion 2022/2023-28] Motion to approve the Bylaws Change for Article IV, Section 2 which ensures all necessary amendments are made to the list of eligible voters seven calendar days before the election. Eligible voters will be notified approximately a month prior to the finalization of the list, any requests for changes can be communicated with the

Committee on Faculty Membership during this period. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

III. Bylaws Change

A. Article IV, Section 2

Clarify that the list of eligible voters closes 7 calendar days before the election. See tracked changes:

Section 2: Conduct of Elections

- a. The Committee on Elections shall notify the General Faculty, no later than January 15 each year, of elective offices to be filled that year.
- b. The committee shall accept completed declarations of candidacy no later than the close of business ten (10) class days prior to the election.
- c. The committee shall conduct general elections for elective offices no later than March 1, allowing ten (10) class days from the opening of the online election to the close of the election. The list of general faculty eligible to vote shall be finalized seven (7) days before the election commences.
- d. The committee shall notify members of the General Faculty of the results of general elections no later than March 22.
- e. The committee shall conduct runoff elections for faculty offices no later than April 1, allowing ten (10) class days from the opening of the online election to the close of the election.
- f. The committee shall notify the General Faculty of the results of the runoff election no later than April 25. Results for all General Faculty elections will include a list of any individuals elected and policies adopted, vote counts, and the overall participation rate for the election.
- g. In the event of a tie vote, the decision shall be made by lot. Lots are cast by the Committee on Elections. The candidates or their designated witnesses are invited to observe the casting of lots.

[Motion 2022/2023-29] Motion to make a friendly amendment to the Resolution of the Minutes on the Meetings of the Faculty Senate. The friendly amendment includes adding timestamps to the minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with a majority vote.

[Motion 2022/2023-30] Motion to extend the discussion on Parliamentarian Stegeman's Resolution by five additional minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with a two thirds majority vote.

[Motion 2022/2023-31] to adopt the Resolution on the minutes of the meetings of the Faculty Senate with the friendly amendment of adding timestamps to the minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-seven in favor. Text of Resolution:

Resolution concerning the process for Faculty Senate minutes:

Purpose: "The Faculty Senate resolves that its minutes shall comply with all requirements of Roberts Rules [henceforth RR] (§48, 12th ed.). The Senate also acknowledges the general guidance in RR (§48.2):" In an ordinary society, the minutes should contain mainly a record of what was done at the meeting, not what was said by the members." The resolution for the minutes captures feedback from previous Faculty Senate meetings.

Resolution: It is appropriate to include more than the minimum, per guidance specified in Robert's Rules, this includes the possibility of adding names of Senators by request, for the purpose of accountability, and to follow the logic of naming both the maker and opposer of the motion. The Senate has discretion to specify what is included in the minutes, by motion. Instructions on how to access the recording of the meeting should be detailed in the minutes. The implementation of this guidance should respect the following general principles:

6. For controversial or major issues, it is appropriate, for the purposes of transparency and informing the General Faculty, to add detail beyond the minimum requirements of RR.
7. Such detail should typically constitute at most held of the total text of the minutes and may include: major points that arose in discussion; the names of Senators leading the advocacy for those points; substantive motions made and later withdrawn; significant comments by visitors who are not members of the Senate, brief summaries of substantial presentations; etc.
8. In specific cases, the Senate as a whole has broad discretion over what is included in the minutes, beyond the minimum required by RR. This discretion, which should typically be exercised through unanimous consent or adopted motions, could include requiring that: (a) particular points or minutes; (b) a particular speaker's verbatim comments be included within the text or as an appendix to the minutes; (c) specific points from discussion, or other items beyond those required by RR, *not* appear in the minutes.
9. The Senate may give such guidance concerning the prospective minutes for a meeting in progress, including concerning an agenda item that has just been completed, or later when minutes for a past meeting are discussed or adopted.
10. In cases where there is no roll call vote on a specific motion, special consideration should be given to Senators who request that the minutes note their support of, or opposition to, that motion. Whether such requests are honored is, however, ultimately a decision for the Senate as a whole.

If recording of a Senate meeting is to be preserved and made available to the General Faculty, then the minutes should include information about how to access the recording.

[Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2022/2023-32**] the Faculty Senate Resolution: We, the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona, request that the President of the University of Arizona in cooperation with the Arizona Board of Regents, the University of Arizona Foundation and/or the Arizona Legislature solicit, procure or allocate from the general funds of the University, the University of Arizona Foundation, or through a budget line item of the legislature, sufficient funds to pay for the Meixner family's (Mrs. Meixner and her eligible dependent children) COBRA or a viable alternative for sufficient healthcare and retirement health benefits until Mrs. Meixner becomes eligible for Medicare benefits and additionally for the premiums for necessary supplemental coverage to Medicare for Mrs. Meixner thereafter. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2022/2023-32**] passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

Text of Resolution:

Purpose: A request from the Faculty Senate, as a symbolic gesture, to the President of the University of Arizona, in cooperation with the Arizona Board of Regents, the University of Arizona Foundation, and/or the Arizona State Legislature to assist the Meixner family with costs associated with sufficient healthcare and retirement plans.

Purpose: To elicit, procure, or allocate the general funds of the University, the University of Arizona Foundation, or through a budget-line-item of the legislature, efficient funds to pay for the Meixner Family's (Mrs. Meixner and her eligible, dependent children) sufficient healthcare and retirement premiums until Mrs. Meixner becomes eligible for Medicare benefits and additionally for the premiums for necessary supplemental coverage for Medicare for Mrs. Meixner, thereafter.

- A. A Senator (unidentifiable from the recording – **(01:58:51)**) made a friendly amendment to the language which includes changing the language from "COBRA" to "COBRA or a viable alternative." The friendly amendment was seconded.
- B. Senator Simmons made a friendly amendment which includes adding "sufficient healthcare" to the language of the resolution. The friendly amendment was seconded.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456

Attachments within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [AGENDA](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the [SEPTEMBER 12, MINUTES](#)
3. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the [OCTOBER 3, 2022 MINUTES](#)
4. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the [NOVEMBER 7, 2022 MINUTES](#)
5. Page 7, Action Item 7A: [UHAP 5.2 REVISIONS – CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, WOLFGANG FINK](#)
6. Page 10, New Business Item 8C: [GUIDELINES FOR THE FACULTY SENATE MINUTES](#)
7. Page 11, New Business Item 8D: [RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE, RECOMMENDATION ON F&A – CHAIR OF THE RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE, DAVID CUILLIER](#)