

**MINUTES  
FACULTY  
SENATE  
MARCH 13, 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 found at:

<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=dee7c0c7-bd7b-4851-9a75-afc5000880fb>

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the March 13, 2023 Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. in Law 160 and via Zoom. Secretary Tessa Dysart was also present. Vice Chair Hymel welcomed all new Faculty Senators, guests, and Observers.

**Present:** Senators Bourget, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cui, Domin, Downing, Dysart, Fellous, Fink, Folks, Guzman, Hammer, Hudson, Hymel, Ijagbemi, Jones, Knox, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Lucas, Neumann, O'Leary, Ottsuch, Pace, Rankin, Rocha, Rodrigues, Ruggill, Russell, Senseney, Simmons, Slepian, M. Smith, Spece, Stanescu, Stegeman, Stone, Su, Tropman, Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Ziurys.

**Absent:** Senators Addis, Alfie, Behrangi, Cai, Cooley, Dial, Duran, Gerald, Gordon, Goyal, Harris, Haskins, Irizarry, Lamb, Murugesan, Nichols, Pau, Robbins, Robles, Sadoway, Schulz, J. Smith, Stephan, Vedantam, Wittman, Zeiders, Zenenga.

**2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [FACULTY SENATE AGENDA FOR MARCH 13, 2023](#) (00:17:46)**

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-62]** to approve the Faculty Senate agenda. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2022/62-2]** passed with thirty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated that reports were inadvertently left off the agenda due to using the same template for the previous "Special Faculty Senate" meeting. Vice Chair Hymel stated that rather than amending the agenda, all groups who have reports can communicate these through the Senate Listserv, they will then be attached to the agenda.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated that Executive Session does not have a time listed on the agenda although, the Senate Executive Committee approved a timeframe of fifteen minutes.
- Senator M. Witte stated a large number of items are coming onto the consent agenda, to avoid becoming a diploma mill, careful attention should be paid to these items, in particular items concerning curriculum and units. Senator M. Witte stated there is an issue regarding the power of the Senate Executive Committee to interfere with the faculty's ability to conduct their business according to what they view is important. Senator M. Witte stated the Senate Executive Committee's ability to exist should be reviewed and the Senate should have the ability to set an agenda with their own important points and order.

**3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF [DECEMBER 5, 2022, JANUARY 23, 2023, FEBRUARY 6, 2023, AND FEBRUARY 27, 2023](#) (00:23:11)**

Senator Hammer moved **[Motion 2022/23-63]** to approve the minutes of December 5, 2022, January 23, 2022, February 6, 2023, and February 27, 2023 with a friendly amendment to include Senator Pace as present for the February 6, 2023 minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- Senator M. Witte stated the minutes are a big improvement and are beginning to appear similar to the original minutes. Senator M. Witte stated she has only been able to spot-check the minutes, and hasn't had time to listen to the recording, and stated she reserves the right to identify potential omissions or distortions in the future. Senator M. Witte stated the minutes should be attached to the agenda, and the minutes should not be edited until the Senate edits the minutes together.
- Senator M. Smith stated she attended the February 27, 2023 meeting by telephone and was unable to vote.

**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.**  
**(00:28:43)**

**Open Session Statement: Peter Neff, Executive Director, University Bookstores. (00:29:41)**

Thank you for the opportunity to share about newest textbook affordability program, Pay One Price which is designed to increase day one access for required course materials and boost student success. You should have received emails about this, but I want to highlight a few key things. Launching in Fall 2023 for all University of Arizona Undergraduates, Pay One Price is a digital, preferred, flat rate, course materials program. It will provide access to all required textbooks and courseware by the first day of class for one low rate of two-hundred-fifty dollars per semester, and one-hundred-twenty-five dollars in Summer semesters, regardless of major. We want to emphasize to faculty, that as always, you have the academic freedom to choose the best course materials for your class needs; to have your course materials included in Pay One Price, it is incredibly important to submit your textbook adoption to us by the due date, which is March 17<sup>th</sup> for Fall 2023, or as soon thereafter as possible.

Students can opt-out of Pay One Price if they wish, and they can freely preview the materials through the opt-out date. We're starting the program with Undergraduates because that is where we can make the biggest impact. We can more easily offer a low price because the size and scope of the Undergraduate population and their required materials. Benefits for Undergraduates include predictable pricing which makes it easier for students and their families to budget and plan; flexible access when dropping and adding courses; the convenience and time savings of not having to comparison shop. Digital content is delivered to D2L course sites and if necessary, print textbooks are an option.

They want access to all required textbooks and courseware, students are better prepared to learn, and instruction can start right away. If you have questions, you can visit our website [shop.arizona.edu/payoneprice\\_faculty](http://shop.arizona.edu/payoneprice_faculty). We are also offering information sessions on March 14<sup>th</sup> and March 29<sup>th</sup>.

**Open Session Statement: Senator Downing (00:33:35)**

The University General Faculty Committee on Safety for All, identified a major shortcoming of the Robbins & Folks administration, broken trust. Tom Meixner trusted that the University authorities and their policies would protect his life, it didn't. Trust is essential for collective safety, for good management, and for social organization. Trust is a presupposition to workable laws, policies, and rules. The experience reaffirms that, drivers trust oncoming cars to stay on their side of the road, a trust reaffirmed by millions of times per day. Central to us, mistrust can rip organizations apart, threatening collective and individual well-being.

Management trusted external consultants, McKinsey and former FBI agents rather than our own faculty, staff and students. Non-disclosure agreements, lack of risk assessment, intimidations, and threats have fed this beast. In 2023, broken trust is a very serious issue. It weakens our collective immunity to the encroaching threats to academic freedom. How do we mend broken trust? Not by arming the President or Provost with new tools, not with apologies, dismissals, or resignation.

Post-hoc power sharing considerations, misread the challenge, trust and power are in different domains. The answer, trust mending is counterintuitive and in plain sight. Trust accrues through repeated, pervasive, meaningful, sharing. Collaboration builds trust, two becomes one. Shared Faculty Governance mend broken trust, protecting and strengthening all.

**Open Session Statement: Senator R. Witte (00:36:21)**

Exactly one month ago today, the Tucson Unified School District Board of Supervisors voted three to two to sign a memorandum of understanding. This included a partnership between Arizona State University, Verizon Wireless, part of America through a three-hundred-thousand-dollar grant from ABOR to issue and expand a program in local public schools for virtual reality, for children as young as Kindergarteners. At that meeting, there were over a half a dozen public comments raising red flags related to ownership of data, related to the health impact with physical and mental on children, including a former PhD student in Optical Sciences who works in the field of Virtual Reality. He, himself, raised red flags about informed consent, and tracking the well-being of our children as well as the teachers.

I also attended a conference over the weekend with world experts in this area, partly related to the whole idea of social and emotional learning which is a concept from cradle to grave. We learned about companies like Zero Trust World which is sort of a blockchain approach to ensure you assume not to have access to things in society, and access needs to be earned. Clearview AI, which is now approaching a database of one-hundred-million images. GreenLight Credentials specifically, is involved in what they call, "life transcript" which is blockchain education for students, micro credentialing, and lifelong learning, reskilling, and upskilling Internet of Things and Internet of Bodies.

My point is, I think we need to expand conversation, to have more discourse in town halls, not just for our kindergarteners but for people here at the University, so we understand what these terms are about, like micro credentials.

**5. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON (00:39:16)**

I spent the last days of Spring Break thinking about the risk of privilege. To have the opportunity to ski in the beautiful white mountains of Northern Arizona as a geriatric skier, I weighed the risks at the top of every run, pushing myself to new challenges, only after calculating to the best of my ability, the potential combined impact of the slope, the terrain, the snow texture, the changing atmosphere, and my muscles and skills. I came back in one piece after achieving new goals. Each night, after skiing, I tossed and turned, thinking about, not only our entire economy's exposure, via unsecured deposits in the failing Silicon Valley Bank. That has been very poorly regulated, up until this morning with internal risk management, with very poor internal risk management which led us to, within hours of a potential conflagration of our entire economy. That was providentially forestalled this very morning.

I was concerned to learn that Arizona Biosciences in partnership with the Flinn Foundation, one of the iSchool's proposed, deep partners, is holding a symposium on venture capital next week with a keynote on Risk and getting to yes, by none other than an official on the Silicon Valley Bank. This is very concerning.

The now disbanded General Faculty Committee on Safety For All, called out the University Administration's failure to perform systemic risk management with regard to our community's physical safety. Instead of thanking the committee for its volunteer, but expert labor, and getting immediately to work fixing the situation, the Administration insulted the committee, cut off access to the people needed to complete its work, and made the committee members feel unprotected against what they termed soft and hard forms of retaliation. In the meantime, there's been no discernible progress in providing for the needs of Dr. Meixner's family, although, I am open to hearing about anything today.

The Department of Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences has still not had its needs for office space addressed and feels even as one of the two top departments of its kind, in the nation and world, is essentially threatened for making its needs known. People who have reported new threats to the direct assessment management team have reported unresponsiveness similar to the kind we know, characterized by the months of violent threats from Tom Meixner's alleged murderer.

Failure to perform the duty of systemic risk managements hurts us all, not just in failing to mitigate the physical, violent threats, but eroding our trust and respect for one another. Individuals, families, departments, and the work we do suffers. There's one more area where our deficient institutional risk management threatens harm, the deep and secret partnerships that are consuming our administration's attention and time.

In May 2022, the Senate passed a resolution expressing the faculty's unease with University of Arizona Global Campus (UAGC)'s deal. Not by condemning it outright, however symbolically satisfying that might have been for me, but by asking the administration to share their assessment of the risks incurred and an order of the unwinding of the UAGC deal. Unfortunately, no such assessment is forthcoming. The risks that I can see are considerable as I and the Vice Chair laid out in a letter to the US Department of Education that was shared with you.

UAGC continues to engage in practices that have an appearance of impropriety about them. Specifically, inexplicably graduating somewhere around 50% of its annual enrollment of students in a single year and charging so-called graduation fees of between one-hundred-fifty-dollars to five-hundred-dollars to fifteen-thousand students in 2022 alone. In the same letter, we pointed out that not only was our proposed switch of accreditors from HLC to WSCUC uncannily swift and secretive, but has also created the appearance of our proposed accreditor WSCUC for inappropriately facilitating the complicated choreography needed to close the UAGC deal. The stakes are very high as the name, the brand, the reputation of the University of Arizona, continues to be used, and possibly abused by the former Ashford University.

The way to mitigate risk is not to silence and attack its critics. Diversity and Inclusion are currently under attack and are a part of the solution. Fiercely protected, academic freedom, especially the right to critique governance are part of the solution. Trust, as Senator Downing was describing building. Trust the hard way. All of these are the way to mitigate risk.

As the Administration moves to close the UAGC deal, even as we speak, institutionally, we are standing at the top of a double black diamond ski slope. Perhaps, constrained by numerous entangling partnerships that restrain our movements in ways that we can't predict, that restrict our freedom, our nimbleness, and are attached to the entities that we can't even fully perceive, let alone control. It is in this context that I persist, as your elected chair, with statutory obligations under Arizona revised statute to ask the difficult questions about governance, conflict of interest, entangling partnerships, and the appearance of impropriety. It slows things down unfortunately, but it produces better outcomes than the sleepy optimism of Administrative groups.

**6. ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – MS Cyber and Information Operations; MS Software Engineering; Proposal BS in Music Therapy; Proposal BS Computer Science and Engineering; Proposal BS in Music Therapy; Proposal BS Computer Science and Engineering; Proposal UG Minor Weight Inclusive Health; Proposal UG Major Planetary Geoscience; Proposal UG Minor Bioethics; Audit Policy Proposal and Benchmarking – Co-chairs of Graduate Council, Ron Hammer and Hong Cui, Chair of Undergraduate Council, Claudia Stanescu (00:45:15)**

Chair Hudson moved [Motion 2022/23-64] to approve the Consent Agenda - MS Cyber and Information Operations; MS Software Engineering; Proposal BS in Music Therapy; Proposal BS Computer Science and Engineering; Proposal

BS in Music Therapy; Proposal BS Computer Science and Engineering; Proposal UG Minor Weight Inclusive Health; Proposal UG Major Planetary Geoscience; Proposal UG Minor Bioethics; Audit Policy Proposal and Benchmarking. Motion was seconded.

- Senator M. Witte stated she would like to reiterate her objection to the Consent Agenda which have the proclivity to lead to a diploma mill. Senator M. Witte stated there are items such as Cybersecurity where there are hundreds of pages, and she hasn't read them. Senator M. Witte stated it is very unfair to the Senate to pass the Consent Agenda and hopes this does not occur in the future, she intends to vote against it due to that basis.
  - Senator Hammer stated he would like to comment as Provost Folks did last meeting, the point of approving proposals that come from either the Undergraduate or Graduate Council bodies, that represent the Faculty Senate, is to approve proposals that come to the Faculty. Senator Hammer stated by delaying the approval "no" is being said to faculty and all of the work they put into the proposals, over the course of months, to prepare proposals for new curricula and new programs through the Faculty Senate and through the process. Senator Hammer stated it is not intended to be a hidden process, it is completely transparent and there are representatives present during every stage. Senator Hammer stated if one doesn't have time to read the proposals in advance, it is unfortunate, but it is incumbent on Senators to take the time to do so, if they are going to be voted against.
  - Senator Ziurys stated it is the body's job to look at items up for approval carefully. Senator Ziurys stated she writes proposals often and they get rejected by Federal Agencies, but this allows for improvement; by objecting to some of the proposals, it is a part of the Faculty Senate's job, and it needs to be done consciously, not every proposal is a good idea.
  - Senator R. Witte stated to respond to Senator Hammer, he realizes that the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees play a role in advising the Faculty Senate, but according to Article 8 Section 1 of the bylaws, the Faculty Senate makes the final determination of whether these items go to ABOR as well as the final form and are the ultimate body responsible to the General Faculty in approving curriculum. Senator R. Witte stated it is important that there is back and forth discussion from the beginning, it is also important that the Faculty Senate is involved within the process. Senator R. Witte stated if there is no involvement, there is a risk of seeing things out of line, and there may be a need for delays or changes.
- Senator Su stated the Consent Agenda Item: BS in Computer Science and Engineering is repeated in the Non-Consent Agenda item. Senator Su asked if the two items are connected, and how it would work if the Consent Agenda Item were to get approved and then there be discussion on the Non-Consent Agenda Item that would lead to non-approval.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated the items are identical and if the Consent Agenda gets approved, the item on the Non-Consent Agenda would be removed. Vice Chair Hymel stated she believes there was confusion on the Consent Agenda Item although the Parliamentarian sent several emails regarding the matter.
- Senator Cui stated she does not believe Senator Hammer means that questions should not be asked, he means that Senators should read all of the content before the time of voting to prevent creating delays.

**[Motion 2022/23-64]** passed with thirty-three in favor, five opposed, and two abstentions.

**7. ACTION ITEM: NON-CONSENT AGENDA – iSchool Restructing and Spreadsheets – Director, School of Information, Catherine Brooks (00:54:51)**

iSchool Director Brooks stated Chair Hudson's point about one of the iSchool's Community Partners is interesting and that can certainly be looked into. Director Brooks stated she is also willing to discuss questions about the iSchool although the proposal is simply about restructuring the iSchool that is already in existence on campus.

- The iSchool has been in existence for years, the proposed change is for the structure. Conversation began with the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) towards the end of Summer 2022. The faculty leaders in SBS have been supportive in helping with arrangements or affairs.
- The proposal has been routed through all processes in the Fall, beginning in early October, where it was sent to curricular affairs; it was then sent to Graduate College Academic Administrations Council (G-CAAC) in late Fall semester. These committees consist of representation from each college where there are Faculty reviewers. The proposal was also routed to the Dean's Council which means all of the Deans were apprised. The proposal was then presented at Faculty Senate meetings on February 6, 2023, February 27, 2023, and the current meeting.
  - Director Brooks stated within this span of time, Chair Hudson was invited to an iSchool Faculty meeting. Brooks stated that since February 6, 2023, other than phone calls exchanges, there have been no questions, emails, or requests for information received.
- Senator Fink asked if the proposal had been forwarded to ABOR.
  - Director Brooks stated that she has not forwarded anything to ABOR and the proposal has been routed through all of the steps that were given to her by curricular affairs in September 2022. Director Brooks stated she would like to recognize the hard work of the iSchool Faculty and Colleagues and there has been following of structures in place for reviewing a unit. Brooks stated this is a unit change, not a unit, after a

meeting Undergraduate College Academic Administrations Council (UCAAC) in January 2023, the proposal came to the Faculty Senate by February 6th.

- Senator O'Leary asked if the iSchool is a new college.
  - Director Brooks stated the iSchool is not a college, and it is unusual at the University of Arizona, although other institutions iSchools are classified as standalone schools; it is the mission to also become a standalone school at the University of Arizona.
  - Senator O'Leary asked if the iSchool reports to a Dean.
    - Director Brooks stated the iSchool would function similar to a college where there is a Dean who reports to the Provost but will still be called an iSchool. Director Brooks stated UCAAC and GCAAC spent a lot of time sorting out the processes for topics such as grade appeals, managing student affairs, and layers of Faculty review. Director Brooks stated the University of Illinois is a large campus where their Library School became an iSchool about twenty-five years ago. Director Brooks stated she is trying to do something similar to match the AAU peers in North America.
  - Senator Downing stated he knows he can only vote yes or no, but he wishes he can vote that he does not know what is going on. Senator Downing stated the word "structural" change is meaningless, and asked if it is a financial change or name change.
    - Director Brooks stated there is a budget which was attached, and given to the Faculty Senate in early February, sent to the Chair of the Faculty, and attached when the proposal was given to UCAAC and GCAAC. Director Brooks stated she is using the word restructuring because there is no new name or unit, the iSchool remains the same and spins out of a library school movement. Director Brooks stated the library program is over fifty years old and there has been a financial and business discussion with the college of Social and Behavior Sciences (SBS); SBS is a very large college, and the iSchool is a large and transdisciplinary place. Director Brooks stated structural change is hard to grasp and her finance Dean called it a shift in columns for their finances in terms of operations and the degrees that our offered although, those will not be changes.
  - Senator Ziurys stated she shares Senator Downing's confusion, and it seems that a Department sized unit is being elevated to a college, which must come with an expense. Senator Ziurys stated it seems like offering a degree in Data Science is more appropriate in the College of Science. Senator Ziurys stated astronomical sciences deals with a lot of data management, for example, their large synoptic survey telescope, she does not know why other departments are not involved.
    - Director Brooks stated Data Science was a conversation that occurred across campus, all colleges are invited to submit courses which has been known since it was approved; the idea is, it is a stacked program where individuals can specialize in different domains across campus. Director Brooks stated the conversation regarding the MS in Data Science occurred about a year to a year-and-a-half ago. Director Brooks stated the iSchool is not the size of a department, when it became a standalone iSchool, it wasn't the smallest college, and there are about four colleges who are smaller. Director Brooks stated she hopes questions regarding data science and how it is being managed were answered, she has been in contact with the Dean of the College of Science to encourage course opportunities across the colleges and campus.
    - Senator Ziurys stated encouraging course opportunities is different from bringing people together to form a curriculum and more discussion is needed with other colleges to build a vibrant program in Data, Science, and Management.
    - Director Brooks stated the degree is only nine months old and there is work being done to steward it. There have been many people brought together across colleges to talk about the design of the MS in Data Science. Director Brooks stated there are additional Data Science degrees being created that the iSchool is in support of, for example a very specific one coming out of Math. Director Brooks stated the curricular development conversation is a different conversation that the one currently taking place, the current conversation is about where to place the iSchool on campus, as it doesn't fit easily into SBS, the College of Humanities, Engineering, or Science; generally, all iSchools stand alone because they work across colleges.
  - Senator Cui moved **[Motion 2022/23-65]** for cloture. Motion was seconded. Motion was defeated with fifteen in favor, twenty-one opposed, and two abstentions.
  - Senator R. Witte moved **[Motion 2022/23-66]** to table discussion. Motion was seconded.
    - Senator Downing raised a point of order and stated a motion to table is not a motion to postpone.
  - Senator R. Witte moved **[Motion 2022/23-67]** to extend the time for discussion by five minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-three in favor, five opposed, and zero abstentions.
  - Secretary Dysart stated this is the third meeting that the iSchool topic has come before, there have been fifteen to twenty minutes included on the agenda for questions, therefore there should be a vote, up or down, so the topic doesn't continue to get passed on and prevent the Senate from doing other important work. Secretary Dysart stated she is going to vote against tabling the motion.
  - Senator M. Witte stated she presumes with the information provided that the Faculty listed are state-funded, it was also listed that additional funding would come entirely from industry with several companies listed. Senator M. Witte stated she believes the Faculty Senate should be very informed about topics in the main meeting, and the Faculty Senate should have a close eye on important social issues. Senator M. Witte

stated that whether the iSchool is created, there should be an oversight committee from the Faculty Senate, appointed by the Chair of the Faculty that will ensure ethical issues of informed consent are addressed. Senator M. Witte stated from her understanding, many experts in this field are unaware of the iSchools existence.

- Director Brooks stated the type of research mentioned by Senator M. Witte is the kind of research the iSchool focuses on, the social and human impacts of technological change. Director Brooks stated she was on the Engineering Research Center, College of Optics, for Quantum Networking and was the Social Impact co-PI for those issues at the time of its funding by the National Science Foundation. Director Brooks stated library science has been in existence for fifty-two years, the iSchool Faculty has worked diligently and done what they were told. Director Brooks noted that this issue has been tabled twice by the Faculty Senate. Director Brooks stated she agreed with Senator M. Witte and the iSchool's industry partners are referenced for new engagements with their capstone students across engineering computer sciences and similar-minded units. They send students out to capstone projects with community members, which is why the iSchool has community engagement. Director Brooks stated she does not recall having a budget line from outside dollars, the budget is very solid and ties to tuition dollars.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated that individuals must be recognized before they are able to speak and moved **[Motion 2022/23-68]** to extend the topic for an additional five minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.
- Senator Hammer over the past three meetings, in many cases, he has seen the same people ask the same questions and continue to obtain answers, although they are not catalogued anywhere leading to continued confusion. Senator Hammer stated his suggestion to form a list of all unanswered questions to submit to Dr. Brooks even though he believes she has verbally answered these questions in each meeting. Senator Hammer stated this suggestion is fair to reach an absolute conclusion and is fair to the group of faculty who work hard to restructure the iSchool.
- Senator Ottusch stated he heard Director Brooks mention that not many people have commented since her last presentation, and it may be useful if people presented those questions as there have been twenty-five minutes spent towards the topic. Senator Ottusch stated it would be useful to provide feedback or ask questions in the interim between meetings to avoid wasting time during Faculty Senate meetings.
- Senator R. Witte stated on the agenda, it specifically states "new unit" which means the topic would be presented to ABOR, meaning due diligence would need to be used, and all information and answers to questions are gathered. Senator R. Witte asked that Chair Hudson assemble a list of questions that have circulated amongst his own constituents, and over a dozen Junior and Senior Faculty who have raised questions and a need oversight; recommendations for independent oversight is important due to the potential abuse for such technology. Senator R. Witte stated the iSchool can be a model, and paradigm for other Universities, but the current proposal relates more to marketing and promotes the technology, but technology is a double-edged sword. Senator R. Witte stated it is important to answer important questions, engage the local community, and integrate well with Colleges such as the College of Medicine and College of Optical Sciences.
- Senator Bourget asked about the overall picture in terms of how creating the iSchool as a new college will affect the budgetary implications of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Senator Bourget stated creating a new college above an existing school creates a precedent and she wonders what the potential implications of this will be. Senator Bourget stated there are guidelines for reorganization which would apply in this situation, to ensure faculty has a form of Shared Governance to determine if guidelines and processes have been followed in the creation of this new college.
- Senator Simmons stated that in relation to process, this item has been on the agenda for a while and there have been opportunities to ask questions. Senator Simmons stated in reference to the last speaker, it appears the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has signed off on the separation. Senator Simmons stated questions should be asked in a timely manner, and continuing to table the item is not a good idea.
- **[Motion 2022/23-66]** was defeated with seventeen in favor, twenty-one opposed, and zero abstentions.
- Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-69]** to approve the iSchool Restructuring and Spreadsheets Item. Motion was seconded.
- Vice Chair Hymel moved **[Motion 2022/23-70]** to extend the discussion by five minutes. The motion passed by unanimous consent.
- Senator Fink asked if the third extension of five minutes is to rush to a vote or if the item will be rolled over to the next meeting as Old Business with more time to deliberate.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is a motion on the floor to approve the iSchool that has been seconded.
  - Senator R. Witte raised a point of order and asked if there is an extension of five minutes for discussion.
    - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated discussion is not closed, and there are five additional minutes to discuss the vote.
  - Senator Fink raised a point of order and asked if an extension allows for the opportunity to vote, or if the purpose is for discussion only.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated the extension of time allows for an opportunity to vote.

- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated it is for an extension of time, however it is chosen to be used.
- Chair Hudson stated after the previous Faculty Senate meeting she had the opportunity to meet with the Chair of the Graduate Council, Senator Cui, where they went over a number of questions she had received from her constituents, including questions about the international partnerships, the international OPM, the very important question of what “deep partnerships” within the proposal means, and a few other questions. Chair Hudson stated she has received and passed on the questions, along with the question about the finances of the new unit, and have received more questions, and news reports which have been mentioned in the current Senate meeting. Chair Hudson stated she will make those questions and reports available, and they have not yet been circulated due to Spring break. Chair Hudson stated she still has the same overarching question of what exactly a deep partnership is, whether it is formal or informal, and what the colloquial or legal meaning is. Chair Hudson stated there are questions on whether the partnerships involve financing or if they are merely volunteer opportunities.
- Director Brooks stated the iSchool has far fewer industry partners than other colleges do such as Optical Engineering, Engineering, or Computer Science. Director Brooks stated typically, there are staff who work on community partnership, so students are able to work on internships and capstone projects, currently there is minimal work being done for those duties. Director Brooks stated she wrote a proposal with input from the faculty and the students need such contacts and jobs.
  - Senator Ziurys stated she objects to the idea of there being an approval due to the item being brought to the Senate three times; when she writes a Grant proposal, if it gets rejected, she makes improvements and makes it more convincing rather than submitting the same proposal repeatedly. Senator Ziurys stated she understands there are many questions and people are not convinced, therefore, these questions need to be answered in a short discussion. Senator Ziurys stated she agrees with sending a list of proposed questions to Director Brooks and receiving answers to make a final decision at the next meeting.
  - Senator Simmons stated in response to Senator Ziurys comment, when grants are submitted, there are decisions made to allow for resubmission, the Faculty Senate is not making any decisions. Senator Simmons stated there are a lot of fantastic questions about matters in the iSchool and those questions will persist whether the iSchool remains in SBS or moves. Senator Simmons stated this is largely a structural change that would create a Dean’s Seat which is primarily the thing we should be discussing.
- Senator Slepian stated there has to be differentiating in the administrative approval step versus having concerns, he had the same concerns about issues as far as effects on individuals; the same thing happens consistently in the medical school, a trial isn’t run without having it go through the IRB, and there isn’t constant reevaluation of assessment risk based on new happenings. Senator Slepian stated certain risks would not exist before a new technology is created, at the time of a new technology creation, there would be addressing for such risk issues. Senator Slepian stated the Senate is dealing with the administrative issues of whether the iSchool becomes freestanding or remains with SBS, the iSchool is already in existence.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman asked for additional time, without objection, to make enough time to vote on the current motion.
  - Secretary Dysart raised a point of order and stated the Parliamentarian previously stated there would be enough time to vote on the motion, even after the time expired, and suggested to vote.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated he was probably out of order the previous time.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated there is no additional time left for the topic and asked for one minute to vote on the existing motion.
    - Senator R. Witte objected.
  - Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-71]** to add time to vote on the **[Motion 2022/23-69]** which is consistent with previous practices during the meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved by unanimous consent.
- Senator Downing stated that the Social and Behavioral Science Faculty is not exercising Shared Governance by discussing and vetting the idea before bringing it to the Faculty Senate and he would’ve liked to see Director Brooks and others bring it to a discussion of their college before the faculty Senate. Senator Downing stated he recommends President Crow’s book on designing the American University, this type of discussion would never take place at Arizona State University. Senator Downing stated there shouldn’t be a college created to attempt to legitimize oneself, questions that are attempting to be solved should be given to the Faculty Senate, not dealing with society and technology is nonsense. Senator Downing stated academically, this is non-sustainable and will not float.
- Senator R. Witte moved **[Motion 2022/23-72]** to postpone the discussion regarding iSchool Restructuring and Spreadsheets to the next meeting, in the meantime, a list of questions will be given to Catherine Brooks in preparation for the next Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded.
  - Secretary Dysart raised a point of order that there is already a seconded motion on the table and time was extended to vote.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated Senator R. Witte’s motion is a secondary motion which can be made.
  - Senator Downing stated he would like to make a friendly amendment to allow the College of Social and Behavioral Science’s faculty governance system to vet the process before the item returns to the Faculty Senate

- Director Brooks stated the information was shared with all SBS heads in September 2022 and is concerned that ad-hoc review processed are being made up, she was not told to do this from curricular affairs.
- Senator Ottusich stated he is confused because the proposal went to the Undergraduate and Graduate Committee and there are comments that are not specific to becoming an iSchool. Senator Ottusich stated these are legitimate questions and comments, but it seems that the questions are pertaining to whether the iSchool is standalone or not, and he believes there are separate questions regarding whether the iSchool gets approved as a school or not.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated she believes the iSchool gets a Faculty Senate vote but she is unsure.
- Senator Downing stated he would like to make a friendly amendment to allow the College of Social and Behavioral Science's faculty governance system to vet the process before the item returns to the Faculty Senate
  - Director Brooks stated the information was shared with all SBS heads in September 2022 and is concerned that ad-hoc review processed are being made up, she was not told to do this from curricular affairs.
  - Chair Hudson stated, as the seconder, she does not accept the friendly amendment.
- Senator Slepian stated his suggestion that the list of questions get submitted within seven to ten days maximum, so all Senators can view the list, and there are two weeks for Director Brooks to provide answers.
- **[Motion 2022/23-72]** passed with thirty-nine in favor, ten opposed, and one abstention.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated he would like to apologize and does not believe he handled the role of Parliamentarian well on the last item very well, he believes he got slightly frustrated and that is not supposed to happen in his role.
- Secretary Dysart raised a point of order to have the minutes show there was not a consistent process followed in the voting of the last item. Secretary Dysart stated for point of clarification, the parliamentary procedure used was inconsistent between votes in the previous item in the respect that there was a vote when time expired, when it appeared the Parliamentarian and Vice Chair and this same process was not followed when it didn't; there was no requirement for a subsequent vote and regardless of the merit of the item, there should be a consistent parliamentary process followed, there was a blatant, different process followed depending on the preference of the Vice Chair and Parliamentarian which is highly problematic.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she is doing her best to follow parliamentary procedures, they are confusing, and the item will be noted.
- Senator Slepian stated he suggests having a list of questions created within seven to ten business days at max, to allow the iSchool two weeks to respond so the Faculty Senate can make an informed decision for the next Faculty Senate meeting.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated the resolution has already been made but there will be a vote and the item will get finalized.

## **8. OLD BUSINESS (01:46:15)**

### **A. Resolution by Chair Hudson**

Chair Hudson stated she would like to give up her time to move to the next agenda item.

### **B. Senate Voting Resolution – Parliamentarian, Mark Stegeman (01:47:15)**

There have been two proposals on voting resolutions circulated. The main difference between what was previously circulated includes how the body selects observers to ensure integrity of the vote. The OpaVote technology has been tested, is used in the Law School, and seems to work well, guarantees anonymity because it is completely outside of anyone's control. The cost would be ten dollars for a vote in the body of seventy people, for up and down votes. It is being proposed that the fee can be paid on the Faculty Center's budget, although, there are three free vote to begin with. The Staff, designated by the Vice Chair, would send a link to everyone on a pre-created voter emails list (seventy-one eligible voters in the Senate) for a secret ballot vote. Senators would have an opportunity to vote where a time limit would be set by the Senate's motion or by the act of the Vice Chair. The proposal includes the allotment of a minimum timeframe of ten minutes, the results would be immediately available and reported by Staff. The Vice Chair would designate two observers by unanimous consent, if anyone objected, or was concerned about bias, then the Senate would be able to vote on who the observers would be and there would be an announcement in the meeting. The process is to be synchronous where voted would be immediately announced. The technology allows viewers to see who voted but makes it impossible to see which way they voted.

- Senator Fellous asked if voting members will be required to have a device with them.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated yes, Senators would be required to sign in with their university email and it would be prudent for everyone to have access to a device if the resolution were to be adopted.
- Senator M. Witte stated there were no issues when everyone was in person because there was an ability to use paper. Senator M. Witte stated there can be a motivation to attend the Faculty Senate meetings in person by allowing in-person voters to vote by paper, and only online attendees would cost to vote.
- Senator Fink asked if OpaVote has a system in place to track duplicate votes, and asked for clarification on if the ten-dollar fee is for an entire vote and not by person.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the ten-dollar fee is for an entire vote and not by person, and the vote



- system has been tested and it has been proven to not show duplicate votes.
- Senator Tropman asked if Parliamentarian Stegeman has used the OpaVote system before and if it would be a possibility to test this platform in the Faculty Senate meeting. Senator Tropman stated that ten dollars doesn't seem financially irresponsible and may be effective especially in times of needing a roll call vote.
- Senator M. Smith stated she would like to clarify what people would be voting on and if this would include the elections for Senators.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the resolution is only for secret ballots that occur in meetings. Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the Constitution and Robert's Rules allow the Senate to have a secret ballot vote which doesn't occur very often, but when the time comes, this would ensure people have confidence on the potential voting process and platform.
- Senator Ziruy asked who will pay for OpaVote.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the Faculty Center will pay for OpaVote.
- Secretary Dysart asked how many elected bodies have the ability to do secret votes, she has worked in both Congress and the Senate and she does not believe they do secret votes. Secretary Dysart stated it seems off to her that the Faculty Senate would have a provision for secret balloting when they are elected representatives, it seems counterintuitive to what many Senators talk about.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the Faculty Constitution guarantees the right to have secret ballots if the Senate wishes and Robert's Rules separately gives the Senate the opportunity for majority votes. Parliamentarian Stegeman stated historically, in the Congress, secret ballots can be done but it has not become the practice for many decades due to people not in favor of it; in the first half of the twentieth century, there were numerous votes on Supreme Court appointments done by secret ballots.
  - Senator Ottusch stated there is another aspect to this topic, President Biden cannot fire House of Representatives for voting in a certain way, where there is a job aspect related, possibly those who don't have tenure, can be more procuring.
- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-73]** to approve the Senate Voting Resolution with a friendly amendment to approve the resolution pending a test vote. Motion was seconded. Motion was passed with thirty-six in favor, one opposed, and no abstentions.

**C. Discussion and Questions regarding University Information Technology Services (UITS) – Chief Information Officer, Barry Brummund (02:01:00)**

The presentation will address questions that have been raised including who established the requirements, how will UITS and college units work together for the major activities and milestones of the program and why the University of Arizona uses cloud for some services.

- This was established in 2018, as a result of State of Arizona, Arizona Auditor General Audit which takes place once every decade. There were three different functions audited for all three universities. Information Security and Practices was one of the three areas audited, they established a set of requirements for the three universities and the board to implement. As a result of the audit, they have continued to engage in follow-up activities, including a Spring 2022 follow-up where they returned and completed a sample audit of three campuses Information Technology (IT) units. They found continued Information Security challenges in those units and issued a follow-up requiring improvements in Information Security Awareness Training, and in the management of networks, data centers, servers, computing, endpoints, and software installed at all levels of the architecture.
- The Board followed up as a response to that State of Arizona Auditor General by requesting that the University immediately implement information security improvements. Knowing that four years had passed and the security program had not been implemented in full, there was a request to centralize information technology organizations at the University of Arizona. The University of Arizona responded with a counterproposal to not centralize but instead, to recognize the current information technology organizational structure in place, and establish, in partnership with UITS and campus organizations. This established a shared responsibility model where UITS undertakes some responsibilities, and campus IT units continue, as structured, undertaking some responsibilities.
  - Responsibilities proposed for campus IT units to continue to implement, including management of content data, application and software, configuration users and training, and network segments.
  - A set of responsibilities that is proposed for UITS to engage in includes the acquisition of equipment, management of data centers, networks, servers, and laptop endpoints.
- The program, as currently proposed, falls into the second step on the five-year implementation timeline. From a practical perspective, this began in 2018, so the timeline falls into year five. The first sets of activities includes the planning phase which has been to gather information on the Information Technology computing infrastructure currently in place on campus IT units. At two different levels of detail, there was an initial submission in December and a subsequent submission in February to follow the information and requirements gathering process. The process included planning, designing, and architecture work with individual unit implementation plans completed late Summer to early Fall to transition Campus IT Units Equipment Management during the course of roughly the next two years. The optimization, stabilization period is expected to be stretched out into 2023 during which time, the University of Arizona will likely be audited again, as part of the Agency Audit of the Arizona Auditor General.

- There is a question regarding why cloud computing is used for some services. The conditions for cases where cloud computing is used, tends to be for cases where University money can be saved, thereby preserving employees and jobs. The case where information technology computing is ran onsite is when there are physical limitations. An example of this is in the College of Law, there are likely access points in the ceiling, equipment such as this likely has limited range. Information Technology like this, is run on campus. Similar Information Technology computing which runs at one-hundred percent utilization, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, like the University's high-performance computing, is also ran on campus. In cases where Information Technology does not run at a one-hundred percent utilization, twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week has been opted to run in the cloud, which means to use data centers where servers can be leased.
- The production database for the University's student administration application is likely the single most, complex information technology architecture at the University of Arizona. There are four technology tiers with load balancing and clustering implements at each tier. The presentation shows the lowest of the four tiers of the database from July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, the number of database cores required to support the load on the system is showed. There are periods of time where significant utilization can be seen such as open registration for spring, and peak usage periods such as senior, junior, sophomore, and first-year registration. There is a similar trend shown for Fall registration, but not as high as in the Spring semester. There is significant utilization in the beginning of each semester.
- There are at least one-hundred-and-sixty cores but likely more to operate the database on behalf of students at the University of Arizona, although, the capacity is not needed twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, three-hundred-sixty-five days a year, this provides opportunities to save money. The capital expenditure for equipment at the University of Arizona, after computing was shifted from the computing infrastructure that does not run twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, showed a drop from six million dollars a year to two million dollars a year. There was an ability to reduce capital expenditure substantially because of leasing data servers in publicly available data centers for periods that were needed.
  - Senator Ziurys stated she has asked the same question repeatedly and has never gotten an answer, there are no slides which address how this will impact research as people use computers to run varied scientific instruments including telescopes, spectrometer systems, nuclear magnetic resonance spectrometers, and transmission electron microscopes. Senator Ziurys stated all of these instruments run on computers and asked how they will be accommodated by the system. Senator Ziurys stated Amazon cannot possibly provide the knowledge to run such instrumentation.
  - CIO Brummund stated the University would not look to Amazon as a place to provide expertise on running scientific equipment, and instead they would be used to rent computing capabilities, data storage, and computing cycles from. CIO Brummund stated the expertise over operating all of the scientific equipment and support for research is a partnership between UITS and Campus Information Technology professionals which would continue to happen. CIO Brummund stated in the case of research, there has been engagement with RII to assess the design and architecture of research, and specific computing during the project; there will be work done to have zero impact to investigators and research projects at the University.
  - Senator Fink asked if instruments for investigators will be touched and asked about costs coming to researchers and whether researchers will need to come up with money to pay for the new undertaking.
  - CIO Brummund stated the instrumentation that is used is not a part of the scope of the Auditor General Assessment, the computing infrastructure that supports the computing and storage is; a requirement of this is to ensure that those systems, such as the servers and data storage are patched on a regular basis which is an important requirement for the University of Arizona today, notwithstanding the 2018 Auditor General requirement. Coming up with a program to manage the patching of that compute and storage is within the scope of the Auditor General requirements, anything related to the scientific equipment is not. The cost for the implementation is based on information that is gathered on the February 24 survey and based on the requirement and design work throughout the Summer; there are opportunities to buy equipment at scale, but also to lease equipment for time periods, least costs are likely to be less than the depreciation. Currently, costs of acquiring the equipment and for micro leases are unknown. When UITS services were moved to the cloud, spending went from six-million dollars to two-million dollars in capital expenditure; that level of savings may not be seen, but some levels of savings are likely to be seen, including buying equipment in bulk, leasing and utilizing servers only for the time period needed, this is likely to be offset by undertaking work that the University is currently not doing. The audit has found that there are a number of activities that the University of Arizona is not currently doing which is the directive of the 2018 report. It is likely that savings that are generated in reducing capital expenditures or leasing servers are likely to be offset by new labor related expenditures in order to complete the Auditor General requirements.
  - Senator Ziurys stated that CIO Brummund mentioned having to interface his computer instrumentation in his lab with some type of database and asked for an explanation to how this works.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated this is a discussion item that requires no vote.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

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

### **Motions of September 12, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2022/23-62]** to approve the Faculty Senate agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-three in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-63]** to approve the minutes of December 5, 2022, January 23, 2022, February 6, 2023, and February 27, 2023 with a friendly amendment to include Senator Pace as present for the February 6, 2023 minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2022/23-64]** to approve the Consent Agenda - MS Cyber and Information Operations; MS Software Engineering; Proposal BS in Music Therapy; Proposal BS Computer Science and Engineering; Proposal BS in Music Therapy; Proposal BS Computer Science and Engineering; Proposal UG Minor Weight Inclusive Health; Proposal UG Major Planetary Geoscience; Proposal UG Minor Bioethics; Audit Policy Proposal and Benchmarking. Motion was Seconded. Motion passed with thirty-three in favor, five opposed, and two abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-65]** for cloture. Motion was seconded. Motion was seconded. Motion was defeated with fifteen in favor, twenty-one opposed, and two abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-66]** to table discussion. Motion was seconded. Motion was defeated with seventeen in favor, twenty-one opposed, and zero abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-67]** to extend the time for discussion by five minutes. Motion passed with thirty-three in favor, five opposed, and zero abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-68]** to extend the topic for an additional five minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2022/23-69]** to approve the iSchool Restructuring and Spreadsheets Item. Motion was seconded.

**[Motion 2022/23-70]** to extend the discussion by five minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2022/23-71]** to add time to vote on **[Motion 2022/23-68]** which is consistent with the previous practices during the meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion was approved by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2022/23-72]** to postpone discussion regarding iSchool Restructuring and Spreadsheets to the next meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-nine in favor, ten opposed, and one abstention.

**[Motion 2022/23-73]** to approve the Senate Voting Resolution with a friendly amendment to approve the resolution pending a test vote. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-six in favor, one opposed, and one abstention.

### **Resolution concerning the Faculty Senate procedure for secret ballots:**

#### **Faculty Senate procedure for secret ballots:**

##### Technology

Secret ballots will be conducted through the automated process offered by the external vendor OpaVote [used by the Law School]. [OpaVote encrypts votes and represents that it is impossible to decipher who cast which votes.] The fee [currently \$10 per vote] will be paid by [?].

Faculty center staff will maintain a current "voting list" of the email addresses of all persons eligible to vote. Anyone on the list is entitled to see the list, upon request. Persons who elect to recuse themselves from all secret ballots, as described below, will, be removed from the voting list.

The Presiding Officer should arrange occasional tests of the system, to ensure that everyone on the voting list receives and can cast a test ballot.

##### Process for conducting secret ballots

The Senate can hold a secret ballot only by majority vote of the members present, and secret ballots must be conducted during meetings. [RR citations]

If available, two staff members, one from the Faculty Center and one from the Provost's Office, will jointly administer the ballot, as "counters," through the OpaVote website. The Presiding Officer shall announce the counters, or the Senate can specify the counters as part of the resolution specifying a secret ballot. At least one of the counters must be a person not on the voting list.

Faculty Center staff shall send the voting link to everyone on the voting list. The emailed "ballot" must provide a complete statement of the motion being voted on, as stated by the Presiding Officer, either in the email, at the voting link itself, or at a different direct link provided in the email.

By default, each voter will choose among: Yes; No; Abstain [or Present]. The Senate has the option, in the motion directing the secret ballot, to specify different choices as appropriate, but Abstain must be one of the choices. [This is important for establishing whether a quorum participated.]

The Senate should, in the motion directing the secret ballot, specify the number of minutes that the ballot will be open. This must be at least ten minutes and must be short enough to cause the vote to close at least ten minutes before the scheduled end of the Senate meeting. If the motion does not include such a specification, then by default the ballot is open for ten minutes.

The counters will close the ballot after the number of minutes specified [this cannot be automated] and have the option to close the ballot earlier if everyone on the voting list has voted.

The counters will advise the Presiding Officer of any technical difficulties during the vote. In that case, the Presiding Officer has the option to cancel the vote and (if the technical difficulties appear to be resolved) to restart the vote, subject to the time constraint implied by the scheduled end of the meeting.

If the counters report to the Presiding Officer, as the end of the voting period approaches, that a quorum has not voted, then the Presiding Officer has the option to extend the vote for a brief period, with the goal of achieving a quorum.

Accidental short delays in closing the vote shall not be grounds for canceling or voiding the vote. Isolated reports of failure to receive a ballot that was provably emailed shall not be grounds for canceling or voiding the vote.

After the vote closes, the counters will advise the Presiding Officer that they are ready to report the results, meaning the number of votes cast for each option. [OpaVote should provide this information almost immediately.]

The Presiding Officer shall announce the results as soon as practical but has discretion to observe a short delay for the purpose of minimizing disruption to any ongoing proceedings. The result must, however, be announced before the end of the meeting, with enough time remaining for any eligible voter to raise an objection to the validity of the vote.

#### Special rules concerning recusals

By voting for a secret ballot, the Senate implicitly acknowledges that it will be impossible to verify any announced recusals from the vote.

An exception is that voting members who are not elected by the General Faculty, or as representatives of their colleges or academic units, have the right to request removal from the voting list, meaning that they are recusing themselves from all secret ballots. The Presiding Officer will advise the Senate of any such standing recusals, which shall be counted as abstentions and do not reduce the number required for a quorum.

#### Permanent recording of who voted and the results

The counters shall make available, electronically, either during or after the meeting, a list of everyone who voted [necessarily including abstentions], a list of anyone on the voting list who did not vote, a list of the standing recusals in effect at the time of the vote, and Opa's automatically generated report of the results, or screen shots of that report. These lists shall be part of the permanent record of the meeting and accessible to any eligible voter, but whether to include them as part of the adopted minutes is ultimately at the Senate's discretion.

**Attachments Within the Minutes:**

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Faculty Senate Agenda](#) for March 13, 2023
1. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the Minutes of
  - i. [December 5, 2023](#)
  - ii. [January 23, 2023](#)
  - iii. [February 6, 2023](#)
  - iv. [February 27, 2023](#)

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456