

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
SEPTEMBER 11, 2023**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/haandle/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=259d7694-f22b-4aef-be7d-b07b00095c9a>

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the first regular Faculty Senate meeting of the semester to order at 3:03 pm in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Tessa Dysart was also present. Vice Chair Hymel introduced herself and asked for a moment of silence for the September 11, 2001 tragedy. Vice Chair Hymel welcomed all new Senators, guests, and observers and explained that Parliamentary procedures, the Constitution, and Bylaws are followed to keep meetings in order. Vice Chair Hymel explained that individuals must first be recognized before they are able to speak.

**Present:** Senators Bernick (ASUA President), Braitberg, Braitwaithe, Cai, Casey, Cochran, Coletta, Cooley, Dial, Domin, Downing, Dysart (Secretary), Eckert, Fellous, Fink, Gerald, Gregory, Harris, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jones, Leafgren, Little, Medovoi, Meyer, Nelson, Neumann, O'Leary, Ottsuch, Pace, Pau, Rafelski, Rankin, Robbins (President), Rocha, Rodrigues, Rogers, Russell, Sanchez, Schulz, Senseney, Simmons, M. Smith, J. Smith, Spece, Stegeman (Parliamentarian), Stephan, Stone, Su, Waddell, Williams, R. Witte, Wittman.

**Absent:** Senators Anderson (GPSC Rep), Barron (ASUA Rep), Cui, Earl, Gordon, Goyal, Grijalva (ASUA Rep), Guzman, Kandel (ASUA Rep), Knox, Schwartz, Slepian, Tropman, Werchan, Willis, M. Witte, Yoon (GPSC Rep), Zeiders, Ziurys.

**2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL](#) [00:02:42]**

Vice Chair Hymel explained that the Senate Executive Committee sets the agenda for the Senate's final approval for each meeting. Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2023/24-1**] to approve the Agenda. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2023/24-1**] passed by unanimous consent.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated that she reserves thirty minutes that can be apportioned if there is additional time needed on any given item.

**3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF [FEBRUARY 27, 2023, APRIL 10, 2023, AND MAY 1, 2023](#) [00:04:52]**

Vice Chair Hymel stated that the February 27, 2023 minutes had a correction made that was requested in the previous year.

- Secretary Dysart stated that Senator Casey sent in a typographical error that was made on the April 10, 2023 meeting minutes that said "computing interests" instead of "competing interests." Secretary Dysart stated she would like to add this as a friendly amendment.
- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2023/24-2**] to approve the February 27, 2023, minutes with the corrections and addendum attached. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2023/24-2**] was passed by unanimous consent.
- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2023/24-3**] to approve the April 10, 2023, minutes as amended. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2023/24-3**] was passed by unanimous consent.
  - Chair Hammer stated he was not listed as an attendee for the April 10, 2023, minutes and he was present.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated the attendance will be updated.
- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2023/24-4**] to approve the May 1, 2023, minutes. Motion was seconded. [**Motion 2023/24-4**] passed by unanimous consent.

**4. OPEN SESSION [00:07:24]**

**Senator Ted Downing [00:07:44]**

I am speaking specifically to elected Faculty Senators. Arizona Law 15-1601B says we are responsible for the academic, educational, and faculty personnel matters subject to the responsibilities and powers of ABOR and the President. However, the next sentence mandates "shall," that we shall participate in University governance and policy

making, an obligation explicitly, not subject to ABOR and presidential powers. We are not solely advisory. I am disappointed that shared governance has been institutionalized into some kind of trivial tug of war between the administration and faculty. The law grew out of legislative concerns about the emergence of a bloated administrative class and overpaid faculty who were believed to be shirking their responsibilities. Proactively it was envisioned to enhance our institutional sustainability in troubled times. A storm is threatening us and other U.S. institutions with an enrollment cliff, with substantial revenue shortfalls. All are seeking shelter. Most will restructure, others merge, a few fold are already folding. Our current approach, mimicking other universities, may be unwise. So far, the University, the Regents and the President have sought solutions without shared governance. Hiring consultants, acquiring a failing predatory online company that collapsed, cutting budgets, and flipping accreditors and football conferences. In the Ashford, Zovio, and UAGC case, Faculty wisdom proved right. Senate and the Eller College warnings were ignored. With Gale's beginning, shackling the elected faculty representatives below deck is foolhardy. We are more likely to find creative, transformative new niches by opening collaboration and transparent shared governance. As the song goes, it's just a kiss away. Thank you.

**Senator Kristin Little [00:10:12]**

Today I am presenting on a serious issue that has happened to several of my colleagues and is one that I believe most of us value, our paychecks. Over the Summer, and for the first two pay periods of this Fall semester, according to a survey we distributed, a number of graduate students and career track faculty did not receive their paychecks. This violated Arizona Law ARS 23-351. Additionally, no resources were provided, and no emergency checks were available. This issue has affected contingent faculty and graduate students, employees who are the most vulnerable in terms of job security and may face serious financial consequences such as late fees for untimely rent. As you can imagine, this has caused quite a lot of stress and anxiety.

A week after the first payday on Friday, September first, these people were informed that they would not receive pay for another week. Not until Friday, September eighth. Imagine the extra stress these people felt due to the first being a day when rent is normally due. Also, it was the start of a holiday weekend and Campus Pantry would not reopen until Tuesday, September fourth. When asked about the possibility of issuing emergency checks, the answer was, due to the holiday weekend, it is not possible. To my knowledge, the affected instructors have continued to do their jobs despite not being paid. These graduate students and lecturers have acted professionally and continue to place their students interests first by continuing to teach their classes. To offer a little perspective, if even five of these instructors had cancelled the four classes that most of them each, this would have impacted five-hundred students. So we ask, how could this have happened at our University? We listen to answers given by the Administration, but at this time we can only speculate.

In the last five years in our department, we have seen a reduction in administrative staff. Now, we are concerned that with the new budget model AIB, this could further increase the pressure on administrative staff and further inhibit their ability to complete essential functions like payroll. I want to be clear, I am presenting this issue today to not point fingers or assign blame, but to achieve three goals. First, I would like to open a dialogue with other colleges across campus, who may have also had difficulty in paying their employees on time. Second, I would like the Administration to tell the Faculty Senate what specific steps the Administration will take to ensure this does not happen again. But if it does, I believe a concrete plan should be in place to provide emergency support and resources to the affected employees. Lastly, my colleagues and I are concerned that this may continue or happen again, and I know that will all the other agenda items, this issue could easily be set aside and perhaps forgotten. So, I am requesting that this issue be added to the next Faculty Senate Agenda for further discussion and to develop an action plan. Thank you.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated that this topic will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

**Senator Katherine Zeiders [00:14:08]**

I'm Katie Zeiders, a Senator in the College of Agricultural Life and Environmental Sciences. Today, I want to alert you to the challenges that my colleagues and I are facing related to Activity Informed Budgeting (AIB). AIB replaced RCM in 2022 and has not been well implemented to the detriment of academic units and their ability to function and plan. If we could describe AIB in a broad stroke, we would say that it is a model that sweeps significantly. More money from academic units, your college, my college, and hoards the money at Central Administration. A plurality of the money swept from colleges goes into the Strategic Budget Allocation, SBA Fund, which we are learning is a fund in which colleges have to beg for money to be returned to their units. SBA allocation decisions are not transparent, nor do they follow shared governance principles. Further, they have come so late in the year that they inhibit planning ahead. The AIB model represents the largest taxation of colleges we've ever seen at UA and allows Central Administration to use millions of Arizona tax paying dollars with no accountability to the University committee. There is no doubt that the AIB is adversely impacting your college right now. Employees are not being paid on time, hiring freezes, promotions taken back, non-renewals of faculty and staff. But specific to CALES, we are an exemplary college in many ways. Since 2015, my colleagues and I have increased our student credit hours by nearly fifty percent, and our research funding by nearly thirty percent. The last fiscal year was no exception. We increased both student credit hours and research dollars. Despite doing everything right under the new AIB model, CALES is facing a ten-million-dollar shortfall this fiscal year, and projections suggest that this would get even worse in the next few years. Even if we continue our trajectories of growth so effectively, we product more, we get less, and Central Administration grows. I will follow up with Senators with more information on CALES's information in the coming weeks, but in the interest of all of our colleagues, and the health of our colleges and academic units, I encourage Senators to start asking questions about AIB. We should be

calling for an elimination of the taxing of our reserves, a reduction of the three percent annual take back and a reversal of the two percent in our current budget. Thank you.

5. **STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR, GFFRC DIAGRAM [00:16:50]**

Welcome everybody. Welcome to the new Academic year. Welcome to Faculty Senate. Welcome to returning Senators, to new Senators, to our President Robins and I see we have some new guests here as well, our new Vice President for Marketing and Communications, Brad Bohlander, and we are joined today by Mr. Paul Pastorek, the Senior Vice President and formerly the President of UAGC. With apologies to Jane Austen and the scholars of Jane Austen, my statement today and my theme for the entire coming year is accounts and accountability. Let me start with the latter accountability. We made important progress on accountability in the difficult and tragic 2022-2023 academic year. Much work remains. After last year's vote of no confidence for the President and Senior Leadership team, in the aftermath of Tom Meixner's tragic murder, the Faculty, speaking for the entire University campus as a whole, sent a message that managers who are not serving the University optimally will be called out, and we will continue with that work.

Nevertheless, this whole process last year, resulted in a much more open, much better, and a much more dialogic relationship with the University Administration than I could have ever imagined at this time last year. And we have more of a power faculty in the administration than ever. We have Interim Provost Ron Marx, Interim Vice President for Research, Elliot Cheu, Interim Vice President for Arizona International, Jenny Lee, Interim Vice Presidents for Campus Life, Jennifer Hatcher, and her predecessor Francisco Moreno. This is good for the University, that those positions of Administration are occupied by our colleagues, the people that we talk to.

Moving forward, the faculty along with our graduate student and undergraduate student government representatives have asked for more participation in assigning of administrative roles, more roles on search committees for administrators, and want fair and independent committees to make permanent, perhaps some of the interim faculty appointments, or search for their successors. We want to be a part of this along with the students. There is still plenty of work on accountability to be done. We need lots of shared governance committees and you will find me scouring the colleges for your colleagues, for people to appoint to shared governance committees that work independently from the Administration, and particularly independently from the Provost's office. We need to do lots of work here in Faculty Senate and we might have special meetings to make sure that we can handle the enormous workload of things that we need to review, vet, approve, discuss and publicize.

Last year, we dealt with crammed scheduled and overwhelming amounts of work to accomplish in two hours. We hope we'll have a better handle both on the technology of these hybrid meetings and the ability to call extra meetings as needed. Proposals, in particular, need to be vetted and approved by the Senate, proposals involving new units. I want to talk, at some point in an upcoming meeting, and I will introduce it today briefly, about a proposal for a new Undergraduate College. I refer you to the Memorandum of Understanding, which there is a copy of on each table. That says, contrary to what you might hear, that the creation of new units is part and parcel of what is needed to be discussed and reviewed to be approved in the Senate. We need to see things, we need to see new initiatives, new proposals, before they are presented to ABOR and so forth.

I am very glad to welcome Mr. Paul Pastorek here today. We continue to educate ourselves about our new entity, UAGC. We are delighted. I speak for myself and many that I have talked to, that 2,300 students of the former Ashford University have had seventy-two-million dollars' worth of student loan debt extinguished by the Federal Government's borrowers defense mechanism. We still need to work out a system of accountability for UAGC's relationship to the University of Arizona. We are deeply concerned, and I have talked to many of you about this, that the University of Arizona is exposed to the United States Federal Government's Department of Education, clearly announced desire to claw back that seventy-two million dollars, and perhaps more, as students from Ashford come forward to request debt relief from the new owner of the house that those fraudulent rooms built us, the University of Arizona. The President will speak to you shortly and I am heartened by his clearly expressed feeling that the feds are bluffing, that we will not be called to account for seventy-two million dollars. But we should never be exposed to that kind of legal or financial risk. We're not a venture capital company. We are a public trust of the people of the State of Arizona and I dearly hope that I am wrong and the President is right, we will not be held to account for those many millions of dollars. Still more than ever, we are under writing an unknown entity, with the trust of the State of Arizona and its' taxpayers. Until we develop a system for effective oversight of UAGC's operations, we will continue to guarantee and warranty, certify unknown practices, until now. I hear this from many colleges, continue to compete with our own programs, but with ten times the marketing budget, there is a great deal of market confusion as to who is the University of Arizona and the ability to create strategy unfettered by either our Administration's rules or ABOR rules.

We need to develop a system now that we and UAGC are one that protects the trust of the State of Arizona. I have reached out to our counterparts at UAGC, they have their own Faculty Senate. I spoke with the President of their Faculty Senate and in doing so, learned a lot about the operation that is now a part of the University of Arizona. When I talked to the President of their Faculty Senate, I emphasized our issues, and frictions are not with their people, faculty, staff or students. It is about articulating two very different business models and structures which will be something that needs to be worked on together in the coming year.

On the accounts side, there is a handout with early factoids based on data investigated that is being investigated by the General Faculty Financial Recalibration Committee headed by Gary Rhoades. I have asked them to come up with

a plan for the repayment of the pandemic era furlough monies and I have asked them to look into AIB, about which you have heard a great deal from the Open Session Statement. Before we even get into AIB, I want to call your attention to just some of the facts on this sheet. These come from the University of Arizona data. Undergraduate enrollment is up almost thirty percent, Graduate enrollment is up almost twenty percent. At the same time, Faculty, especially tenure track faculty and graduate assistants are decreasing. The change to the faculty student ratio is alarming. There is a twenty-two percent decrease in the ratio of faculty, especially tenure track faculty to students. There is a twenty-two percent decrease for graduate assistants, while at the same time, the number provosts and vice presidents have increased greatly. The change to the administrator's unit ratio is not the kind of thing that will produce excellence in an R1 university. We will hear more about AIB, as soon as October. There will be a Financial Recalibration Committee in addition to SPBAC to look at how the model can be changed to provide support the operations of an R1 institution, and not be a strategy that has taken the institution into risky legal and financial exposures.

On the other handout is a proposal that will be discussed in October for a College of Undergraduate Studies. You will hear from some of my colleagues and some in Administration that the Faculty Senate has no role in the approval of this college of Undergraduate Education. I beg to differ and so does the memorandum of understanding signed by the President. This project is seen by many of the institutions needs as normalizing a faculty predominantly without the protection of tenure, centralizing the undergraduate curriculum resembling a monopoly for general education offerings, and most importantly opening up a drain and siphoning off a very important percentage of the academic funding that goes to nearly twenty colleges. These are some of the things that I want to work on with your help and active participation this semester. Thank you so much for being here. Thank you so much for volunteering your time and your expertise to these efforts.

- Secretary Dysart asked where in the MOU, Senators should be looking for the information Chair Hudson referred to.
  - Chair Hudson stated the information is located in Section 2: Academic and Academic Personnel Policies in the second sentence where it reads “the creation, reorganization, merger, elimination of programs, and academic units, academic personnel, ... are all within the scope of shared governance.” Chair Hudson that is in the MOU signed by the predecessors and President Robbins. Chair Hudson stated it is common sense as the Constitution and Bylaws were written at a time where there were no proliferating new units which is a technique of management that will be discussed.

## 6. **REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT – PRESIDENT ROBERT ROBBINS [00:31:24]**

President Robbins report is appended to these minutes. President Robbins stated he is open to take questions about his submitted report and looks forward to hearing a formal presentation about the numbers mentioned as he has many questions.

- Chair Hudson stated she believes people would like to report back to their constituencies, his take on the Department of Education's callback of seventy-two million dollars.
  - President Robbins stated the Department of Education announced loan forgiveness and he believes it is a great program. President Robbins stated there is a question which he is still unclear of which is whether the seventy-three million dollars was a part of a bigger case that was settled, which was previously four billion eight hundred million dollars. President Robbins stated there has been no communication from the Department of Education requesting repayment of the money, and there is constant communication with them, the Arizona representative in both the United States Senate and the House, and the White House. President Robbins stated he believes it would be highly irregular and unusual for the Federal Government to ask for a State institution to pay back the Department of Education. There is uncertainty of the DOE budget but they have forgiven five billion dollars' worth of student loans.
  - President Robbins stated as far as he knows, there have been rare circumstances where colleges or universities have gone out of business, and DOE tried to recoup any of the money. Earlier that day there was the first Arizona-wide HSI Retreat and Conference and representatives were present from the White House. President Robbins stated he believes there is a panel now, and in opening remarks it was highlighted that the main issue for administration is forgiveness of loans. President Robbins stated he believes everyone can agree that the loans should have been forgiven especially for the Ashford students, but many others endure unfair practices and deserve to have their loans repaid.
  - President Robbins stated when it comes to the idea of whether recoupment would be requested, there is a recent case where DeVry, which is still operating, was requested by the Department of Education to repay about twenty-three million dollars. President Robbins stated this is the first case that he is aware of where the Department of Education has tended to call back money from an accredited and operating University. President Robbins stated that case is in litigation currently, and he has spoken to lawyers who have stated the Department of Education took action unilaterally with no due process, the idea is that DeVry will likely win the case or there will be a settlement.
- Senator Rafelski asked if a third-party sued the Department of Education.
  - President Robbins stated he is unsure and that it may be a possibility, but he is unsure of how effective

that would be.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated they would not have standing,
- Senator Rafelski stated he has seen the Department of Education's very public message.
- Senator Harris asked if this is such a rare event for the Department of Education to ask for repayment and has only been done with DeVry, why the Department would signal the UA as they must feel they have a standing or some motivation. Senator Harris stated this can be seen as a potential liability.
- President Robbins stated he believes this can definitely be seen as a potential liability, but the Department of Education never singled out University of Arizona, they referred to Zovio and Ashford. President Robbins stated he believes it is part of a strategy to send a signal to other universities, he believes the University of Idaho borrowed about three-hundred-twenty-three million dollars to purchase the University of Phoenix, and this can be a signal to that transaction but doesn't believe that has yet been approved. President Robbins stated another institution can be Grand Canyon University as they have a mix of for-profit on their online side but not-for-profit in their residential side.
- Senator Downing stated he is concerned about increased financing of the University operations based on student debt. Senator Downing stated he and everyone is living today off of student's future wages that they will hopefully make from attending school. Senator Downing stated when ABOR voted to integrate UAGC into the UA, the motion stated that they accepted all of its liabilities. Senator Downing asked if the Department of Education says that either seventy-two or seventy-three million dollars is a liability, how would the University refuse, or would UA ask for forgiveness of them.
  - President Robbins stated his assumption is that they would ask the UA to repay the money which they haven't.
  - Senator Downing stated he believes the Department of Education made a statement.
  - President Robbins stated the Department of Education made a statement where they stated they would seek to recoup some of the money. President Robbins stated he doesn't recall the number for the DeVry students as twenty-three million seems like a small amount for what the overall quoted liability for DeVry is as they are a large operation. President Robbins stated DeVry is for-profit and based on political discussions, the idea of the Department of Education coming to a State Land-Grant University to ask for repayment doesn't sound likely.
- Senator M. Smith stated there were concerns raised by Senator Zeiders regarding financial status and the AIB model. Senator Smith asked what kind of assistance the President's Office may be able to offer in a timely manner.
  - President Robbins asked if Senator M. Smith referred to individuals not receiving their paychecks.
  - Senator M. Smith stated that the paychecks issue seems to be a part of it, and Senator Zeiders can list some of her other concerns.
  - President Robbins stated this is the first he has heard of the issue regarding paychecks and wished he was given advanced notice as he would like to understand the root cause of the problem for why people did not receive their paychecks on time. President Robbins stated he can never promise nothing similar will occur in the future as there are many reasons for these things to happen but understanding the root cause of this situation will help him try to prevent the issue from happening again. President Robbins asked if the problem is still occurring and if there are still individuals who will not receive their paychecks for another week.
  - Senator Little stated everyone but one individual has been paid.
  - President Robbins stated he will research the cause and will reach out to the individuals involved. President Robbins stated he can help but contrary to the discussion about AIB, there is no large amount of money in the President's Office. President Robbins stated there are a lot of other locations where there is money, and he is disappointed to hear about this and will report back to the Senate in writing what he finds. President Robbins stated he will do everything he can to ensure people are paid in a timely fashion.
  - Senator M. Smith stated she believes Senator Zeiders was also referring to shortfalls of money in her college which has created difficulties to cope with.
  - President Robbins stated he read Chair Hudson's handout in what he believes will yield in a more formal presentation. President Robbins stated he and Chair Hudson met in the Summer where he thought work would be done in the Summer, but he understands the work is ongoing. President Robbins stated he looks forward to working with the committee and with the Senate to discuss AIB, RCM, and his favorite which is incremental budgeting. President Robbins explained incremental budgeting means there are no formulas, and there is a new budget every year. President Robbins stated he believes that would spark a lot of discussion and there should be a retreat and a Commission Task Force Committee appointed to discuss these issues, as well as a committee to discuss UAGC issues as this would allow everyone to be at the same place, at the same time, where everyone can be understanding of what stakeholders want.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated her appreciation for President Robbins and that she looks forward to hearing additional information from President Robbins.

7. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST – INTERIM PROVOST RON MARX [00:46:04]**

Interim Provost Marx's report is appended to these minutes.

- President Robbins stated that Provost Marx is at a meeting in DC.

8. **INFORMATION ITEM: PROPOSAL NEW ACADEMIC UNIT SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ANALYTICS AND ABOR SUMMARY- INTERIM CHAIR OF GRADUATE COUNCIL, RON HAMMER [00:46:35]**

Chair Hammer stated that this item is the first of two and is a proposal for a new academic unit of the School of Business Analytics. Chair Hammer stated the item came before the Graduate Council in April 2023 and he informed the council that this was not a part of the workflow for new academic units. Chair Hammer stated when the item was presented at the Graduate Council, there was an animated discussion, and it was ultimately approved by the vote of individuals who were present. Chair Hammer stated that the editorialization comes in a reply to the Chair of the Faculty urging the new academic unit to be part of the consideration of the Faculty Senate. Chair Hammer stated it is detailed in the workflow how new academic units proceed and is not a part of the workflow for there to be a vote of the Faculty Senate. Chair Hammer stated he knows it would be a difficult thing to change but if the Faculty Senate were to create a resolution to create the change, then this would be favorable rather than butting heads against the wall. Chair Hammer asked if there was anyone to present about the new unit.

- Senator Stegeman advised Eller Management that it would be prudent to have someone discuss the item and answer questions, he provided Zoom information. Senator Stegeman stated he or Senator Neumann can answer certain questions but does not have a presentation provided and it may be more information to have the Dean's office provide information.
- Senator Neumann stated there has been a discussion that has gone through shared governance in the college and the impacted units and the college has spoken on the item and has supported the creation in the School of Business Analytics.
- Chair Hammer stated as he recalls from his discussion with the Graduate Council, there are reasons why the new unit was created and there is emphasis on analytics as a profession as a way of developing a career rather than being a part of the Department of Management where those courses reside.
- Senator Neumann stated Management Information Systems is where the program began and was nurtured. The intent was to be a standalone college wide program so this is filling that trajectory.
- Chair Hudson stated she believes this is a great proposal and supports it going through and hopes there will be a process developed for voting incentives on matters such as this one. Chair Hudson asked if there is any component of this program offered at a different location such as Chandler, or whether it is a Main Campus or Online location.
- Senator Neumann stated he received note from the Dean that he is able to report on the subject.
- Dean Karhik Kannan stated the Undergraduate and Graduate program has been approved as a separate entity, the school is simply hosting those programs and there are discussions being held about the program having an online component. Dean Kannan stated there is thought about the Executive MSBA Program and other programs that may be of interest to the Phoenix market as well. The school is a home for all the programs that have already been upgraded, the MSBA program was approved many years back. The undergraduate program was approved last year.
- Chair Hudson asked for clarification on whether the school would involve Chandler or Phoenix real estate, and if it would be a competing head in Arizona State University
- Dean Kannan stated there would be no real estate place there but if there was either an MSBA or any other pro- version of the program, there would be space used in that area. Currently, there is a PMBA which is in the Phoenix-Chandler area which is competing with ASU. Dean Kannan stated there is a limited footprint and limited space at Eller and there is creative thought into how space can be used elsewhere.
- President Robbins asked if this new school was voted on by the Faculty Senate and whether it is required to be voted on by the Faculty Senate.
- Chair Hudson stated there are different sources and she believes the MOU suggests there is broad consensus that these kinds of proposals going forward should be discussed and voted on.
- Dean Kannan stated the school is independent of the MSBA and apologizes if he does not understand all the intent of the questions. The school is independent of the degree programs. Dean Kannan stated he would like to be careful about what he is communicating and he and his team will be thinking about the Phoenix market as there is a large demand independently and will discuss the pros and cons.
- Chair Hudson asked if there is any dependency on any Phoenix based transaction building.

- Dean Kannan stated no, the school is not tied to that.
- President Robbins asked Chair Hudson for the significance of her question.
- Chair Hudson stated the significance of the question was due to a question that came up at ABOR in June 2023 where the Provost of ASU was concerned about redundancy and that UA was opening a competing program in their home territory. Chair Hudson stated this question was the liveliest debate she has ever seen in ABOR. Chair Hudson stated ABOR approved UA to move forward despite ASU's compelling arguments, and there was no news heard afterwards.
- Dean Kannan stated if one were to look at Emory University, they have an MSBA program that is available which serves a population that is different than UA's typical master's in business administration.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is no time left on the item and thanked Dean Kannan for coming to answer questions about the program.

9. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – PROPOSAL Ph.D. IN SOFTWARE ENGINEERING AND ABOR SUMMARY, INTERIM CHAIR OF GRADUATE COUNCIL – RON HAMMER [00:56:53]**

Chair Hammer explained Item 9 is an action item which requires a vote as a proposal for a PhD in Software Engineering. Chair Hammer asked if Sharon O'Neal was present to describe the program but was informed by Vice Chair Hymel that she was not present in the meeting. Chair Hammer explained there is a good reason for the particular program because there was a question raised regarding the difference between software engineering from an engineering perspective, and software development from a computer science perspective. Chair Hammer explained there is a great difference between the two, there is a complete list of components that the engineering of software requires which is the reason for this specific proposal and seems to be a great fit for the College of Engineering as it does not exist elsewhere.

- Chair Hudson stated she is considering sending the item back to the College of Engineering, although it seems to be a great program, there may be a question for the senators from the College of Engineering. Chair Hudson explained she read the sixty-four page document and it seems that the proposed director of the PhD program does not hold a PhD. Although she wishes not to bring this up, the institution should have the resources to have a holder of the credential that the program trains and certifies students, as the director of the program. Chair Hudson stated she believes this is both an important and awkward question, and she would like to table the item and have it sent back to the College of Engineering and see a change made to have the director hold the degree that it trains people in. Chair Hudson stated she would like to direct the question to either Chair Hammer or senators of the College of Engineering.
- Chair Hammer stated he wishes that the director were at the meeting, but he believes that Sharon O'Neal is a professor, and he believes she holds a PhD. Chair Hammer stated it may be difficult in a program that is developing in Software Engineering, for the director to have a degree in Software Engineering. Chair Hammer stated he can assure Chair Hudson that since the program doesn't exist at the University, the director and faculty who are listed as credentials understand the difference between software engineering and computer science software development, and that is the rationale for the program.
- Chair Hudson stated she does not doubt the point made by Chair Hammer and requested comments from the Senators of the College of Engineering.
- Senator Fink stated, as he speaks for himself and not Senator Guzman, it is the first time he was made aware of the proposal, and he was not informed by his college which is somewhat remarkable. Senator Fink stated to Chair Hammer's point, he did a quick search on the table of Faculty Resource and found that Sharon O'Neal is listed as a Professor of Practice with a Master of Science.
- Vice Chair stated the time is almost up.
- Senator Fink stated that it seems that Chair Hudson's point seems to be verified and she is listed as the Director.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated that since this is a substantial item, he would like to suggest to Vice Chair Hymel that she use some of her discretionary power to extend time as necessary. Parliamentarian Stegeman stated he has a couple of questions regarding the timeline, if the Senate were to approve the item, when does the program anticipate opening and admitting new students, and when is it anticipated that the item will be sent to ABOR for approval.
  - Chair Hammer stated he cannot answer either of those questions with certainty but assumes that if the program were approved and went through the system, it can be viable to start in Spring 2023 or the following Fall 2024. Chair Hammer stated there is a Graduate College Policy where individuals with Masters Degrees cannot instruct students who are taking courses pursuing their PhD. Individuals who teach students pursuing a PhD are required to hold a PhD. Chair Hammer stated he is not aware if there is anything in the Graduate College policy that pertains to the Director of the Graduate Program with regards to a degree requirement. Chair Hammer explained that coordinators of the Graduate Program may have a Bachelors or Masters Degree and complete a lot of work.

- Senator M. Smith stated there is a University regulation regarding the rule where individuals cannot be involved in granting a degree that is beyond their own, meaning, in order for an instructor to teach students pursuing a PhD, the professor must hold a PhD themselves. Senator M. Smith stated there is an important consideration to be made in this scenario.
- Vice Provost Heileman stated Sharon O'Neal has a Master's Degree in Computer Engineering from the University of Southern California. Vice Provost Heileman explained O'Neal was charged by the Dean with putting the proposal and does not believe she plans on teaching. Vice Provost Heileman stated he does believe that the proposal details hiring of new faculty at the PhD level to cover the courses in the program. Vice Provost Heileman stated the regional accreditor requires individuals to have eighteen units in a degree that they are teaching in, O'Neal does not have these units and he doesn't believe she will be teaching in this program nor supervising PhD programs. Vice Provost Heileman stated it is very common for a proposer of the program to not be involved as an instructor of the program.
- Secretary Dysart stated she would like to thank the Vice Provost's office for the explanation and she appreciates all of the concerns raised but she does not believe it is sufficient to hold up the various steps that are necessary for curriculum to be approved. Secretary Dysart stated she does not believe that the Senate should pick and choose who is teaching classes, but it is clear there are University and Accreditor policies that must be followed. Secretary Dysart stated the President has heard the Senate's concerns and they have been noted, and she would like to refrain from delaying other approvals which may prevent students from pursuing this degree, and keep the institution from being in the market for this degree. Secretary Dysart stated she would urge the Senate to approve the item with the noted concern, rather than hold up the multi-step process.
- Senator Simmons explained in the context of Arizona Online, his team has been working with a PCE Program, Sharon O'Neal, and several other Faculty to launch the program. Senator Simmons stated it was intended to hold the program up, and there was an understanding that it would grow once approved.
- Vice Provost Heileman stated Sharon O'Neal has thirty-five years of experience in industry including leading software development at Raytheon Missile Systems.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the item comes to the Senate as a Consent Agenda Item.
- Chair Hudson moved to table the item until there is clarity that there is a director listed on the application who holds the degree that the program confers upon its students.
  - Senator M. Smith seconded the motion.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman asked for clarification from Chair Hudson and asked if the contingency was satisfied, would the item return to the Senate's agenda.
  - Chair Hudson stated as soon as the contingency is satisfied, the item can return to the Consent Agenda.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated the clarified **[Motion 2023/24-5]** to table the approval of the program until there is a director with a PhD, once that contingency is satisfied, the item will return to the Senate for the vote.
  - Chair Hudson stated in favor of the motion, the institution is in the business of providing credentials and it is important that there is demonstration of this value. Chair Hudson stated by following common sense and accreditation-based rules for the organization of programs, there are many roles for any new and important programs which can be held by all degree ranks and faculty types. Chair Hudson stated she is sure there will be a role for everyone but she would like to see the degree program headed by a Faculty member who holds a Doctorate degree.
  - Chair Hammer stated that while the courses must be taught by an instructor that holds the degree, there is no policy which states the director of the program must hold the same degree, a PhD. Chair Hammer stated if the Faculty Senate wants to reduce the value of Sharon O'Neal's contribution, or state that she cannot be the Director of the program because she holds a Masters degree instead of a PhD, he supposed that is their right. Chair Hammer stated this seems to be an issue of policy, and in this case, a policy doesn't exist. Chair Hammer stated it seems that the Faculty Senate is voting on a policy which doesn't exist to delay and affect the proposed program that everyone agrees is exceptional.
  - Secretary Dysart stated that she requests that there is a secret ballot vote because it raises important concerns about holding departments to different standards, and she would urge people to vote against it. Secretary Dysart stated in the Department of Law, the degree is a J.D. and that is the only requirement individual's need to teach although, some people do hold higher degrees. Secretary Dysart stated that with what she has observed, the University policies will be followed and the individual taking on the important role has significant experience. Secretary Dysart stated that to protect anonymity, there should be a secret ballot vote, and if it fails, she will offer a motion to approve this with the condition of noted concerns.
  - Senator Russell stated that she concurs with Chair Hudson's opinion that the new PhD program should be led by an individual with a PhD.



- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated as a point of procedure, Vice Chair Hymel should allow the discussion to continue at her discretion with the consideration that the time limit has passed. Parliamentarian Stegeman stated that with the interpretation of the bylaws, the Vice Chair has discretion to order a secret ballot which requires a motion.
- Senator Harris stated she agrees with Senator Russell's point that the new degree program should require the Director to hold a PhD. Senator Harris explained that while she respects the contribution and experience from industry, industry does not grant degrees, and that is what the institution's business is.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she has no problem with the secret ballot motion, but she is unsure of how those are done.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated that Vice Chair Hymel should be sure that the discussion has ended, unless she would like to exercise her authority to state the time is up. Parliamentarian Stegeman stated that Faculty Center Staff, Jasmin, will send a secret ballot following the process used in the previous year.
- Senator Fink stated he would like to address Chair Hammer and Chair Hudson's statement, on the same table, there is another individual listed with a Masters degree. Senator Fink stated if the Senate were to stick with the rule that a Masters degree cannot teach a PhD program, from a housekeeping standpoint, at least two names would need to be removed from the list. Senator Fink stated from an opposing point, there is no policy stating what degree the Director should hold. Senator Fink stated Secretary Dysart's point of noting the concern, two names would have to be removed for housekeeping purposes.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the discussion has gone over time, and there will be a secret ballot sent via email. Vice Chair Hymel stated voting should take place as soon as possible, and results will be announced.
- Vice Chair Hymel announced the results of [Motion 2023/24-5] to table the approval of the program until there is a director with a PhD, once that contingency is satisfied, the item will return to the Senate for a vote. Motion carried with thirty-one in favor, seventeen opposed, and no abstentions.

## 10. OLD BUSINESS [01:15:57]

### A. [Update on Presidential approval of Constitution and Bylaws](#) – Secretary of the Faculty, Tessa Dysart

- Secretary Dysart stated she would like to give an update and background to the new Senators who haven't carefully followed the approval of the Bylaws and Constitution which she finds interesting. Secretary Dysart stated she took office in June 2022 and at the time, changes had been made to the Bylaws and Constitution, and the changes had been sent to the President's office but there was no approval over the Summer. When there was correspondence from the President's office, it was said that the documents sent did not match the documents posted to the Faculty Senate website. Secretary Dysart stated she casts no blame on anyone as the pandemic was rough for everyone. Secretary Dysart stated she was able to see that the Senate had been approving changes from 2020 to the end of the 2022 academic year, and not all changes were incorporated into the documents which were sent to the President's Office. Secretary Dysart stated she also believes there were proposed changes which were not ultimately approved but included in the documents. Secretary Dysart stated the Constitution and Bylaws committee met and discussed the best way to address the issue, and it was to go line-by-line through the Senate minutes. The committee went back to 2020 to find specific voting records for where changes were made. Secretary Dysart stated she went through and did a red line of the documents, including specific references to where those votes were done, to the minutes. The documents were sent to the President's office and there was confusion over when they were received. Recently, the changes came back to the committee with a partial approval and a memo from the President, which was attached to the agenda.
- The highlights of the memo include being over broad in the definition of housekeeping changes. The Senate has the power to approve minor, grammatical changes. For example, if a committee changes names, that can be considered as a housekeeping change and doesn't need to be voted on by the General Faculty.
  - There may have been concern in the President's Office that there was overestimation on what housekeeping changes were, the Constitution was approved but there was a caveat for the Senate to be more careful in the future.
  - The Bylaws were not approved in whole and there were concerns that were identified by the President's Office. A portion of the Bylaws were identified as contrary to Arizona Law, the Administrative Review Act. The President's Office requested the deletion of that provision from the bylaws and noted some of the inconsistencies through grievance processes as compared to UHAP.
  - Secretary Dysart stated she plans to reconvene the Constitution and Bylaws Committee to discuss this issue because has process concerns about the Senate striking a portion of the Bylaws. For example, there is precedent if the Supreme Court declares a State Statute unconstitutional, it doesn't get automatically struck from the code but there is notation that it is unconstitutional. Secretary Dysart stated she will propose that the Bylaws committee follow the route and then follow the process to strike out the problematic procedure from the Bylaws. Secretary Dysart stated she will also propose that the entire grievance process is updated to be consistent with UHAP.
  - Secretary Dysart stated there was another notable change which was a provision that was changes in Article 8, Section 2 of the bylaws which removed voting rights from ex-officio members, and the President disagreed with

the voting change.

- Senator Eckert asked if the proposed changes would go to the Academic Personnel Policy Committee.
- Secretary Dysart stated when she chaired APPC, the changes originate in the Bylaws committee, but she does remember APPC helping with the review of the Bylaws changes. Secretary Dysart stated she would be happy to work with APPC. Secretary Dysart stated changing the Constitution and Bylaws is a lengthy process where there is consulting with other people such as APPC, then it comes to the Senate for an up or down vote and should be passed by a super majority vote. Secretary Dysart stated if it not a general housekeeping change, it would go to the General Faculty, which in this case it will. Secretary Dysart stated there were some minor changes made to the Constitution and Bylaws last year and she plans to draft a memo to the President of those changes.
- Senator Neumann stated in prior years, housekeeping changes were by the consensus of the Senate unless there was an objection.

## 11. **NEW BUSINESS [01:23:56]**

### **A. Mandatory Meal Plan – Assistant Director of Meal Plan Programs, Lexi Czopek [01:26:05]**

Assistant Director Czopek stated she had the pleasure of speaking about meal plans and explained how the program works in the Student Affairs Policy Committee in April. First year students on campus are required to have a meal plan and there has been a relatively easy rollout of the program and satisfaction with student and parent responses.

- There are over 6,500 students with swipe meal plans this year, which allows students to eat consistently throughout the academic year at all-you-can-eat restaurants. These restaurants have a variety of options in food choices. Students can use their swipes in conjunction with their dining dollars at including a-la-carte at any of the over thirty restaurants, including cafes, restaurants, and markets on campus such as the New Highland grocery store. Meal plans can be complicated to use as they take a lot of explaining.
- This year, it has been found that many students and parents have come to campus informed and confident about eating on campus. There was hard work done to ensure orientations were educating and reaching as many students in different venues as possible.
- Swipes are set up to ensure students can eat consistently throughout the academic year and are allocated monthly to encourage students to use their swipes in a timely fashion. This also provides students with flexibility for when and where they would like to use their swipes. Many peer instruction set weekly deadlines which don't consider students who are going out of town or who would like to do more grocery shopping than eating at restaurants.
- The total amount of supplementary funds including cat cash and dining dollars are split between the Fall and Spring semesters to help students budget and ensure their meal plan money can serve them for the entire academic year.
- Students are offered the chance to select their preferred meal plan tier. Students who did not select prior to the billing date for the Fall semester were automatically assigned at the second-tier level which is a level twelve swipe level. This plan comes with slightly more of the supplementary funds in comparison to other plans.
- Many students took advantage of the opportunity to make changes to their plans in the first two weeks of classes. It was surprising to see students were increasing their plans, although, more students decreased their plans.
- Anecdotal evidence and traffic seen at the Student Union shows that students are successfully using their meal plans and taking advantage of technology to make getting food more convenient. There are rovers on campus, as well as other convenience options that allow students to skip the line in the food court such as order ahead, remote pickup, and quick lunch at markets and the union. This allows students the ability to be on time to class and get their meals in a timely fashion.
- There is still a wait to know final numbers for signups, plan ownership, and early usage information. These data points will be looked at closely to ensure improvements can be made for next year.
- There was feedback from faculty, staff, cultural organizations, and campus peers during the Waiver Committee Meetings leading up to the rollout of meal plans. There were a lot of strategies in place to help students navigate the requirements.
- A committee focused extensively on the needs of students who are eligible to receive Pell Grant funding and ensured those students were not discouraged to enroll or have difficulty staying in school. There was a partnership with the Thrive Center to identify and support students who were requesting financial waiver reductions. There was also work with cultural groups to identify cultural and religious concerns. There were opportunities to discuss and support students with medical and allergy concerns. There was hard work to ensure everyone who needed accommodations were able to speak with nutrition educators to find out about available options on campus. There has been a low number of requests for consultation, and many are happy with the outcome. There were partnerships with groups who received guaranteed meals elsewhere such as individuals in the Greek organizations and athletes who receive meal plans through their scholarship. Once these meal plans were confirmed, individuals were not required to maintain their University meal plan.
- Feedback will continue to be sought out and incorporated.
  - Senator Eckert asked if students who do not use all funds will receive a refund.

- Assistant Director Czopek stated the meal plans are set up to encourage students to use their meal plans. Swipes are allocated monthly and need to be used in the month they are issued for. Students have the full year to use their dining dollars and Cat Cash, but those plans are not designed to be excessive. There was work done to ensure students got the plan that would meet their eating needs. Students are encouraged to be conservative in their own original purchases which may be why there was a surge in increased plans in the first two weeks of school. There are no refunds available for students who do not use their meal plans.
  - Senator Fellous stated there are students who have dietary restrictions which can prevent them from being able to eat on campus. Senator Luz asked if these individuals would be forced to have a meal plan even if they are unable to eat on campus.
  - Assistant Director Czopek stated students who are unable to eat safely or comfortably on campus are not forced to have a meal plan and there is an arbitration process in place. Students can submit a personal letter explaining their situation, students can also submit medical or other supporting documentation if needed. There are several students with religious and cultural restrictions and those students have been given exceptions.
  - GPSC President Bernick asked what the income threshold is for deciding who qualifies for waivers.
  - Assistant Director Czopek stated the process was largely driven by the Student Success and Retention initiative at Thrive and she is unsure of the threshold. The threshold for Pell eligible students were eligible to be considered for a reduction or waiver and the meal plan office does not have access to that financial aid data so they did not set those parameters. The Thrive program is designed to support Pell eligible students in being successful and transitioning to the college experience. The Thrive program is able to see more specific financial data and talk students through the benefits of guaranteed food versus how much financial aid they are receiving. There were fewer of those requests than anticipated which can speak to how well students are supported.
  - GPSC President Bernick stated graduate students make a minimum of \$22,000 a year and it would be useful to have waivers available or some type of guaranteed meal plan as many cannot afford to eat. GPSC President Bernick asked if there were opportunities being investigated to support the rampant food and security issue in the graduate professional student population.
  - Assistant Director Czopek stated at this point, there is nothing designed specifically for graduate students as they are not required to have a meal plan, and she is unsure of how a waiver would work. There is no scholarship for paying for meal plans.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is no time left on the issue and thanked Assistant Director Czopek for all of her work.

**B. Ad hoc [Committee on Donor Influence Report](#) and Resolution – Chair David Gibbs [01:38:20]**

The Committee on Donor Influence was formed by the Faculty Senate. There was a report issued by the committee as well as a motion made by the Faculty Senate in response to the first report. The committee arose in response to a concern by many faculty about the problem of restricted grants by donors, private sector, and donations given to specific units sometimes with political or ideological objectives or agendas.

- The role of the Center for the Philosophy Freedom, and the widespread perception that donors have been allowed to exert heavy influence in hiring faculty, and designing coursework and curriculum, goes against widely accepted standards of university operations. Chair Gibbs stated the Freedom Center was founded in 2008. It has denied that donors are allowed to influence its conduct and have repeatedly stated this to him. Chair Gibbs stated the Administration has repeatedly denied any donor influence both privately to him and to the public.
- There is a sizable number of internal documentations from the Freedom Center obtained under the State Open Records Act. The committee has been allowed to evaluate the documents and there is clear and unmistakable evidence of direct donor influence in the most inappropriate way which directly contradicts statements to the contrary regarding hiring faculty and designing curriculum. This is part of a larger issue led by wealthy donors which are associated with Charles Koch associated with Koch Industries. There are efforts to use money on a vast scale to transform American education including higher education in a much more free-market direction.
- Chair Gibbs stated he would like to emphasize the issue is not one of Academic Freedom as there is freedom to develop free market ideas and it is a legitimate part of academic discourse and social libertarian ideas. The committee offers no objections to these ideas, the key issue is inappropriate donor influence. Chair Gibbs stated he has a respect for libertarian ideas and some of his own publications appear in libertarian venues. There is a lack of transparency and a presence of factually incorrect information being transmitted to the faculty and to taxpayers in the State of Arizona, which is the key issue.
- Key findings from the committee include the year 2009 where there was hiring in the Philosophy Department which was funded by the Freedom Center and supported by the Thomas W. Smith Foundation. This is a very conservative, business-oriented foundation.
- David Gibbs stated there was an email to David Schmitz who then headed the Freedom Center. Schmitz described in the email on behalf of TWS, the name of the faculty member that the Thomas W. Smith Foundation wanted to hire by phone stated that “Jim” was okay with it, Chair Gibbs stated this meant that Schmitz ran the proposed hire by the donor and got their permission which is donor influence.
- Chair Gibbs stated in 2010, there was another hire funded by the Charles Koch Foundation in the Philosophy

Department and there is an email from an individual in the Koch Foundation, sent to David Schmitz that stated the individuals board is okay with moving ahead with the potential co-professor hire.

- Chair Gibbs stated there is also an email from David Schmitz in 2018 where a new department called the Department of Political Economy and World Science which would be founded by the Freedom Center. In this situation, there was another independent hire with the Thomas W. Foundation. Chair Gibbs stated it appears the Thomas W. Foundation was upset about the committee's plan and did not approve. There is an email from Schmitz to the team which states, "The committee has no right and no power to divert the search in some ways other than what the Thomas W. Smith Foundation wanted to support." Chair Gibbs stated that Schmitz was a faculty member and the head of the Freedom Center and was valuably defending the right of the Thomas W. Smith Foundation to dictate the character of the hire.
- Chair Gibbs stated there was another hire in 2022 in the Philosophy Department which was also funded by the Freedom Center. Chair Gibbs stated there are Faculty meeting minutes discussing this hire. In one of the documents it states, "We are looking for someone in the classical liberal tradition, because with Dave (Freedom Center founder, David Schmitz) leaving, they (Freedom Center) want to maintain the balance of the Freedom Center." Chair Gibbs stated it was said that those supplying state funding were also in favor of this effort. Chair Gibbs stated the State legislature is heavily funded and was funding this. Chair Gibbs stated the Philosophy Department was saying that they would allow the legislature to influence, or some may say, dictate, ideological character of the higher with ideological conception who will study classic liberal tradition.
- Chair Gibbs stated there are further statements where an individual states, "I support this, but I am not especially happy with the State funding controlling the focus again, underscoring that the State is influencing, possibly dictating the character of a hire." Chair Gibbs stated there was another communication from an individual which states, "The reasons are unclear though we are more vulnerable if we don't appease those plying the State fundings." Chair Gibbs stated that this is not the way the University is supposed to work, nor is it the way a hire is supposed to be conducted, especially as there have been promises that these things do not happen.
- Chair Gibbs stated there was also evidence that donors influence the writing of curriculum which is included in the report.
- Chair Gibbs stated a leadership position is assumed by Charles Koch previously with his brother who is now deceased, David Koch is among the richest in the world. Chair Gibbs stated there is galvanizing of other wealthy interests who invest in this process and the investment is considerable.
- Chair Gibbs stated he has a report from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) which noted that in 2016 alone by just Charles Koch on higher education amounted to four-hundred-fifty-eight billion dollars at over five-hundred-fifty universities, around the country. Chair Gibbs stated this is a massive operation with other individuals involved. Chair Gibbs stated there was an interview with David Koch who stated that if he gives money, he expects to exert control. Chair Gibbs stated this seems to be true in operation based on the documents obtained in the State Open Records Act.
- Chair Gibbs stated the deceptive practices are disturbing as the faculty and State have been told the opposite.
- Another point the committee made is lack of transparency. Chair Gibbs stated it has taken years to get information out of the Freedom Center and the Department of Political Economy and Moral Science, and there have only been summaries provided of agreements.
- Chair Gibbs stated there has been a detailed report issued with citations and there will be a proposed motion of censure of the Freedom Center for its conduct that will be presented in the October Faculty Senate meeting.
- The committee will continue to meet and there will be another report issued to the Faculty Senate with proposed remedies to these issues.

**C. Ad hoc Committee on General Education – Chair Mark Stegeman**

Parliamentarian Stegeman stated in Spring 2024 there was a formation announced of several ad-hoc committees. One of the committees was for General Education which reflected difficulty that arose when the General Education refresh came before the Senate in 2021 and everyone was on different pages.

- The Chair of the Faculty created the ad-hoc committee on General Education with and Parliamentarian Stegeman was charged as the Chair.
  - The committee's charge is to "
    - work to create a culture of communication and cooperation between administration and the General Faculty on issues related to General Education, through the institutions of Shared Governance."
    - "work with the General Education Office to being a comprehensive General Education program package through the Shared Governance process stipulated by the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, including elements posted for Senate review in 2021 and newer elements, thereby resolving historical disagreements concerning whether the program approval process in 2021 complied with the Constitution and Bylaws;"
    - "work with the General Education Office and relevant committees and task forces on unresolved elements of the new General Education program..."
    - "Prepare written progress reports for the Faculty Senate: an interim report due by December 1, 2023, an interim report due by June 1, 2024, and a final report due by December 31, 2024.
  - New member of the committee include Bram Acosta of Humanities, Dan Asia of the College of Fine Arts, Isabel Barton of the College of Engineering, Ethan Orr of the College of Agricultural Life and

Environmental Science (CALES), Michael McKisson of the iSchool, Tarnia Newton of the College of Nursing, Anna O'Leary of the College of Social and Behavioral Studies (SBS), Jennifer Ravia (CALES), Joellen Russel of the College of Science, Mae Smith of the College of Education, Roy Spece of the College of Law, Mark Stegeman of the Eller College of Management, Keith Swisher of the College of Law, and Chris Weber of the College of SBS.

- Initial Activities of the committee include collecting data and soliciting ideas and opinions which has to do with the charge of understanding what stakeholders want with regards to General Education. This includes employing students to do research on other schools' programs. There is an intention to send out a short survey of faculty concerning courses that overlap the Regents' Civics mandate. There will also be a survey of opinions of academic advisors.
- Executive Director Miller-Cochran asked if a part of the initial activities will be communication or collaboration with the Office of General Education.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated yes there will be as it is part of the committee's specific charge, to work with the Office of General Education.
  - Executive Director Miller-Cochran stated her team has done quite a bit of work with matters such as the short survey of faculty concerning courses. Executive Director Miller-Cochran stated she would like to ensure faculty do not get confused as there will be two different bodies asking the same questions.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated he agrees that the two bodies should work together, and his presentation only highlighted short and simple points, he is willing to return to another meeting to discuss more.
  - A Senator stated this may be out of the Parliamentarian's purview although General Education raises budgetary questions and whether competition will be generated over revenue. The Senator asked if there will be a way that questions raised for General Education will be thought through.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the committee's discussions have gone beyond what is in his presentation and the revenue model impacts are a part of the discussion.

## 12. **ADJOURNMENT**

Vice Chair Hymel stated she hopes that the Faculty Senate meeting is a good example of working together with the Administration. With no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:01 PM.

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

### **Motions of September 11, 2023 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2023/24-1]** to approve the Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2023/24-2]** to approve the February 27, 2023 minutes with the corrections and addendum attached. Motion was seconded. Motion was passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2023/24-3]** to approve the April 10, 2023 minutes as amended. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2023/24-4]** to approve the May 1, 2023 minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2023/24-5]** to table the approval of the program until there is a director with a PhD, once that contingency is satisfied, the item will return to the Senate for a vote. Motion carried with thirty-one in favor, seventeen opposed, and no abstentions.

### **Attachments Within the Minutes**

1. Page 1, Item 3: Action Item Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Item 4: Action Item Approval of the Minutes of
  - a. [February 27, 2023](#)
  - b. [April 10, 2023](#)
  - c. [May 1, 2023](#)
3. Page 3, Item 5: Statement from the Chair – [GFFRC Diagram](#)
4. Page 4, Item 6: [Report from the President](#) – President Robert Robbins
5. Page 6, Item 7: [Report from the Provost](#) – Interim Provost Ron Marx
6. Page 6, Item 8: Information Item: Interim Chair of Graduate Council, Ron Hammer – [Proposal New Academic Unit](#)

[School of Business](#) and [ABOR Summary](#)

7. Item 9: Action Item: Consent Agenda, Interim Chair of Graduate Council, Ron Hammer – [Proposal Ph.D. in Software Engineering](#) and [ABOR Summary](#)
8. Page 9, Item 10: Old Business Item A: [Update on Presidential approval of Constitution and Bylaws](#)
9. Page 13, Item 11: New Business Item B. *Ad hoc* [Committee on Donor Influence Report](#) and Resolution

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456