

The University of Arizona®
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
1216 E. Mabel St. (PO Box 210456)
621.1342
facultycenter@email.arizona.edu
Minutes: October 23, 2023
3:00-5:00 p.m.
VIA ZOOM

Present: M Hymel (Chair), J Bernick, C Casey, H Cui, J Dudas, T Dysart, W Fink, J Frumkin, R Hammer (for H Cui), G Heileman, L Hudson, J Jones, K Maggert, R Marx, H Nelson, D Ohala, C Rankin, C Simmons, S Su, M Stegeman (Parliamentarian), J Vetter, and L Ziurys

Absent: A Sanchez

Guest: K Kannan

Call to Order

Chair Hymel called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

The meeting agenda was approved.

Approval of the Minutes of September 18, 2023

The minutes of September 18, 2023 were approved as written.

Review agenda for the November 6, 2023 Faculty Senate meeting

- Kannan introduced the confidential naming request scheduled to be voted on in Executive Session at the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting on November 6, 2023. The announcement of the approved naming is scheduled for Homecoming, which is the weekend prior to the scheduled Faculty Senate meeting. Kannan asked if a Special Senate meeting could be called prior to November 4, 2023 Homecoming in order for Faculty Senate to approve the naming. Hudson suggested calling a Special Executive Session Faculty Senate meeting for October 30, 2023 to finalize the naming request. Committee members agreed. Fink asked for an Executive Summary and/or Donor Agreement for Faculty Senate to review. Kannan agreed to provide the documents. Faculty Center staff sent out a meeting call for the Special Senate meeting on October 30, 2023 at 4:00 p.m.
- Dysart mentioned the end of the last Faculty Senate meeting where Senator Downing proposed a Resolution to send apportionment issues to the Committee of Eleven. If Downing's seconded Resolution is pending, then that item needs to be addressed first under Old Business. Downing's Resolution contradicts the Constitution and Bylaws where it states that apportionment recommendations are charged to the Committee on Faculty Membership (COFM). Stegeman responded

that the Presiding Officer did not formally restate the motion to put it on the floor for a vote. Since the meeting ended abruptly, the item would come back to Faculty Senate, but without a motion on the floor. The Presiding Officer has the jurisdiction to call a motion out of order because it's unconstitutional. Stegeman doesn't particularly agree the Resolution is unconstitutional because the Faculty Senate would always have the right to ask to form any committee for its advice, conversely, it would be unconstitutional for Faculty Senate to say that the COFM could not consider it or take it away from the COFM. Simply asking C11 or any other committee to look at it and offer comment is not unconstitutional. C11 could send its recommendation to the COFM. Hammer stated that the Bylaws are very clear that apportionment is under the purview of the COFM. The issue of new college representation is a different issue. Dysart stated that it's been impossible to review apportionment standards with no members on the committee. Committee members discussed.

- Casey requested that all handouts given to Faculty Senators be distributed to everyone attending the meeting online. Faculty Center staff requested that all handouts be sent to the Faculty Center in an email so they can be distributed to everyone.
- Technical issues with Faculty Senate meetings have been addressed and an IT person will attend all meetings.
- Ziurys mentioned the Astrobiology Center in the College of Science that never came before Faculty Senate for approval. Fink concurred. Marx responded that a change in ABOR policy requires RII-type centers across the three in-state Universities be approved in a manner like academic units. This change in policy was overlooked and is a regrettable oversight not intended to be so. All Centers that were bypassed previously will be consolidated for perusal at a later date. Discussion will be put on the December Faculty Senate agenda.
- Items were added, removed, and rearranged. Time allotments were prescribed for each item. The Faculty Senate agenda was approved.

UPDATES

President's Report – Jon Dudas

- ABOR added two additional at-risk compensation goals for President Robbins' portfolio; the Maricopa Agricultural Center and a new AI Institute (or Center). ABOR also mentioned centralizing all of UArizona's IT by 2024, but that wasn't the path the University had been taking. The University has always promoted centralizing accountability and responsibility for campus IT security, so it will be a matter of working with ABOR to explain the difference. ABOR's mandate for the latter is due to the State Auditor General finding a level of decentralization that was causing problems.
- Fink asked Hudson where the *ad hoc* IT committee stands on this issue. Hudson reminded the committee that committee member Jeremy Frumkin is a member of the *ad hoc* IT committee, and as concerns are articulated to Brummund and the President, the *ad hoc* committee is available to also address concerns.

- Fink asked Dudas if the “one laptop” model was designated as the standard package. Dudas responded that several configurations of suites of products are available to the campus community depending on needs for customization and support.
- Su said that the Department of Physics has been chosen as one of two departments as the guinea pig in this area of IT centralization. Su’s concern is that things are moving forward extremely slowly, and finalization keeps getting pushed farther out. What is an approximate timeline so plans can be formulated? Science Administration’s Senior Director for IT, Michael Morris, explained that so far, only discussions and meetings are taking place.
- Frumkin responded that the *ad hoc* IT committee has met twice with another meeting scheduled for tomorrow. A Chair for the committee still needs to be appointed. The committee has discussed what the perception is versus what the reality is, and to clarify many areas that have been communicated or heard differently so facts can be put on the table and gaps can be closed. Knowing timeframes, understanding specifics of the laptop program, how these issues affect security, while doing it in a way that improves overall cost to the University, as well as understanding how it impacts the faculty involved, are a few of the many issues the committee is undertaking. While the Auditor General’s office focused on security and what changes needed to be made, it didn’t focus on how to address security. A factual based approach on other issues like cost efficiency, consistency, and quality of service are objectives the committee wants to report on with qualitative feedback. Reports will be made in the fall and spring.
- Marx reported that in the next couple of weeks the finalists for the Dean of the Honors College will be on campus and is hopeful faculty who have a vested interest will participate.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 p.m.