

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
MAY 1, 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 be found at:  
<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=a8af18ff-3946-46dc-92af-aff6000e5212>

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the April 3 Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. Secretary Tessa Dysart and Parliamentarian Stegeman were present.

**Present:** Senators Brummund, Cai, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Cui, Domin, Downing, Duran, Dysart, Fellous, Fink, Folks, Guzman, Hammer, Harris, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Ijagbemi, Irizarry, Jones, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Neumann, O’Leary, Ottusch, Pace, Pau, Rankin, Robbins, Rocha, Ruggill, Russell, Senseney, M. Smith, J. Smith, Spece, Stanescu, Stegeman, Stone, Su, Vedantam, Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders, Zenenga, Ziurys

**Absent:** Senators Addis, Alfie, Behrangi, Bourget, Dial, Gerald, Gordon, Goyal, Haskins, Knox, Lamb, Lucas, Murugesan, Nichols, Robles, Rodrigues, Sadoway, Schulz, Simmons, Slepian, Tropman

**2. APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE AGENDA FOR MAY 1, 2023 (00:00:43)**

- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is a newly edited Faculty Senate Agenda for May 1, 2023, to be distributed during the meeting. Changes include adding binding times, reports from the President, Provost, and Committees moved to item six to allow a chance for reporting, a change to Consent Agenda item where one item was moved to New Business, and the UITS Discussion was moved from agenda Item E to Item A. Vice Chair Hymel stated Parliamentarian Stegeman attempted to email the new agenda, but the formatting was incorrect, although, it is to be distributed during the meeting for viewing.
  - Secretary Dysart asked if the ten-minute timeframe for reports is for individuals or a total. Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-98]** to adopt the Faculty Senate Agenda for May 1, 2023, with the amendment of moving reports (Item 6) to the end of the Agenda due to a decision made by the Senate Executive Committee.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated reports were moved to end of the agenda several meetings ago to allow more time for other business and was the formatting wasn’t intended to be continued.
  - Senator M. Witte stated she speaks against Secretary Dysart’s motion because there are several committee chairs present, a couple who are leaving the University and have important recommendations to bring forward. Senator M. Witte stated reports are always an item of business for the Senate and if it is left to the end, it will not be addressed, the item should be short. Senator M. Witte stated she would like to endorse Vice Chair Hymel’s suggestion for reports to remain near the item for the President’s comments.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated Secretary Dysart’s motion does not have a second.
  - Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-99]** to adopt the original amended Faculty Senate Agenda for May 1, 2023. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she has worked so hard, and everyone is amazing. Vice Chair Hymel stated she would like to thank the outgoing Senators for their service to the Senate as she knows it is a difficult job, outgoing Senators include Alfie, Addis, Behrangi, Bourget, Brummund, Citera, Duran, Hammer, Haskins, Ijagbemi, Lamb, Lucas, Murugesan, Nichols, Ruggill, Sadoway, and Stanescu.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE APRIL 3, 2023, APRIL 10, 2023, AND AMENDED FEBRUARY 27, 2023 MINUTES (00:07:47)**

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-100]** to approve the April 3, 2023, minutes. Motion was seconded.
  - Senator M. Witte stated she is provisionally approving the April 3, 2023, minutes because for recent

- minutes, there were several important omissions and she reserves the right to return in the Fall once she has the chance to review minutes which arrived late, at the time she will address corrections.
- Senator Downing stated he has a comment.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated it is time for voting.
    - Senator M. Smith stated Senator Downing raised his hand to comment before the vote and he was not recognized.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated it is her prerogative and she apologizes for missing Senator Downing's hand, but the vote is only for the April 3, 2023, minutes.
    - Senator Downing stated his comment is for the April 3, 2023, minutes.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated it is too late and she apologizes although changes can be made in Fall 2023.
    - Senator Downing raised a point of order and stated the Vice Chair must ask for those who are in favor and those who are opposed.
  - Senators Hammer, Senator Ziurys, and Senator M. Smith stated they were unable to vote via Zoom.
  - Senators agreed that those who are on Zoom can hear those in person although those on in-person are unable to hear those on Zoom.
  - Senator Downing stated the April 3, 2023, minutes are omitting the last four minutes of the meeting include motions made by Senator Fink, and comments made by the Parliamentarian which are missing.
- **[Motion 2022/23-100]** carried with thirty-three in favor.
4. **ACTION ITEM: SENATE ELECTIONS FOR UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT, COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD, SHARED GOVERNANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE, GRIEVANCE CLEARINGHOUSE COMMITTEE, SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE. (00:13:32)**
- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated he distributed an email a few minutes prior to the meeting regarding Senate Elections which will be conducted by OpaVote to ensure anonymity. There will be six separate emails sent to Senators, each email will have an individual link to an individual election. Senators will have until the end of the meeting to cast their ballots where results will then be announced.
  - Vice Chair asked who the email was sent by.
    - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated OpaVote distributed the ballot.
5. **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. (00:16:24)**

**Open Session Statement: Kian Alavy, Manager, Undergraduate Education (00:17:01)**

My name is Kian Alavy, I am a staff member in the Office of Undergraduate Education. For over a year, I have been helping facilitate the work of the undergraduate research task force with the goal of making world class research a defining characteristic of the undergraduate experience at the University of Arizona. I am here today to provide some timely updates. The task force launched in April 2022, as a joint endeavor, led by the Office of the Provost and Research Innovation and Impact. The campus community, including all faculty, were invited to participate. There is a Faculty Dimension Subcommittee since we know undergraduate research is a high priority for the faculty. The task force call to action resulted in 311 task force members. The task force work has proceeded in three phases during the past academic year.

We have completed Phase One: Discovery, Phase Two: Planning and Development, and we are transitioning to Phase Three: Implementation. In Phases One and Two, the task force was divided into themes or dimensions, which were philosophy, experiences, students, diversity, equity, and inclusion, faculty, and organization. The report submitted by each of these subcommittees revealed emergent cross-cutting priorities which are: commonly defined research, undergraduate research, and undergraduate research experience, assess and evaluate undergraduate research, coordinate and make broadly visible many undergraduate research opportunities and functions, integrate undergraduate research into the curriculum, purposely fund and reward undergraduate research. As one of the next steps in Phase Three, the University will create a center to coordinate undergraduate research activities and facilitate collective impact. Coordination is necessary for a variety of reasons. We know that undergraduate research is a high impact practice that improves retention, graduation, and student learning outcomes. A center will be a key differentiator and a recruitment tool highly visible to prospective students and their families. Finally, we will continue the work of the task force to provide the campus community and new center with an undergraduate research roadmap and description of existing assets, resources, and programs. The center will implement the tasks forces, vision, and roadmap.

**Open Session Statement: Secretary Tessa Dysart (00:19:25)**

I requested this spot a couple weeks ago and it seems that events have eclipsed what I originally wanted to say,

but I thought I would comment briefly on current events. So first, I want to thank the outgoing senators. I especially want to thank Senator Hammer, who was a huge mentor to me when I started serving on APPC and the Senate will be a sadder place without you Ron, we will miss you.

I also want to thank Provost Folks who I didn't know would be sitting next to me, but she is, for her amazing leadership this year. I would say one of my highlights in working in Shared Governance has been working with her, and even though she and I don't always agree, I appreciate her candor, directness, accessibility, and willingness to work through her willingness to work through the tough issues. As a woman in academic, I really appreciate that she fought for diversity and first-generation students. Leisl, thank you, I am honored to consider you as a friend and aspire to be more like you, except I don't want to be Provost.

I would like to talk about Shared Governance. I appreciate Senator Casey for sending around Chair Manson's comments on Shared Governance. Shared Governance is a collaborative venture. It is one that requires us to recognize our role, and it is that of participation, and not of oversight. We are not in the U.S. House of Representatives. We do not control the purse, right? So, it is not one of oversight. Sadly, our improper attempt at oversight this year has been detrimental to many of our colleagues who have seen their curricular proposals stymied in the Senate. I am thrilled to see so many members of the iSchool who have been fighting for weeks, and months, for the approval of their program. I thank them for their hard work and dedication to making this University a better place. I know there are other curricular matters that we will consider, so we need to be mindful of our colleagues and our faculty friends and think about them. Thank you.

**Open Session Statement: Jessica Emerson McCormick, Executive Director, Hillel Foundation (00:22:12)**

I am speaking today as the Executive Director of the Hillel Foundation which is the primary Jewish campus-cultural center in connection with the recent, massive, anti-abortion displays on campus. Hillel condemned the display, and the Hillel treasures the first amendment. We are asking questions of the University, not prescribing solutions that limit speech. Because so many faculty members reached out to us in the wake of the display, and some specifically asked to be to be here today, I can to speak to this body.

Our questions include: Why do some events and programs apparently get rejected by the University while others proceed? We understand the forms needed, we fill them out all the time ourselves, but based on student reports, there seem to be elements other than logistics that prevent some events from being approved. Meanwhile, this known display by an openly litigious group was approved by the GC's office in January. Why were some campus groups alerted in advance about this particular display and others weren't. If hate speech is expected, students should be warned. Are there repercussions for student groups that knowingly bring hate speech to campus while the speech may be protected? We believe that the student club that brought the group to campus violated numerous aspects of the student code of conduct, and we want to know what actions the club might face. Could the free speech zone be redefined physically? Our research tells us that other campuses have free speech zones that are removed from the center of campus or smaller in scope than the Mall. Is any redefinition possible or even desirable at this campus? What are the limits of free speech as it relates to hate? Are there any limits at all to free speech on the Mall? We asked because more than the displays, we were especially shocked that a person shouting racial slurs was welcome back on campus another day. It is not just the display either, our students face an unusually hostile campus environment. My students complain every single day about being shouted at, they're going to hell, etc. You guys have it too.

We're curious if there is a red line on which hate speech on the mall would demand action. We have raised these questions with the University, and we will keep following up. We look forward to achieving clarity and we thought you might be interested in hearing our perspective and approach today, so thanks for your time.

**Open Session Statement: Senator Lucy Ziurys (00:24:54)**

I'd like to make a statement on Regent Manson's speech at the last ABOR meeting. Although Regent Manson raised some good points, the comparison of the University of Arizona Faculty Senate with those of ASU and NAU was unfortunate. Administrative decisions made at the University of Arizona have put undue stress on the Faculty which NAU and ASU do not have to bear. There are many examples, one obvious is the furlough. While the Faculty and Staff at the University of Arizona had to endure the most draconian furlough in the country, ASU had none, and NAU had to pay back the furlough money. One wonders, in the interest of health of this marvelous institution, why was there discrepancy between these three Universities? This may explain, in part, the veracity of the University of Arizona Senate. However, moving forward, announcements made this morning have already, in my opinion, addressed some concerns of the Faculty Senate. We look forward to working collaboratively with President Robbins to solve the other problems in the future with clarity and vision, and continuing on the path of Academic Excellence at UArizona that has been the tradition of this University for over fifty years. Thank you.

- Senator Zeiders stated there is a question in the Q&A section of Zoom that people online are unable to see speakers and are only able to view a blank screen. (00:32:05)
  - Senators on Zoom stated they are unable to hear anything. (00:33:23)
  - Senator R. Witte stated no one is speaking at the moment and the Vice Chair is working on a resolution for audio. (00:34:17)
6. **REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, APPC, RPC, SAPC, DEI, CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS COMMITTEE, SGRC, GRADUATE COUNCIL, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UARIZONA STAFF COUNCIL, GEN ED OFFICE WITH UWGEC, C11 (00:33:56)**
- President Robbin's speech was inaudible due to technical errors.
  - Chair Hudson stated she would like to echo what the President stated, the elected faculty leadership is very encouraged, the President has begun to be very responsive to the call from the Faculty and the Campus Community at large to restructure risk management and threat assessment. This puts safety and security of many kinds as the new North Star. Chair Hudson stated she wishes all the best to those entering in new roles with their new endeavors. Chair Hudson stated that within her role, she has been and will continue to work very closely with President Robbins and his team as there is an adjusted course moving forward. There will be a forward motion in collaboration and mutual respect to continue improvement, working, teaching, and learning conditions for everyone at the great University.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated most of the reports are attached to the agenda which will be posted.
  - Chair Cuillier of the Research Policy Committee stated in the agenda, there is a link to the committee's report. Chair Cuillier stated his appreciation to the Provost for meeting with the committee in the previous month, there was also an additional meeting in the week prior. Chair Cuillier stated he would like to highlight the last point in the report, the RPC Committee believes the Faculty Senate should revisit percentage allocation to Principal Investigators in their research for their grants. The University will pay two percent, but the RPC Committee believes it should be five percent. Researchers incur overhead like the University and RPC believes it should be compensated as there are many smaller expenses that add up. Two percent most likely will not create a big incentive or motivator. Chair Cuillier stated he believes five percent is more attractive and a better incentive, the Faculty Senate should address this topic in Fall 2023 as research distinguishes UArizona from other universities in the state. Chair Cuillier stated his appreciation for the Faculty Senate's work as he knows it is not easy.
  - Chair Fink of the Committee of Eleven stated a report will be posted before evening following the evening.
7. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – REQUEST FOR NAME CHANGE FROM CALS TO CALES AND ABOR SUMMARY, PROPOSAL MS IN DATA SCIENCE & APPLIED STATISTICS AND ABOR SUMMARY, GRADE APPEAL POLICY REVISION AND BENCHMARKING, PROPOSAL BA IN GEOSCIENCES AND SOCIETY AND ABOR SUMMARY, PROPOSAL BA SCIENCE AND ABOR SUMMARY, PROPOSAL BS SCIENCE AND ABOR SUMMARY, PROPOSAL MINOR CLIMATE CHANGE AND PUBLIC HEALTH, PROPOSAL UG MAJOR BSBA BUSINESS ANALYTICS AND ABOR SUMMARY (00:39:34)**
- **[Motion 2022/23-101]** to approve Seconded motion for Request For Name Change from CALS to CALES, **[Motion 2022/23-102]** to approve seconded motion from Graduate Council Proposal MS In Data Science & Applied Statistics and ABOR Summary, **[Motion 2022/23-103]** to approve seconded motion Grade Appeal Policy Revision and Benchmarking, **[Motion 2022/23-104]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal BA in Geosciences and Society, **[Motion 2022/23-105]** to approve seconded from Undergraduate Council Proposal BS Science and ABOR Summary, **[Motion 2022/23-106]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal Minor Climate Change and Public Health, and **[Motion 2022/23-107]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal UG Major BSBA Business Analytics.
    - Senator M. Witte stated it is the Faculty Senate's responsibility who should have caution, to review and approve curricula, to have time to do so, and to get reports from the groups that bring such items forward. It falls on Senators' laps to have due diligence, find topics where more questions should be asked, and concerns raised to prevent the University from being a diploma mill. Senator M. Witte stated she will vote against the Consent Agenda and hopes in the future that the curricular items will not be brought as concepts as the curricula and faculty are no longer known. Senator M. Witte stated it is the Senate's business to perform due diligence and if it hasn't been done, such as the iSchool, it should be done. Proposals do not come with an in-depth review due to other committees considering it out of their purview and rushing to bring items to the Faculty Senate.
    - Senator Hammer stated the purpose of the Consent Agenda is to expedite this issue for anyone, an example is the Senator who just spoke who wishes to not have an item on the Consent Agenda and they are able to remove it. Every proposal in the Consent Agenda undergoes an extensive review by a Faculty Committee at either the Graduate College, Graduate Council, or Undergraduate Council level. There has also been an additional step taken which was adding the ABOR summary to the files posted in the agenda to provide a summarized version that ABOR reviews, it is accurate and approved by the

Graduate or Undergraduate Council. Senator Hammer stated there is no reason to avoid approving the items due to the lack of time one had to read the material with a week to do so, he can understand not approving an added measure such as the one on new business for a new proposal; he cannot see avoiding approval of programs that have been worked on for six months to a year, received approval from the appropriate committees, and then has gone to the Faculty Senate and has been posted for over a week for Senators to review.

- Senator Stanesco stated she agrees with Senator Hammer's statement regarding the review that is done at the level of the Undergraduate Council. She acts as Chair of the Undergraduate Council and proposals are vetted, details are looked at, there are a lot of questions asked, and there is a lot of time spent reviewing and receiving feedback. Proposals are not "rubber stamped," and a lot of time is spent on them as they get moved to the Faculty Senate.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated prior to the Senate meeting, anyone can inform her that they would like an item pulled off from the Consent Agenda.
- [Motion 2022/23-101], [Motion 2022/23-102], [Motion 2022/23-103], [Motion 2022/23-104], [Motion 2022/23-105], [Motion 2022/23-106] and [Motion 2022/23-107] carried with forty-two in favor.

8. **NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. PROPOSAL BACHELOR CREATIVE INTELLIGENCE AND INNOVATION AND ABOR SUMMARY – JOHN POLLARD, ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND CURRICULAR INNOVATION (00:45:55)**

- Associate Dean Pollard stated he would like to acknowledge comments made by Senator Hammer and Senator Stanesco regarding the Bachelor in Creative Intelligence and Innovation. Associate Dean Pollard stated his thanks to all Senators, U-CAAC, and G-CACC members who worked together to unanimously approve the program as it shows how well Shared Governance can work.
- The Bachelor of Creative Intelligence and Innovation is a University of Arizona degree focused on how to enhance a student's degree through additional studies, complex problem solving, critical thinking, and to contextualize with real world problems.
- The program is meant to map onto any other degree for Honors students at the institution. There are approximately 4,000 students at the University of Arizona. About ten percent of Honor's students earn dual degrees and there are even more students who earn double majors.
- The project arose from discussions with partner the University of Technology Sydney who developed the curriculum. There was a decision made to pair with the University of Technology Sydney to co-develop and evolve the curriculum. The program is not designed to be a standalone degree and must be paired with another degree, the same regulations apply at the University of Technology Sydney (UTS).
- The new program can bring in unique internships for students including corporate, nonprofit, and government agencies. This can provide students to take their degree program and amplify but thinking from a systems perspective, instead of thinking about problems to solutions, there can be more thought put into complex systems and how change can be invoked in such systems.
- The degree is a forward-looking, innovative, and modern degree that will allow the W.A. Franke Honors College to continue to stand out in the country. The program will provide a unique study, broad experience for students, and provide a skill set for students that will be useful and make them more marketable for jobs and Graduate school. Ninety-three percent of students at UTS who complete this specific dual-degree program get employment offers after they graduate and can go straight into the workforce.
- Associate Dean Pollard stated he is excited for the program and thanked Chair Hudson for the opportunity to speak with the Senate as the program is new, innovative, and important to speak about.
  - Senator M. Witte stated her appreciation for Dr. Pollard to respect the Senate and allow them additional time to ask questions. Senator M. Witte stated she believes this is a model of what each item on the Consent Agenda should be doing. Senator M. Witte stated she believes at Arizona State University there is a committee of the Faculty Senate where all curricula items are reviewed again, three months before information is presented to the Faculty Senate.
  - Senator Simmons stated Dean Pollard for presenting in the Senate and he has been involved in many discussions with UGC regarding the proposal. Senator Simmons moved [Motion 2022/23-108] to approve the seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal Bachelor Creative Intelligence and Innovation. Motion was seconded.
- Senator Ziurys raised a point of order and asked if there is any discussion on the degree.
- Senator Bourget asked what the nature of the partnership is with the University of Technology Sydney and if they are selling the University of Arizona their curriculum. Senator Bourget stated she finds it odd for there to be a major that is unable to standalone, she has reservations about it, and asked if this concern has been brought up in previous discussions. Senator Bourget asked why students admitted in the Honors College receive different treatment than other students in terms of opportunities such as double-majors and dual-degrees.
- Associate Dean Pollard stated students choose to enter the Honors college and continuing students can

enter. There is a hope to draw more students into the Honors College. Once students are attending the Honors College there is a current wildcat Admission's program which requires a 3.4 GPA. There are many programs on campus with GPA requirements. The Honors College is on track to be the most accessible and diverse college in the institution in terms of access as there are students from many colleges. There are reasons for a minimum GPA requirement. Honors students tend to make the choice to complete a dual degree. The proposed program would start as appropriate for Honors Students due to their demographic. The program is unique and innovative, the program is run similar at UTS and it is not a standalone thing. There is work being done to create a co-development arrangement with UTS although the curriculum must first be moved forward.

- **[Motion 2022/23-108]** carried with thirty-six in favor.

## 9. **OLD BUSINESS**

### A. **UITS DISCUSSION & POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM (00:55:24)**

- Senator Downing stated there was a very detailed report distributed which concerned the issue of centralization and mega-migration to the cloud. Senator Downing stated he would like to make a motion that summarizes the findings of an investigation that was done on the proposed mega-migration.
- Senator Downing moved **[Motion 2022/23-109]** to  
Suspend all further IT integration/centralization until the issues in the UITS assessment are properly addressed, and until a full risk assessment of any proposed mega-centralization and cloud migration framework is conducted and 2. Form immediately a UITS Technical Oversight Committee composed principally of knowledgeable faculty who are true stakeholders in IT efforts (for example, those who scientific instruments that require computers), chosen from the affected colleges, mostly non-UITS IT-personnel (Colleges/units), who will devise a plan on a short time scale (i.e. before Fall Semester 2023) for campus IT security that addresses all remaining security issues to the satisfaction of the AZ Auditor General and the UITS Technical Oversight Committee.  
Motion was seconded.
- Senator Downing stated the reason for the motion is due to the centralization which has already begun. He discovered a disturbing piece of information in the last week which is that many have purchased their technology through the BookStore. The BookStore feeds back 6.5 million dollars into the campus of which three-quarters-of-a-million-dollars supports the ASUA, KUAT, and other scholarships on campus. It was discovered that the UArizona BookStore is not permitted to bid on the proposal therefore there is undercutting of the student government, the Daily Wildcat, and KUAT by moving central operations to purchasing through UITS.
  - Senator Hammer stated he is sorry to see that the resolution as well as most of the content in the letter distributed to Senators is based on misinformation and miscommunication about the existing plans for security changes. Senator Hammer stated there is no centralization and there was a response which came from CIO Barry Brummund earlier in the afternoon that address matters presented in the proposal. Senator Hammer stated most of the content that generates such a radical proposal is based on fear mongering and is not an understanding of what the existing plan is. Senator Hammer stated the plans are to take college level and individual faculty level needs into account. Senator Hammer stated if there is a desire to move into a centralized structure like NAU, where there is a more employee intensive structure like ASU, it can be suggested although facts should be put in order before presenting such a proposal. Senator Hammer stated the proposal will not only defeat the security issues needing to be solved before they are solved for the University of Arizona by the Auditor General or State Agency but will make it more difficult to survive in the current structure.
  - Senator Zeiders stated she disagrees with Senator Hammer and met with CIO Barry Brummund and a group of CALS senators earlier in the day. Senator Zeiders stated she fully supports Senator Downing's resolution.
    - Over the last eight months, CALS Faculty and Staff have been very concerned about the UITS centralization project. It is known that leadership is now backing away from the term "centralization," although this is what was communicated to staff across the University, including staff of the CALS IT Department.
    - There has been significant "behind the scenes" work done from both faculty and staff in CALS because it was recognized that the project would significantly impact the way research is done and the way that the IT supports CALS and the larger mission of research.
    - There have been repeated attempts to seek more clarification, information, and documentation with little success.
    - Many members of CALS Faculty and IT Staff met with CIO Barry Brummund where they were able to ask questions and express concern. The conversation was productive and there were a few key takeaways.
      1. There was a request for a concrete plan. Senator Zeiders stated Senator Hammer

- mentioned specific steps although CIO Brummund stated he was unsure about the plan or the specific steps but the project would most likely take three to five years.
2. The CALS group asked what success will look like in the project. CIO Barry Brummund discussed the Arizona Auditor General report of 2018 and catching unsecure servers. Senator Zeiders stated this is the first time there has been discussion on patching servers, all communication regarding the project both internally and externally never mentioned it. The CALS group followed up by asking about the data of unpatched servers and CIO Brummund did not know the information. The data collected in the last six months from colleges and departments did not ask about unpatched servers.
  3. There was a question regarding the efforts at NAU and ASU. CIO Brummund stated those models cannot be followed as UArizona is more complex than the two colleges. Senator Zeiders asked why.
    - Senator Zeiders stated while she appreciates CIO Brummund for meeting with CALS Faculty and IT Staff, it is clear there is still no concrete plan, no metrics for success, and no assessment of real impact on research and teaching at the University of Arizona. Senator Zeiders stated her team of organized individuals fully supports the resolution to halt UITS centralization efforts that are being deployed as well as the oversight committee.
    - Senator Russell stated she is speaking on behalf of herself although she is also the Chair of the UA Research Computing Governance Committee and assists with building the supercomputer. Senator Russell stated she is a climate modeler; it is her major research tool. Senator Russell stated she had to pay for her higher bandwidth ethernet connection to her lab and office because her building is old and is not wired for it, this came out of her research budget because the National Science Foundation (NSF) would not pay for this. Senator Russell stated there was a lot of time spent transferring data from Google Drive to Amazon Web Services, there will most likely be issues in three years regarding the contract which is happening at the expense of computer engineering time. Senator Russell stated the UITS proposal is expensive, she agrees in implementing more security, she loves the amendment as an experienced individual in the area and would like to have more time to consider the UITS proposal.
    - Vice Chair Hymel moved **[Motion 2022/23-110]** for a cloture vote. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-one in favor, and eight opposed.
    - Senator Ziurys asked if the Senate can add ten more minutes of discussion. **(01:07:45)**
    - Secretary Dysart stated she asked for a cloture vote so there could be no more discussion.
    - **[Motion 2022/23-109]** Resolution carried with thirty-three in favor and twelve opposed.

**B. NEW ACADEMIC UNIT – iSCHOOL – DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES, LORI POLONI-STAUDINGER (01:12:54)**

- Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated she is representing the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) which is a strong college with rigorous degree programs, accomplished faculty, and committed students which will be intellectually and fiscally sound without the iSchool as a part of the college.
- From the iSchool's inception, the intention was never to reside permanently in a college, but to be incubated by a college. The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences has done this in good faith and the iSchool will always have a natural relationship with SBS. The iSchool and SBS College have a shared focus on human impacts, public interest, and quantitative Social Science.
- Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated when she arrived on campus in July of 2022, there were conversations underway regarding the iSchool separating from SBS. Dr. Brooks and the entire SBS Dean's leadership team have worked collaboratively, this academic year, to untangle operations.
- There was a plan approved in 2015 which was for the iSchool to be a temporary member of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.
- Deans from iSchools across the country were on campus in 2014 and recommended that the University of Arizona iSchool be allowed to stand as an independent unit, not in a college. At the time UArizona Central Administration preferred that the iSchool be housed in a college as a temporary step towards independence. Over a decade ago, the iSchool becoming independent was reposed, the proposal to become separated from SBS is one-hundred-percent supported by the Faculty.
- The College of SBS surmised that the separation would eventually be approved by reviewing committees, then the Faculty Senate. Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated given the unanimous support of the iSchool Faculty for the proposal, she comes on their behalf in the spirit of advancing shared governance and a faculty voice. Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated she asks that the Senate consider the vote of the iSchool faculty in their decision making.
- The iSchool remaining in the College of SBS creates a set of complications. An example is the iSchool hiring pressures which are profound with faculty expectations differing from the trends that typify SBS faculty. The issue of retention will remain an issue until the iSchool operates independently and more in line with other peer institutions. To retain faculty in the iSchool, SBS resources are unfairly distributed to the iSchool rather than in other SBS units. Allowing the iSchool to separate, SBS will be able to focus resources and efforts on growing and

strengthening their other disciplines. SBS has predicated their budget planning for the upcoming years based on the separation with the iSchool and has asked for payback to SBS for their investments. To derail the iSchool separation from SBS at this juncture would cause increased workload and budget pressure on the College of SBS.

- Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated she has been learning more about the iSchool and knows it to be a strong unit with potential growth. The iSchool can draw new students to the campus for programs such as gain development and data science. Suggesting that these are not rigorous programs does students and faculty in the degree a serious disservice.
- Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated the review process has been in motion for an entire academic year and delaying the support for the proposal is a strain on the campus, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and most importantly, the iSchool faculty. Dean Poloni-Staudinger stated she hopes the Faculty Senate will consider these factors and she appreciates the Senate for considering the perspective and providing her with a platform to speak.
  - Senator Cui stated her appreciation for Dean Poloni-Staudinger speaking to the Faculty Senate and sharing information. Senator Cui moved **[Motion 2022/23-111]** for a simple vote, yes or no, on approval for the iSchool as there has been a lot of information and answers provided from the faculty. Motion was seconded.
  - Chair Hudson asked the parliamentarian if the Senate is able to entertain a simple up or down vote given a vote that was taken in a previous Faculty Senate meeting regarding submission of a document summarizing all arguments and answering all questions on the April 9, 2023, question list.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the vote for that motion is binding and it would be at the discretion of the presiding officer whether the motion is in order and whether the conditions have been satisfied.
  - Senator M. Witte raised a point of order and stated to amplify Chair Hudson's statement, many of the major questions asked were not answered in the fifteen-page document. There was a concern that the Faculty Senate faced in due diligence including four items:
    1. The precedent that no department or school has ever become a separate college on campus.
    2. There was no review at the level of the Undergraduate and Graduate Council because it was stated that it would be a unit issue.
    3. The first time the item came to the Senate for due diligence, the process was violated.
    4. There have been many details regarding the perils and promises regarding the item, at the March meeting of the Arizona Board of Regents, President Robbins stated his vision of the iSchool was much different and broader than what is being presented.
- Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the Presiding Officer has the floor and Secretary Dysart raised a point of order. The Presiding Officer must rule on the point of order and decide whether the request of the previous motion was satisfied. After the ruling, the body can decide whether they want to overrule by making a motion.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated she viewed the materials of the iSchool earlier in the afternoon and there was a link to the FAQs and she does not believe all questions were answered. Vice Chair Hymel stated she does not want to destroy the iSchool and would like to propose that the item be referred to a committee to work on during the Summer. Vice Chair Hymel ruled the motion out of order and stated the criteria of the previously passed motion has not been satisfied.
  - Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2022/23-112]** for a roll call vote to overrule the Vice Chair's ruling to not cast an up or down vote on the iSchool vote.
  - Senator Fink raised a point of order and requested the Presiding Officer to call for an anonymous vote in replacement of a roll call vote.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated there will now be a vote to overrule her decision that the iSchool had not met its burden of providing enough information and referring it to a committee.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated a Yes vote implies that there can be a vote on the Motion for an up or down vote on the iSchool and it will overrule the Vice Chair's ruling. A No vote means the Chair's ruling is sustained and there will be no motion on the floor. The Constitution gives the Vice Chair the right to call for a Secret Ballot vote.
  - Senator Fink raised a point of order and asked how many minutes the Senate will have to complete their vote.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated by the process adopted by the Senate, there will be a ten-minute minimum.
  - **[Motion 2022/23-112]** carried with twenty-nine in favor, and eighteen opposed.

**C. APPC RESOLUTION RE. ART. II., SEC. 2 – CHAIR OF APPC, JOHN MILBAUER & UPDATE ON CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS AND PROPOSED CHANGES TO ART. II., SEC. 2 – CHAIR OF THE CONSTITUTION & BYLAWS COMMITTEE, TESSA DYSART (01:27:23)**

- Vice Chair Hymel stated she combined the items for APPC and Constitution and Bylaws Committee because the two items relate.
- Chair Milbauer stated there was a request from the Provost that there is a change to disallow participation in electing individuals who are candidates of a degree because of a clause in the Constitution. Article II., Section 2



- states “no candidate for a degree at the University of Arizona shall be a member of the General Faculty.”
- Chair Milbauer stated by extension, it would mean there would be no one elected to Senate or Senate committees, nor serving on those.
  - APPC was asked to look at the clause by the Chair of the Faculty. APPC has reviewed the Provost request that Faculty Constitution Article II., Section 2 be followed in the current election cycle, has discussed the issue with members of the Committee on Elections and has deliberated over the matter.
  - Given the information, there are three points:
    1. The election cycle had already begun when the request was made.
    2. There was no evidence found that Article II., Section 2 has been followed in recent years, if ever, regarding Shared Governance.
    3. The intent of the original policy itself is unclear to disallow terminal degree holding faculty members who seek additional degrees at the University from general Faculty status or to disallow students pursuing their terminal degrees at UArizona from General Faculty status.
  - Chair Milbauer stated given the three points, APPC strongly recommends the following:
    1. The continuation of the current election with all candidates included.
    2. The adherence to the Faculty Constitution and subsequent elections.
    3. Discussion in the Senate and in the Constitution & Bylaws Committee of the intended purpose of Article II., Section 2 including consideration or elimination of the clause.
  - Chair Dysart stated the provision of the Constitution went to the Constitution & Bylaws Committee early in the academic year.
    - Chair Dysart stated as frequent Senate participators know, she is eager to follow the documents as they are adopted for a reason.
    - Once there was a conflict found, the Committee met with a Provost to discuss a solution and move forward. Originally, there was an idea to eliminate the provision but upon further reflection, it was determined that it would create significant, real, or potential conflicts of interest. An example is Faculty members who are seeking degrees in a different department of their college who serve on P&T committees or other committees reviewing Faculty members. There is now a proposal to change the language.
    - The new proposed language is an expansion of the existing language. The committee considered the fact that faculty members who are seeking degrees could not vote in the faculty election. The Constitution & Bylaws Committee also wanted to ensure faculty members would be able to serve on departmental committees, but they could not serve on elected committees at the College or University member.
    - This would affect approximately forty Faculty members out of the approximately six hundred members of the General Faculty.
    - If the proposed change to the Constitution is approved by the Faculty Senate, it would be sent to the General Faculty for a vote.
  - Senator M. Witte stated she is confused because when Chair Milbauer read the resolution it seemed that it was fine and looked forward to furthering discussion, however, the second resolution presented by Secretary Dysart has a clause which is concerning. Senator M. Witte stated the clause would allow administrators to appoint some of the Faculty members to other committees and discretion to administrators to decide who they would like to place on committees. Senator M. Witte stated times have changed for example, the Master of Public Health Degrees and other Master degrees are online to encourage faculty development, there is a question on whether an individual loses their Faculty status if they will also lose their tuition waiver. Senator M. Witte stated there are several issues that haven't been considered.
    - Chair Dysart stated Senator M. Witte's questions are associated with the proposed resolution of the Constitution & Bylaws Committee. If an individual is not a part of the General Faculty, they would not vote in Faculty Elections and would not be considered a part of General Faculty which is a term defined in the governing bylaws. Chair Dysart stated when the language of the proposed change was drafted, an example she thought of was Chair Hudson who could put someone who is seeking a degree on a Faculty Committee and would still be able to appoint them, just not elect them. Secretary Dysart stated she was not thinking about administrators and was thinking about Faculty Senate committees. The intent would allow the Chair to appoint individuals to committees with disclosure.
    - Chair Milbauer asked for clarification on whether degree seeking Faculty can serve in University Shared Governance committees if they disclose their degree seeking status.
    - Chair Dysart stated the way the resolution was written is that an individual could serve as an appointed Faculty representative on a Shared or Faculty Governance committee at any level, requires that the degree seeking faculty disclose, in advance, to the appointed entity, their department head, and to the full committee, their status as a degree-seeking student.
    - Chair Dysart stated if a Faculty member is on a General Faculty committee, she would say they couldn't serve because they are not a part of the General Faculty. If there were another committee that does not require General Faculty membership, she would say the individual would be able to serve based on the

language of the resolution. The individual would no longer be a member of the General Faculty and could not be appointed to a General Faculty committee similar to how a Staff member couldn't be on a General Faculty committee.

- Chair Milbauer stated he would not be in favor of the Constitution & Bylaws proposal because it precludes Faculty from being elected to committees if they are degree seeking at the University of Arizona. There are many examples where there are very few possibilities for advancement for Faculty other than promotion to Associate and promotion to Full. Shared Governance and QTR, second-degree seeking or third-degree seeking are two of the main ways Faculty can advance their careers. The resolution of the Constitution & Bylaws committee precludes that possibility.
  - Chair Dysart stated she would like to clarify that the current documents also preclude the same possibility although they have not been followed.
- Senator Simmons stated his thanks to Chair Milbauer and Chair Dysart for their presentation, it is a complex issue that directly affects him because he is degree seeking and a member of the General Faculty. Senator Simmons stated while he would like to continue as General Faculty, he was able to see the potential conflicts of interest on both sides. An example would be voting on issues that affect professors and if he was in their class, he would have potential for getting favor although, there were also professors who referenced the fact that he is vocal on Shared Governance and certain issues. Although none of it was a threat, it may have been perceived that way. Senator Simmons stated the language is there for a reason and he is in favor of the clarification, some form of language should be kept maintaining balance as there have been concerns of conflicts of interest within the Faculty Senate body. Senator Simmons stated he would like to maintain consistency about thinking about the different conflicts of interest.
- Senator Zeiders stated she is unclear about how Chair Milbauer and Chair Dysart's recommendations do not correlate. Senator Zeiders asked Chair Dysart for clarification regarding an example where there is a CAFT nominee and whether they would be ineligible if they were also a degree seeking candidate student.
  - Chair Dysart under the current documents, that is how it is written, and it would remain the same. Chair Dysart stated she is aware that would raise concerns because CAFT is required by ABOR and it could subject the University to legal challenge if a CAFT Committee was improperly constituted. Chair Dysart stated what the Constitution & Bylaws Committee is suggesting is more generous than what is currently written in the documents which currently do not allow degree seeking students from being members of the General Faculty.
  - Senator Zeiders stated it is unclear whether no student at UA who hasn't completed a degree can be considered as Faculty or if Faculty at UA cannot take courses. Senator Zeiders stated is not clear and goes against ABOR policy in terms of tuition. Senator Zeiders stated from a Nominating Committee perspective, they are always at a challenging place of getting individuals included in Shared Governance. Even forty to forty-five individuals is considered as significant. Senator Zeiders stated Chair Milbauer's point should be carefully considered that the clause has not been followed in a long time.
- Senator Stegeman stated he is on the Constitution & Bylaws Committee, and he is in support of the resolution, and he is support of a vote.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated there will be no vote as there is no more time remaining.

**D. LMS RFI/RFP PROCESS – ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST, DIGITAL LEARNING AND ONLINE INITIATIVES, MELODY BUCKNER, ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST, OFFICE OF INSTRUCTION/ASSESSMENT, LISA ELFRING, PROFESSOR, CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY, ROGER MIESFELD (01:41:11)**

- The Learning Management System (LMS) Request for Proposal (RFP) is a contract with the LMS which is currently D2L Brightspace which expires in January 2025. As a State agency, it is required that requests for proposals are published.
  - Professor Miesfeld stated he would like to make sure that everyone on Faculty Senate understands that it is a transparent process, and all policies that are in place are being followed.
  - There is not necessarily a change being made to the LMS but the standard RFP must be followed. There is commitment to engaging the campus community through surveys and platforms which has already been initiated. The process has already begun, there was a town hall in the past week where there were about two-hundred participants. There were sandboxes set up where people participated and look into vendors who responded to the request for information. There was information collected from the individuals who tested the LMS systems that began in Summer 2021.
  - In the upcoming Summer, the RFP proposals will be distributed, and vendors will have a chance to respond.
  - There is a committee that is in the process of creating a scoring rubric which is the criteria used for the recommendation.
  - The Committee will complete a report in Fall 2023 and send recommendations to the Office of the Provost.

- In Fall 2023, there may be vendor presentations and proposals will be reviewed and scored. Weighed criteria will be used, the weight of the criteria is not shared with the vendors and is used internally. There will then be a report written that leads to a recommendation submitted to the Provost Office leadership.
- In Spring 2024, the contract will be rewarded and there will be a year of transition to either better utilize the LMS system that is currently in place or to switch to a new LMS.
- The Request for Proposal Recommendation Committee includes Roger Miesfeld who is serving as the Chair, Staff: Ginger Hunt, Lara Tarantini, and Laura Lustro and Faculty: Lisa Rezende, Rob Stephan, Paula Blowers, Romi Wittman, and Na Zuo. The individuals were selected through a working group which provides support for the committee, this includes Melody Buckner, Darcy Van Patten, Lisa Elfring, Janet Smith, John Potenza, and Emily Perry. There was a meeting in the month prior to discuss the criteria for evaluating RFPs in Fall 2023.
- The initial survey had 686 respondents of which were about fifty-percent Faculty, two-hundred Career track, and one-hundred-fifty Tenure track. There is a website which walks-thorough the process of the LMS Review. The website includes data and additional information.
- Features received from the survey included the following:
  1. The top response was “Ease of use and accessibility for both myself and my students.”
  2. Course site design is easy to customize.
  3. Grading features that save time and effort for instructors.
  4. Flexibility – allows different approaches for quizzing, assignments, and grading.
  5. Accessibility.
- Recent meeting dates included April 18, 2023 which was the RFP Committee and Kick-off meeting and April 24, 2023 which was the Town Hall Meeting via Zoom. There was a lot of information collected by using the “Waterfall” chat feature. The feature uses a countdown feature and allows individuals to submit their comments. This gathered raw feedback from the participants.
- Vice Chair stated before recognizing additional individuals she would like to state her decision regarding the iSchool vote was overruled and a link will be distributed for an up or down vote on the iSchool. **(01:48:05)**
  - Senator R. Witte stated he would like to make a motion.
  - Secretary Dysart raised a point of order and stated there is already a motion on the floor.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated the Parliamentarian stated Senator R. Witte was able to make a motion.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated that was an incorrect ruling and there is a call for a vote to be taken.
  - Senator R. Witte said there was no call for a vote to be taken.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she did call for a vote to be taken. Vice Chair Hymel stated her apology and stated she has worked hard to follow the rules and it takes a lot of work.
  - Senator R. Witte raised a point of order that a motion was made although there has been no discussion nor cloture on the motion.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated the Vice Chair called for a vote and he is unsure whether Senator R. Witte’s hand was up or not.
  - Senator R. Witte stated the Vice Chair is unable to close cloture when there is discussion on an item and hands are up.
  - Senator Ziurys stated there were many hands up.
  - Senator R. Witte stated there were many hands up and a second motion was made that the motion was out of order.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman raised a point of order and stated once a vote begins, that is it.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated there was a motion to approve the iSchool.
  - Senator R. Witte, Senator Ziurys, and Senator Downing stated there was no discussion.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated it is too late and there will be no further discussion.
  - Senator R. Witte and Senator Ziurys stated they appeal the ruling on the matter.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated as soon as she heard she was overruled, she asked the Parliamentarian if she can call for the vote, and if she made an error, she made an error.
  - Senator Downing raised a point of order and asked if there can be a vote on whether the Vice Chair can be overruled.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated the vote was that she was overruled.
  - Senator Downing and Senator Ziurys stated that is a motion.
  - Senator R. Witte stated there has been no further discussion.
  - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated Senator R. Witte is out of order and the Vice Chair may have made a mistake, but the matter is over.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated she will notify the Senate the results of the up or down vote for the iSchool when she is informed and the Senate will move on to the next agenda item.

**E. SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE ACTION PLAN – DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SUSTAINABILITY, TREVOR LEDBETTER AND CO-CHAIR, SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE ACTION PLAN, SABRINA HELM (01:53:41)**

- Associate Professor Helm stated the Sustainability and Climate Action Plan is headed by Trevor Ledbetter, the Director of the Office of Sustainability and she is an Associate Professor of Retailing & Consumer Sciences.
- Director Ledbetter stated he is there to engage as many stakeholders in the process as possible. The plan launched in the last two to three weeks and it is important to include individuals in each of the Shared Governance organizations.
  - There are six working groups including academics, research, equity and justice, built environment, engagement communications, and responsible sourcing and investments.
  - Representation from across campus can assist with building recommendations that will make up the sustainability and climate action plan. Feedback and follow up conversations are welcome.
  - Colleagues are asked for self-nomination or nomination of potential colleagues who may be interested in participating in one of the working groups. Students who have a strong passion for sustainability and climate action are welcome to join in the working groups, it is difficult to recruit students, and this may be done in classes or labs. Co-chair Sabrina Helm and Director Trevor Ledbetter can be contacted at climateaction@arizona.edu
  - There will be additional engagement opportunities specific to Faculty. Currently there are no dates for the workshops, but Faculty can leave their contact information and complete a survey online. The community survey will be left open for two additional days to allow Faculty Senate an opportunity to provide input.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she is exercising her authority to ask the Senate to view the UArizona Academic Calendar for approval.

**10. NEW BUSINESS (01:58:05)**

**A. APPROVAL OF THE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC CALENDAR (01:58:22)**

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2022/23-113]** to approve the University Academic Calendar for 2023-2024. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**B. REMARKS BY INTERIM CHIEF SAFETY OFFICER, STEVE PATTERSON (02:00:19)**

Vice Chair Hymel stated that she would like to thank everyone in Faculty Senate as it has been a long and arduous year with the abundance of agenda items, she appreciated everyone's hard work.

Interim Chief Safety Officer Steve Patterson stated he was asked to speak briefly about the threat made to the Faculty member which happened approximately six weeks ago. Interim Chief Safety Officer Steve Patterson stated he is limited on what he is able to say as far as specificity although, there was no information in the threat that was specific to being a University of Arizona employee or faculty member. There was a text message which was a threat. The individual who received the text message had already filed a police report with the Tucson Police Department and Interim Chief Safety Officer Steve Patterson forwarded the threat to another Government agency to review. Interim Chief Safety Officer Steve Patterson stated he has not followed through with the Government agency since as he does not have the authority to, although, he is in consistent contact with the faculty member who is also engaged with the law enforcement agencies.

Interim Chief Safety Officer stated he is available to return to Faculty Senate another time as he is aware of the time constraints, he is able to answer questions as there have been a lot of changes and updates in the last few weeks.

**C. ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE iSCHOOL VOTE (02:02:37)**

Vice Chair Hymel asked the Faculty Center staff to announce the secret ballot results of the simple up or down vote for the iSchool. **[Motion 2022/23-114]** carried with thirty-two in favor, fourteen opposed, and no abstentions.

**D. ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SENATE ELECTION RESULTS (02:03:35)**

Vice Chair Hymel instructed Faculty Senators to vote via OpaVote during the meeting and the results of the election would be shared at the end.

***\*Elected***

**Shared Governance Review Committee**

**WITTE, RUSSELL (27)\***  
**DYSART, TESSA (21)**

**Committee on Conciliation**

**GIPE, LAWRENCE (27)\***

**MAGGERT, KEITH A. (31)\***  
**WRIGHT, ASHLEY (41)\***  
ZIURYS, LUCY (23)

**Senate Executive Committee**

**SU, SHUFANG (27)\***  
NEWUMANN, WILLIAM (21)

**Grievance Clearinghouse Committee**

**DIAL, SHARON (44)\***

**University Committee on Ethics and Commitment**

**LI, DIAN (44)\***  
**PERFECT, MICHELLE (42)\***

**University Hearing Board**

**GARCIA-FILION, PAMELA (21)\***  
**KENNEDY, AMY K. (22)\***  
**POEDEL, ROBIN (19)\***  
**SKORPUSKI, KAYLE (18)\***  
JOLIE, EDWARD A. (17)  
LYNCH, ALEX (12)  
MCKISSON, MICHAEL (16)  
WERCHAN, HENRY (14)

**11. ADJOURNMENT (02:05:00)**

Chair Hudson invited everyone to join her in a rooftop reception. Chair Hudson stated her thanks for the Presiding Officer, Mona Hymel, the Parliamentarian, Mark Stegeman, and the Secretary, Tessa Dysart for their hard work throughout the entire year of Shared Governance. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

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

**Motions of May 1, 2023, Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2022/23-98]** to adopt the Faculty Senate Agenda for May 1, 2023, with the amendment of moving reports (Item 6) to the end of the Agenda due to a decision made by the Senate Executive Committee.

**[Motion 2022/23-99]** to adopt the original amended Faculty Senate Agenda for May 1, 2023. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2022/23-100]** to approve the April 3, 2023, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-three in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-101]** to approve Seconded motion for Request For Name Change from CALS to CALES. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-102]** to approve seconded motion from Graduate Council Proposal MS In Data Science & Applied Statistics and ABOR Summary. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-103]** to approve seconded motion Grade Appeal Policy Revision and Benchmarking. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-104]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal BA in Geosciences and Society. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-105]** to approve seconded from Undergraduate Council Proposal BS Science and ABOR Summary. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-106]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal Minor Climate Change and Public Health. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-107]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal UG Major BSBA Business Analytics. Motion carried with forty-two in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-108]** to approve the seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Proposal Bachelor Creative

Intelligence and Innovation. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-six in favor.

**[Motion 2022/23-109]** to 1. Suspend all further IT integration/centralization until the issues in the UITS assessment are properly addressed, and until a full risk assessment of any proposed mega-centralization and cloud migration framework is conducted and 2. Form immediately a UITS Technical Oversight Committee composed principally of knowledgeable faculty who are true stakeholders in IT efforts (for example, those who scientific instruments that require computers), chosen from the affected colleges, mostly non-UIITS IT-personnel (Colleges/units), who will devise a plan on a short time scale (i.e. before Fall Semester 2023) for campus IT security that addresses all remaining security issues to the satisfaction of the AZ Auditor General and the UITS Technical Oversight Committee. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-three in favor, and twelve opposed.

**[Motion 2022/23-110]** for a cloture vote. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-one in favor, and eight opposed.

**[Motion 2022/23-111]** for a simple vote, yes or no, on approval for the iSchool as there has been a lot of information and answers provided from the faculty. Motion was seconded. Motion carried with thirty-two in favor, fourteen opposed, and no abstentions.

**[Motion 2022/23-112]** for a roll call vote to overrule the Vice Chair's ruling to not cast an up or down vote on the iSchool vote. Motion carried with twenty-nine in favor, and eighteen opposed.

#### **Attachments within the Minutes**

1. Page 1, Item 2: Approval of the **Faculty Senate Agenda** of May 1, 2023
2. Page 1, Item 3: Approval of the minutes of [April 3, 2023](#) and [April 10, 2023](#) Faculty Senate Meetings, and amended February 27, 2023 minutes
3. Page 4, Item 6: Reports from the [President](#), [Provost](#), Faculty Officers, APPC, [RPC](#), [SAPC](#), DEI, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, SGRC, [Graduate Council](#), Undergraduate Council, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UArizona Staff Council, Gen Ed Office with UWGEC, C11
4. Page 4, Item 7: Action Item: Consent Agenda: [Request for Name Change CALS to CALES](#) and [ABOR Summary](#) (Information only), [Proposal MS in Data Science & Applied Statistics](#) and [ABOR Summary](#), [Grade Appeal Policy Revision & Benchmarking](#), [Proposal BA in Geosciences and Society](#) and [ABOR Summary](#), [Proposal BA Science](#) and [ABOR Summary](#), [Proposal Bachelor Creative Intelligence and Innovation](#) and [ABOR Summary](#), [Proposal BS Science](#) and [ABOR Summary](#), [Proposal Minor Climate Change and Public Health](#), [Proposal UG Minor BSBS Business Analytics](#) and [ABOR Summary](#)
5. Page 6, Old Business Item 9A: UITS Discussion and Possible Action Item: [Letter to the Senate with Resolution](#)
6. Page 7, Old Business Item 9B: New Academic Unit – [iSchool](#)