

MINUTES FACULTY SENATE OCTOBER 4, 2021

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/>

1. CALL TO ORDER

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Melanie Hingle, called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle reminded the body that this is a Faculty Senate business meeting, and everyone is welcome to attend, but only Faculty Senators may participate. Any Senators wishing to participate are asked to raise their virtual Zoom hand, and please stay muted when not speaking. The preferred method of voting is by a show of hands, which was voted on at the April 2021 Faculty Senate meeting. Robert's Rules of Order also recommends a hand-raise as the default method for voting. Faculty Senators may raise a real hand on camera and wait until voting has concluded, but using one's "zoom" hand is preferred.

Present: Senators Addis, Alfie, Bolger, Bourget, Brewer, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Devereaux, Diroberto, Domin, Downing, Durán, Fink, Folks, Gephart, Gerald, Gordon, Goyal, Hammer, Haskins, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Ijagbemi, Jones, Kline, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Lucas, McDonald, Milbauer, Murphy, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Reimann, Robbins, Rosenblatt, Russell, Schulz, Sen, Slepian, J. Smith, S. Smith, Su, Summers, Vedantam, M. Witte, R. Witte, Zenenga and Ziurys. M. Stegeman served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Behrangi, Dial, Knox, Mansour, Rodrigues, Simmons, Stone, Valerdi, and Vega.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Hingle stated that with the help of Faculty Senators, continued improvements are being made to better conduct the Faculty Senate meetings. Parliamentarian Stegeman suggested having the final Faculty Senate agenda approved at the beginning of every meeting. The draft agenda is approved at the Senate Executive Committee meeting and posted on the website. Hammer moved **[Motion 2021/22-4]** to approve, motion was seconded. Hudson moved **[Motion 2021/22-5]** to amend the agenda by introducing two items for discussion and possible action at the beginning of the meeting to be heard after Open Session. Hudson asserted that the two items should not take more than fifteen minutes each, and the two items pertain to the Faculty Senate properly fulfilling its legal responsibilities. One item is for naming facilities and the other item is for curriculum development and approval. The first item Hudson would like to add after Open Session is a motion suggested by Senator Downing pertaining to the Faculty Senate's role in naming facilities. Immediately following, Hudson would like to introduce an Information and Possible Action Item to clarify the Faculty Senate vote on April 5, 2021 concerning the Gen Ed Refresh. Hingle reiterated Hudson's request, and stated that there is a set order to the meeting, and would prefer new items to be discussed at the end of the meeting. Stegeman said that when the Faculty Senate votes to accept an agenda the order of the agenda is part of the vote and can vote on any sequence it prefers. Hingle said she is not clear what the body will be voting on because no information has been presented. Summers asked procedurally if an amendment to the original agenda could be part of the initial motion as opposed to a new agenda because that would alleviate two votes. Stegeman said that the motion to approve the agenda now has a motion to amend, which is standard for any motion to pass or fail, at which time the original motion will be on the floor. There will be two votes regardless. M. Witte asked if the amendment needs only a simple majority to pass and if the original motion needs only a simple majority to pass. Stegeman concurred, but stated that the special rule about agendas is once an agenda is passed, any further modifications need a two-thirds vote. Hymel asked if the amendments are approved, then the initial agenda vote includes the amendments. Stegeman concurred. Hingle asked Stegeman for clarification on procedure. Stegeman instructed Hingle to informally summarize the motion to amend to put it on the floor and then open it up for discussion followed by a vote. The motion to amend gets voted on first, which will determine what the vote is on the initial motion. Hudson added her motion into Chat: *By introducing two items for discussion and possible action at the top of the meeting. Directly after open session. For no more than fifteen minutes each. These two items pertain to the Senate properly fulfilling its legal responsibilities – one for naming facilities and the other for curriculum development and approval. The first item is pertaining to the Senate's role in naming facilities. The second item to be added is an information and possible action item to clarify the Senate's vote after the April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting on the Gen Ed Refresh.* Stegeman said the fifteen-minute limit is not binding unless passed by two-thirds vote and suggested it be removed, but it would have to be accepted by the proposer and seconder. Hudson entered the revised amendment into Chat: *By introducing two items for discussion and possible action at the top of the meeting. Directly after open session. These two items pertain to the Senate properly fulfilling its legal responsibilities – one for naming facilities and the other for curriculum development and approval. The first item is*

pertaining to the Senate's role in naming facilities. The second item to be added is an information and possible action item to clarify the Senate's vote after the April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting on the Gen Ed Refresh. Ziurys stated that she seconded the motion and approves of the change. McDonald said he is confused and has two questions and a comment. First, were the amendments submitted to the leadership in advance to be added to the agenda in the normal fashion? Second, Hudson states that it's a motion by Senator Downing, and if this is Senator Downing's motion, shouldn't he be putting it on the floor? As a Faculty Senator, McDonald stated that he would like information in advance of the meeting to make things less complicated, since he and most other Faculty Senators spend time looking at the agenda in advance of the meeting. McDonald suggested adding the items to the November Faculty Senate meeting with supporting documentation. Hudson responded that she, in consultation with Senator Downing, is making the motion to amend the agenda. Hudson said she submitted a request for information on the Gen Ed Refresh which appears at the end of today's agenda as an Information Item, and after seeing the item, made the decision to amend the agenda to encourage a more in-depth discussion at the beginning of the meeting. McDonald clarified that the item is already on the agenda. Hudson said that the item listed is a report of University-wide General Education Committee (UWGEC) Chair, and what Hudson would like clarified is what was explicitly voted on in Qualtrics at the April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting after the discussion of the Gen Ed Refresh. Stegeman interjected that Downing's name should be struck from the motion since the body cannot bind him to make a motion. Downing concurred, and stated that his motion arises from the last Senate Executive Session where procedural confusion occurred and the proposal is very simple to create a procedure to alleviate any further entangled situations. Stegeman halted Downing's clarification, explaining that at the time of discussing changes to the agenda, merits of the issue are not relevant at this time. Downing apologized, stating that he was addressing McDonald's question. Ziurys questioned Stegeman that the body needed to know the merits of an issue in order to place it on the agenda. Stegeman explained that it's difficult to draw that distinction, precisely, but the discussion should be based on whether or not it makes sense to discuss the issue during the meeting. Ziurys said it makes sense to discuss both issues given the recent incident at Yale involving donors and naming, and how donors were to abstain from any influence, but were apparently making decisions as to which professors would be teaching certain programs and is a timely issue, indeed. The Gen Ed Refresh issue is timely because the Regent's Professors are extremely upset about what is going on with the program, and White Papers are being circulated. Ziurys wasn't a Faculty Senator last April and is unsure of the vote on April 5, 2021, but is aware of the unrest among faculty and clarification by Hudson is extremely important. M. Witte said she speaks similarly and is in support of the motion, that these two matters are very important issues. The Faculty Senate was missing key elements that should have been presented in the naming. The Gen Ed Refresh has upset many on campus and should have been discussed at great length and involved many more individuals and groups, and the tenured faculty feel very much left out of the direction of the Gen Ed program. Hammer agrees that both are important issues, but feels that the important players who are best informed are missing, all the more reason to discuss at more length as agenda items in November rather than rushing to judgment now. Downing moved **[Motion 2021/22-6]** for cloture. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Hingle moved **[Motion 2021/22-7]** to introduce Hudson's proposed two items following Open Session for discussion on today's agenda. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. **[Motion 2021/22-5]** to amend the agenda passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

The minutes of September 13, 2021 were approved as written.

4. OPEN SESSION: STATEMENTS AT THE PODIUM ON ANY TOPIC, LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES – MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPEAKERS IS FOUR. NO DISCUSSION IS PERMITTED, AND NO VOTES WILL BE TAKEN.

Senator Hudson stated that under the Arizona Open Records Act, a document on funding sources has been received for the Political Economy and Moral Science (PEMS) Program. The Koch Foundation did in fact contribute over \$400,000 to the Department of Political Economy in 2020. This is contrary to what Department Head Vlad Tarko reported to Faculty Senate in the minutes from March 1, 2021 where the PEMS graduate program was approved. *"Hudson asked as a preeminent scholar of polycentricity and biographer of Eleanor Ostrom, and very much in the lineage of Michael Polanyi, does PEMS understand why people are worried about the possible effect of Koch-related money on the fragile polycentric commons that is the University? Tarko responded that the Koch Foundation retracted their money, and the worry is based on something that no longer exists."* Hudson said this is not the case according to the public records document. Neither Dean J.P. Jones nor Provost Folks contradicted Tarko's statement. Furthermore, while Faculty senate discussed this matter and its January and March 2021 meetings, Provost Folks had already bypassed the Faculty Senate and presented the proposal to the Academic Affairs and Educational Achievement Subcommittee of the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) on January 28, 2021. ABOR's approval for the MA Program was quietly given at its February 10-12, 2021 meeting without mentioning the program by name. Bypassing the Faculty Senate on matters of curriculum clearly violates the letter in the spirit of Arizona Statute 15-1601B and the UArizona Faculty Constitution. The [attached untitled PDF document](#) was provided by the University of

Arizona Office of Public Records in response to public records request no. 2021-0143, dated April 15, 2021 and Hudson would like to add it to the official senate record.

Senator Russell spoke on behalf of some of the members of the Regents and Distinguished Professors group regarding the Gen Ed Refresh. Refreshing UArizona's General Education curriculum is a necessary exercise of the faculty to encourage innovation and reexamine pedagogy in a time a great change in academia. However, the implementation and roll out of the current Gen Ed Refresh at UArizona has been problematic, particularly given the current environment of faculty exhaustion and burnout due to the pandemic. UArizona faculty are the main engines for prestige, inspiration, and knowledge creation at the University and they also represent the core means for capturing tuition and research dollars. Given these facts, it is tremendously important to engage UArizona faculty of all levels with the Gen Ed Refresh development, especially knowledge creators and research-intensive faculty who might be struggling to keep labs afloat and lights on during this profound difficulty. Russell read highlights from the longer letter, "Knowledge creation and the disciplinary perspective seems underrepresented in the current Gen Ed Refresh reducing emphasis on knowledge creation at an R1 AAU member University seems unwise. The faculty must own and create the curriculum, particularly the proper mix of knowledge creation and reasoning. Russell points to the financial underpinnings of the Gen Ed Program and the larger UArizona budget context, including cost in time, personnel, and money. What are the stakes for units regarding funds that feed back to them, given the new structure and the single credit classes that will be created. Development during pandemic necessarily excludes people who are struggling to give care, teach, and keep the research lights on. Participation in a voluntary additional activity that is important to all of us is difficult under the current conditions. Russell says she is teaching in person and online simultaneously while recording in order to do a-synchronous and it's more than difficult. Streamlining the Gen Ed Refresh course prep training program – creation of the online training module was a positive step in this direction, i.e. less than the projected twenty hours per standard training, but it too, in our opinion, needs a healthy trimming.

5. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: NAMING OF FACILITIES – SENATOR LEILA HUDSON AND SENATOR TED DOWNING

Downing moved [**Motion 2021/22-8**] that the Faculty Senate should not consider a request for naming of facilities or academic program units for the Faculty Senate's approval unless the President and/or his or her designee share with the Faculty Senate all commitments and contractual agreements and specifics in compliance with the criteria and scope stated in ABOR section 1-117(f) and EOP-100 criteria, including a vote in support of the proposal from the faculty affiliated with a programmatic unit being named. Downing explained that this motion would clarify how Faculty Senate receives naming requests, and does not attempt to define how the policy is written, which is already well-defined. Naming is important, philanthropic gifts are important to the University, and they recognize either contributions of individuals to society or recognize faculty. Many of the buildings around campus are named after individual faculty who were great teachers. Apart from great rewards are also certain risks, as Ziurys mentioned earlier with the grand strategy at Yale, where donors were allegedly attempting to influence the direction of the program. More importantly, and more locally, Downing referred to two issues where the Faculty Senate and President were aligned on issues, 1) Former President Likins supported Downing's opposition to Kit Carson's rifle being awarded as a trophy to the winner of the New Mexico/Arizona game, and 2) the naming of a professorship after Kemper Marley, whose name was associated with the assassination of an Arizona Republic reporter in 1976. President Schaeffer stood by the faculty to oppose the naming, but they were overruled by ABOR. The current policy comes out of this which leaves the decision in the hands of the President with approval by the Faculty Senate, which shows a unified approach with the faculty and administration on this particular issue. What happened at the initial Executive Session was confusion because many of the clarifying documents were not provided. The motion states that all documents be presented to Faculty Senate as our procedure, require transparency in compliance with ABOR policy and University policy before casting a vote on the naming. Downing asked for support and thanked the Faculty Senate. Brewer feels that the University policy should be amended for all stakeholders, rather than Faculty Senate creating its own ways of operating, especially if the naming is reliant on University policy. Russell stated that ABOR and University policies were not followed before the item was placed on the Faculty Senate agenda, and agrees with Downing's motion to make sure those protocols are followed prior to Faculty Senate voting. Stegeman asked for a second on the motion. Ziurys seconded. M. Witte said that namings can present themselves at any time, and the Faculty Senate can have its own rules and expectations if its approval is being sought. Hingle agreed with Witte, but proposed an additional solution to Downing's motion. The Naming Advisory Committee, which includes the CEO of the UArizona Foundation who answered questions at the Special Senate Executive Session on September 27, 2021, offered to have further discussions and provide information in advance that Faculty Senate may request. Hingle sees this as a more direct route to achieving the goal of transparency, and proposes convening the Naming Advisory Committee. Downing said there is a deeper issue, and that is the Faculty Senate is a legislative body, and legislative bodies make their own rules. A body that runs efficiently starts each session by approving its operating rules, which Faculty Senate doesn't do. UArizona is different from most states because it is part of Arizona State law RS 15-1601B and each of us is empowered by law as elected faculty representatives. The motion is very straight forward by saying that we, as Faculty Senators, can define what our positions are and what our own

internal rules are for receiving information for making decisions. The motion is simply a procedural one, and there is no need to rewrite and Constitution and Bylaws to set up Faculty Senate's rules. Think what would happen if we had to rewrite the United States Constitution every time someone wanted to make a rule. The law doesn't work that way. Hingle restated **[Motion 2021/22-8]** We, the Faculty Senate shall not consider requests for naming of facilities, academic program units for Faculty Senate approval unless the President, or his or her designee, share with the Faculty Senate all of the commitments and contractual agreements and specifics, in compliance with the criteria and scope of State and ABOR Section 1-117(f) and EOP-100 criteria, including a vote in support of the proposal from the Faculty affiliated with the programmatic unit being named. **[Motion 2021/22-8]** passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Stegeman added that although the actions taken are acceptable, unlike the United States Congress, which has the ability to make laws vested in by the Constitution, there is no authority in the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws for Faculty Senate to legislate, which is an odd lacuna, and future work to revise the Constitution and Bylaws will be necessary to allow Faculty Senate to legislate in a way that binds future Faculty Senate meetings. Downing respectfully disagrees, because the UArizona Faculty Senate is established under the statutes of the State of Arizona. The revision of the Constitution's new version should begin by stating verbatim the Faculty Governance Law in Article I.

6. **INFORMATION ITEM: GENERAL EDUCATION REFRESH – SENATOR LEILA HUDSON**

Hudson moved **[Motion 2021/22-9]** that the vote on the Gen Ed Refresh taken on April 5, 2021 on Qualtrics was a vote in support of the continuing implementation, but not the final approval of the General Education Refresh Program. That ABOR be formally informed on this clarification by the Provost, and that the Faculty Senate cannot grant final approval without seeing and discussing all plans developed in the General Education Office, all version of documentation presented and commitments made to ABOR about American institutions and civil discourse, including conversations with ABOR staff, and the organizational and budgetary implications of the Gen Ed Refresh and the new Gen Ed Office. Motion was seconded. Hudson explained that Faculty Senate had approved a general plan for implementation, but not the final program including content, because content had not been developed yet. Hingle reiterated that there was no content to approve, and Faculty Senate approved the moving forward of the framework and implementation so that the work of the committees can begin. Hudson agreed, but yet on May 26, 2021, Provost Folks presented Faculty Senate's vote of April 5, 2021 as final approval to ABOR's AAEA Committee, which then on June 9/10, 2021 was approved as part of a consent agenda by ABOR, which in Hudson's opinion, is a rather tendentious reading of what happened in Faculty Senate on April 5, 2021. Hudson clarified that the Faculty Constitution states that while matters pertaining to courses, major/minor requirements, degrees requirements for each will originate in the various colleges, the final formulation, which is to be recommended to the Board of Regents, shall be determined by the Faculty Senate. The resolution presented for adoption by the Faculty Senate on April 5, 2021 made no specific reference to any of the written documents or program details that were submitted to the Faculty Senate or to ABOR and its subcommittee on May 26 or 27, 2021. Moreover, a comparison shows that the two document packages, the one presented to Faculty Senate and the one presented to ABOR at the end of May 2021, were not identical. Importantly, details on ABOR mandate on American Institutions and Civics component that were presented to ABOR at the end of May 2021 were never clearly presented to the Faculty Senate. The vote itself was flawed, since the resolution presented for an online vote after the Faculty Senate meeting was simply General Education Refresh – yes or no. The vote was highly ambiguous, and as Hudson pointed out at that time, a very poor process. The April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting discussion focused on approval of the process and we have recorded comments by participants that make it abundantly clear that the vote was not perceived as an approval vote of the specific curriculum in any final form, rather "to vote on the General Education process and implementation and moving forward with the program, not content since content is still being finalized." Hudson asked for permission to quote Presiding Officer Hingle, "We are not approving content because it is not all in yet. We can't. It has to be about the process, about the implementation, and so what you will be giving your approval or not upon today is to move forward with the engagement and the way we have been laying out here, and we have to make sure that whoever is part of this discussion will keep reporting back." Hingle agreed that what Hudson states is correct. Hudson reported that on May 27, 2021, Provost Folks presented a Gen Ed Plan to the ABOR subcommittee on Academic Affairs and Educational Achievement, stating "We have, I can assert meticulously and carefully, followed all applicable University of Arizona processes for the review and approval of the new program. The program was approved at our April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting and far from being symbolic, it does, that is a vote of the full Faculty Senate, in fact represents the views of the Faculty and triggers the proposal being brought forward today for your review and approval." Hudson contends that this is an unfortunate misunderstanding resulting from the ambiguity of that April 5, 2021 vote, and it is imperative that we, as the Faculty Senate, clarify this ambiguity. The stakes are very high as [Provost Folks stated before ABOR](#) emphatically and accurately, "This [the Gen Ed] program probably constitutes between 25-30% of our total operations in any given year, and so it is the mission critical to our success as an institution that we do it very, very well." Hudson added that an article appeared in the *Daily Wildcat* on September 21 or 22, 2021 entitled, "[ABOR Bypasses Faculty Senate-Passes New Gen Ed Curriculum](#)." Although the article writer and editor stood by their story, the article was removed from the website of the *Daily Wildcat* later that week. Censorship of the student newspaper rather than continuing discussion in the form of a letter to the editor, an op ed, or a factual correction is unacceptable. Freedom of the press is one of our basic principles, and if there is disagreement, more discussion is appropriate, not less. The aforementioned incident suggests that we all might benefit

from a refresher in Civics, but not one that is developed behind closed doors. Hudson asks to get to the root of the misunderstanding, and clarify what the Faculty Senate voted for on April 5, 2021. Ziurys stated that this is a very concerning issue because it was conveyed that Faculty Senate approved the Gen Ed Refresh, yet it seems that the faculty were run over in the process. Considerable concern among the Regents' Professors is that the process does not include that group and the developments have taken its own separate course. Summers clarified that the piece of curriculum on American Studies and Civic Engagement is part of ABOR policy and was not part of any discussion at the three in-state Universities, only at the ABOR level. Arizona Faculties Council did not object to that piece of the policy or the way it was written and approved at that time. M Witte moved for approval of **[Motion 2021/22-9]** and thinks that both this item and the previous item go to the heart of what Faculty Senate approval means. Obviously, approval is a stumbling block for things that might not have to otherwise go through with further discussion, but if the Faculty Senate is to give its approval, it is up to the body to say how and what the body will approve. It makes no difference if Faculty Senate is a legislative body or not, Faculty Senate approval is required, and its constituents are entitled to have all the information that it decides it wants. Hurh said he was in support of the motion, and was under the impression like most Faculty Senators that the Gen Ed Refresh was going to come back to Faculty Senate for approval. The curricular requirements and guidelines are much more important content than the classes that will satisfy the requirements, because they create a standard. The budget and how Gen Ed was going to work with RCM, knowing the challenges of interdisciplinary work and all of these elements needed discussion and consideration. McDonald is in favor of clarification and supports part of what is proposed, but the motion is a little cloudy and would prefer a clean motion stating exactly what the April 5, 2021 vote was, and McDonald asked Hudson if she would be in agreement to modifying the motion to read, "that the vote on the Gen Ed Refresh taken on April 5, 2021 in Qualtrics was a vote in support of the continuing implementation, but not the final approval of the General Education Refresh Program." Bourget suggested adding to McDonald's suggestion to include program requirements in addition to specific courses, which encompasses Hurh's comments. M. Witte said that the word "implementation" is a problem because implementation in medicine means finishing the job or finalization. Encouragement/engagement are cooperative and collaborative process and objects to the word implementation in the motion. Stegeman said that short of a formal amendment process, not expressing an opinion on what should happen, the maker of the motion can revise the motion in response to suggestions, with the consent of the seconder of the motion. Summers said that Hudson is accepting the friendly amendments in Chat. Hudson stated that she is agreeable to changing the word "implementation" to "engagement" and including "as part of our requirements for final approval." In reply to McDonald, Hudson agrees with the simplicity of the first lines of the motion moving forward, but feels it is important to delineate the programmatic requirements to mention by name one of the most controversial aspects of this engagement between ABOR mandate and University policy, namely the American Institutions and Civil Discourse section. This is the part where Faculty Senate was not clearly presented with items that were presented to ABOR, and the tapes clearly confirm this omission. Hudson confirmed that the list of missing items should be included in the motion. Hudson is interested if Faculty Senate can require the Provost to revisit ABOR and explain there was a misunderstanding due to an ambiguous and rushed vote. Stegeman said that the Provost doesn't report to Faculty Senate, and is not sure how the Faculty Senate could compel the Provost to act, but the Faculty Senate could send something to ABOR on its own authority. Hudson said that is a point well taken and will change the language on the motion. Stegeman said that the Faculty Senate could send a letter indicating its vote, but is not sure if signatures are needed. Hudson put the revised language in Chat. Neumann stated that two things are being conflated; the structure of Gen Ed including two major tracks and the attributes are part of the program. Individual courses are where it's problematic because it's a continuously moving target, much like courses would be in a degree program at a college in a department. The degree is not revised every time someone wants to add a new course to a degree. Focus needs to place on the structure on the program itself and leave it to UWGEC to approve individual courses. Bolger read a comment from Executive Director for General Education, Susan Miller-Cochran, "I'm concerned that such an important matter and one that has had such broad faculty involvement will be discussed and voted upon without any invitation for discussion on more information from the faculty who are involved with the Gen Ed process. To vote on such a motion without inviting that dialogue and placing it on the agenda in advance seems to repeat the rush decision-making that the Faculty Senators are advocating against." Faculty Center staff upgraded Miller-Cochran to Panelist. Russell said that given how important UWGEC is now to approving curriculum, and is supposed to be part of faculty shared governance, elected members from each college are required to sit on this committee per the Bylaws. Looking at the membership list, this doesn't hold true, therefore not vigorously a part of shared governance. Ziurys said after only being on Faculty Senate for a month, she is seeing a trend that the Faculty Senate is asked to vote on things without all the information being presented. Matters seems to come back later on because decisions were made saying that Faculty Senate voted and approved, but no information was provided to prove what actually happened. Fink said that since the motion was seconded, will that person second the amended motion. Russell confirmed seconding the amended motion. M. Smith called the question. Stegeman asked Smith if she wanted cloture. Smith affirmed. **[Motion 2021/22-10]** was seconded, passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. **[Motion 2021/22-9]** the vote on the Gen Ed refresh taken on April 5, 2021 on Qualtrics was a vote in support of continuing engagement, but not final approval of the Program. This vote will be that ABOR be formally informed of this clarification by Faculty Senate, and we clarified by members of Faculty Senate, and that the Faculty Senate cannot grant final approval without seeing and discussing all plans developed in the Gen Ed Office, all program requirements, all versions of documentation presented, and commitments made to ABOR about the American Institutions and Civil Discourse including with ABOR staff and

the organizational and budgetary implications of the Gen Ed Refresh and new Gen Ed Office. Motion passed. M Witte had a Point of Order regarding the role of the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate. Witte said she has sat on Executive Committees where she's disagreed with the majority vote, but it the responsibility of the Chair to report that vote, whether the Chair agrees with the outcome or not. The Chair cannot refuse to transmit something forward because you don't agree with it, and that's a parliamentary point. Hingle clarified that the transmission can be via the Faculty Center email address to alleviate any personal email addresses. A report of the vote is sufficient, with signatures not required. Downing asked if the Chair of the Faculty has a position on ABOR in terms of governance structure. Dudas responded no. There is a faculty representative from all three in-state Universities that rotates each year who attends the meetings and gives a report to ABOR on behalf of the faculty who sit on the Arizona Faculties Council.

7. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN ENVIRONMENT AND OCCUPATION HEALTH – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, MOLLY BOLGER**

The proposal comes to Faculty Senate as a seconded motion from Undergraduate Council. [Motion 2021/22-11] carried and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

8. **Q & A ON REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE CHAIRS, PRESIDENT, AND PROVOST**

There were no questions.

9. **INFORMATION ITEM: SUMMARY OF CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES AND CHANGES TO UHAP COMING TO SENATE FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE IN NOVEMBER – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER**

Brewer explained that there are several proposals to add to or amend the Constitution and Bylaws, as well as a number of housekeeping changes. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is the committee that vets any changes or revisions, and suggestions can come from Faculty Senate or a number of committees and committee chairs. In some instances, the APPC will look over proposed changes for input or clarification. Changes can be "housekeeping" (title/membership changes), but Faculty Senate may also determine that a change put forward as "housekeeping" needs to go to a vote of the General Faculty, where those revisions are put on the Spring General Faculty General Election ballot for voting. All proposed changes to the two documents are linked on the Faculty Governance website. Downing stated that the two-thirds as a protection of minority rights that was suggested on one of the proposed additions is basically a filibuster rule, two-thirds majority does not protect minority rights and should be considered. Downing asked how one proposes injecting new language into the Constitution, i.e. the aforementioned founding document stating the law itself. Brewer stated that the Shared Governance Review Committee was focusing on the Shared Governance Law written into the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which establishes the agreement with administration and what shared governance is at the University of Arizona. Brewer said insertion of the law would be considered. The MOU is broader than only encompassing Faculty Senate. Downing reiterated that the language "elected faculty representative" is indicative of who is relevant to shared governance. M. Witte has concern about housekeeping in relation to the grievance process, and wanted information on how many grievance procedures have been carried out by the different committees and how many have been successful in terms of the grievant being supported by those committees. If this is an exercise in futility where the faculty go through grievances and even when they get a positive verdict by CAFT and it's overturned by the President, Witte would like to see that statistic. Witte doesn't want to limit the ability of faculty to have grievances and to have them carried out in a swift fashion. Brewer said that all revisions/additions are moves toward improving the process and reducing faculty frustration with delays. Dysart added that APPC reviewed the suggested grievance process changes and the committee was overwhelmingly supportive and only offered minor clarifications that were taken into consideration. Brewer said there are two other documents to consider; changes to UHAP Chapter 6 (the administrative grievance processes) and a discussion item on shared governance representation with elected representatives on curriculum committees. The changes to UHAP, which are related to the changes being proposed in the faculty shared governance grievance processes, will be moving through Faculty Senate for approval in the near future. Having elected Faculty Senate representatives on curriculum committees increases connectivity between Faculty Senate, making the curriculum committees more of a shared governance entity, something Senate has shown a lot of interest in. Two Faculty Senators are expected to be added to each of those committees. An issue has arisen, however, related to senators' bandwidth to do this work. The number of Faculty Senators participating on other committees has increase dramatically recently with the new Senate Standing Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. A year ago, there were 19 appointed positions for Senators. This has now increased to twenty-nine. The Faculty Officers are finding it difficult to find Faculty Senators who are willing to do the work and to fill these appointments. Brewer shared the breakdown of Faculty Senator appointments for all shared governance committees, and asked the body for advice on whether to increase Faculty Senate membership or decrease Faculty Senator representation on committees. Russell said she was in favor of increasing Faculty Senate membership, but only with elected representatives. Downing supports more engagement with Faculty Senators, and offers the idea of employing Faculty Senators to work on administrative issues rather than expending money on hiring additional

administrators. Brewer noted that all senators are elected, except for when no one can be found to stand for election. In those instances, a dean can appoint a representative (but that this has happened very infrequently). Brewer noted that he will engage the Committee on Faculty Membership for Faculty Senate apportionment, and asked Faculty Senators to reach out to him with any suggestions.

10. **INFORMATION ITEM: UNIVERSITY-WIDE GENERAL EDUCATION COMMITTEE (UWGEC) UPDATE – CHAIR OF UWGEC, JOAN CURRY**

Curry, who introduced herself as Associate Department Head in the Department of Environmental Science and a Cardon Academy of Teaching Excellence Fellow, teaches General Education Courses and was recruited to chair UWGEC by Chair of the Faculty Summers a few years ago. The Gen Ed Program hasn't been updated substantially since 1998, and the Refresh is being run by all of the faculty in conjunction with the new Office of General Education. In past years, UWGEC and its twenty-three members have been the only entity that considered all curriculum changes, and they continue to do so for any and all General Education courses. With the addition of the General Education Office, the undertaking of revising the General Education program has been much more feasible than it would have been in the past. Curry encourages all Faculty Senators to contact her with any questions they may have moving forward. The General Education Office has been working diligently in its mission to revamp the Gen Ed Program, and has invited faculty from the campus community to participate, and in no way has excluded anyone in this process. For those that are concerned about the direction of the Refresh, Curry urges concerned faculty to get in contact with her and sit in with UWGEC. Curry explained that UWGEC has been working to take in existing Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses and transition them into to the new Gen Ed Program, and content is currently being worked on. Formerly, UWGEC would review approximately ten courses a meeting, and with nine meetings a year, ninety courses would pass through the committee's purview. The number of courses on the books currently is 768. UWGEC is working with the Faculty Coordinators in the Office of General Education. Forty-five courses have been approved for the Spring 2022 rollout and those courses are all existing courses that had been routed through the proposal process. For fall 2022, there are 502 courses that have been nominated by colleges. The Quick Start Program is faculty training to modify courses for the course modification proposal. To date, there are seven additional courses beyond the spring 2022 set that have been approved, and as of September 29, 2021, 111 courses have been submitted and are currently under review. UWGEC anticipates 269 additional proposals before the curriculum affairs deadline of February 1, 2022. Quick Start is being handled asynchronously or live online. Live online is recommended due to its collegiality of the group who oversees the program. The General Education Office will check for basic verification and the Faculty Coordinators are designated to each section of building connection, explorer perspectives, and each of the attributes. Faculty Coordinators have a portion of their FTE associated with the General Education Office, and are a point of contact helping with prechecks, provide suggestions, and help speed up the process with the organizational flow. After the initial submission, a UWGEC subgroup will perform a review to make sure all items are in order, and then the UWGEC committee will finalize the review process. Curry's presentation showed a graph of Tier 1 and Tier 2 offerings by college, as well as categories by college, and courses by categories and attributes. Curry explained that all courses required a writing emphasis and diversity was the only attribute obtainable, and expansion has been extensive to include U.S. context, equity context, and international context, quantitative reasoning, world cultures and societies, and writing. Any course is allowed one and up to two attributes relative to the type of course. For fall 2022, 500 college-nominated courses were shown, and Curry said 500 Quick Start invitations have been sent to all proposers. Curry shared a list of spring courses offered and a link to the committee membership. Ziurys said she was unclear about who was making all the decisions about what courses get approved and which ones are denied. Curry answered that UWGEC makes the decisions. Ziurys said that UWGEC is populated mostly with Career-track faculty, and senior faculty are few. Curry concurred, but reiterated that senior faculty with tenure also sit on the committee. Ziurys said she was confused by that fact that the committee was populated predominately with Career-track faculty. Curry responded that Deans often appoint people to the committee, and all people associated with Gen Ed want to do the work, and numerous Career-track faculty teach Gen Ed courses. Curry said the committee make up has been this way for quite some time and doesn't see a problem with it, but more senior faculty can be added. Curry asked Ziurys if she'd like to volunteer to serve on UWGEC. Ziurys said that faculty are upset that not enough senior faculty are involved in the process and many are upset by it. Russell said her question was more parochial because as a College of Science faculty member, she is concerned that there aren't more research-intensive faculty involved in the process. Russell's Gen Ed Introduction to Oceanography class has over 500 students enrolled. Russell's concern is that her class is going to be reviewed by people who don't teach science, plus twenty-plus hours of training, on top of juggling a multi-million-dollar research program, plus the massive Gen Ed classes doesn't feel reasonable. Another concern is only eleven classes for spring and six for fall are approved from the College of Science when that college teaches more student credit hours than any other college on campus. Russell wonders if the College of Science isn't getting graded harder because the work doesn't fit into the mold because the college has a disciplinary aspect believed to be critical. Curry responded that no sciences courses are being rejected or pushed down and all the Gen Ed's have come through fine. The asynchronous Quick Start can be done at your own pace. A simple form is filled out to look at your course. The new program also includes a signature assignment, which is going to be part of the ePortfolio for students and the changes are minimal. Ziurys said that the addition of senior faculty should have been done at the onset and not as an afterthought. Miller-Cochran said that a large number of senior

faculty have been involved in the development of Gen Ed and even more were invited to participate. Everyone is well aware that everyone is busy, but there is a lot of opportunity to be involved if anyone is still interested, and there are different levels of involvement. Miller-Cochran is fully aware of the Russell's time constraint concerns, but not everything requires a great deal of time. There is still a need for more faculty who would like to help review proposals, and encourages everyone to reach out in order to figure out ways to get your involvement in the process. The Gen Ed Refresh wants the broadest amount of faculty possible in the process. Russell retorted that no one is listening to the fact that invitations are to review proposals according to established criterion that doesn't account for input from an expert on a research-driven process brought into the classroom and then one is expected to press through a set of criteria that is not agreeable. Miller-Cochran replied that she understood, but a large group of faculty colleagues wrote and set the criteria, including senior faculty with tenure. Miller-Cochran said she was offended at the assumption that UArizona's Career-track faculty colleagues are not equipped to participate equally in the task or reviewing General Education courses, because the fact is that in many of the colleges, they teach the majority of General Education classes. It's very important to listen to the experience that they have with their students and many of them are nationally known experts in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Bourget asked who is developing the courses being rolled out the in spring and who will be teaching them. Miller-Cochran said the two initial course proposals went through UWGEC last semester, but is unsure of the specific date. Timelines will be forthcoming with the documentation provided to Faculty Senate. The initial design for the two courses was developed in collaboration with the committee's task forces that have worked on General Education, as well as faculty involvement and feedback on the design of the courses. The specific syllabi that were developed for the course proposal process that were taken to UWGEC for vetting and approval were developed by directors of those two courses who are in the Office of General Education. Subsequently, those courses and syllabi were reviewed by the faculty on UWGEC and sent forward through the regular course review process. Who will be teaching the courses is still be worked on. The Provost would like courses for credit to be taught by faculty, and a budgetary model is being formulated to make sure that is carried out. Conversations with senior leadership have centered around how to make sure that courses are staffed in a way that has faculty involved with teaching, but still maintains consistency across the curriculum in those special courses.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:34 p.m.

Michael Brewer, Secretary of the Faculty
Jane Cherry, Recording Secretary

Appendix*

*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.

1. **Faculty Senate Minutes of September 13, 2021**
2. **Undergraduate Minor in Environment and Occupation Health**
3. **Report from the President**
4. **Report from the Provost**
5. **Report from the Faculty Officers**
6. **Report from APPC**
7. **Report from RPC**
8. **Report from SAPC**
9. **Report from SPBAC**
10. **Report from Graduate Council**
11. **Report from ASUA**
12. **Report from UArizona Staff Council**
13. **Summary of changes to the Constitution**
14. **Summary of changes to the Bylaws**
15. **UHAP Changes**
16. **University-Wide General Education Committee update**

Motions of October 4, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2021/22-4] Motion to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion was superseded by **[Motion 2021/22-5]** and not voted on.

[Motion 2021/22-5] Motion to amend the agenda. By introducing two items for discussion and possible action at the top of the meeting. Directly after open session. These two items pertain to the Senate properly fulfilling its legal responsibilities – one for naming facilities and the other for curriculum development and approval. The first item is pertaining to the Senate’s role in naming facilities. The second item to be added is an information and possible action item to clarify the Senate’s vote after the April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate meeting on the Gen Ed Refresh. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-6] Motion for cloture. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-7] Motion to introduce Hudson’s proposed two items following Open Session for discussion on today’s agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-8] We, the Faculty Senate shall not consider requests for naming of facilities, academic program units for Faculty Senate approval unless the President, or his or her designee, share with the Faculty Senate all of the commitments and contractual agreements and specifics, in compliance with the criteria and scope of State and ABOR Section 1-117(f) and EOP-100 criteria, including a vote in support of the proposal from the Faculty affiliated with the programmatic unit being named. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-9] The vote on the Gen Ed refresh taken on April 5, 2021 on Qualtrics was a vote in support of continuing engagement, but not final approval of the Program. This vote will be that ABOR be formally informed of this clarification by Faculty Senate, and we clarified by members of Faculty Senate, and that the Faculty Senate cannot grant final approval without seeing and discussing all plans developed in the Gen Ed Office, all program requirements, all versions of documentation presented, and commitments made to ABOR about the American Institutions and Civil Discourse including with ABOR staff and the organizational and budgetary implications of the Gen Ed Refresh and new Gen Ed Office. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-10] Motion for cloture. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-11] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Undergraduate Minor in Environment and Occupation Health. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456