

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MAY 6, 2024**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/107812>

Visit the faculty governance webpage at:

<http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/>

The recording of this meeting may be found at: _

<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=b1477b43-cc37-4e37-8d98-b1690009d047>

1. CALL TO ORDER [00:00:14]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the May 6, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Dysart was also present.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated her thanks and appreciation for service and commitment to departing Senators: Anderson, Barron, Cai, Casey, Cooley, Dial, Dysart, Gerald, Gordon, Kandel, Ottusch, Pace, Senseney, Stone, Tropman, and Yoon, as well as Provost Marx and Chair of SPBAC, Cindy Rankin.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated that on Thursday, May 9, 2024, there will be a meeting with the Presidential Search Committee for the Faculty Senate and it is important to hear all voices.

Present: Senators Bernick, Braitberg, Braithwaite, Brochin, Cai, Casey, Cheu, Coletta, Cooley, Downing, Eckert, Fellous, Fink, Gregory, Guzman, Harris, Heileman, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jones, Knox, Leafgren, Little, Marx, Medovoi, Meyer, Nelson, Neumann, O' Leary, Ottusch, Pace, Pau, Rafelski, Rankin, Rocha, Rogers, Russell, Schulz, Senseney, Simmons, Slepian, M. Smith, J. Smith, Spece, Stegeman (Parliamentarian), Stephan, Stone, Tropman, Waddell, Werchan, Willis, T. Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders, Ziurys.

Absent: Senators Anderson (GPSC Rep), Barron (ASUA Rep), Buxner, Cochran, Cui, Dial, Domin, Dysart (Secretary), Gerald, Gordon, Grijalva (ASUA Rep), Kandel, Robbins (President), Sanchez, Schwartz, Su, Torres, M. Williams, Yoon (GPSC Rep).

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:02:56]

Vice Chair Hymel stated the following changes to the May 6, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda.

- The minutes of February 19, 2024, and March 11, 2024, will be voted on but April 1, 2024, minutes will be removed from the agenda.
- The Consent Agenda was moved up to Item 5 and included with it is the approval of the 2024-2024 Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule.
- There will be five open session speakers instead of four due to Faculty Center staffing.
- Clarification was added to Old Business Item 7A which now clearly states the resolution.
- New Business Item 8D has changed from an Action Item to an Information Item and there will be substitute speakers on other New Business items.
- The Statement from the Chair was moved from the top of the agenda to item 9.
- Item 10 is a new item added since the Senate Executive Session which will have 20 minutes allotted.

Vice Chair Hymel stated there is only one individual from the Faculty Center present, Sabrina Smith, which is the reason there are no nameplates and why their supervisor is present.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2023/24-54]** to approve the Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE FEBRUARY 19 & MARCH 11 FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS [00:07:41]

- Senator Fink stated there were two occurrences where "House Bill 2735" was incorrectly written "House Bill 2375."
- Senator Fink stated the attachment regarding questions sent to President Robbins was not the updated version and the edited version of the document has been sent to the Faculty Center.
- Senator Fink stated his name was spelled incorrectly in one instance.

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2023/24-55]** to approve the Minutes of February 19, 2024, and March 11, 2024 as amended. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-seven in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

4. **ACTION ITEM: SENATE ELECTIONS FOR UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ETHICS AND COMMITMENT, COMMITTEE ON CONCILIATION, UNIVERSITY HEARING BOARD, SHARED GOVERNANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE, GREIVANCE CLEARINGHOUSE COMMITTEE, SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (VOTING VIA OPAVOTE, PLEASE BRING DEVICE) [00:09:12]**

Vice Chair Hymel stated candidate statements for the Senate Elections were put in the shared Box folder. Faculty Center Staff will start the election in OpaVote which will distribute an email, votes will be casted on an individual's own device. The election will be closed shortly prior to the end of the meeting so that an announcement on the results can be made.

5. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA (NO DISCUSSION) – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, HOLLY NELSON, AND CO-CHAIRS OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL HONG CUI AND SANLYN BUXNER. APPROVAL OF THE 2024-2024 FACULTY SENATE MEETING SCHEDULE, EMPHASIS TO STANDALONE BS NUTRITION AND DIETETICS, EMPHASIS TO STANDALONE BS NUTRITION AND WELLNESS, EMPHASIS TO STANDALONE MAJOR BAS JUSTICE GLOBAL SECURITY, MS IN MIDWIFERY, MS IN IMMUNOBIOLOGY [00:11:23]**

Vice Chair Hymel stated the Faculty Senate Meeting Schedule was added to the Consent Agenda.

- **[Motion 2023/24-56], [Motion 2023/24-57], [Motion 2023/24-58], [Motion 2023/24-59], [Motion 2023/24-60], & [Motion 2023/24-61]** to approve the Consent Agenda passed by unanimous consent.

6. **OPEN SESSION [00:13:38]**

Keiron Bailey, Associate Professor, Educational Policy Studies and Practice [00:13:55]

After my last Faculty Session Open Session, I was subjected to another three-week office exclusion categorized by HR as a non-disciplinary. Again, with the refusal of the former Provost, HR and OGC to provide rules or policy support, despite no UAPD or any other police record, deposit TAMT and OIE finding no course for action against me. As revealed by my F.O.I.A of the EEOC file, an HR officer who sought anonymity, called on UAPD in the safety forum on May 4, 2024. Ironically as I was raising the issue of staff safety and the culture of retaliation, even President Robbins as was agreeing with me, UAPD report is on the desk in front of you. An anonymous call stating that an individual is not welcome does not constitute legitimate grounds for police action in this state. The UAPD officers request that HR clarify the exclusion order demonstrated in bad faith because they stated in writing six days earlier this is not their emphasis as a UAPD process, and this is not a campus exclusion order.

Misleading a peace officer is unlawful under ARS 132907-01. Here's your civic sidebar, see if you can find another such violation in the UAPD report. Six days later, I was subjected to an immediate campus exclusion on pretextual basis of disruption at the forum despite UAPD's total lack of finding this action at the scene again. Eight days later, I was dismissed without a single policy or rule being cited against me, or without cause being provided.

The letter used my previous address that had been changed two months prior in the UA system. Four hours and fourteen minutes after I was served the dismissal, my former Dean sent me a PIP coercion. When I raised the abuse of law enforcement with Regent Mr. Duval personally, during his recent campus visit, he agreed with me that any UA office who calls PD on official business should put their name to it. I'm in correspondence with Mr. Duval, the governor, the FBI, and the DOJ about the abuse of law enforcement.

Senator Ted Downing [00:16:29]

We all look forward to a successful search for a new President, but its puzzling. Why the low turnout in the search committee's public listening forum? Particularly since ABOR has added an additional objective to their search, which is to reinvigorate the University and bring people together. A lack of public interest maybe, but even members of the committees are not showing up. Like the low participation in the search committee sessions suggest a lack of public confidence and mistrust in the search itself, or maybe in the Regents,

The methodology has flaws, handpicked the search committee narrowly reflects the community avoiding critics. It violates state law by excluding active engagement with elected faculty bodies such as this one. It precludes internal searches. It relies on external consultants rather than faculty expertise. It seeks positive viewpoints, ignoring questions emerging from two years of vociferous, often constructive criticisms. Key questions are being raised by former President John Schaefer, the Governor Michael Chihak, and many here in this meeting.

Topping the list would be: what are the proven abilities of a candidate to identify, avoid, and manage financial and reputational risk, restore broken trust and reverse our Universities' precipitous academic decline? Years ago, management consultants taught clients how to cope with difficult people by telling them to say, "I'm listening," or "I understand," tactically blowing them off. The low participation means the public is aware that the Presidential Search is morphing into a self-justification or PR campaign. Whether we are seeking a manager, a messenger, marinade, Messiah, or a match, this quest merits methodological rigor.

Jeremy Vetter, Associate Professor, History [00:19:18]

My name is Jeremy Vetter, and I am an Associate Professor of History here at the University of Arizona. Last week, our campus was rocked by the President's decision to deploy harsh police repression against a student political demonstration, including the reported use of rubber bullets, chemical agents, and violent force. This has led to multiple petitions expressing concern and outrage, amassing hundreds of faculty and other signatures within hours, including many of you who serve in the Faculty Senate. Similar repressive measures elsewhere against political encampments have led to hospitalizations, similar injuries, and excessive, severe penalties for students participating. I've heard secondhand reports of UA students who have been injured, including at least one serious head injury.

Some campuses have managed to avoid a harsh police response and provide a different model. Our free expression policy, which is available on the University website, guarantees all members of the University community, the broadest possible latitude to speak. It contemplates restrictions on that freedom only as necessary to the functioning of the University. It is not the proper role, it says, of the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Regulation of that speech should only involve "narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University's commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas."

The intended purpose of the encampment was, it seems, clearly political expression, to protest the killing of tens of thousands of Palestinians in Gaza and to call on the University to divest from Israel. Whether you agree with this point of view or not, the fundamental right to freedom of expression must be protected on our campus. Students and others must be free to criticize any foreign government and our own government on campus. Indeed, our University owes a further duty to protect political expression against violent attack by those who might seek to suppress that speech. I urge you to convene a general faculty committee to investigate the harsh police response last week and to recommend measures to restore and improve freedom of expression.

On our campus, which is seriously imperiled, nothing in the campus use policy requires the President to bring in police with force to clear out protests. I urged you to examine how freedom of expression can be expanded on our campus, rather than suppressed. Thank you.

Senator Marlys Witte [00:21:45]

Following up on Old Business, I am presenting 2 awards today that I donated, to recognize the legacy of 2 iconic UA faculty members who passed away several years ago – both personally influenced me along with decades of students and colleagues, and both in different ways were protectors of academic freedom on this campus.

The first award is in honor of the late Distinguished Professor of Physics, William S. Bickel, who encouraged "original" student research, including our son Russ' undergraduate project on "making a more perfect rainbow" (even 3 supernumeraries). This award goes to all 10 of the undergraduates carrying out original student-generated research during 2023-2024 (most are at this moment taking their final exams) but if present please stand or show yourself on ZOOM if present and able). The list of these awardees has been previously provided to you as part of the RII sponsored program that I, as PI, and Co-PI Ken McAllister of the College of Medicine developed. The program for the final presentation Forum is attached, where 10 undergraduate students competed for this year's award of \$500. However, the presentations were so outstanding that we decided to award each student \$50. Also, note, Bill Bickel's wife Barbara, sends you all her congratulations as well.

The second award honors Professor and former Head of Journalism George Ridge and goes to two undergraduate student journalists who advanced the cause of Freedoms of Speech and the Press on this campus - Professor Ridge advanced the same causes (with his wife here Earlene), at UA and worldwide. This award, given for the first time, recognizes the 2 Arizona Daily Wildcat reporters who were fired and their Opinion Desk closed, ostensibly as part of supposed campuswide "budget cuts," when they tried to report on the impact of cross-the board budget cuts and what they termed an "out of touch" central Administration. They boldly questioned the logic and motives behind their firing in an op-ed piece published subsequently in the Arizona Daily Star. Their Opinion Desk was the only desk closed at the school newspaper that could properly question the need, impetus, and impact of the budget cuts. Silencing their voices and thereby silencing the collective voice of the student was brave and deserves recognition. The two students are Olivia Krupp and Luke Lawson (please stand or present yourself on Zoom), and each will receive stipends of \$250 each as a share of the award. They truly are joining with the vast majority of the faculty, students and staff concerned about free speech infringements on this campus and who together echo Emile Zola's famous words during the Dreyfus Affair in France; "la vérité est en marche, et rien ne l'arrêtera" – "the truth is on the march, and nothing will stop it." The Faculty Senate should stay after 5PM finding inspiration from our very own students to discuss the outrageous state of free-speech on this campus and what we should be doing about it - not just about the heavy-handed police response to peaceful student protests but also retaliation at many levels and surveillance of our emails and social media entries in the name of public "safety" and rather, what we should be doing about it at all levels.

We should be reminded of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis' admonition, "The best remedy for poor speech is more speech." Let us engage in "more speech."

Senator Stegeman [00:25:03]

Thanks, I'm sorry to be the fifth speaker but there was a communication error with the Faculty Center Office. Over commitments were made. I want to follow up on Mona's comments earlier. The search committee, with the organization of ABOR, met with several stakeholder groups on Wednesday. There were about two thirds of us, I was there the whole day, and I think many of the committee members were there the entire day, met in forty-five-minute, back-to-back meetings with fifteen-minute breaks with their representatives and various stakeholder groups. There is a similar sequence of meetings set up for Wednesday as Mona already mentioned.

The attendance last Wednesday was very low as Senator Downing mentioned. I want to positively call out the Staff Council, which was very well represented at that particular meeting, but the attendance was generally low. My interpretation, which I conveyed to ABOR, was that it was due substantially to poor communication, a lack of clarity about the content of the interviews. On the other hand, I think that was on ABOR's part. I certainly don't think they wanted to discourage participation. I want to second Mona's suggestion that although we're all busy this time of year, if you have been invited to any of the sessions on Wednesday, you should have received a clear invitation explaining the context and I encourage you to come. I think the search committee really wants to hear your viewpoints on this. There has also been a meeting added on Thursday at 12:15 PM for an hour and a half via Zoom with the entire Senate and I encourage you to come to that as well. Both because I think this search committee is sincerely interested in how people feel about the search and showing up indicates engagement in a positive way. So, if that is possible for you, I encourage you to do that and we can have a constructive, hopefully looking forward, discussion. Thank you.

7. **OLD BUSINESS: [01:11:03]**

A. Action Item: Resolution- In Support of Shared Governance: "We the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona, support strong and collaborative shared governance processes and therefore oppose HB 2735." Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [00:27:29]

I would like to take five minutes, probably not more than that today, to deal with some Old Business and align us with our peers at ASU and NAU, and to express our support, hopefully uncontroversially for shared governance. So the proposition that I move **[Motion 2023/24-62]**, "*We the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona support strong and collaborative shared governance processes and therefore oppose House Bill 2735.*"

- Senator Stegeman stated he does not vote on most policy questions but because he personally went to the Senate to lobby against this bill, he will be voting "yes," as it would be silly of him to abstain in this case.
- Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

B. Information Item: Senator Russell Witte [00:30:43]

My old business item goes back to February or March 2020 when I spoke about the dangers of pulse modulated microwave radiation and wireless communication. I want to invite you all to an event tomorrow at the sea of glass, there will be an expert panel moderated by Pamela Powers, former State Representative as well as Neurosurgeon and Public Health Expert. I've worked with microwaves for over twenty years in medical and defense research. Very few people recognize the dangers of wireless communication so it's a chance to come out there, ask questions, and learn from some experts.

Deborah Davis is one of the leaders in the field, she was originally responsible for removing smoking from airplanes when she was working with the government. I invite all of you to think about that event which will also be streamed on Facebook Live tomorrow from 7:00-9:00 PM. Thank you.

8. **NEW BUSINESS [00:32:05]**

A. Action Item: [SBS School of Global Studies – SBS Dean Lori Poloni-Staudinger](#) [00:32:09]

Dean Staudinger stated she is joined by colleagues Julie Ellison from the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Jennifer Jenkins from the Southwest Center, and Sandra Soto from Gender & Women's Studies.

- The first couple of slides within the PowerPoint detail the timeline that was taken for the proposal which essentially brings together eight units into a new school of study. These include the Southwest Center, Latin American Studies, Mideast North African Studies, Judaic Studies, Center for Mideast Studies, Gender & Women Studies, Global Studies, and Human Rights Practice. The latter two units were not departments, they were programs in the Dean's office and are being moved as part of an effort to put curriculum into academic units.
- The conversations and process are predated to her arrival on campus, they go back to at least 2015. Upon her arrival, the conversation was continued, and she discovered a Senate document from 2014 that governs how such curricular processes should take place. Chair Hudson was contacted to retrieve that document, and a pause was placed on the process to retool and restart to use the Senate process, holding meetings over the course of the 2023-2024 academic year.
- A final report was culminated in February 2024 and voting from the constituent units began in between February and March of 2024. These were anonymous votes where the heads of each unit indicated which faculty were eligible to vote within the unit. The bylaws differ for each unit. The anonymous Qualtrics ballot was shared with a staff member and the two co-chairs of the committee to ensure there were checks in place. All checks were in place logistically for things such as duplicate voting.
- Regarding the Qualtrics survey, there was a range from 100% support down to 73% support with a 79% turnout.

The Senate process calls for a Faculty vote, not a Staff vote but her committee felt it was important that staff also had a vote. Staff preference was retrieved in a different poll which resulted in 100% support.

Jennifer Jenkins, Professor, the Southwest Center [00:35:38]

Professor Jennifer Jenkins stated the committee was amazing as individuals were working for the greater good and it was a pleasure to be a part of as it was the best exercise a University can produce.

- The PowerPoint shows an organizational structure, not a governance structure but the two overlap. There will be a Head of the school along with two Associate Heads.
- The group of disciplines have been divided into regions such as Latin American Studies, Southwest Studies, Middle Eastern and North African Studies, and two Title VI centers including the Center for Latin American Studies and the Middle Eastern Studies.
- Program Directors will be included for Judaic Studies, Gender & Women Studies, and Human Rights Practice. Those heads will sit on a board or a shared governance body of some sort with the Head and two Associate Area Heads and Bylaws will be written, which is the next step.

Julie Ellison, Associate Director, The Center for Middle Eastern Studies

Associate Director, Julie Ellison stated she has learned a lot from the committee and has been inspired by the comments received from students, faculty and staff, which gives her great respect for the institution. She will list the positives of the proposal while allowing time for questions as the committee is dedicated to answering all questions.

- The proposal allows the school and units to draw a critical mass of faculty for in-school reviews.
- It creates wonderful synergies of small capstones that can be drawn together and there can be wonderful graduate methodology classes with Latin American Studies, Middle Eastern Studies, and Global Studies.
- Another ability is the increased potential for grant seeking.
- There are many talented individuals who worked on the proposal and with the support. It is written within the proposal that within the third year, there will be an individual asked to assess with closeouts where there has been a significant delay.
- There are three years of protection for staff jobs in these units because staff and everything they do are valued.
- To ensure every branch of each part is represented, there is a lot of balance. The director is to be chosen from alternating branches each time. It is meant to maintain financial viability of all the units.
- There will be more work on coordinated scheduling of classes and reducing duplication of classes. Everyone will maintain their degree programs.
- She has a graduate student seeking a PhD in Global Studies. When she finished, she had a choice of a PhD in Middle Eastern Studies or North African Studies and selected Middle Eastern Studies. It is nice to hear that someone would be interested in a viable degree option.

Sandy Soto, Associate Professor, Gender & Women Studies [00:40:04]

- Senator O'Leary stated it seems that most of the program's part of the proposed group have been responsible for addressing important social issues for decades. These issues have been politically unpopular and more so today, these include issues of sexuality, transgender persons, the conflict in the Middle East, Displacement in Latin America, and Immigration. The topics are politically unpopular and potentially stigmatizing.
- Senator O'Leary stated there were comments in the report that reflect the same concern where someone stated they were content and politically unpalatable. She is unsure of how much weight such comments have in the committee's deliberation, but SBS does not have a dedicated DEI officer who is from a historically marginalized group as in some other colleges.
- Senator O'Leary asked if there was discussion regarding what might happen to these marginalized knowledge areas, perspectives, and voices that align with their intellectual identity. One commentator stated the structure did not make intellectual sense, so the question is, "what happens to this diversity of thinking once they are merged?"
- Senator O'Leary stated the other concern is that the proposal for Global Studies will have more visibility, but the question is, "will this be at the expense of certain invisibility of the units that are now being absorbed and is there a plan to mitigate this?"
 - Associate Professor Soto stated she heard three questions: one had to do with visibility and invisibility, the second had to do with risk regarding what happens if all marginalized projects came together and whether that opens them up to more risk.
 - Senator O'Leary stated her second question was because there are many departments who deal with the stigmatized topic areas, it seems as if they're all being combined into one area. This is concerning in terms of further stigmatization.
 - Associate Professor Soto stated she believes what Senator O'Leary is asking is how did the particular units come to be merged, and did it have to do with the knowledge they produce and the marginalized knowledge.
 - Associate Professor Soto stated her understanding is that the eight to nine units that are being proposed to merge, came together because of some overlap between some of the course offerings and due to the smallness as they are boutique departments in terms of numbers of majors.
 - Associate Professor Soto stated she is one of the individuals in Gender & Women's Studies who teaches senior capstones and sometimes she only has four students which doesn't seem viable anymore. This

- would be a way to merge some of the capstones.
 - Associate Professor Soto stated she does not see it as merging due to non-mainstream knowledge being produced.
 - Dean Staudinger stated there are people who interrogate these issues across the college. The college's vision is a just world together which encompasses the entire college.
 - Associate Director Ellison stated from the grant-seeking perspective, the ability to synergize with the other units within this project already includes pre-existing collaboration across the University including departments like the Poetry Center. There are many potential collaborations.
 - Associate Director Ellison stated the Legislative Branch accomplished the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which includes a call for the University to work more collaboratively with other centers like the Center for Latin American Studies. There has been work done with this center for over twenty years. This will increase the potential for collaboration, and it is a positive initiative.
- Senator Senseney stated he is an SBS representative and understands that the idea for this school predates public knowledge of the financial mismanagement crisis. He understands that everyone agrees, in the wake of the crisis that decisions need to be data driven. This proposal is justified by several rationalizations that are open to debate.
- Senator Senseney asked if hard data can be shared which justifies the proposal. Costs are seen when viewing the logistics of the proposal such as the needs for a school Director, two Associate Directors, and during the first year, the salaries and benefits attached to them come with the continuation of the Unit Heads as Program Directors. Additionally, there will be a speaker series.
- Senator Senseney stated as a representative of the college, he is also aware of the non-renewal of eight lecturers in the writing program. At the same time there is a proposal to invest in the creation of a new school, and hiring of new administrators, there are also layoffs for eight instructors. The layoffs are from a program that is one of the backbones of Undergraduate Education at the University of Arizona. The support from SBS Heads and Faculty cited in the proposal was secured prior to May 1st when layoffs were announced.
- Senator Senseney stated he doubts the proposal would receive the support it did if it was known it was to be coupled with layoffs. He asked Dean Staudinger if she would be willing to renew the contracts of those eight lectures so that senators do not have to connect the proposal to the layoffs of colleagues. Additionally, so that there doesn't have to be recognition that the support of the proposal is tantamount to a green light to lay off colleagues as misplaced responses to the Central Administration's financial mismanagement.
- Senator Senseney stated in light of that travesty, he would hope that no senator would vote to approve the proposal under this circumstance as he certainly will not vote in favor without such assurances.
 - Dean Staudinger stated they are there to discuss the School of Global Studies and there will be no non-renewal for many of the faculty at the School of Global Studies. There were several faculty members who retired out of the school which is assisting with the balance of payroll costs within the units of each school.
 - Dean Staudinger stated she believes the budget materials were included in the agenda, by year three, there is anticipated savings of several \$100,000 with the creation of the school. Adjunct labor will be decreased as teaching across programs can happen in a way that's currently impossible. Administrative costs will be decreased, currently there are eight Unit Heads receiving stipends and that will be reduced to one. Administrative costs and overhead will be reduced in the college with this move.
- Senator Ziurys stated given the budget crisis and layoffs across many colleges, she can't justify this proposal and suggested waiting until the budget crisis is resolved.
 - Associate Professor Soto stated one reason the faculty and staff in the voted for the college is to prevent layoffs.
- Senator Zeiders stated her thanks to the members for their presentation and said she understands some of the push to reorganize has been driven by financial budgetary pressures. She also understands the proposal was framed as a way for some of the departments to not be further harmed or cut in the current context.
- Senator Zeiders stated she has questions about the financial piece of it including, what are the actual cost savings? There is limited information provided in the proposal as it gives guestimates and one of those being attrition. Those who retire or leave will save the school about \$600,000 which is something that would be saved regardless of the implementation of the school.
- Senator Zeiders stated that regardless of the answers to the financial questions, she is concerned that six-hundred of her colleagues and her attended the general assembly last week and heard about working conditions of career-track faculty. The faculty voted and had a very clear indication that herself and colleagues should continue asking the hard questions in the Faculty Senate.
- Senator Zeiders stated she is aware of the five faculty who are already non-renewed including women of color and she knows there are plans for more.
- Senator Zeiders stated there are faculty and colleagues with a starting salary of \$45,000 that are in extreme fear of losing their jobs. Due to this, she is not in support in the creation of the new school until it can be assured that all of those faculty member's best interests are kept in mind and that there will not be layoffs in the most precarious positions.
- Senator Zeiders stated she understands that the school is separate from the writing program faculty being laid off, but there is lack transparency in pushing to consolidate programs. This includes adding administration and

pressure to approve a school when something worse can happen. The non-renewal of five faculty is not very separate as this is austerity brought on by a mismanagement crisis that is now trickling down the system.

- Senator Zeiders stated she hears her colleagues who worked hard on the proposal and thanked them, but she will not be supporting this proposal until jobs are protected and working conditions are rectified.
- Senator Braithwaite stated he would like to offer support for the program, fundamentally, he is now concerned that colleagues on the Senate will now be contradicting the overwhelming amount of support which came directly from the unites. He appreciates the speculation where others may have changed their votes had they known the budgetary decisions, he doesn't feel confident and comfortable that the Senate contradicts that vote.
- Senator Braithwaite stated as a member of the college, he has worked closely with these units and coming from a larger unit within the college, he is excited about the prospects that are provided by having a consolidated school of Global Studies. This plan makes sense for the rest of the college, and he will be supporting the proposal.
- Senator Cochran stated as a nine-year Career-Track faculty member in the writing program, and in SBS, he would like to acknowledge his support from fellow senators but would also like to recognize that the writing program is separate from this school. The will of the vote of the faculty members in this proposed school is nearly unanimous.
- Senator Cochran stated he would like to try to not conflate the writing program, which is a large issue, with the good proposal he sees.
- Associate Professor Soto stated she would like to add that the University is siloed in terms of knowledge production. She has never had such important conversations as she has had over the past year with her colleagues on the committee. She can't wait to be able to cross-list all functions together and conduct joint conferences; the financial component is not the only aspect.
- Senator Brochin stated it is important to listen to units that create schools which is faculty driven as the job of faculty senators is support the work of the faculty. She feels there is deep contradiction. She agrees with looking at the layoffs, but the Senate is not the space for this.
- Senator Brochin moved **[Motion 2023/24-63]** to approve the SBS School of Global Studies. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

B. Information Item: BS MDTD (Medical Device Technology and Development) Senator Marv Slepian [00:56:42]

Good Afternoon. Thank you very much. I would like to thank leadership and the Executive Committee for allowing me to be on the program. I am here purely to provide an informational item. I'm here to talk about a project we have been working on for about a year in the College of Medicine. This involves multiple faculty, and other colleges, four of us working collectively.

The idea is to being forward a new Bachelors Program in the Medical School called B.S. MDTD (Medical Device Technology Department. As a Faculty Senator who has been on the Senate for many years and who is sensitive to the collective sensitivity of being hoisted to vote on items without any background information, he is not one to do that. His goal is to provide the Senate with information and allow people to engage with him over the course of summer to provide input to move forward collectively. There is hope to bring this item back to the Senate in the Fall which will then go through with everyone's collective input an wisdom.

This program is addressing a new focus which we don't have at the University of Arizona. It is an important focus around the United States. Big points include medical devices – pharma and biotech are at the core of diagnostics and therapeutics today, particularly more on the device side than the drug side for Arizonans and people around the world. There are many competencies which are needed to go out into this space at the bachelor's level to then get a job or to continue for advanced training. This is not the same area as Biomedical Engineering or another heavy engineering discipline. This involves softer or broader qualitative competencies such as the understanding of the market, design, regulation, finance, the law, public sensitivities, not just art to engineering. As I am standing here with a BME title, this is a different aspect. This program will involve many broader skills. There are many jobs ready for this kind of graduate.

We are trying to bring our collective activities that we have across four colleges to develop this new Undergraduate Bachelors program that would be run through the College of medicine with involvement from many other entities. What is the background? What is the argument? There is no program like this in Arizona, and frankly, there is no program like this in the Unites States. Yes, there are BME programs, Biomedical Engineering programs, but they are heavy on the quantitative elements. If you're not good at math, frankly, you're up the creek. We need to cater to many other students, not only for the students, but we also need these other skills, and they have to be brought together. The concept of the MDTD program is to create a synergistic program which would work together. The rationale is that this is a multidisciplinary program which we are trying to encourage at the University, rather than silo. This would go across Life Science, Engineering, Business, and Law. The individuals involved in this program are the line workers doing this work in real life either at the University or as consultants in the real world. This gives true understanding of what students would learn –and how combinational products work. This is why there is also involvement with biotech and pharma and answers the questions of "How do we work with the new medicine and telemedicine? How do we incorporate AI? Where does all that fit in? In clinics? What is the cost benefit?"

This program would go forward with existing faculty and personnel within the medical school, the cost would be

minimum, and we will be happy to provide our projections in these protocols as we move forward. There has been research done on the figures. This would lead to an increase in the pool of students at the UA because a program like this does not exist. This is interdisciplinary. I know from teaching BME or other students that I have in Eller. They are looking for a program like this. We have done a survey yielding information from several hundreds of students who have indicated their interest in the program. This would lead to broader involvement from students and would take advantage of many of the benefits listed in PowerPoint, which includes the opportunity for income within the University. This would be broadly embraced by many students at the University.

There is currently a Bachelor of Science in Medicine, this degree is more for students interested in a medical and clinical path. That program doesn't include the legal, business, and social aspects. It is more of a biology degree. The MDTD would bring in all the other aspects including journalism, and the ability to communicate information to the public. It is quantitative and we are working closely with the College of Engineering and Dr. Hahn, and with Mario Romero-Ortega, the Head of Biomedical Engineering and others to ensure they are not homogenized, and toes aren't stepped on. It is important for it to be synergistic.

We expect to have about twenty-five students in our first year and there would be slow growth. I think these are conservative numbers using the precedent of what happened with the BS in Medicine where we projected low, and the enrollment took off and became a popular program. There is market demand, and we have done research, we have done market surveys. The market space is 500 billion, projected to go to 7,700 billion by 2029. There is a workforce that is needed in this space, and I have been working closely with this.

Companies like Hoffmann-La Roche, Cardinal Health, Genentech, Johnson and Johnson, Abbott and BSC are all looking and have open spots for many graduates. At this level, jobs include liaisons in terms of medical devices, pharma, biotech, medical pharma sales, political research associates involved in trials, data management, digital health specialists with wearables and telehealth that is oncoming, quality systems management which is the quality backbone of every FDA regulation which we don't have any in that program and is absolutely needed. Medical devices and more are on the ergonomic side, not the engineering side. Health device pharma IT specialists and AI specialists. There is an open call right now within the federal government to have AI workers. Scientists, you don't have to have a PhD, we need people who can work in the lab at a BS level. Another includes technical support specialist.

This is a multi-college partnership that we are envisioning. This is a collaborative initiative from all of the colleges listed in PowerPoint and involves pushing forward where we invent things and we work with TLA to get tangible products or patents out, or other things that can be invested in. This would be 120 credits and many courses that already exist would be used. We have already spoken to faculty at different places to cross list a lot of the curriculum. There are several forces that are already listed from the BS in Medicine.

The goal is to give the information out today, gather feedback over the Summer, then vote on the item in Fall to hopefully enroll students in Spring 2025 or Fall 2024. This really creates an active, new, and exciting major that would attract students to come to the University of Arizona in the future. Thank you for your attention. If you have questions, please get in touch with me and I would be happy to reply over the Summer.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated this is an information item and if anyone has questions, contact Senator Slepian. She just spoke to many doctors in Pittsburg about business and she finds this very interesting.

C. Information Item: TRIF money status update – Interim Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact, Elliot Cheu [01:07:21]

For those of you who don't know, I am the Interim Senior Vice President for Research and Innovation, that means I oversee both the research and things like Tech Launch Arizona (TLA). I was asked to come here today to discuss TRIF (Technology Research Initiative Funding), funds that come from sales tax. Interim Provost Marx and I worked on TRIF initiatives a while ago. It was originally meant to K-University funding. It is a .05% sales tax which roughly generates over \$100 million from the three Universities and the Arizona Board of Regents. Funding comes in every year which is based on sales tax. Sales tax has also been going up. Our component of TRIF over the past few years

This was enacted in 2001, over two decades ago. Previously there was a five-year cycle where TRIF was renewed. In 2018, it became a three-year cycle. We are nearing the end of the most recent three-year cycle at the end of FY 2024 and entering a one-year cycle. The one-year cycle is challenging for us because sometimes we do not get authorization for TRIF under well under the fiscal year and there are only nine months or so to spend \$34 million. It is quite a bit of money and one of the reasons I believe the University of Arizona does so well on the research aspect is because we have the ability from the state. I've talked to many other Senior Vice Presidents around the country, and they often don't have this level of state funding to provide for research. In spite of the fact we have other research constraints, this is one that we don't, so we take it very seriously. Our proportion is \$34 million, ASU gets the same amount, and NAU gets slightly less. The remainder goes to ABOR who now receives a significant amount of TRIF dollars.

There are five TRIF initiatives which are the same for all three universities. We don't control how things are divvied up. We do have the ability to decide how much money goes into each initiative and then we have to negotiate with ABOR. We have gone back and forth in the past to try to change the five initiatives, but ABOR has said no consistently.

- We just purchased a new 3 Tesla MRI (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) device installed as we speak. This was done through funding directly from TRIF. We have also funded other things in each initiative, for instance, there is a lot of work being done on PFAS (polyfluoroalkyl substances) also known as "forever chemicals." There has been investment on the national security side.
- There is a \$35 million grant from the state and from Arizona Commerce Authority (ACA) through the state, funding semiconductor in manufacturing, this was done by investments in TRIF which has helped to work on this in the current position.
- fund many things regarding space exploration. An example is an economic study through the Space Institute, and we found that the annual economic impact from space sciences at the University of Arizona is over a half a billion dollars in economic impact. To put that into perspective, the Super Bowl was here about two years ago and brought in about \$500 million. The scale of research that we do, just in the space sciences, have had a big impact just in space sciences.
- Within space sciences, we invested money which resulted in extension of the OSIRIS-REx mission which was our \$900 million sample return mission which was then extended by NASA with an additional \$200-\$300 million invested. This resulted in extended missions allowing us to go to the asteroid Apophis which is now called the OSIRIS-APEX mission which will be visited in five or six years. Apophis will be the asteroid to approach closer to the earth in the next five to seven years. A few days after it almost approaches earth, Apophis will be within a tenth of distance between the moon and the Earth. It will practically be brushing the Earth as it goes by and OSIRIS-REx will rendezvous with that.
- There has also been a lot of workforce development.

We decided to pull back money in the TRIF account this year. As I said, the current TRIF cycle ends this year on June 30, 2024, we want to ensure that we are spending those dollars and remember that these are state taxpayer dollars being invested in the UA for improving research. As everyone knows, we have had this financial crisis, and the financial platform required a reduction in spending. We want to make sure that we had good access to those dollars.

It turns out that in FY23, before I got here, there was about \$20 million of TRIF dollars that were carried from one year to the next. That is a significant amount of money. We wanted to look at all those dollars to make sure we were both spending them, and they weren't just sitting in people's accounts. We found that there were a lot of dollars sitting in people's accounts. There are starter accounts that have been around for many, many years that people have not been spending and are basically sitting in Faculty Members' accounts, so we pulled those monies back.

The \$20 million is not the same as carried forward, but it turns out to be the same amount of money. We have \$34 million in our base budget, and we had \$17 million in these particular accounts. There are other funds we receive from the Regents as one-time spending and that is where some of the \$20 million was. There was \$17 million carried from these accounts and we looked at how much we had actually spent. When you do the math, it turns out there is \$20 million of funds that were not yet spent or planned to be spent which we also looked at. There were two pots of those.

There was \$6 million in funds that we had not yet allocated and there is \$14 million that people ask for waivers for where people were able to ask for their money back. Of the \$14 million, we kept \$2.5 million. Of the \$6 million, we kept another \$3.5 million. The net result of that was that we kept \$6 million of the total \$20 million that you see here. We had a certain criterion that was applied uniformly, we didn't just say we're going to take everybody's body. We looked at the amount of money in those accounts that were carried forward, the amount of money not spent from FY23, the amount of money that people spent in this fiscal year up to that point, and the length of the original plan. We had people who had a startup commitment that was six or seven years old. For those who have gotten startup accounts, or those who haven't, the idea is generally that we want people to spend their startup accounts within three years. Some people held onto dollars for seven years and have basically been keeping money that we invest in other faculty members, so we decided to pull this back. We also looked at the number of times people asked for those monies to be extended. Most of those funds were two or three years old and we asked for a budget justification.

In the presentation, it shows the bolded line where we had roughly \$20 million. We reviewed both the \$14 million and submitted waivers of \$6 million unallocated funds, and we pulled back \$6 million. With the \$6 million, we have decided to hold onto it a little bit longer. The reason is, because of the financial crisis, we want to preserve dollars,

and we do not want to spend them all at once. \$5 million is going to high-performance computing, this is something that many faculty have stated there were no allocated funds for. \$1 million will go to support the OSIRIS-APEX which is a \$200 to \$300 million dollar mission that the University is overseeing.

One of the challenges seen is that with TRIF, there were generally big balances. Leadership team and I are now reviewing the accounts on a regular basis, roughly every two weeks. Each of the five TRIF Initiatives has a lead who will meet with our team on a regular basis. By the time we get to the end of the fiscal year, we are pretty confident that we won't have \$20 million left over. Typically, we don't receive the number from ABOR until a bit after the fiscal year starts, but we need to start having conversations as soon as possible.

Questions [01:19:42]

- Senator Fink asked what the actual drop-dead spending deadline for this year's TRIF funding, June 1st or June 30th, there has been some conflicting information.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated the deadline is June 30th.
- Senator Fink stated two years ago, there was another round of TRIF funds under special programs and June 30th was also the drop-dead deadline, not everyone was able to spend because of the Ukrainian-Russian War because of delivery shortages and such. Senator Fink asked if these monies could be accessed again.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated, generally speaking, this year the department is being tighter on those dollars due to the challenges in both spending, and fiscal balances. Dr. Cheu stated they will have to look at all of the balances on June 30th and he has a pretty idea on the current spending but will look at the funds as the year continues to ensure the dollars are spent or the carry forward can be spent.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated the challenge is that this year is the end of the three-year cycle, therefore the amount cannot be spent. There is collaboration and conversations with ABOR and CFO and COO John Arnold.
 - Senator Fink asked about the funds from two years ago and whether those funds are basically gone.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated there were \$20 million carried forward and it depends on how those dollars are counted and where they come from, so they can be gone. It is hard to count which year's dollars are being spent at this time.
- Senator Rafelski stated that \$16 million flows to ABOR to administer a \$1 million program, this is unprecedented. He is familiar with administration of science programs in the nation and the allocation is usually 1-3%. Senator Rafelski asked what ABOR is doing with the University's money, he would like to understand this and have a full account. While members cannot be removed, they can be held responsible for abusing the funding of taxpayer's money. This is important because of constant pressure faced by ABOR on use of resources. This is a golden opportunity because they are taking 10% more than they should be taking.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated ABOR allocates the distribution which is \$34 million. There are a couple of different other sources of TRIF funding including opportunity funding. Opportunity funding is monies that ABOR gave the University about one to two years ago, it was roughly \$10 million. We also received Regent's grants. ABOR has collected a fraction of the money and not all of it is going to administration.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated a sizable amount of this are Regent's grants which ABOR has kept and they ask that the University works directly with state agencies and the other two Universities. The UA applied for those grants and received roughly another \$10 million which are not included in today's slides in terms of dollars as they are not funds directly accounted for. Those are funds that ABOR decided they would have some type of competition or call for proposals. ABOR gives us funds from the TRIF dollars, and they don't keep the exact amount, they keep roughly 12% which is still a lot for the operation of ABOR.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated him, and his team have tried to advocate for getting more of the dollars back directly, but ABOR has not been agreeable to that.
 - Senator Rafelski stated the Senate can show support to win this hypothesis.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated he has asked for those dollars back while he has been at the UA>
- Senator Rafelski stated TRIF, as the way it was presented, doesn't have a vision and seems to support existing ideas. It seems that extra money is thrown in as there is already extra funding. Senator Rafelski asked in what way does the work of the department create succinct funding for novel departments for greater value.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated he didn't go into great detail on this topic, but there are a lot of areas of funding. One of them are internal grants. A lot of money in TRIF in each of the areas is invested in internal grants. The term "seed funding" is no longer used because it seems to be a stem-like grant. Internal grants are given to complete initiatives similar to what Senator Rafelski is stating.
 - Interim SVP for RII, Dr. Cheu stated himself and his team had a review retreat the week prior to think more broadly about the big things that are cross cutting which can be supported and benefit the people

of the state. He thought it was an engaging conversation, and what Senator Rafelski is saying is being done.

D. INFORMATION ITEM: DISCUSSION OF RESOLUTION ON ANTISEMITISM – CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON

For reasons I hope you will all be patient with, I have failed to bring you a resolution on anti-Semitism as promised today. I want to start out my first reiterating from the faculty's unconditional rejection of all forms of biased dignity, hatred, intimidating, or harassing conduct, based on race, ethnicity, disability, language, nationality, physical appearance, political views, affiliations, age, religion, sex, gender identity, reproductive status, and/or sexual orientation; And to involve the faculty in documenting and where necessary, investigating or monitoring the administrative investigation of incidents that may be motivated by those rejected prejudices.

A few weeks ago, I started working with some very concerned faculty members who are here today to come up with a draft resolution responding specifically to the April 9, 2024 graffiti of a phrase called, "What side of the history will you be on?" on the wall of a private building, owned by Alpha Epsilon Pi, a fraternity run on Jewish principles, sometimes called the informal name "the Jewish fraternity." Wrestling with the language on this matter has been challenging and not just because of my encounter with a cactus this weekend that put me in urgent care, but more due to the events of the past three weeks.

So, I have failed to come up with language on this matter that I think we could easily pass in the seven minutes allotted, let alone, the shorter amount of time remaining. We need more people involved, more time, more deliberation, and more debate about how to come to a consensus on what to do as a community when people on our campus feel threatened.

After the events of the last few weeks, locally and nationally, I cannot in good content, bring the original resolution as drafted and written, without opening the Faculty Senate up to becoming the director adjudicator of every act of alleged, perceived, and real bias on campus. We don't have the resources or the formal administrative mandate to do that. I cannot do it without dueling the current, extremely concerning trend of reflexive and unexamined mobilization of police power that we saw on April 30th which so many of us mean to be disproportionate, selective, violent, and threatening to the First Amendment freedoms and the traditional obligations that a public land grant has to its community.

In a critical moment for the principles of free speech and academic freedom challenged by that mobilization of force to silence urgent protect and debate, and a moment nationally, in which the US Congress is attempting uniquely to legislate, the meaning of anti- Semitism, in a way in which many individual scholars and many individual citizens believe will limit free speech in the name of fighting hatred, and which I personally oppose.

I will therefore refer to the draft motion and the question of how the Senate might respond to alleged hateful conduct to the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee and possibly other committees for further study. I submit to you that it's more important to get the matter right than to do it quickly, in the short time allotted. I know this will disappoint some of you, but I hope it opens us up to a broader conversation about how we become a more united and effective community.

Thank you very much. I will give the time back and hope people reach out to me with their concerns about this matter. Thank you.

E. INFORMATION ITEM: CLARIFY RULES REGARDING PRIVATE CITIZENS' POLITICAL ACTIVITY ARS 15-1633 – ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT & ASSOCIATE SECRETARY, KODY KELLEHER [01:32:02]

For those of you who don't know me, my name is Kody Kelleher, I am in the Office of the Secretary and related to that topic, I am going to mention that this body has previously expressed an interest in receiving an update on happenings at the legislature and we have provided that in the President's written report for this meeting. I encourage those of you interested to look at that.

The first thing I am here to talk about is regarding political activity. First, I would just say the University recognizes the right of every individual to engage in political activity. The primary focus of the University administration and our government affairs team is to facilitate free speech and the use of faculty as experts on public issues. The university has registered lobbyists who advocate on behalf of the University, and they are regulated by the Secretary of the State and state lobbying laws. Additionally, when the University wants to take an official position on a piece of legislation or the state budget, typically we coordinate that with the Arizona Board of Regents as do the other two public universities. Outside of those official lobbying activities, state law prohibits the use of any University resources to advocate for or against a bill or to influence elections. The State Statutes include a list of what is prohibited such as using university equipment, buildings, time, etc.

With that being said, employees may engage in political activity if it is done on personal time and on their own behalf as a private citizen. University employees may use their title and university affiliation for identification purposes specifically. We've done this before when university employees have wanted to testify on a bill as an expert in a particular field or issue area. I can say we have had folks from the College of Education testify on

things like the Arizona Teachers Academy. We've had individuals from the College of Engineering talk about our state budget requests and the previous new economy initiatives.

Typically, when individuals testify at the legislature, they specify at the beginning of their testimony that they are doing so as an individual and are not representing a position of the university. Occasionally, employees will fill out a conflict of commitment form beforehand. This is just an additional measure that's taken to ensure employees don't violate the state statute unknowingly. The University has an existing policy HR104 which is an interim policy and serves as additional guidelines to interpret that state law. I would say that every circumstance is pretty unique so I can try to answer specific questions you may have. I would encourage everyone to use the resources available provided by the University.

- Senator Downing asked for the speaker's name.
- Assistant VP and Associate Secretary Kelleher stated his name is Kody.
- Senator Downing asked Kelleher if he is an attorney.
- Assistant VP and Associate Secretary Kelleher stated he is not.
- Senator Downing stated he would like to point this out because there was a misunderstanding in the past time with a statement made by Dr. Cheu, the law Kelleher is referring to HRS 1516-33. He will put a link in the chat for everyone to see, what Kelleher is citing from that law, is Section A.
- Senator Downing stated he would like to point out, as an advocate for free speech, Section B. The disagreement came when it says, "you may engage." This doesn't mean you need permission from the University to exercise political activities. Specifically, on Section B of the same law, although Section A was decided on, it says that a supervisor at this University or any of the State universities cannot use the authority of their position to influence the political activities or vote of an employee. That is illegal.
- Senator Downing stated if an employee desires to take on political activity, from his interpretation of the law, they do not need permission from the University, nor do they need to fill out a conflict of commitment form.
- Senator Downing stated the Commonwealth Commitment Forum can be filled out. It has been tried by members of the APPC and it is impossible to fill out. Senator Downing stated individuals are being asked to do "catch twenty-two."
- Senator Downing stated as a person who was directly affected by this policy, we should give the entire policy including the "enforcements policy," which is not done at the university. Enforcement is done by the county attorney in which the violation occurs, or by the attorney general.
- Senator Rafelski stated this is an example of administrative bloat which needs to be removed and this is what the Senate is fighting against. Administrators appoint new administrators which creates rules which sometimes violate the law. It is important to remember that if administrators were reduced by a factor of two or three, it would be the end of law violating rules and regulations. Currently, what is written in the law can't even be read and that is the outcome of this conversation.

F. INFORMATION ITEM: CHIEF OPERATION OFFICER (COO) SEARCH – ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT & ASSOCIATE SECRETARY, KODY KELLEHER [01:38:59]

In light of the financial challenges that became apparent in November, there have been ongoing discussions about establishing a Chief Operating Officer position in the university administration. Primarily to ensure all business and nonacademic units are properly coordinated, this is part of general overall restructuring discussions that have been ongoing. The President continues to engage in these conversations. There has been no decision made on anything at this time, but I anticipate that the President will be discussing this with the new University Provost moving forward and I'd be happy to answer questions.

Questions [01:39:49]

- Senator Stegeman asked what the anticipated reporting relationship between the CFO and COO will be.
- Assistant VP and Associate Secretary Kelleher stated he believes everything is currently on the table at this moment and from what is aware of, there haven't been further discussions to give specific responses to that question.
- Senator Harris stated she is wondering if an update can be given on hiring a new CFO and the termination date for the current CFO.
- Assistant VP and Associate Secretary Kelleher stated he doesn't have a response to that question at this time but he is happy to get back to her on that.
- Senator Harris stated that would be good.
- Senator Ziurys stated she finds it difficult to believe that the University, given all the financial crisis, is hiring another high paid administrative official. It seems like high paid officials are fired, then someone else has to do their job.
- Senator Ziurys stated an example is the CFO, John Arnold who is trying to manage the budget of the University and the College of Science. He is apparently hiring the firm Ernst & Young. Senator Ziurys asked why there is a highly paid CFO who can't understand the budget of the College of Science and has to go to an outside firm who must know more than the University itself, and its professors, about the budget in the College of Science. She finds it hard to believe that that an outside firm can know more.
- Senator Ziurys stated she doesn't understand the constant addition of another administrator to do the jobs of

the current administrator, paid huge salaries, but can't carry out their jobs.

- Senator Fink asked if there will be a search process for the COO position and if there will be a faculty led committee to determine that position. Senator Fink stated if so, who will be on the committee and asked what the salary range is for the COO position.
- Assistant VP and Associate Secretary Kelleher stated he does not have specific information regarding the questions Senator Fink asked. He believes there have been initial conversations which are still ongoing, these conversations have been taking place since right before the calendar year.

9. **STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [01:43:28]**

I'd like to thank our Interim Provost Ron Marx for his immense service to the University of Arizona. He stepped into the most difficult of roles at the most difficult of times and we all remember the fourth industrial revolution ticking time clock of the weeks, days, and hours of his tenure embedded firmly in his forehead. Well, it's tempting to focus on what each of us would have done differently, the faculty owes him an enormous debt of gratitude for beginning to bridge the gap between us and our managers and mitigating in ways we may never know. Some of the damage of the broken trust and mismanagement crisis. Please join me in thanking Ron Marx for his service.

I also want to welcome our new Provost Joseph Glover. I've already suggested to him that while the campus community was vocally divided on his appointment, I for one now look forward to working with him to transform real concerns about equity forged in a particularly humid and swampy political context far, far away, into an unequivocal University of Arizona. Intense dry heat commitment to maximum inclusion and maximum diversity. In Arizona, equity is not and there will be a 0-sum game and I'm confident that the new Provost Glover, who is after all, a mathematician as well as a career faculty member, Provost, an experienced leader, and negotiator understands that. Welcome Provost Glover.

I also urge all Senators to meet with the ABOR Presidential Search Committee at the Zoom meeting which will be held this Thursday at 12:15 PM which Senator Stegeman had arranged at my suggestion. If you didn't get an invitation, please let Sabrina know. Getting the right new President is too important to do anything but take the high road and participate in the search in good faith.

Sadly, we mourn the loss of one of our students, Erin Jones, to gun violence. Described by her friends as always singing, always dancing, her unsolved murder on April 28, 2024, shocks us all to the core and redoubles our commitment as academics to engaging with the world around us and its difficult questions. The faculty extends our deepest condolences to her family and friends.

In the rush of events at a time of our local and national trauma searching, I've almost forgotten about last week's general meeting of the faculty. It was attended in real time by 630 participants and the subsequent referendum in which 1,330 faculty of all ranks and status groups participated. In spite of, and perhaps because of our disagreements, the spirit of engagement in civil debate is strong and getting stronger on our faculty. 97% of the 1,294 voted on question one, agreed that our budget should prioritize academics, control executive and central spending, and be thoroughly transparent. 95% of 1,279 people who voted on question two agreed that shared governance should be based on democratically elected representatives in their properly constituted bodies and should have a guiding and determinative role in the academic and intellectual culture of this institution. 85% of the 1,209 voted on question three agreed that cuts to the working personnel of the institution should not happen until and unless the financial situation is better understood.

While we lack the resources and the mandate to enforce those views formally, we cannot be accused of not engaging. We speak, we struggle, we remain committed to our mission and our people. When the administration does not renew our faculty colleagues and dismisses our staff colleagues to secure petty savings from the wrong places. We notice, we speak, we resist, and we will collaborate to undo those actions and prevent more like them. When we disagree with, indeed fail completely to understand the distorted logic or justification of certain policy moves like the ill-advised informed technologically centralization, we will let the world know and we will offer our best recommendations to walk back and prevent more mistakes from being made with the impunity of past administrations.

The Research Policy Committee has made recommendations that we must take up as soon as possible, I don't know when, based on the work of the Ad-hoc Committee on Information Technology. In short, strongly recommend a thoughtful, hybrid approach, designed to secure faculty needs and faculty research on information technology.

Needless to say, this week's press investigation of the surveillance of personal social media and the chronic and troubling of selectively investigating, swatting, and swatting members of our community as dissidents to be silenced, dealt with, or taught a lesson, we will be watching this and speaking out in the future.

Before we turn to our last discussion, and I hope we can extend out time a little bit. I want to thank our Vice Chair of the Faculty and President of the Senate, my dear friend, and colleagues, Mona Hymel. The hardest working elected faculty

officer and the nicest person who does the thankless job of officiating here in the Senate. I also want to thank our Faculty Center staff Jane Cherry, Sabrina Smith, and Jasmin Espino along with our indispensable tech coordinator, Andrew Wasilow.

Now with that, I want to turn over the remaining time, and hopefully extend it, to discuss the matter of events on April 30th and the morning of May 1st.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated OpaVote is being closed.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is a discussion of events on April 30, 2024, and an Ad-hoc Committee on Protest and Policing.
- Senator R. Witte stated on the OpaVote, it requires you to select candidates on the entire ballot and you cannot just select one and not vote on another, like you normally can. He is doing his on a paper ballot as this is not the way the vote is normally done. Usually there is a way to abstain, or not vote on the others.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated they will try to fix this issue.

Discussion [01:51:51]

- Chair Hudson stated in this forum and elsewhere, she would like to open the floor to a discussion of events of April 30, 2024 to May 1, 2025. One of the reasons she will establish an Ad-hoc committee at the request of a number of faculty is to analyze what happened last Tuesday night and early Monday morning.
- Chair Hudson stated although there has been focus on campus safety for all since Fall 2022, there are still mistakes being made.
- Chair Hudson stated according to the accounts that she has heard in her own experience visiting the Olive Road on Tuesday afternoon, students and community members who peacefully breached university rules in the long condition of civil disobedience on college campuses, assembled peaceably to call attention to Israeli atrocities in Gaza, unconditional US material support, and university ties to government and private sector contributors to the political economy of occupation, ethnic cleansing, and the violation of international humanitarian law.
- Chair Hudson stated after a promising negotiated decampment on the previous day, and instead of creating a forum to discuss in good faith, the protesters concern and demands, as some of our administrators I understand did in fact surge, the university appears to have escalated with a zero-tolerance approach to rule breaking based on the dubious and debatable premise that the encampment posed a clear and present danger. After an ultimatum to the protesters back with the visible show of the UAPD Department force, the early hours of Wednesday May 1st involved mobilizing three additional law enforcement agencies, and a very concerning volatile crowd emerging from the clubs and bars of nearby neighborhoods in the wee hours. This was disturbingly similar to those which engaged in violence at UCLA and other campuses.
- Chair Hudson stated rule breaking in the tradition of civil disobedience was reportedly met with threatening displays of lethal force, government power, pepper and other chemical sprays, observed weapons violations, allegedly, on the part of the early morning crowd and even one of our students being shot with a rubber bullet in the head causing a concussion.
- Chair Hudson stated a path forward must be found that aligns us with the universities that create forums or listening, exchanging of views, debating, negotiating, not escalating and punishing.
- Chair Hudson stated this is her opinion and she opens the conversation for questions and comments not only in this space but moving forward.
- Senator Brochin stated she wants to provide the story of accounts from students and faculty observers who were there that night. What has been heard officially is a statement from the President, the individuals who were there enrolled as faculty observers have not been heard from. A part of this is to set the record straight and to document what happened on Tuesday night up until 3:30 Am on Wednesday morning.
- Senator Brochin stated because there is no time to have this discussion now, she will not go into a detailed timeline of what happened, but she does want to share that at the request of UAPD, TPD, the Sheriff's Department, and Border Patrol moved in. The weapons that were used included pepper ball, contrary to its name, is gas balls and not pepper, grenade launcher with forty rounds, and a less "lethal shotgun" which is the same as a regular shotgun just painted in orange. The operating distance for most 40-millimeter CS gas rounds is 40 meters. The entire scene on Tuesday night was not even 40 meters across all people. By any count of rounds from police, were within about 5 meters of the police line.
- Senator Brochin stated she will share documented violence against students, there was one Freshman Undergraduate student who was shot in the head with a rubber bullet and has a severe concussion and cognitive symptoms which are seriously impacting the individual. The injury is ongoing and is life altering.
- Senator Brochin stated there is a Senior Undergraduate student who has suffered eight blows from rubber bullets and CS gas, the student has been having difficulty walking and doing daily tasks, rates of pain are at eight to ten, two days after the attack.
- Senator Brochin stated another student was hit a single time in the chest and has had difficulty standing which might delay the end of their semester.

- Senator Brochin stated another was hit in the knee joint with the rubber bullet, unable to stand or put weight on the joint. Now six days later, they are waiting for an MRI.
- Senator Brochin stated there are several other students who have received baton blows including to the throat and possible others who were struck by projectiles about which we don't know yet. One thing is to pressure and ask UAPD, the Chief of Police, and Steve Patterson, to disclose exactly what was used against the student body.
- Senator Brochin stated as the Faculty Senate and faculty across the campus, it is their job to keep students safe. She calls on the Senate to take action and let students know they stand with students, either in front, besides, or behind them, or in the faculty observer role. If faculty doesn't bear witness, another narrative that has been seen will emerge from the senior leadership team.

ELECTION RESULTS [01:58:04]

****Elected***

Shared Governance Review Committee

DOWNING, THEODORE (19)*

RISHEL, CINDY J. (12)

GOETZ, NELLIE (6)

GIACOBazzi, ROBERTO (4)

Committee on Conciliation

KOSS, MARY P. (34)*

SALMON, SUSIE (29)*

BACA, DAMIAN (19)*

WERCHAN, HENRY (17)

CERNY, TOMAS (15)

MOUNEIMNE, GUS (9)

Senate Executive Committee

COCHRAN, STACEY (41)*

Grievance Clearinghouse Committee

ZEIDERS, KATHERINE (20)*

GOETZ, NELLIE (8)

HARRIS, WALTER (7)

GIACOBazzi, ROBERTO (6)

University Committee on Ethics and Commitment

WILLIMAMS, MATTHEW (27)*

BLOCH, STEFANO (25)*

CRAIG, ZELIEANN R. (19)

FEHMI, JEFFREY (11)

University Hearing Board

BOUSTEAD, ANNE E. (22)*

BURROSS, HEIDI LEGG (22)*

GOETZ, NELLIE (20)*

SHEARER, ELYSE A. (18)*

CLARK, ADAM M. (15)

HARTMAN, ROBERT (15)

WILLIS, JR., SPENCER L. (11)

YAN, XIADONG (11)

KANNADATH, BIJUN (10)

PARK, CHAD K. (10)

SOWICZ, TIMOTHY (10)

[Motion 2023/24-63] to approve the SBS School of Global Studies passed by unanimous consent.

10. Reports from [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
11. **Adjournment** [01:47:46]

Vice Chair Hymel thanked everyone for their hard work. Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2023/24-64]** to adjourn the meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Katie Zeiders, Secretary of the Faculty
Jasmin Espino, Recording Secretary

Motions of April 1, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2023-24/54] to approve the agenda. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-55] to approve the Minutes of February 19, 2024, and March 11, 2024 as amended. Motion passed with forty-seven in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

[Motion 2023/24-56] to approve seconded motion from the Senate Executive Committee, Faculty Senate Standing Meeting Schedule. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-57] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Emphasis to Standalone BS Nutrition and Dietetics. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-58] Motion to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Emphasis to Standalone BS Nutrition and Wellness. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-59] Motion to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Emphasis to Standalone Major BAS Justice Global Security. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-60] Motion to approve seconded motion from Graduate Council, MS in Midwifery. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-61] Motion to approve seconded motion from Graduate Council, MS in Immunobiology. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-62] to pass the statement *"We the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona support strong and collaborative shared governance processes and therefore oppose House Bill 2735."* Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-63] to approve the SBS School of Global Studies. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-64] to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the minutes for the [February 19](#), and [March 11](#) Faculty Senate Meetings.
3. Page 2, 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.
4. Page 2, Action Item: Action Item: Consent Agenda (no discussion) – Chair of the Undergraduate Council, Holly Nelson, and Co-Chairs of the Graduate Council Hong Cui and Sanlyn Buxner (5 minutes). Approval of the [2024-2025 Faculty Senate meeting schedule](#), [Emphasis to Standalone BS Nutrition and Dietetics](#), [Emphasis to Standalone BS Nutrition and Wellness](#), [Emphasis to Standalone Major BAS Justice Global Security](#), [MS in Midwifery](#), [MS in Immunobiology](#)
5. Page 4, New Business Item 8A: Action Item: [SBS School of Global Studies – SBS Dean Lori Poloni-Staudinger](#).
6. Page 15, Item 11: Reports from the Faculty Officers, [Provost](#), [President](#), APPC, RPC, [SAPC](#), DEI, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, SGRC, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UArizona Staff Council, C11.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456