

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 14, 2022**

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 3:02 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle welcomed all Faculty Senators and Observers. All are welcome to attend, but only Faculty Senators may participate. Audience members are encouraged to direct questions or comments to Faculty Senators. Panelists will be able to mute and unmute themselves, as well as turn cameras on and off. Please stay muted when you are not speaking, and raise your virtual Zoom hand to be recognized. In the interest of time, Faculty Senate is a two-hour meeting, so please keep questions and comments brief and limited to the agenda.

Present: Senators Behrangi, Bolger, Bourget, Brewer, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Dial, DiRoberto, Domin, Downing, Durán, Fink, Folks, Gephart, Gerald, Gordon, Hammer, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Ijagbemi, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Little, Lucas, McDonald, Milbauer, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Rosenblatt, Russell, Sen, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, S. Smith, Stone, Su, Summers, Vedantam, M. Witte, R. Witte, Zenenga and Ziurys. M. Stegeman served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Addis, Alfie, Devereaux, Goyal, Haskins, Hymel, Jones, Kline, Lee, Murphy, Reimann, Robbins, Rodrigues, Schulz, Valerdi, and Vega.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE AGENDA FOR MARCH 14, 2022

Hingle referenced a proposed addition to today's agenda to give Faculty Senators access to the revised Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between faculty and administrators that has been proposed. An *ad hoc* committee started the revision process over three years ago, and in December 2020, the Shared Governance Review Committee was reconstituted and convened to update/revise the document. Hingle would like to formally add the documents to the end of the agenda as an Information Item. Pending no significant changes, the document can possibly move forward to the April Faculty Senate agenda for a vote to approve. On Monday, March 28, 2020 at 4:00 p.m., a meeting has been scheduled with the Faculty Officers, Shared Governance Review Committee members, and SPBAC Co-Chair Helm to give the campus community an opportunity to weigh in with questions or comments. Hingle asked if there were any more proposed changes to today's agenda, and hearing none, moved **[Motion 2021/22-35]** to accept the revised agenda. Motion was seconded. Downing said that he is under the impression that the MOU requires a vote by the General Faculty and asked for clarification. M. Witte agreed with Downing, and added that the Faculty Senate voted to table the document indefinitely. In the past months, no evidence of shared governance has been prevalent, and it appears that the Memorandum of Understanding is more accurately described as a Memorandum of Misunderstanding. Witte is hopeful that putting the document on the agenda as an Information Item will allow for comments before other discussions. Simmons stated that he agrees to append the draft documents to move discussion forward. Downing discussed splitting the motion, first voting on accepting the appended documents and secondly voting on the approval of the agenda. Downing's suggestion to split the motion was not recognized or seconded. Hingle asked for the vote to approve the revised agenda. **[Motion 2021/22-35]** passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 31, 2022 AND FEBRUARY 2, 2022

Hingle asked for **[Motion 2021/22-36]** to approve the minutes of January 31, 2022. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2021/22-36]** passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. M. Witte raised a Point of Personal Privilege. When the December 2021 minutes were approved, Witte noticed after that meeting that none of the Open Session statements were included in the minutes. Witte asks that her personal statement be included, as well as the other statements. Faculty Center staff affirmed her request. Hingle asked for **[Motion 2021/22-37]** to approve the minutes of February 2, 2022. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2021/22-37]** passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

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 R. Witte talked about identifying as an Arizona Wildcat. A Wildcat is born blind and helpless and turns into a fearless and tenacious fighter. A Wildcat is a stealthy and patient animal, and its survival depend on being an

attentive listener to her family and surrounding environment. The Wildcat is quick on its feet with lightning fast reflexes defying danger. We live in a world that's being taken over by science and technology. UArizona's Strategic Plan includes *The Fourth Industrial Revolution* written by Klaus Schwab. How many have read that book or its sequels, *Stakeholder Capitalism* or *COVID-19: The Great Reset?* Just to be clear, the last two in-person Faculty Senate meetings (February/March 2020), Witte made comments and brought in experts on 5G, specifically the dangers of exposure to microwave radiation, the most studied environmental factor on the human body. Today, Witte will use a different strategy to get his fellow Faculty Senators' attention. Klaus Schwab said that "Every country, from the United States to China, must participate and every industry from oil and gas to tech, must be transformed – the 'Great Reset' of capitalism." Witte also said that "all aspects of our societies and economies" must be "revamped," "from education to social contracts and working conditions." Witte wants people to look at the bigger picture. Not what happened last week or last month, or what may be a scandal or not, but to think carefully about what it means to be a Wildcat and the direction we want to head towards. Prof. Yuval Harari, top advisor to Schwab and the World Economic Forum, refers to a mathematical equation of the 21st century: $B \times C \times D = AHH$ or Biological Knowledge X Computing Power X Data = Ability to Hack Humans.

Chair of APPC, Tessa Dysart, thanked Witte and agreed with more public discourse. Dysart talked about the previous Faculty Senate meeting going over forty-five minutes the allotted time. Some may have great flexibility in our schedules and may view ourselves as elected representatives of the Faculty Senate who should be able to donate that time. For others, it is a great hinderance to our ability to serve. Dysart's children are one and four years old and when they arrive home, she needs to be dedicated to their various needs. Dysart may work after bed time on projects, but it's important to end the meeting as close to 5:00 p.m. as possible, if not for Dysart, for the Faculty Center staff who devote so much time supporting the Faculty Senate and shared governance. Over extending meetings is not respectful of their time and working hours by making them stay an extra thirty to forty-five minutes. Dysart hopes in this and the rest of the meetings for this term, and in the future as well, we all can commit as a body to ending the Faculty Senate meetings at 5:00 p.m. Nothing is so important that it can't be put off to a subsequent meeting, so we can all be respectful of our colleagues.

Senator Simmons congratulated incoming Officers Hudson, Hymel, and Dysart on their election to the faculty leadership positions. There is a lot of work ahead, and Simmons thanked everyone for their service and leadership. Simmons mentioned a troubling trend that was seen in the nomination of candidates with fewer candidates running for open seats. Many Faculty Senate seats remained open after the General Election and filling the seats had to be pushed off to the Runoff Election. The trend could be interpreted as apathy toward shared governance, but he feels that this trend is not evidence of faculty being apathetic. The elections were spirited, a lot of important discussions generated about the direction of the University, and most importantly, voters came out in record numbers to elect new leadership. This shows that faculty are tired and have a lot of commitments, but are very much invested in shared governance in the directions of the University, and have spoken with a loud voice about how they want this discussion to continue forward. Faculty care about shared governance matters and Simmons looks forward to working with the new leadership to stand for the faculty voice and to answer this charge from the General Faculty.

Senator Ziurys addressed the Faculty Senate about a serious growing concern and a major demoralization among faculty. There appears to be an ever-increasing top-down decision-making process by the University's administration with siloed management and communication structure. Decisions are made and actions imposed by the administration with little understanding of the impact on faculty. For example, the UAGC/Ashford deal, where California won the case against Ashford/Zovio. Excessive furloughs, the GTA situation, Gen Ed Refresh, and so forth. University of Arizona was successful in the past because it was enterprising and creative, not burdened with the costly top-down bureaucratic administrative structure. As we look toward the events in Eastern Europe over the past few weeks we shudder. In quoting the Prime Minister of Lithuania, Ingrida Šimonytė, the crisis was partly brought upon ourselves because "we care too little about separating propaganda and freedom of speech, political correctness versus hard-headed analysis." As with the free world, the University of Arizona must work together to move away from the Soviet style management mentality and regenerate the spirit of open dialogue and meaningful self-governance.

5. **REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, APPC, RPC, SAPC, DEI, GRADUTE COUNCIL, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UARIZONA STAFF COUNCIL**

There were no questions.

6. **INFORMATION ITEM: BGS TRANSFER CREDIT EXCEPTION WITH POWERPOINT – DIRECTOR OF BGS CALEB SIMMONS, AND CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, JESSICA SUMMERS**

Summers said that the Arizona Faculties Council advised about the allowable transfer of credit hours in programs, but that currently there is no ABOR or University policy that states decisions about the number of credit hours that can be transferred need to be approved by Faculty Senate or any of the other approval gateways at the University for ABOR consideration. A case recently surfaced where the Bachelor of General Studies program was told by ABOR that they

could write their changes directly to ABOR and bypass shared governance mechanisms. Perhaps ABOR will devise a requirement for Universities to approve its own transfer of credit hour exception because of curricular issues, which should be examined by faculty. Simmons said he would be in favor of an official policy because it would help to figure out the path one needs to take. A policy would streamline the process and alleviate having to comb over previous Faculty Senate minutes and ABOR summaries to see how the institutions handled this in the past. Simmons has been the Faculty Director of the Bachelor of General Studies Program (BGS) for six months, and the idea to increase the transfer credit limits started long before his appointment. Simmons shared a PowerPoint and the BGS mission. The BGS is a broad, multi-disciplinary course of study that offers different degrees and not a BA or BS, but a BGS. Oftentimes in curricular circles it is referred to as a completion degree for students who have a broad interest or a difficult time committing to a particular discipline for study. The degree appeals to many transfer students, particularly non-traditional transfer students. The population is also made up of students who began in a pre-major track and for whatever reason, were not admitted to their desired degree program, and students who are having difficulty declaring a major. The BGS degree is one of the most diverse at the University. Because the BGS is not a BA or BS degree, the criteria for graduation differs, the main difference being the language requirement. One reason for the request is competition with online programs, including Global Campus. The idea of the transfer originated in discussions of distance learning opportunities, and UArizona has teamed with community colleges to provide a pathway to UArizona. The overall credits to transfer are sixty-four from community colleges, no limit applies when transferring from a four-year college for the General Studies degree. The rationale is wanting to address equity of access issues in the State of Arizona and make a pathway for community college students to be able to get a high-quality, reputable degree from UArizona and bypass a for-profit institution or less-reputable institution while providing pathways into the workforce. Many questions early in this discussion were about comparisons to our peer institutions and they are scattered. Fifty percent allow more than seventy-five and fifty percent allow seventy-five or less, keeping UArizona within the same limits as ABOR approved peer institutions. BGS is not part of RCM and its budget does not derive from courses taught because courses from other colleges are accepted. Increasing credit transfer would lower student credit hour (SCH) revenue because there are eleven credits that are not required. Eleven less credits can be used as a recruitment tool, particularly for the distance campuses. In 1996, the Articulation Task Force implemented the sixty-four transfer credit requirement. In 2007, Northern Arizona University created its 90/30 plan. In 2009, UArizona's Bachelor of Applied Science was approved for seventy-five transfer units, and in 2021, NAU's BS Biological Sciences increased to seventy-five transfer units. Hudson said she wasn't aware that the BGS was not a BA or BS degree and asked for elaboration on the comparison, as well as how many peer institutions offer this degree. Simmons said that although not uncommon, the trend at peer institutions has been to change the name due to difficulties students have explaining the degree to employers. The lesser language requirement shortens the time to obtain the degree by two semesters, and the requirements are separate from the traditional BS and BA degrees. Hudson asked how many students are enrolled, what is the growth trend, and how does it stand outside of the budgetary model. Simmons explained that he is not privy to the budget, but BGS does not get money for major or SCH because it doesn't have courses. There is an introductory course and a capstone course to help acclimate students, but all other courses are in other departments. An allotment of funds are given for advisors and for a stipend provided by central administration. Enrollment peaked at 1000 across all campuses, and has declined to ~780 currently. The decrease could be pandemic related, but Simmons isn't certain. M. Witte said from a historical point of view, Columbia had possibly the first and largest General Studies program and she had taken a number of pre-med courses there while attending Barnard College. Witte is certain Columbia had a Bachelor's degree associated with that General Studies program, and wonders how that program has evolved within the Columbia University system. Simmons said there was a point in time where the BGS was a very popular degree because of the way it was set up to benefit students in the marketplace and thinks the degree is an ethical one. Students can choose one of six different emphases, which provides a well-rounded, personalized "build your own degree" model similar to that of Columbia's. Hurh asked if it would make sense for the entire University to accept more credits for all degrees instead of only a few. Regarding using the program as a recruitment tool, what would be the advantage of recruiting students into a program that doesn't fulfill the requirements for their intended major. How will the University see recruiting into the BGS degree as a first option for students rather than a second option. Simmons replied that distance network is where the conversation originated because many students after obtaining Associate's degrees were looking at online institutions who would accept their transfer credits instead of four-year institutions. UAGC has a similar degree in Liberal Arts, as does University of Phoenix and Southern New Hampshire who all accept ninety transfer credits. Sixty-four versus ninety credit hours seems more attractive because students have largely paid for their courses out-of-pocket and they don't want to lose money for courses already taken. Although the University doesn't have a lot of students currently who request to transfer more, the change is to get ahead of the curve. Downing asked how Arizona State University (ASU) and Northern Arizona University (NAU) are handling this issue. Simmons said ASU has a similar completion degree, and will email Downing the information. NAU has a 90/30 plan that includes an interdisciplinary degree. UArizona has the most stringent transfer policy of all the in-state Universities for completion degrees. Downing said that this topic has been one of the most contested issues in the Legislature over the relationship of community colleges to the Universities. Simmons added that the increase to seventy-five credit hours originated from the Legislature with a State Representative writing to ABOR specifically to increase the transfer limit for community colleges. Summers asked the Faculty Senate if they thought it prudent to review any changes in transfer credit hours

as a curricular issue, and if so, would draft a policy for ABOR for insertion in its policy manual. Summers asked for an informal hand raise, and asked Faculty Senators to contact her with any concerns.

7. ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA: UNDERGRADUATE MINOR JEDI; UNDERGRADUATE MINOR FUTURE EARTH RESILIENCE – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, MOLLY BOLGER

The proposals come to Faculty Senate as seconded motions from Undergraduate Council. Bolger explained that there was 100% agreement for both Minors to move forward from Council members. **[Motion 2021/22-38]** Undergraduate Minor JEDI and **[Motion 2021/22-39]** Undergraduate Minor Future Earth Resilience carried and are detailed at the end of these minutes.

8. FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION: RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAREER-TRACK FACULTY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM REFRESH – SENATOR TIM OTTUSCH

Ottusch read the Resolution to the Faculty Senate, including all signatories. Hingle restated the proposed Resolution, and asking for a second on Ottusch's motion. Motion was seconded. Hudson said she had reservations linking the appreciation of Career-track faculty to the Gen Ed Refresh, which never passed the approval in Faculty Senate. Hudson said she would be more supportive of a Resolution if it generally called for Multi-year contracts for all of the University's Career-track faculty. Hudson learned in SPBAC that as many as 90% of UArizona's Career-track faculty are on year-to-year renewal contracts. Pathways should be made to work toward tenure for long-term Career-track faculty and pathways to Multi-year contracts for all Career-track faculty. Hudson applauded Ottusch's college for making inroads towards assuring Career-track faculty are offered Multi-year contracts in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Hudson said that many Career-track faculty who participated in the Gen Ed Refresh did not sign the Resolution, and is reluctant to engage in symbolic acts of praise rather than material ones. Hudson would like to see a document less specific, more ambitious, and not linked specifically to the Gen Ed Refresh. Ziurys agreed with Hudson, saying that praising Career-track faculty is reasonable, but the Gen Ed Refresh discussion was never finalized in Faculty Senate. M. Witte said she had a number of reservations for the similar reasons. Certainly, praising Career-track faculty who contribute to everything at the University, but the understanding of Resolutions is to omit the word "whereas." Senator Neumann brought up the fact that the Board of Regents is aiming to have 40% of the Faculty designated as Career-track and this topic was dropped and never brought up again, and Witte thinks it warrants further discussion since it is a reflection on the abolition of tenure. Increasing Career-track faculty, particularly those who don't have a yearly contract, changes the character of the campus. Instead, looking at the role of Career-track faculty, appreciating and remunerating them appropriately, and the increase in percentages of Career-track faculty versus Tenure-track faculty are all important discussions for Faculty Senate. Hingle referred to Summers' comment in Chat stating that ABOR encourages 40% of Career-track faculty to be on Multi-year contracts. Simmons said that the fight for Career-track faculty has been an ongoing fight, and understands the reluctance for symbolic gestures, but sometimes they are important, especially when thinking back through the process of the Gen Ed Refresh. Going through the records of previous Faculty Senate meetings, many Career-track faculty felt disrespected in those conversations. Faculty Senate should reaffirm that there was no disrespect intended to our colleagues, but in fact recognize that the majority of the people doing the hard work of looking at proposals, giving feedback, etc., was all done by Career-track faculty. The Resolution is not about agreeing or disagreeing with the program itself, but showing appreciation for stepping up to do the hard work. Bourget said her reservation about the Resolution is that in her department, the heavy lifting of refreshing courses was done mainly by Tenure-track faculty, so recognition should be made to all faculty. Faculty Senators engaged in discussion at a previous Faculty Senate meeting pertaining to a promotion path for instructors echoing what Hudson said, and Bourget feels discussing specific measures that will improve working conditions and recognizing contributions of Career-track faculty is more important. Dysart feels that Ottusch proposing a Resolution for Career-track faculty precludes anyone else from submitting a Resolution to recognize Tenure-track or Continuing track faculty for this type of work. Dysart doesn't feel that the Resolution is a symbolic gesture in any way. If a faculty member was recognized by their Dean for doing outstanding work, the gesture would make that person feel proud about the work they've done. Praising people who do good work is one of the best ways to have a positive, healthy work environment, and this Resolution is no different. Possibly including all the people who were involved would alleviate anyone feeling excluded. Downing said he feels from listening to the discussion that some additional ideas be added, along with what Dysart mentioned. Downing would like to table the motion to reflect today's discussion. Hingle reminded Faculty Senators that the original motion for the Resolution is still on the floor. Downing said that the Resolution should be strengthened with the suggestions brought forth in the discussion today, and it could be brought back at the next Faculty Senate meeting for a final vote. Downing moved **[Motion 2021/22-40]** to postpone the motion until the next Faculty Senate meeting in order to enhance the document. Motion was seconded. Hurh agrees with updating the Resolution to include all faculty who were involved in the Gen Ed Refresh process and to fine-tune additional suggestions. Career-track faculty don't have the job security that Tenure-track faculty have, therefore, many do not speak adversely to power, making this motion extremely important and making their job more difficult. Although Faculty Senators may be divided over the Gen Ed Refresh program as a whole, the body is together with recognizing the efforts of Career-track faculty. Ijagbemi stated that the context of the motion is a result of the past discussions questioning the credentials of

Career-track faculty who are working on the Gen Ed Refresh and is about the work that UWGEC is doing, and the majority of Career-track faculty who were diminished in the Faculty Senate's discussion last semester. Ottusch said that he would prefer to keep the Resolution as is, but Stegeman spoke to the motion to postpone and said that any addition of names would mean that the motion would have to move forward. Hingle called the question for Downing's motion. Slepian said he is in favor of process and product, and the body agrees that the Resolution is a positive one for honoring Career-track faculty, and suggest moving forward to approve. Motions on more substantive issues can be done at a later date. Faculty Senate is being obstructive by not moving forward. Leafgren said his biggest issue is with the list of names not being complete. McDonald said he is in favor of the Resolution and would like it to be correct. Faculty Senate has a habit of kicking things down the road again and again, but if the names are not correct, the message is hollow. McDonald, who helped write the Resolution, is in favor of postponing until the next meeting. M. Witte believes Downing's motion is appropriate and that the discussion warrants practical changes, which should be done correctly. Hingle restated the motion for a vote. **[Motion 2021/22-40]** to postpone voting on the Resolution pending changes until the next Faculty Senate meeting passed 23-20.

9. **INFORMATION ITEM: UHAP CHAPTER SIX REVISIONS AND GRIEVANCES AND HEARINGS – VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY AFFAIRS, ANDREA ROMERO AND CHAIR OF APPC, TESSA DYSART**

Dysart opened by explaining that the revisions being reviewed are for the Grievance and Hearings section in UHAP, not the Constitution and Bylaws of the University. Revisions were given to APPC via the Grievance committees for review and the results are highlighted in yellow. Foremost, Dysart explained that the revisions were to improve clarity in the policy to make it clear where faculty needed to go to set a clear timeline so that administration could not stall grievances or not render a decision in a timely manner. Clear timelines were added, but timelines can be extended for good cause by both parties. The page limitation was changed from five pages to ten pages plus attachments, which don't count against the page limit. Clarity was added outlining how the UHAP process works with the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws of the University. Other non-substantive changes such as changing "shall" to "will" were inserted. As an Information Item in Faculty Senate, the revisions to the policy will be posted for a thirty-day review and comment period online. Administration is tasked to respond to all comments and provide reasoning for its decision to agree with the suggested changes or decline. M. Witte said that when changes to the grievance policy are overseen by the Office of General Counsel (OGC), important clarifications get lost. When Witte was involved in grievance procedures in the 1970's, it led to a marked reform of the grievance procedure and the increased ability for faculty to get their grievance heard fairly. Witte urges Faculty Senate to look at the document carefully and make sure that the revised version is better for the grievant. Hudson said that one thing she notices that is missing in the document is a time limit or deadline that the administration has to respond to the grievant. Dysart said that a thirty-day period was added to the document. Milbauer asked who determines what is good cause. Dysart responded that this point is lacking in the document, and is certain that there are examples in Arizona Case Law. Milbauer asked how Ombuds relates to the policy. Romero responded that Ombuds is an informal process and is separate from this policy. The goal is to apprise faculty of the informal and formal grievance resolution procedures. Milbauer stated that in many matters, ABOR, UHAP, and the Constitution and Bylaws are not congruent with one another, and after investigation, ABOR and the Bylaws seem to be congruent but it's UHAP that is out of compliance, especially the mandate that all grievances must begin with the immediate administrative head above the problem. The Bylaws state it is the "preferred" option and not mandatory. The Bylaws also state that at each level of the grievance process, the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee (GCC) or decision-maker will advise the grievant of the options available and that's extremely confusing if the grievance needs to begin locally. ABOR 6-201 is referenced in one of the proposed changes, *"Each University shall provide an established grievance procedure to resolve any work-related concerns of a faculty member..."* *"The grievance procedure shall authorize a faculty member to initiate a grievance by filing with the Chair of the designated faculty committee (Milbauer reads that as the GCC) a written statement that describes the specific actions..."* Anyone on campus who has been involved in these procedures over the last few years knows that they would like the immediate administrative head to weigh in, which would make things copasetic in a well-functioning system that works, but head and deans punt or alternatively insist on non-involvement or are non-committal because of APR involvement with the grievant. Being a half-time Dean for Faculty Affairs in the College of Fine Arts, Milbauer would be the first person to try to resolve grievance issues for faculty, but explained that he would also like the faculty member to go over his head if they saw fit to do so. Downing said that changing "shall" to "will" would draw attention to colleagues in the Law College and wanted clarification on the change. Dysart said that would be a question for OGC since it was their choice to make those changes. APPC did not address that change. Slepian responded that "will" is more definitive and "shall" is more suggestive. Downing disagreed and said that "shall" is more imperative in statute. Ziurys insisted on defining "good cause." M. Witte said that since Dysart has divulged that OGC wants to change this language, it is cause for alarm and is completely against this change because OGC represents and sides with administration and not the faculty. The change is adversarial and would weaken the faculty grievance procedure for the faculty member. In Witte's view, the University attorneys are conflicted when giving faculty advice and are in violation of their professional ethics. Milbauer asked Dysart if ABOR 6-201 came up in discussion, since it seems to be a mandate from the highest level that faculty have authority to not go through the immediate administrative head. Dysart responded that the committee did not discuss ABOR policy, and were more focused on things that would be of concern to Faculty Senate. Milbauer said

many of the issues raised are thorny and sticky with so many places to look for guidance on procedure, and more concerning are the numerous places changes need to be made when revisions take place. Simmons requested that a reminder be sent out to the faculty for the thirty-day review. Dysart added that OGC does not want the University to be sued, and although some of the choices OGC makes can be clarified better, Faculty Senators should not assume that everything OGC does is not in support of faculty. Dysart encourages posting concerns and questions on the comment page for the policy. Romero provided the link in Chat for the policy page.

10. **DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: SERIES OF RESOLUTIONS RE: UAGC FROM THE FEBRUARY 7, 2022 FACULTY SENATE MEETING – SENATOR LEILA HUDSON**

Hingle stated that Hudson decided not to bring the proposed motions forward for a vote. Stegeman stated that at the February 7, 2022 Faculty Senate meeting, no action was taken and Hingle agreed at the conclusion of the meeting to move the item forward to the current meeting, but no motion is on the floor and it is up to the body to make a motion or not. Hudson explained that events overtook the last Faculty Senate meeting and apologized for the extended meeting without a fruitful resolution. The results in the California legal action against Ashford were distributed to all Faculty Senators and Hudson shared a local story in Chat about a student who was defrauded by Ashford. A list of documents was submitted to administration that Faculty Senators would like a response to before trying to craft any Resolution. Hudson stated that, prior to the start of meeting today, Senior Vice Provost Burd announced a Steering Committee whose membership is lacking significant faculty representation.

11. **DRAFT REVISED SHARED GOVERNANCE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING DOCUMENTS AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

Hingle proposes that because this item was added at the beginning of the meeting, that discussion be postponed until Faculty Senators have had a chance to read the documents. M. Witte said that Hingle cannot make such a motion and it is up to the body to decide its postponement. Witte cautions Faculty Senators that the document is a Memorandum of Misunderstanding and to never sign something unless it is clearly titled as such. Hingle responded that the Shared Governance Review Committee is made up of elected faculty, appointed faculty, administrators, staff, and students who have spent the last year and a half working on the document and had been informed by efforts of the Faculty Senate. Calling such document a Memorandum of Misunderstanding is doing it and all of us a disservice because everyone has worked countless hours to revise it. Making such accusations and calling the document names before reading it is something that Hingle doesn't understand. Witte said the Presiding Officer should not engage in banter with members of Faculty Senate.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 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.

Motions of March 14, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2021/22-35] to accept the revised agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-36] to approve the minutes of January 31, 2022. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-37] to approve the minutes of February 2, 2022. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-38] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council to approve Undergraduate Minor JEDI. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-39] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council to approve Undergraduate Minor Future Earth Resilience. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-40] to postpone voting on Recognizing the Contributions of Career-track Faculty in the Development of the General Education Refresh Resolution pending changes until the next Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed 23-20.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456