Subcommittee of Committee of Eleven (SC11) Investigation Report to the Chair of the Faculty in Response to the Concern submitted by Drs. Abraham, Lin, and Maggert on 07/28/2022

December 20, 2022

Contents

Preamble	4
The Concern Relevant Statutes and Policies	4
The Sequence of Events	5
Points of Procedural Failure	9
SC11 Recommendations	10
Appendix A: Current policies, descriptions, and charges of relevant University	sity Committees
Annendiy R. Refer	

Appendix D: Original Letter of Concern by Dr. Matthew Abraham, Dr. Wei Hua Lin, and Dr. Keith Maggert

Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure Faculty Bylaws, Art. V §9

$Wpkxgtukv\{"Jcpfdqqm"hqt"Crrqkpvgf"Rgtuqppgn\\Ctk/qpc"Dqctf"qh"Tgigpvu"Rqnke\{"Ocpwcn$

Appendix C: Transcripts of relevant correspondence between SC11 and OGC

Appendix D: Original Letter of Concern by Dr. Matthew Abraham, Dr. Wei Hua Lin, and Dr. Keith Maggert



Ms. Cherry's interference with the Nominating Committee seemingly goes unquestioned by members of the Nominating Committee (outside of Dr. Zeiders), shrouded from scrutiny or accountability. When pressed by Dr. Zeiders, Ms. Cherry did not explain herself or provide any information supportive of her actions. Ms. Cherry indicated to Ze



should be excluded from serving on CAFT. For the Faculty Center coordinator to use such a nebulous descriptor as "hidden agendas" to disqualify faculty from receiving fair consideration to serve on CAFT demonstrates an almost Orwellian use of language. For example, is a strong and unceasing commitment to the defense of faculty rights as outlined in UHAP an indication of faculty member's "hidden agenda"? Ms. Cherry's deployment of "hidden agendas" in this way reveals a very tendentious understanding of how faculty are supposed to conduct themselves with regard to shared governance.

Second, that others may influence Ms. Cherry's decisions. Ms. Cherry indicates that our culling was due to our annoyance to the administration. This is implicit admission that others' opinions – specifically administrators' opinions – are being enacted through Ms. Cherry. This circumvents protections made by policy, providing a conduit for people who have no right to make these decisions to now do so.

Third, that using the University's grievance process itself is sufficient to blackball an individual. No person should be declared ineligible to participate in a process because they choose to use that process. In our case, our knowledge and understanding of the grievance process, of state law, of Open Records requests, of University policies, and our willingness to fervently support policy and individual rights, should be heralded. For example, Ms. Cherry's



These actions will restore some faith in the nominating process, and in the Nominating Committee specifically. They will also end improper and possibly illegal influence on faculty self-representation and shared governance. Finally, they will create barriers to the reestablishment of backroom dealings and blacklists. These actions will serve every employed member of the University – administration, staff, and faculty – by safeguarding them from secretive influences and bringing our joint efforts to serve the University to a more open and honest state. To do nothing in light of the evidence we have uncovered will send a chilling message about how the University will continue to operate with the Faculty Senate's tacit endorsement.

With kindest regards,

Matthew Abraham, Ph.D.
Professor, Department of English
College of Social & Behavioral Sciences

Wei Hua Lin, Ph.D. Professor, Department of Systems and Industrial Engineering College of Engineering

Keith A. Maggert, Ph.D. Associate Professor, Department of Cellular & Molecular Medicine College of Medicine – Tucson

CC:



Dr. Wolfgang Fink, chair of the Committee of Eleven Dr. Rebecca Tsosie, Co-

