

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 11, 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=f43eecb-6664-4827-8b15-b131000b56fe>

1. CALL TO ORDER [00:00:18]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the March 11, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:02 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Dysart was also present.

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

Absent: Senators Anderson (GPSC Rep), Barron (ASUA Rep), Bernick, Buxner, Cooley, Cui, Gordon, Grijalva (ASUA Rep), Kandel, Neumann, Pace, Robbins (President), Rogers, Sanchez, M. Williams, Yoon (GPSC Rep).

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:00:06]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2023-24/42**] to approve the March 11, 2024 Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE JANUARY 29, 2024 AND FEBRUARY 5, 2024 FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS [00:00:45]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2023/24-43**] to approve the January 29, 2024 and February 5, 2024 Faculty Senate Minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION [00:01:55]

Senator Wolfgang Fink [00:02:27]

Thank you. I am sharing this letter which will be sent to President Robbins on behalf of the Committee of Eleven later today:

"Dear President Robbins,

As per your email from February 27, 2024, the members of the proposed University Advisory Council (UAC) will be **selected by the President and his delegates and not elected by the General Faculty**. They do NOT represent the Faculty Senate, the Committee of Eleven (C11), and/or any other elected shared faculty governance bodies, recognized by ARS 15-1601B and University policies dating back to 1947. UAC is a selected body, and NOT to be misinterpreted as an elected shared faculty governance body in compliance with Arizona-Law (ARS 15-1601B).

Respectfully submitted

The Committee of Eleven (minus one dissension by C11 member Dr. Caleb Simmons)

CC:

- Minority Statement by dissenting C11 member Dr. Caleb Simmons"

Caleb Simmons will be preparing a minority statement which will be submitted later today with the letter from C11. I would like to yield my remaining minutes to Senator Ziurys.

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:03:49]

With the announcement by the University's administration about the impending layoffs of faculty and staff, there has

been increasing concern from University employees that they are being laid off to “make room for former Ashford-Zovio employees.” 3,000 FTE is my understanding. This situation is further exacerbated by the firewall that apparently surrounds former Ashford-Zovio, now UAGC employees. It is very difficult to get any information about them. Furthermore, it is also my understanding that any dealings with UAGC must be “negotiated.”

Does this mean that UAGC has veto power over any university decisions? We also note that many of the UAGC employees do not even live in Arizona and are we laying off UA employees who are state residents, in favor of non-residents? This must be what Governor Hobbs was referring to in her latest comments when she wrote that the University “should prioritize those who have larger lengths of time working at the University of Arizona, and Arizona based employees when assessing layoffs.”

We need transparency for once, and accountability concerning the upcoming layoffs, the criteria that are to be used and an explanation of why. Both for University of Arizona employees and those from UAGC. Clarity and truth are especially needed now, given the situation concerning UA’s finances have worsened.

Moody’s revision of the University’s bond rating went from stable to negative and the Department of Education has signaled that it intends to force the University of Arizona to payback \$72 million in student loans from Ashford/Zovio. As an editorial board of the Arizona Republic writes “the University of Arizona is one of the oldest and most important institutions in the State. It’s current leaders foolishly fell for a scheme executed by a number of for-profit schools to merge with State universities to gain respectability and take cover from creditors and lawsuits.”

Given all of these continued problems, why not develop a plan or at least examine a plan to phase out UAGC? The University budget situation is ample justification for examining such a plan and perhaps it should be done. Thank you.

Senator Ted Downing [00:06:56]

There is a frontal attack going on in higher education. Not just in Arizona, but everywhere across the United States. That frontal attack involved especially removing the concept of shared faculty governance, a fundamental principle that goes right down to our valued membership in the AAU (American Associate University professors) which only came about in 1985 and ASU last year.

The idea of how it is being attacked is coming from every direction. A lot is happening right here in the Arizona Legislature and there are some outrageous claims. One of them is that the financial crisis at the University of Arizona came from shared faculty governance. That we were the origins of it. Part of that dates back to that silly bar chart without any data points, but wouldn’t be acceptable in any class at this University. That shows University units that are gaining and losing numbers, that are profitable and not profitable from their point of view.

Let’s put these shoes on the right foot. Shared faculty governance, where did that come from? I was there in 1992 when it happened. It was a bipartisan, full support from the legislature, signed with two opposing votes out of a hundred, the House and the Senate. Governor Simpson, a Republican governor signed it. Why did they do that? Because they anticipated that co-governance or as we had, shared governance, would give them a window at the ground level of things that could be difficult mismanagement from the point of view of the state. At that time, there was administrative bloat. People imagined that it would reduce the bloat.

Let’s put the shoes on the right foot. What has shared faculty governance brought to us? Let’s be proud of it senators. We identified the Ashford problem back in September 2020, but only recently did ABOR begin to recognize it. We identified the problems with the furloughs, which we took, and the other two universities didn’t, and we proposed plans for payback. We identified the public safety problem with Meixner’s murder, and the gross mismanagement of handling that may have prevented it. We identified the problems of the great giveaway which is where we gave merit financial aid to out-of-state students but not in-state students who are still struggling to pay. All of this, plus doing this behind the scenes that I cannot identify, but the Chair of the Faculty and others have worked with the President to avoid embarrassment to the University.

It is time for more empowerment, increased shared governance. It is time for that, rather than removing it. Let’s be proud of what we did, let’s go forward. Thank you.

5. Action Item: Consent Agenda – Chair of the Undergraduate Council, Holly Nelson – [00:10:15]

[Undergraduate Minor: Semiconductor Manufacturing](#)
[Undergraduate Minor: Teaching Online By Design](#)
[Multiple Use of Courses & Undergraduate Certificate Policy](#)

Vice Chair Hymel asked if anyone would like to pull any item off the consent agenda and stated she has not received any communications in opposition to the consent agenda.

- Senator M. Witte stated she will continue to use her rubber stamp because it is the only power shared governance

has had. She believes that when consent agenda comes to the Senate it should be an item of business for discussion. Among these are some worthwhile projects that have been reviewed, sometimes a few months earlier, which could have been presented a month in advance like the other two Universities do in the State. This can be done in replacement of getting a packet of a hundred pages.

- Senator M. Witte stated there are some questionable programs and degrees that would make the University a diploma mill, and not helpful to Arizona residents. There are some programs that require extra information. The Senate should not be ex post facto after the regents have already decided they are going to approve something, then come back to get the Senate's approval. ABOR obviously respects that this rubber stamp has some meaning to them and that is the only thing that shared governance means.
- Senator M. Witte stated she will continue to withhold her approval of the consent agenda as it appears.
 - Vice Chair Hymel asked Senator M. Witte if she would like to add discussion of the consent agenda to new business.
 - Senator M. Witte stated yes, it should be discussed as an item which is expected when the consent agenda items are given to the Senate.
- Senator Zeiders stated she had two questions on the Undergraduate programs which she sent Vice Chair Hymel an email for shortly before the meeting. She does not understand their budgets, one was based on AIB and the other was based on RCM. It is her understanding that those are obsolete and she would like to see a realistic budget estimate in both cases.
- Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2023/24-44]**, **[Motion 2023/24-45]**, & **[Motion 2023/24-46]** to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-nine in favor, three opposed, and no abstentions.

6. Statement from the Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [00:14:55]

Welcome back everyone. I hope you all had a restful Spring Break. I think we all needed it.

Our work here together is gearing up into the busy season. Traditionally the spring time is the period when new proposals burst forth in abundance, so I ask all of you to pay special attention to the consent agenda and its contents - I hasten to add that our primary job in Senate is reviewing, approving and passing on to ABOR of these types of proposals that our colleagues work hard on and as you may recall from last year the process can be rushed and contentious - I ask you all to be cognizant of all of the different parties and perspectives doing what we do - forming our research into new educational programs for Arizona's students -and Mona and the staff and I will try to guide and facilitate that process so every initiative gets the attention and time it needs to get on the books at the appropriate time.

The other Spring ritual going on is the budget and all funds process that each college and other budgetary unit is undergoing with our interim CFO. This year as I understand it we are working without a budget model, the notorious AIB having been cast into the dustbin of history. As I understand it, each dean and department head is coming to the table with plans for 5-10-or 15% cuts. There are two impulses here. One is - let's get a budget for FY 24-25. What we are beginning to hear is that units are able to cover the 5% and even the 10% cuts through attrition via departures all too common and retirements. We may have to forgo growth and reinvestment in this year of chaos. But Deans and department heads should be transparent with each other and with faculty and staff about their recommendations and implications of the All-funds budget process.

If cuts are being planned, discussed, or made to existing programs or especially faculty, staff or graduate positions your peers and employees should know about it. There is no reason why positions should be cut in any way - nonrenewal, layoffs, terminations, contract adjustments in departments and units which are financially healthy. I will be sending out a Qualtrics survey with guaranteed anonymity for reporters to find out about what is going on. We have begun to see examples of this and will be working to try to come up with alternative solutions to cutting people who teach or support students, produce research-based knowledge and the grants that it often produces. If you are laying off people in a financially healthy department, I will be working collegially with our financial recalibration committee and the relevant administrations, come up with alternative plans that find savings in senior administration of that unit. We cannot afford to cut people who do the mission of research and teaching. We do need to cut senior administrators even though we haven't heard a target. Let me say that again. I will go down fighting to make sure that not one working person's position is cut when there are administrators galore who need to be accountable for mismanagement. If we run out of those then we start on the UAGC administrators. Then we have the president go to the foundation for help. Then we look into recapitalization options. Doesn't help that Moody's just downgraded us. But mark my words - the only thing that will restore trust.

When I was young, I never wanted to be an accountant. I arrogantly thought that the great truths were to be found in other less quantitative disciplines. How wrong I was. In my old age I've come to appreciate as never before the importance of accuracy, precision, and generally accepted accounting principles. The numbers and data that we request and fight for in the name.

of basic transparency are very difficult to interpret because of the lack of accuracy, precision, and generally accepted accounting principles. WE still need to get Ernst and Young to audit our - not UAGC's finances as the governor requested - So as I make my assertions, please keep in mind that I'm not qualified and that the data I'm using to reverse engineer all this is grudging and imprecise. All mistakes are my own. But here are some hypotheses I'm working with.

Teaching and research produce the majority of our revenues.

Academic units house and host the people who do the mission and make the money. They are the engines of our mission and our revenues. They should not be abused in the process of socializing and concealing mismanagement.

Until I am convinced otherwise - I think that productive academic units only get back about 42% proportionately to the research and teaching revenues that they bring in with 58% retained at the center for non-transparent redistribution. There is plenty of money in the system to top off academic and support operations in an academic unit while we figure out where the mismanagement is coming from and hold the administrators accountable.

On the topic of academic units. About half of them are thriving doing ever more with ever less training at high altitude. Those which are in minor deficit may appear that way as an artifact of the disastrous AIB used in 2023. Those units should be topped off while we figure out what's going on with their management.

There is only one academic college which appears to be unsustainable. This unit's leadership is the beneficiary of the socialization of the losses. I'm not going to name it right now, but even the imprecise numbers can't conceal it. We need to ask tough questions of the management of this college, as we do with other chronically overspending units. No working faculty staff or student should be cut when is- managers take cover behind intimidation and the chilling of free speech, socialization of losses, confusing and obscure data, whitewashed performance reviews and weaponized collegiality.

There are many little breaches to be addressed at the college level - Health sciences have been the beneficiary of so much of the academic revenue produced on main campus that I don't want to hear about cuts in contracts, non-renewals of faculty or staff layoffs in FY 2024.

Anyone and everyone should be speaking out about the cuts to our students. Curtailing the funds for student clubs is not ok. Saving a few hundred dollars by eliminating the student newspaper wildcat OPEDS is a horrifying development. IF that isn't quietly turned back, we'll be bringing a resolution to the next Senate meeting.

ON UAGC. News reports suggest that the US DoF is preparing to ask the University of Arizona to pay the 72M\$ of forgiven fraudulent UAGC loans. We need an all-hands-on deck initiative to renegotiate whatever was secretly negotiated between our administration UAGC WASC and the federal department of education.

7. Report from Interim Vice President and Chief Safety Officer, Steve Patterson [00:27:19]

My hope is to be able to provide regular updates as needed and as requested by all of you. The first thing I really need to mention is fiscal responsibility on the Office of Public Safety's part. A lot of the work we're doing, unfortunately, when you're talking about adding door locks, regarding fiscal safety of some of those things are very costly. We need to make sure that we are good stewards of our money, and that is what we are trying to do: committed to making impactful, meaningful change while still being fiscally responsible.

We regularly do a cost benefits analysis of what we are looking into doing, and we really try to evaluate whether things are a necessity at this moment. However, I do not have a crystal ball. When we start to have conversations about AEDs, stop the bleed kits, locks on classroom doors, I unfortunately do not know which one of those is going to be most important. I don't know which one is going to be the one that can potentially save someone's life.

I was hired to do a very important job. You have all heard my story. This University means a whole lot to me. We are continuing to maintain focus on being fiscally responsible while striving to get to a point where this campus is as safe as we can make it.

Moving forward, approximately a year ago, the PAX report was generated. The PAX report provided the University with thirty-three recommendations. With that upcoming one-year mark, we are working towards providing clear and concise details and updates for the thirty-three recommendations, on the safety.arizona.edu website. A majority of those have been completed and some are ongoing. The ongoing training will occur forever. Seven of those recommendations will be continuous and ongoing.

When I got here, my commitment was to do much more than the thirty-three recommendations from PAX. We continue to look at enhancing safety within our community. A lot of that is through awareness and training. A lot of the awareness can be done in a relatively low-cost manner, however, it will take time to continue the training.

One of the things that I would really like to for is the mandatory active shooter video. It is mandatory to all faculty, staff, and DCC. We are up over 85% of completion for faculty and staff, which I think is exceptional. I didn't pull the number for faculty specifically, but they are around that same percentage. That is ongoing training, just because you did it last year, doesn't mean you no longer have to look into it. It is meant to be a starting point. Dr. Fink has been very helpful with this, we are looking into updating the video and providing clarity on areas that may need more discussion. The active shooter video will continue to live, and I will continue to send emails asking for you all to complete the training.

Please look for additional Edge Learning opportunities. Dr. Jessie Semmann, the Director of the Threat Assessment and Management (TAMT) program is currently working with Edge Learning to create additional threat awareness videos. The overall goal is to provide different tiered levels of training based off your role at the University: student, faculty, or supervisor. This will take time, but we look forward to continuing down that route.

I would be remiss without giving a big thanks to the Safety Commission who meets every three weeks. We met this morning in the Boardroom. They are tremendous in providing advisory guidance, and their perspective. We have members of the faculty, staff, students, and individuals who are UA alumni and members of the community who all provide a lot of guidance and support.

With the one-year mark of the PAX report approaching, we are in the process of completing questions for a safety survey. Our goal is to provide the link for that safety survey around the end of this month. There have been a handful of members of the Faculty Senate who have looked at this and provided updated suggestions. I thank you for those. The goal is to continue to enhance the safety within our community. As we all know, our community is very large and it is not just this main campus, we have areas throughout the State. I look forward to seeing that survey here in the upcoming weeks.

We continue to install AEDs (Automated External Defibrillator) and stop the bleed kits while also proving training. For those of you who aren't aware, in 2022, the state of California passed a law that all new buildings with a certain population number are required to have stop the bleed kits. These are basic level trauma kits for someone who were to be bleeding. We are in the process of installing those throughout campus. We do not have the numbers that we currently want to have but are in the process of getting to that goal as funding becomes available. We will be ordering more of those and providing more training. We have been using a lot of UEMS and additional folks around campus to assist with training.

When I first started here, I began to look at the hundreds of buildings the University has both on Main Campus and remote. We are in the process of developing an application to establish minimum safety criteria for each building. I want to get to a point where we go to each building, and we make an evaluation as to whether each one has a base level criteria. Once we get to that point, we will add all of the associated costs and provide that to Interim CFO, John Arnold and President Robbins. Ultimately, it turned into deferred maintenance which can take 5-10 years to get all items. Each building with be evaluated with risk associated. For example, the museum has a lot of priceless items which require a certain level of safety and security that must be enforced.

I hope to be able to use this application tool and to start that evaluation for each building within the next six months. My ask of you, is to please provide feedback on the safety survey. There will be opportunities to write information. If there are areas that you have concerns with, please let us know as we go through campus.

As of right now, it looks as though the trial will take place on May 7, 2024 for the individual who shot and killed Professor Meixner. I ask you all to be very supportive of each other as this is going to be a very difficult time. We will be advertising resources available to you all, but I ask you to please look out for yourselves.

Last month, I started a safety stroll with students. It occurs once a month in the evening and starts by the library, I walk around campus with a handful of students and talk to them about areas on campus they don't like going to and why they don't. There have been a handful of faculty and staff who have reached out and asked about doing something similar for them. I welcome this opportunity, and this is something we will be looking into this fall. With the end of the year coming, this is not in many people's focus but it is something to look out for if you are interested.

- Senator Schwartz stated following the Chair's comments, he finds it rather amazing that within seemingly femtosecond, there was money provided by the foundation for coaches, athletic directors, and other various ancillary parts of the athletic program. We all enjoy this, but there isn't money for you to buy gauze.
- Senator Cochran stated his thanks for Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson as he feels the University is in capable hands as he has provided calmness and clarity in a troubled time.
- Senator Cochran asked if faculty are allowed to participate in the walks with the students as he would be interested.
 - Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson stated he would provide this opportunity but does not want to minimize the students' voices. There is a representative from UAPD, Parking and Transportation, and Facilities. Most of the comments from students were that they do not like dark places and garages are concerning to them which he assumes faculty would state the same.
 - Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson stated he is interested in giving faculty this opportunity. The next safety stroll is the following day at 8 PM starting by the library. He provides students who come with a gift card which does not come out of UA money.

- Senator Fink thanked Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson for his work and collaboration as he has been enjoying it. He encourages everyone to participate. The garages were mentioned which he can relate to because he tends to work until 2 or 3 AM. He concurs with the senator who mentioned the lack of funds for safety and feels that it would be beneficial to have camera surveillance in the parking structures and hopes there will be funding for that.
 - Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson stated his thanks for Senator Fink's help and said there is currently a test being done on one of the garages where there are cameras. There is hope to get to a point where there is sufficient funding to add surveillance.
- Faculty Center Staff, Sabrina read a question from the Q&A on Zoom: "Which students are invited on these walks? Undergrads, Grads, or both?"
 - Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson stated any students are invited, last month was the first month and was more focused on students living in the dorms because they were the ones walking around campus at hours like 2-3 AM, aside from Dr. Fink. The walks are open to anyone and will work on getting a link for individuals to register so that there is a better idea of who is coming, and how many gift cards for him to purchase.
- Vice Chair Hymel thanked Interim VP and CSO, Steve Patterson for all of his and the committee's hard work.

8. [Report from the President – President Robert Robbins \[00:44:24\]](#)

- Vice Chair Hymel stated President Robbins is not in attendance, but he did submit a written report which is included in the agenda.

9. [Report from the Provost – Interim Provost Ron Marx \[00:45:00\]](#)

I want to start off with the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, Dr. Jennifer Hatcher was newly appointed as Vice Provost & Chief Inclusion Officer. This office has now moved into the President's office which I think is a good move because that will allow us to integrate the work of ODI with other kinds of student support and retention efforts. We just had a meeting over lunch with the leadership of various culture area advisory groups from around campus and town. That was really helpful. She has been doing a fabulous job and she is with us.

Chair Hudson talked about the all-funds budget meetings that are underway. These have been very interesting. We are in the third week of these meetings, and we've met with a number of support units and with colleges and they have been very enlightening. It is absolutely the case that some programs will wind up with more funding out of this than less. It is going to be difficult and challenging to meet our budgetary goals. I'm mindful of the injunction from Chair Hudson and others about cutting central funds. I am not going to say instead of collegiate funds, but more severely if you will, my office. For example, the Office of the Provost, not the entire Provost world (which is much bigger), but the one I am dealing with in my office will probably have a 10% cut for the next fiscal year in addition to what I have already been able to do this semester.

Those meetings are very interesting, and very helpful. I want to thank the deans and their budget officers for the detailed work they have provided for us as we move forward. We're not going to finish those until sometime around early to mid-April. There are about 6-10 meetings per week which will take us to that point at which time, along with Interim CFO Arnold and President Robbins, we will send budgets out for next year. I can answer any questions afterwards regarding all-funds meetings.

In addition to that kind of work, we have gone through some centralization processes recently with IT and HR. There were a lot of issues and questions raised by Senators and many others including the Committee of Eleven, and the Regent's distinguished group. I have many holes in my back as evidence of that kind of feedback. We responded as well as we could over the time period we did. One of the issues for example, in IT, was the fact that there are a number of people in IT job titles who are doing work that is not IT. We tried to move as quickly as possible on that and we reclassified people. I want to thank Helena Rodriguez and her staff for doing that. The Deans have been concerned about that. For the last three weeks and moving into this month, President Robbins and I have been meeting with all Deans for an hour or more every week to get feedback from their perspective on how things are moving forward with that. I am also ready to answer questions about that.

Faculty have received the UA COACHE Survey which is a collaborative academic careers and higher education job satisfaction survey. I really want that data and would hope that you as Senators can please promote this among your colleagues. This is very important; we're living in a land of this information and innuendo. I'd like to have some really good data about how our colleagues on the faculty, faculty at large, are responding to the issues at hand. I know there is a lot of angst, maybe not every single person is suffering the same kind of angst, I am not sure, but it would be nice to get data about that. Please encourage your colleagues to respond to that survey that has been out there. We disaggregate but we are very concerned about implicit disclosure, so you don't aggregate down to cells that have any less than five people. Rest assured we will be very careful about that.

Recently, we had a ceremony for 2024 Outstanding Faculty Awards, it was fabulous, and it would have been nice to

have that in the paper (I think there is a reporter in the room). It was a great event, we had new distinguished professors, new regents' professors, and a wonderful opportunity to celebrate the excellence of our faculty.

I just checked with Professor Russell and the Provost Search Committee is very much underway. They are doing their work very earnestly and I can assure you that we will have finals on campus this semester, and one would hope, someone signing a letter committing to be our next Provost.

- Faculty Center Staff, Sabrina read a question from the Zoom Chat: "Will the COACHE Survey summaries be made public to the Faculty Senate."
 - Interim Provost Marx stated yes, absolutely.
- Senator Ziurys stated she is curious as to why the IT centralization was kept hidden in sort of a cloak and dagger manner. The poor IT employees received a letter one morning saying they were no longer working for the same person and would now be working for someone else.
- Senator Ziurys asked why it was handled in such a way, now people are doubling back on what was done any many changes are being made.
- Senator Ziurys asked if that should've been worked out upfront and in a transparent and open forum beforehand.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he doesn't believe he would've done it that way. There were a lot of warnings that this was coming but he thinks the University could have done it better and he has apologized to as many people as possible about the way it was done.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated there will be more centralization efforts down the road, but it will not be done how IT centralization was done.
- Senator Zeiders stated she would like to comment on the all-funds, multi-year presentation. For her fellow senators, she would like to remind them of what that is: it is a time when Deans meet Deans, and Finance Deans meet with the CFO office and the Provost. Deans are provided a template for the presentation and are asked to fill it out in advance. The template includes information about financial positions, revenue growth opportunities, space needs, hiring plan. This year, Deans were asked to provide a plan for 5% and 10% reductions in their budgets over 18 months, then a plan for 15% reductions over 36 months.
- Senator Zeiders stated the CALES all-funds meeting was March 8th. On Sunday morning they received a summary of the meeting with a description of the process and a promise that the slides would be shared with Faculty.
- Senator Zeiders stated Dean Shane Burgess reported that Interim CFO Arnold and Interim Provost Marx listened and understood the immense stress of colleagues and things going on in CALES which is appreciated. There was advocacy that even a 5% cut in CALES would eliminate critical parts of their mission. Her college is grateful for Interim Provost Marx and Interim CFO Arnold for listening.
- Senator Zeiders stated she brings this up to inform other senators and to mention there is a very functional way of shared governance within CALES and it is playing out in productive ways with transparency and communication during this crisis. She encourages other senators to reach out to their deans about this all-funds meeting so there is transparency and communication about this.
- Senator Zeiders stated her thanks to Interim Provost Marx for all of his input and for listening to the needs of CALES.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated Dean Burgess presented him and Interim CFO Arnold with many slides so he wins for the most slides. He thanked Senator Zeiders and asked Senators to connect with their Deans about these presentations as they are important and are used as a way to collect data used to make financial decisions.
- Senator Russell stated it is appreciated that Interim Provost Marx attended the meeting to inform the Senate of what is occurring. When centralization or other major budget cutting done, she is looks for metrics. She asked what it looks like when there is a "win." She has never seen this other than "closing the hole" where values are maintained, and students and staff are supported but it is unknown what the metrics for success are.
- Senator Russell stated she would like to see a big, red button on the website that says, "process for redress." When there is a major change such as someone being fired, or something that has changed the environment in a way that causes major difficulty or damage, this would serve as a documentable and transparent way to ask for redress. She feels a message of redress should be included in the immediate plan.
- Senator Russell asked if retention levels will be addressed with regards to positions such as groundskeepers, janitors, student services, and professors of practice. She has seen a lot of losses recently, in the last three weeks, and she would like to ensure someone is keeping an eye on the distress being felt across the University. She is worried about the Tucson and Southern Arizona Community as it is the largest employer in the area.
- Senator Russell stated she would like to see metrics for success, methods of redress, and some type of measure for the distress across campus. Examples can be half of an entire college quitting, or a segment of the University is struggling more.
- Senator Russell stated she has not heard this matter discussed in any plan, SPBAC, or the President's office. This seems fundamental if there are going to be large-scale changes, regardless of it being difficult to gather data.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated there is data regarding people who have left which can be resolved down to smaller units.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he heard from Interim CFO Arnold that the payroll has not declined since January 2024 when the hiring freeze began. The last pay cycle was the first time when total payroll went down. It is important to track this in a disaggregated way moving forward.

- Senator Russell stated she felt like this happened in the last three weeks.
- Interim Provost Marx stated there is a one-week lag on the pay period.
- Interim Provost Marx stated regarding the first issue mentioned by Senator Russell, some is related to money, and some is not. Regarding the IT server issues, important metrics relate to security breaches and how many servers are patched to current times. These should be made public.
- Interim Provost Marx stated he agrees with the issue of redressing, this is the issue that was brought up by Senator Ziurys. There is local redressing but making the process transparent needs more work.

10. **Old Business [01:01:29]**

A. **Constitution and Bylaws revision – Constitution and Bylaws Committee member, Senator Alex Braithwaite [01:01:51]**

This is a brief update from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee which will come as a seconded motion and allows discussion to follow. Members of the committee include: 1. Dr. Alex Braithwaite, 2. Dr. Theodore Downing, 3. Prof. Tessa Dysart, 4. Dr. Amy Fountain, 5. Dr. Andrea Romero, 6. Dr. Mark Stegeman.

This information relates to a requested change. There are currently updates to the Bylaws being finalized. Over the last couple of years, there have been several items which have come to the Faculty Senate which were designed to help clarify the Bylaws and proposed changes that may have been voted on and/or approved by the General Faculty. These were not always updated in documentation, especially during the pandemic which is understandable. The current and former secretary have been working diligently to keep the pace with the changes and updating the current Bylaws. In the presentation, there is a QR code which allows senators to view the Bylaws with a series of updates and the note that they were approved October 27, 2023.

At the end of the current Bylaws document, there is a note that says changes were sent to the President on April 10, 2023 and approved in part, and rejected in part on August 21, 2023. On August 21, 2023, the committee received a memo from the President's office where all changes were approved except one. The committee met early in the Fall and requested a number of clarifications, and confirmation of their interpretation which came with the memo which is the reason it has taken since August 2023 to come to the Senate with updates. There was a memo received in January 2024, attached to the agenda, which includes that President Robbins request for a final change.

President Robbins' request related to internal grievance processes and not those under the ABOR policy which would include things such as termination or suspension without pay.

- Senator Spece stated he would like to make a motion related to the issue.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she will allow Senator Alex Braithwaite to finish his report, then Senator Spece will be recognized.
- Senator Braithwaite stated this report comes as a seconded motion from the committee which opens the door for discussion.

The committee's recommendation is that they accept President Robbins recommendation which would include replacing "*The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. 12-901 et seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision is served upon the party affected.*" with "*The President's decision on reconsideration is final and not subject to further review.*" This is a correction and clarification to the Bylaw and not a change in policy.

At this moment the Bylaws include what appears what appears to be a loop, where Faculty have a grievance being decided upon or determined, would seem to be able to call upon State law. The clarification is that this is only the case if an individual has been subject to dismissal or suspension without pay. For all other instances not covered by ABOR policy, the Administrative Review Act would not cover those. The moment there is language in the Bylaws that suggests to individuals that they have rights under State Law that they do not have was a requested clarification sought from the President's office. There is an established grievance policy at UA which can be found on the website. This change is a removal of a statement that seems to be expanding State law beyond its scope. This is what was raised in the President's note.

The committee's recommendation and second motion is to replace the first notation: "*The President's decision on reconsideration shall include a statement that an appeal to Superior Court pursuant to the Administrative Review Act, A.R.S. 12-901 et seq., if desired, must be filed within thirty-five (35) days from the date when a copy of the decision is served upon the party affected.*" with, "*The President's decision on reconsideration is final and not subject to further review.*"

- Senator Braithwaite stated he is one person from the committee and will not attempt to represent either the committee or the President and will try to offer responses.

Discussion: [01:08:18]

- Senator Spece moved **[Motion 2023/24-47]** for the Constitution & Bylaws Committee to report back to the President Robbins to answer the following questions is the Arizona Board of Regents is a State or administrative agency for the purpose of the Arizona Procedural Review Act or the Arizona Administrative Procedures Act.
 - Senator Spece stated these are interrelated statutes, and his reasoning is that he believes the President is incorrect and these questions will undercut a vital assumption made by the President. The assumption is whether ABOR is a state or administrative agency. The APRA and the AAPA can be read to exclude ABOR from the category of a state or administrative agency. Vital premise can be erroneous which he believes it is.
 - Motion was seconded.
 - Senator Spece stated people who have grievances can have actions taken against them which are worse than being fired. There is an attempt to exclude them from court review which he finds inappropriate and wishes the President, legal counsel, and regents would be more attuned to protecting faculty, staff, and students.
- Secretary Dysart stated she would like to add more context, the committee can send this back to the President although he will answer this consistently with what ABOR says. This will continue to be delayed.
- Secretary Dysart stated the President's office has stated the bylaws are not approved until the change has been made and she suspects that any further changes to the Constitution and Bylaws will not happen until this particular provision is addressed.
- Secretary Dysart stated she thanks Senator Braithwaite for his explanation of this issue.
- Secretary Dysart stated for clarification purposes, this does not deal with grievances of individuals who are terminated or suspended without pay. The concern that has been heard, especially in meetings with OGC, is that the current Bylaws are making it appear that people have rights which don't exist. This is confusing to non-attorneys who are already accessing a confusing grievance process.
- Secretary Dysart stated there are many ways the Bylaws can be improved, and the committee is working on a broader set of grievance changes to make it clear. This is for the benefit of the entire faculty to better understand their rights. This can be sent to the President's office, but the committee did have concerns which were addressed in the President's letter.
- Senator Downing stated he is on the committee but was not a part of the meeting where this was discussed due to medical reasons. This is a serious matter, there is ambiguity when there is back and forth discussion. From his perspective, he believes it discusses the rights of individuals who are dismissed or who have had suspensions which seems to be happening around campus.
- Senator Downing stated he believes he knows what the issue is, he read the Arizona Administrative Procedures Act, and it explicitly states, on page ten, that ABOR is not an administrative agency but the letter from the President says it is which is a contradiction.
- Senator Downing stated this is important because he has been involved with this and so have others. If an individual gets involved in a court case over a grievance, they would be entangled in a fight over which policy is the correct one. The individual will waste all their money while they are unemployed and will begin to have troubles in their life and waste their time in court trying to figure out what happened with the current procedures.
- Senator Downing stated he believes the President should go back and read the information. There is a mistake in the President's letter which should be straightened up, otherwise "we've added a steel toe to a boot that kicks people when they are down."
- Senator Ziurys stated she does not see what is wrong with getting clarification on these issues since it seems there is controversy. A simple discussion seems to be able to solve the matter.
- Senator Zeiders stated her thanks to the committee as she is the incoming secretary and can imagine the work is long, tedious, and drawn out.
- Senator Zeiders asked if in addition to all points that senators made, there has been requested consultation and input from grievance committee chairs including the Grievance Clearinghouse Committee, CAFT, the Committee on Conciliation, and APPC. This seems like an important issue to discuss with them.
 - Senator Braithwaite stated there was a meeting in early Fall where there were representatives from APPC but otherwise, this matter has been exclusively taken up by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. To move forward, the committee would like to work with a more comprehensive set of changes to both the constitution, bylaws, and grievance documentation in conjunction with all parties mentioned by Senator Zeiders as well as the Provost's office. It seems a broader set of clarifications can help individuals navigate the process.
 - Senator Braithwaite stated the point the committee understood and sought clarification on multiple times was the statement in the Bylaws that seemed to expand on state law beyond what it was intended for. The committee is happy to seek further clarification.
 - Senator Zeiders stated she does believe clarification is needed.
 - Senator Braithwaite asked if Secretary Dysart can provide clarification as she has institutional memory.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated she will allow senator to ask questions then will allow Secretary Dysart to speak.
- Senator M. Witte stated senators are there to protect the faculty and ensure they have all outlooks for grievances. She resents the threat of the President that he will not approve the Bylaws until this change is approved.
- Senator M. Witte moved **[Motion 2023/24-48]** for cloture of discussion. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 33 in favor, 11 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

- Secretary Dysart stated this is not a two-thirds vote as there are 16 who did not vote for it.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated abstentions are not counted.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the vote will now be on **[Motion 2023/24-47]** for the Constitution & Bylaws Committee to report back to the President Robbins to answer the following questions is the Arizona Board of Regents is a State or administrative agency for the purpose of the Arizona Procedural Review Act or the Arizona Administrative Procedures Act.
- Senator Simmons stated there was already a seconded motion on the floor from the Constitution & Bylaws Committee that needs to be resolved.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated this is what she assumed.
 - Parliamentarian Stegeman stated **[Motion 2023/24-47]** is a subsidiary motion, effectively postponing items, there is in order.
 - Senator Ottusch asked for the official wording of the motion before voting.
 - **[Motion 2023/24-47]** passed with thirty-six in favor, sixteen opposed, and two abstentions.
- Secretary Dysart raised a point of personal preference and stated she would like for the minutes to reflect that she was trying to assist Senator Braithwaite in answering Senator Zeiders's question as Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee and she was silenced by the Presiding Officer and the Chair. This is consistent with what has occurred at previous Senate meetings where dissenting voices have been silenced by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the faculty.
- Secretary Dysart stated she was trying to provide more information for Senator Zeiders's question and believes it is unfortunate that this is continuously happening in Senate meetings.

B. [Report and Presentation](#) from the General Faculty Financial Recalibration Committee – Committee Chair, Gary Rhoades [01:26:34]

The sixteen-page report from the committee was distributed to the Faculty Senate prior to the meeting. I appreciated working with my colleagues on the committee, it is a fabulous committee, and the best one I have been on in thirty-seven years.

The title of the recommendations, "Correcting course, protecting the core, & Targeted, not across-the-board cuts," is based on those made by a large group, but also as part of a smaller group with a management committee in mid-December. The title is very consistent with what President Robbins articulated very consistently to ABOR in mid-December.

After a Senate meeting in early December, President Robbins invited the recalibration committee to participate with a management committee, and GFFRC did so for two meetings. Out of those two meetings, a group of four was identified to complete a two to three set of notes that would be the basis of some of what the President reported to ABOR. Most of the content is the core of today's report. Cody, Barry Brummund, Shyam Sunder from the committee, and myself were a part of this.

At the end of the report is a slide which is one of the premises that underlies the committees work, which you can tell from the title which is to, "protect the core." This has been heard repeatedly from individuals such as President Robbins, Interim CFO John Arnold, and in the actions of Interim Provost Marx. This is the same case for the word, "targeted," which will be addressed in the meeting.

Another premise was the two-step process which took at least five years to get to financially, even though it blew up, and was discovered at the November 2, 2023, presentation with ABOR. It took five years to get to that state and it will take several years to work our way out of this. Senator Russell made a wonderful literature, "success, redress, and stress." There is pressure to take action immediately including filling a hole.

In mid-December, the committee agreed to take a two-step process which was to plug the annual year-on-year spending more than budget, and over time we need to rebuild and build the strength of the institution's reserves, and the larger balancing of accounts. There is a lot of pressure surrounding taking action, moving fast from centralization, and making 5%, 10%, and 15% cuts. I am not sure whether Interim CFO John Arnold is online, but I am sure from his perspective, when he started on this endeavor, he figured it was a three-month job and it has now become longer.

There is a two-step process which includes the first step to stop spending over budget, then build up with a variety of strategies that go beyond that and build up the reserves of the institution. I appreciate with Interim Provost Marx stated as I so often do, I understand the reason for the exercise. My prediction is that what is going to come out of these cut scenarios is that some units will realize increases. There will be some that realize somewhere in the order of 5%, there will be a bunch of others in between. We are in the midst of an exercise that is creating a lot of external anxiety and internal angst. That is what our recalibrating recommendations are designed to address.

There are a couple of narratives, and both originally come from central administration. The first narrative is about what happened, centralization or decentralization. Chair Duval's remarks stated, "there were investments, strategically made, which we could not afford." We have clearly discussed aggressive discounting of merit aid (between \$26-\$36 million per year) and strategic investment spending of \$146 million over four years (\$36.5 million per year. If you add these up, this is what accounts for the overspending in 2023. There is a relationship

between the centralized narrative, that it was central spending, which has been said before. There were insufficient to non-existent expenditure controls on the center. This can be why overspending is seen in the units because the monies could have and should have gone to the units who got more students but did not get the money. I am told now. There are about 7,000 students who pay nothing and receive a lot of financial aid. If they paid something, monies would go back to the units. This is the same case for strategic initiatives which come out of taxation then reallocation.

The committee is trying to bring attention to the fact that both narratives are related. The unregulated spending by central administration led to a systematic, cumulative, under-compensation for the work that is being done. More grants take more people, educating students takes more people. Undercompensating in the units for the additional students, credit hours, and grant productivity of those units. A lot of the increased expenditures is a volume issue, more students, more grants – it costs more. It is not that there has been extravagant spending within the units, although, there are certainly units, with one in particular (Interim Provost Marx is aware) that can spend less. This also includes the sweeping of money from those units for reallocation.

There are two narratives related. The long-term perspective matters because the strategic initiative spending has stopped, and the hold being pulled out has stopped. I have given repeated shoutouts to Kasey Urquidez who just sent another set of detailed materials to one of our committee members, Pierre Lucas regarding scaling back. This will not kick in immediately, but it will decline over several years, which calls for a multi-year plan, not filling the hole all at once.

Regarding the 5%, 10%, and 15% cuts scenarios strategy, I understand this is a scenario, and not cuts. I stood up here and made a prediction that there will not be across the board cuts. It would go a long way to reducing the loss of loss of staff and faculty, reducing anxiety, and reducing the damaging of the public image. If we had a public communication that stated something along the lines of, “we’re going in, we’re meeting with units, we’re learning a lot, some of those units were realizing, if we cut 5% it’s really going to do some harm and compromise our mission, and future revenue generation.” That sort of communication and rollout is what all funds meetings are about, and I believe would enhance the meetings and the greater good of the institution.

The word “disaggregated” was mentioned, I have a staff member who was a former student eight or nine years ago and she gave me a t-shirt which said “What would Gary do? Disaggregate.” Some of the committee’s recommendations are to disaggregate and to take the 5%, 10%, and 15% cut scenarios, which I know are not cuts. When you start doing the cut scenarios, supervisors, directors, and deans start saying “maybe we should stop hiring,” or “not rehire work study students,” or “maybe we should cut graduate students stipends.” Disaggregation can happen between support, academic, and auxiliary units. We have done this before in January 2020 with Lisa Rulney, where there was an across the board cut, but it was different for academic and support units. This is what it means to protect those categories. There should also be disaggregation within the categories because as pointed out before in the tornado chart, there are eleven units which account for around 95% of the over-budget spending. If I am in a college that has four to five units, and two of those units account for 90% of the overspend, I don’t subject all units to the same scenario. That really doesn’t make a lot of sense. The committee’s second recommendation is to disaggregate to the actual position of the units in their spending patterns. A spending pattern is not one year to the next. A lot of things happened in FY23 that were not necessarily going to happen this year, and maybe didn’t happen the year before. You must look at multiple years.

To Interim Provost Marx’s point, some units will grow, or have the potential to grow with a minor bit of additional investment. The minor bit of investment is worth it, given the growth. Why not ask units to do growth scenarios? I am gathering from the memos that Dean Burgess sent out to CALES, which has been circulated around campus, that was part of the pitch. There are ways we can grow that would really go a long way. To address what Interim CFO John Arnold has said one of our issues is, not just cost, but revenues. How could you build revenues? How could you expand revenues without just throwing money at it?

There are a couple of units already moving in a direction that is very much along the lines of what we recommended in mid-December, one of them is UAGC. Caleb Simmons connected me with Senior Vice President and CFO of UAGC, Lisa Kemp who I am meeting with Wednesday morning. There was already a very detailed exchange, explaining the nature of the finances, short-term contracts, and number of those who work in UAGC. It was explained that there was realization of 6.9% reduction in operating costs this fiscal year. This is halfway to the goal of GFFRC’s recommendation. This shows progress, and it would go a long way if this campus did the same thing. It is nice that the President stated he will take a 10% cut, it would be even nicer if the President committed to annual reductions. This can include fewer senior administration positions. There has also been word that the new AD may want to meet with the recalibration committee.

A lot of people understand enrollment management and that tuition discounting was so aggressive that we lost over \$100 million in net tuition revenues. This doesn’t mean this will just get cut off. I just had a conversation with a Dean who said his college benefited from tuition discounting because they get a lot of these students. There was worry regarding what the college will do when those students do not come to the college and he was challenging the idea that the UA would be able to redistribute the savings back through the units. This is a fundamental misunderstanding of how this will work. Kasey Urquidez’s proposal is gradually scaling back and losing about

1,300 students per year. The gain is to mitigate those losses. Multiple examples can be given, in my college we are partnering with Sunnyside School District which for three years has leveraged an increase of two hundred matriculants per year from a low-income, high minority district in Tucson. These are not out-of-state students, many are receiving Pell Grants but we actually receive from them. There are net revenues we will be gaining from them and ways that we can collectively move to mitigate the loss of students from the gradual scaling back that Casey is involved in. A lot of those have to do with local knowledge, and local initiatives. GFFRC is making the pitch that Ernst and Young is not needed.

To Senator Russell's point, GFFRC started as a committee in Fall 2023 to discuss workforce. This workforce has been wrong sized, there are fewer tenure stream faculty than ten years ago. There are roughly the same number of staff as right before the pandemic, with a lot more students. There are fewer grad assistants and individuals who got furloughed at the highest rate in the country in 2020. This is not the time to say there is a problem with our finances, we invested too much in staff and faculty. The data doesn't bear out. We need to do a three-to-five-year plan and discuss how we are going to build up and stem the loss of good people in both the staff and faculty. This is what GFFRC is proposing. We are hoping to meet soon with Interim CFO John Arnold, we know he has many meetings with all funds groups, but this would be helpful for him and us.

11. New Business

A. Report and Presentation from the ad hoc Committee on Information Technology – Committee Chair Tyson Swetnam [01:46:48]

I have been at this University since I was seven years old, my father is a retired Regents professor here. I did all my degrees here, I did my post-doc here, got a faculty appointment and I am now the Director of Open Science in the Institute for Computation and Data-enabled Insight. I am also a co-PI of a couple very large cyber instruction projects from the National Science Foundation (NSF).

I want to say thank you to the members of the ad-hoc committee that helped produce this initial draft in a very timely manner. Second, I just want to add the following quote from F. Scott Fitzgerald, "The test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in at the same time, and still retain the ability to function. One should for example, be able, be able to see that things are hopeless yet be determined to make them otherwise." That fits the tenor of this meeting, and this is the spirit in which we approached writing our report.

We were tasked by the Faculty Senate President to assess the IT landscape especially line of research and teaching infrastructure needs, the crisis, staffing, the findings of the recent state audit, the ABOR mandate, and recommendations about centralization storage and meeting the needs of a premier research institution.

This March 4th centralization of IT caused us to fast-track this report so that we could provide you, the Faculty Senate, with information we feel is valuable and that you can use in the coming months. The CIO has shifted his position and has made his deputy, the CIO, but the CIO is still in charge, she still reports to him.

The March 4th centralization has created risks which threaten our research project and specifically the educational mission and university. There are security issues that still persist but these are being addressed. The efficiency goals, which have been defined as part of a mandate for centralization are not clear, and the cost of transitioning our campus IT to the cloud is not exactly clear. We have provided the factory sign with the executive summary which is about six pages long, and the full report is over sixty pages. It is completely supported with references and publicly available information. For every one of the technical sections of the report, we have provided a list of benefits and opportunities. We also provide a list of risks and pitfalls. For every risk and ever pitfall, we provide a mitigation and alternative approach which we feel will solve some of these issues.

For historical context about where UITS came from, we pulled the 2007 website for the University of Arizona. UITS was formed in the centralization of six different units back in the fall of 2007. Centralization is a part of the history of UITS. We have also provided you all with a timeline of relevant events which we believe lend context to where we are today.

This starts in 2017 when the University won a leadership and cloud award. We have been leading on using the cloud for many years. In 2018, we had a new CIO and it is also about the same time that the security audit first came out which listed some security limitations that we were experiencing. We all went through COVID together in 2020 and acquired the UA Global Campus at the same time.

2021 saw a larger section of migration for University service to the cloud. In 2022, there was an audit and forty-eight-month report which came out with evaluations of our status relative to the first audit. We found ourselves in the financial crisis in the fall of last year, and now beginning of 2024, we are looking at full centralization of IT.

We attempted to create an organization chart which shows how UITS is currently operating and how it will operate along with the new centralization. Mr. Barry Brummund, the CIO of UITS in the central office, and the

Vice President for the University Planning Office for the Secretary of the University. We feel this dual role creates a bit of an issue. Barry has oversight and access to planning and financial information that other senior vice presidents and deans don't necessarily have access to regarding IT. In this moment, he has moved away to focus on the financial action planning and elevated his deputy CIO. This still leaves him an authority to make decisions about UITS, even though he has another position. He will return back to CIO in FY25 which is at the end of June.

We were informed there would be three major supervisors taking on the department's IT staff. Darcy Van Patten will have twenty-two units reporting to her. Susan Legg will have eleven units which includes the College of Science which has six observatories for astronomy, twenty-three cooperative extension offices, and seven external station units. Michael Medina will manage twelve units, the color-coding shows that those in blue are non-academic units, and those in red are academic units. This report is online where everyone is able to view. For reference, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) encourages a span of control of about five to one for supervisors to direct reports. There are other sources which vary from eight, to fifteen, to twenty direct reports for reasonable levels of management. You can see the direct reporting numbers are pushing the standard control which will make 1. communication is more difficult and 2. Siloing of units and 3. Will result in lower staff morale as we have already seen.

The August 22nd audit which was the forty-eight-month audit found that we only had fit five of the twenty-three recommendations, twelve had only been partially implemented, and six have not been implemented at all. This indicates slow progress towards meeting our IT strength efficiencies. The UA response to the auditor did not include how we would do these changes, instead, we only provided a single sentence, "The findings of the Auditor General is agreed to and the audit recommendation will be implemented." On the other hand, ASU and NAU both provided long detailed responses for how they are going to fix their security audit. Relevant to other technical sections in our report, the 2018 and 2022 audits of recommendations made no reference to the total centralization of IT, moving operations to the cloud, hiring outside of the company to help advise, or concern about saving money.

As a follow up to that forty-eight-month report in 2023, we got the Arizona Secure IT Services (ASITS) initiative which was developed by Mr. Brummund and the former Vice President for Research. This unfortunately became quickly unpopular with academic departments and research units for specific reasons which we outline in section 2.2 and 3.5. Most were related to the costs and perceived loss of supervisory control over units. The IT centralization will provide the office of the CIO now with the ability to initiate all of the assets under its new umbrella through centralization. Centralization has been a goal of campus IT and administration for several years now.

In 2021 and 2022 it was identified in the President's incentivized compensation goals as something to be done. In 2023 or 2024, the IT centralization is now at risk and will result in a compensation deduction from the President's salary if it is not implemented by the end of this fiscal year. Those were some of the justifications around security and financial efficiency.

The statement on the website states, "As part of the University's financial action plan, UITS is centralizing information technology across the institution to create operational efficiencies, standardized processes and procedures, and mitigate cybersecurity risks." Some of the justifications related to financial or efficiency standards are shown in the slide. The table was presented in the 2020, 2021, and 2022 UITS annual reports. We do not have the 2023 annual report. On the bottom left of the slide titled "§3Centralization: Financial & Efficiency (§3.1)" shows numbers for IT staff FTE. If you look at the numbers on the left, they are smaller than our ABOR peers or other institutions. We are currently operating with a smaller IT staff, we have a smaller IT expenditure, and we have fewer IT staff per 1,000 students than many of our other peer institutions. According to UITS records, we are already more efficient than our peers, yet we are looking at a 5, 10, or 15 percent cut.

Campus IT managers run locations across the State of Arizona, we have a location in Shiprock, New Mexico. When we look across the state at these decentralized locations and we think about or partners on federal projects including the Department of Defense, and NASA, we have special requirements for IT which stand in the control of their mission directors. We start to run into problems around centralizing these groups. Draw your eyes to the orange colors on the map ("§3Centralization: Decentralized, Sovereign, Federal Products (§3.4).") The points are cooperative extension locations, the orange colors are tribal nations. Whenever we run a location on Tribal Nation, tribes have a travel jurisdiction or travel sovereignty over their land and they own the information and the data maintained on those servers in their land. By centralizing IT, there may be tribal law issues.

The migration to cloud services, specifically Amazon, offers University of Arizona the opportunity to modernize its infrastructure, achieve scalability, flexibility and access to today's technology services. I, myself, am a cloud native scientist. I do most of my work on the cloud. It is a good place for us to think about doing research. Nevertheless, this transition to the cloud comes with its own problems and specifically, we found out in the report that there is an issue called vendor lock. When you develop services on a specific provider,

you're relying on the provider and if they change their pricing, you can't leave. There are complexities to managing cloud-based services which need to be considered. These risks necessitate careful planning and the mitigating strategy to prevent dependency on a single provider and to ensure the cloud service will remain cost-effective for universities.

The University of Arizona has over \$400 million in sponsored research which relies on research computing clusters. The HPC provides the equivalent of about \$16.5 million per year in value relative to what it would cost. Elliot Cheu has helped procure money for the new HPC refresh which is greatly appreciated by everyone.

Regarding data storage, CyVerse has calculated that the UA's ten petabytes of data storage, maintained in the co-location space in UITS, would cost \$10 million per year [on commercial cloud]. The annual operating budget for the entire project and with all staff is approximately \$3.5 million per year. There is an enormous value in keeping things in our own cloud.

B.

Faculty Senate, I would encourage you all to engage with the office of the CIO and work towards developing new IT committees which can help with decision-making as the centralization process moves forward. We want to ensure the University is operating effectively and efficiently in the cloud, and we continue to keep that as a top priority. We also want to re-emphasize adoption of cloud computing commercial cloud runners is not a zero, summer, all-or-nothing decision. We want to be careful about managing our financial efficiency, sacrificing the capability of our units.

12. Reports from [President](#), [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](#)

13. **Adjournment [02:00:51]**

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

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

Motions of March 11, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2023/24-42] to approve the March 11, 2024 Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-43] to approve the January 29, 2024 and February 5, 2024 minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-44] to approve *Undergraduate Minor: Semiconductor Manufacturing*. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-nine in favor, three opposed, and one abstention.

[Motion 2023/24-45] to approve *Undergraduate Minor: Teaching Online By Design*. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty-nine in favor, three opposed, and one abstention.

[Motion 2023/24-46] to approve *Multiple Use of Course & Undergraduate Certificate Policy*

[Motion 2023/24-47] for the Constitution & Bylaws Committee to report back to the President Robbins to answer the following questions is the Arizona Board of Regents is a State or administrative agency for the purpose of the Arizona Procedural Review Act or the Arizona Administrative Procedures Act. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-six in favor, sixteen opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2023/24-48] for cloture of discussion. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 33 in favor, 11 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Item 2: Action Item Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Item 3: Approval of the minutes for the [January 29, 2024](#) and [February 5, 2024](#) Faculty Senate Meetings.
3. Page 2, Item 5: Consent Agenda – Chair of the Undergraduate Council, Holly Nelson
 - a. [Undergraduate Minor: Semiconductor Manufacturing](#)

- b. [Undergraduate Minor: Teaching Online By Design](#)
 - c. [Multiple Use of Course & Undergraduate Certificate Policy](#)
- 4. Page 5, Item 8: [Report from the President](#) – President Robert Robbins
- 5. Page 8, Old Business Item 10A: [Constitution and Bylaws revision](#) – Constitution and Bylaws Committee member, Senator Alex Braithwaite
- 6. Page 10, Old Business Item 10B: [Report](#) and [Presentation](#) from the General Faculty Financial Calibration Committee – Committee Chair, Gary Rhoades
- 7. Page 12, New Business Item 11A: [Report](#) and [Presentation](#) from the *ad hoc* Committee on Information Technology – Committee Chair Tyson Swetnam
- 8. Page 14, Item 12: Reports
 - a. [President](#)
 - b. [SAPC](#)
 - c. [Graduate Council](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456