

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 9, 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=b0217b0b-bbc5-4cc1-ae2e-b1e7000811a4>

Present: Senators Baker, Barefoot, Bernick, Braitberg, Brochin, Cochran, Coletta, Cooper, Cornelison, Domin, Downing, Eckert, Figler, Fink, D. Garcia, Giacobazzi, Gregory, Grijalva, Guzman, S. Harris, W. Harris, Hingle, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair) Joseph, Knox, Leafgren, Little, Marx, Medevoi, Meyer, Neumann, O’Leary, Palacios, Paschke-Wood, Pau, Rankin, Rafelski, Rishel, Rocha, Rogers, Russell, Schultz, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, M. Smith, Stegeman (Parliamentarian), Stephan, Torres, Waddell, Werchan, Williams, Willis Jr., M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders (Secretary), Ziurys.

Absent: Senators Braithwaite, Buxner, Cheu, Cui, Diaz, F. Garcia, Goetz, Hall, Nelson, Robbins, Spece, Su, Tafolla, Thomas, Roche.

1. CALL TO ORDER [00:03:26]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, introduced herself as the presiding officer and called the September 9, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

- Vice Chair Hymel explained that time limits will be strictly enforced due to a loaded agenda and went over how the meeting will be run.
 - Time has been split so that half of the time is for business, and the other half is for discussion.
 - There will be no motions to vote on during this meeting which may help with remaining within the timeframe.
 - Individuals must be recognized by the Chair before speaking.
 - If an individual believes a parliamentary rule has been violated, they should raise their hand and raise a point of order. At this point, a correction will be made.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated this is the first Faculty Senate meeting of the year, she is grateful for everyone’s presence and welcomed new senators.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL](#) [00:06:04]

Vice Chair Hymel stated agendas are put together in the Senate Executive Committee meetings.

- The report from Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, John Arnold and Vice President of Finance and Chief Budget Officer, Garth Perry have been moved to the end of the agenda.

Senator Fink moved [**Motion 2024/25-1**] to approve the September 9, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE [APRIL 1 & MAY 6, 2024 FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS](#) [00:07:22]

Vice Chair Hymel introduced Secretary Zeiders.

- Chair Hymel moved [**Motion 2024/25-2**] to approve the April 1, 2024, and May 6, 2024, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION. SENATOR LUCY ZIURYS, UASC PRESIDENT MELANIE MADDEN, SENATOR JOELLEN RUSSELL, & PETER STRITTMATTER [00:08:23]

UASC President Melanie Madden [00:10:01]

As chair of the University of Arizona Staff Council, I would like to share some of our accomplishments from the past academic year:

In February we hosted a Staff forum with Senior Leadership which 300 people attended in-person and another 1,700 watched online. We launched a staff newsletter that sees an average of 4,400 readers per month. In May we hosted

over 500 participants for 81 professional & personal development sessions at the annual Crossroads Conference for staff. We served on the Provost and Presidential search committees. We doubled our roster of representatives

This year, our ongoing initiatives and goals include:

Issuing a workplace climate survey which was emailed to all staff last month and will close on September 30
Continuing to advocate for professional development opportunities and defined career pathways for staff. Broadening access for staff to participate in university service opportunities. Elevating the profile of our shared governance bodies who are uniquely suited to help our administration respond to challenges and plan for future success.

Our Staff Council officers and representatives look forward to partnering with the Faculty Senate this year to create a university where we are all proud to work. You can help us by encouraging the staff in your colleges to complete our Workplace Climate Survey, sent on August 27, before it closes at the end of this month.

Thank you.

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:11:41]

I'm here to comment on the new University vogue of centralization. Recently, College of Science administrators have been proposing to centralize all business operations within the college, from all different departments, for the sake of streamlining, efficiency, cost saving, and so forth.

They are starting to move all the departments budgets to a central source and to begin hiring for "key leadership positions." In other words, they're hiring more administrators for this centralization. This is hardly making things more streamlined, efficient, and saving money.

The details of the centralization plan in the College of Science aren't formulated yet. They will be formulated through three working groups, "who spend three to five hours per week in the first eight to ten weeks, interviewing and information gathering." In other words, they are instituting a plan for centralization, without a plan. Doesn't seem to make good administrative practice.

Regarding the staff in the business departments, in the College of Science, I have known them for many years, particularly in the Steward Observatory and other departments. I have found them to be dedicated, hardworking, efficient, and successful. Now they are effectively being told they are not doing their jobs, and their initiative and knowledge is being replaced by a working group who presumably knows better. How humiliating and demoralizing it must be for the staff. It seems to me as if the College of Science is being reduced to the Soviet Style, Collective Farms.

I call for the end of these poorly formulated, highly damaging, costly, and morale crushing initiatives. Can we please, for once, in the words of Thomas Payne, have some common sense here at the University. Thank you.

Senator Joellen Russell [00:14:02]

It's a delight to see all my colleagues again. Hope you had a happy summer, and you know the pink thing is awesome, I am really thrilled, clearly it is a thing. I am Joellen Russell, and I am a Distinguished Professor in Geosciences, joined in Hydrology and Atmospheric Sciences, Planetary Sciences, and Applied Math. I want to talk to you again about our supercomputer.

The RFP was closed last Spring, and we were told that the money had been identified and it would be reopening shortly. I am going to quote from when I talked last time, "what this means is the end of support for a shared high performance computing storage is September 2024, and the end of the support for our shared supercomputer hardware is April 2025." It is September 2024. While it's true that we are limping along, it is like using a 2012 iPhone. This is not what we want to be doing as a university, an incredible fraction of our incredible research dollars is generated by people who have accounts that they use regularly on our high-performance computing center.

So, I'm not saying all the money goes to high performance computing. I'm saying all of the PIs on the supercomputer with accounts there, that they use all the time, \$504 million dollars are attributed to these PIs only. It's a huge amount of us of our productivity, and we still don't have a supercomputer. I'm told again and reassured, that we will be reopening the RFP, but tick, tock, tick, tock. I'm very concerned, and I'll just remind you researchers with current money to purchase additional high-performance capacity cannot do so. There are at least twenty-five of them. I just got a \$9.5 million grant last week that has money in it, almost more than a half a million to put into our supercomputer, but I can't do it because we don't have an RFP.

Regents' Professor Peter Strittmatter [00:16:47]

During my nearly 53 years at UA, it's been great to see it develop into one R1, AAU institution by emphasizing academic excellence, both teaching and research, so that it is now capable of attracting excellent students, faculty and staff, from around the globe. Hopefully, this will continue. Unfortunately, that emphasis now seems to be faltering, an

opinion shared by several of my Regents Professor colleagues. Their concerns of both administrative bloat and the perception that academic decisions are increasingly by nonacademic. Clearly, things are coupled. Both need to be corrected swiftly.

In recent years student enrollment has increased substantially. The number of tenure-track faculty, the motors for academic excellence, has declined, while the number of high-level administrators, usually with high salaries have increased dramatically. This is a lose-lose combination for sustaining academic excellence. Reducing the administrative boat, and reinstating a system whereby faculty with proven records in both academics and administration take on leadership roles in the university, could help enhance the UA's academic programs, improve overall faculty, staff, and student morale, and potentially reduce student tuition costs. It could also help control centrally imposed mandates such as the campus-wide centralization of HR and IT functions without any clear demonstration of benefit to the UA's calls for missions.

I hope the UA's faculty will work closely with incoming President Garimella and with Provost Marx to address these things. Thank you for listening.

5. **STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [00:19:24]**

Thank you all. Welcome back! It's great to see you all here for another season of Faculty Senate. Mona and I, of course, are returning to our second term as Chair and Vice Chair of the Faculty, respectively and we are thrilled to be joined by Katie Zeiders in the absolutely central role of Secretary, that in and of itself is going to add a great deal to our leadership team.

So, as we come into, for us, is our second term in these roles of faculty governance, let me tell you that I hope to turn the corner. I know you've heard me say this before, and I'm always cautiously optimistic, or, as Marlys Witte says, "cautiously pessimistic." I hope to turn the corner from what we spent most of the last two years doing, agitating against incompetence and mismanagement, and getting some tangible results on the ground. But I hope to turn now, into the primary role of rebuilding trust, rebuilding relations with the President, the President's office, the Provost office, and perhaps even our Board of Regents.

So let me first welcome President Designate Garimella. He has already proved himself to be a champion by doing the nearly impossible, or what we all thought was impossible, and persuading Interim Provost Marx to come back. Something which we had all resigned ourselves to never seeing again. But in doing that, we now have a good faculty-based leadership team in administration. In my brief interactions with the President Designate, I was quite convinced that he understands research, having been the Vice President for Research at Purdue. He understands students, having been the President of the University of Vermont during a time of turmoil there, as here. He understands the centrality of the Faculty And I think he understands where the buck stops. He cannot get here a minute too soon.

There's a lot of work that needs to be done, and I'm grateful to our four previous speakers for highlighting some of those aspects. I can tell you already, we in elected faculty governance leadership are working more smoothly than we ever have with the Provost's office, on things like Undergraduate Research the Gen-ed Committee, possible co-sponsorship of programs into the future in a way that I think will make us less turbulent and less fictitious and adversary, than we have been in the past. Now, that's not to say that there aren't still serious issues. The budget process requires scrutiny, verification, from every corner of the University, and we need to understand what it means to have a Chief Operating Officer and to whom that Chief Operating Officer is accountable. The situation in IT centralization, which Joellen presented, is intolerable. There needs to be faculty at the table, at the top levels of IT. The business office centralization that is setting the College of Science is unsustainable. We need an army of professional support staff, supporting an army of faculty, more and more of whom are tenured or tenured-track to support our evermore diverse and potential-filled students' classes.

One of the key issues I want to focus on this year is Campus Climate. We're coming into a contentious election year, and so many of us are outraged, traumatized, and hurt by what happened on October 7th, what has happened in the 76 years before October 7th, and what has happened in the eleven months since October 7th. We, as a University, have not only the right, but the obligation to talk, and talk, and talk some more on topics that may make us uncomfortable, that might be difficult to cross divide about, but we will always talk with civility and compassion to each other. There is no alternative but to talk.

With that in mind, we will try in elected faculty to set up more venues, more opportunities, for more voices to be heard. We've talked about having an Executive Session of the Senate to talk about our own agendas, since we're not obligated by open meeting law to talk about our Senate objectives in a more intimate setting. We are talking about having monthly open forums, much like the General Faculty Assembly that we had last spring. We will exercise academic freedom in our classrooms. We will exercise our first amendment rights of speech, assembly, association, and conscience on campus, while respecting the rules and we will continue to work with the Administration, to open those channels of communication to minimize opportunities for friction, misunderstanding, and God forbid, violence.

Faculty Governance is working on things like policy reform and grievance pathways to make sure that when the inevitable frictions do arise, we have rational, institutional, means of solving disagreements and we don't need to resort to name-calling, silencing, or chilling of speech.

Let me end with something that I know you all agree with, but let me say it again, and again, and again. We the faculty, as part of the campus community, we reject all forms of hate, all forms of hatred, harassment, and intimidation, and we will fight against them. In this time, let me say that we, specifically, reject Antisemitism and we specifically reject Islamophobia anti-Arab or anti-Palestinian sentiments, and I think we speak for the entire community in that. If there continues to be a need, I will bring a motion in October, that I'm sure we will pass with unanimity, to reinforce that important point onward. Thank you.

6. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST [00:27:12]**

I looked so forward this fall semester and then I got a text message from Jenny Lee, the Vice President for Arizona International and Dean of International Education and it said, "have you looked at your email in the last ten minutes?" Then I saw the resignation of Provost Glover. I took a rest for six weeks then President Garimella called me up and asked if I would do this again and I said "no, I wouldn't," and by the end of several conversations, he had twisted my arm.

So, let me just tell you how this is going to work. I am yet again the Interim Provost, and I am glad to be here. As long as I am Provost, I plan to attend these Senate meetings, beginning to end. That is a commitment I've made to Professor Hudson at the end of August, when we met. I will do that. I think that this forum is a very, very important forum for the University, so you can expect me to be here.

My deal with incoming the incoming President, is that he mounts a search for a Provost. This sounds familiar, all over again. He will begin a search for Provost beginning when he arrives in October, so he has told me, and I hope he does that. I will stay in this office until the new Provost is found and is on our campus. The goal is to have that happen during the academic year, not at the end of the academic year. Just to let you know, that is the timeline.

Dr. Hudson, thank you for those comments, I agree with everything you said, and it is great to have critical friends. It is better to have critics in the house rather than critics outside the house, so I welcome the criticism of the Central Administration and to work with you as I did last year, to try to do what I can to move us forward.

I met with the leadership of the Heads-Up group earlier today, and I asked if they could more systematically, rather than catching me in a hallway somewhere in the Student Union with their complaints about IT and HR Centralization, to please be a little more systematic about that. To prepare a document for me, so I have a coherent sense of what the issues are before I can take those to my colleagues and central administration. I need to be coherent about what I believe to be the issues. I also asked the Deans to do the same thing when I met with them last week. I dare say if you are organizing something like this in the Senate, that would be another voice I think would be good for us to take forward.

There is some urgency to some of these things because there is some sense that I won't be around here in you know, five to six months, I will step back into my role as Professor. So, if you want me as your champion, that's probably unwise, but if you do, I'm happy to help on those issues.

Last year, we had some issues in our Student Affairs area of campus, and I want to let you know that we have now bifurcated what had been the Dean of Students and the Vice President for Campus Life. That was an unmanageable portfolio of work, and this was done by Provost Glover, in the six weeks that I was sitting by my pool. Amanda Kraus has been named the Interim Vice President for Student Affairs. I've asked Amanda to create a group that includes faculty administrators, students, and to do some planning on how to reconstitute what used to be the Vice President or Senior Vice President. We are not going to go in the direction that we were in seven or eight years ago, but I want to be organized and systematic about how we move forward for that. So that is underway, and I have insisted that a Senator be on that group. She has been named a Senator.

Chrissy Lieberman, who has ably stepped into the role of Interim Dean of Students, has agreed to continue that work. I agree that we're going to have a fractious fall. It's always when we have President elections, on top of world affairs. I think that will be an important set of activities that we're going to be doing in the Fall. I thank you for the kind of program, Dr. Hudson, that you were talking about.

In the Provost for Faculty Affairs Office, we are planning on some sessions on Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech. I recommend to you Cass Sunstein's article in this morning's New York Times, very interesting piece on free expression on campuses. I also should say that my office has already received requests from members of our community, and affiliated members of the community to suppress certain kinds of activities. We're not going to do that. Free expression will be honored here, in the same vein that Dr. Hudson was discussing earlier.

I look forward to a productive Fall, I look forward to a productive Senate. I have a few minutes if there are any questions of me.

Questions [00:33:13]

- Senator Bailey stated the position of the Senior Vice President for Campus Life was mentioned, and it was said that the reorganization is not intended to go back to where it was seven or eight years ago. Senator Bailey asked Interim Provost Marx to give more background on the change, what is currently happening, and the preferred form of the office moving forward as it sounds interim currently.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated to remember that individuals must be recognized to speak.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated the last incarnation of the office included a lot of academic programming, for example, UA South and AZ Online reported that.
 - No academic work will be brought into the new Student affairs portfolio. There will be three important auxiliaries which include residences, student health, and the campus recreation centers. Those three enterprises are close to \$100 million of expenditures, and this has to be done very well.
 - The Recreation Center, and in particular, residences, are a revenue source for the University and this will be focused on.
 - The non-curricular student experience from when students enter the University, until when they graduate, will also be more focused on.
 - There will be instances where things will be bumped up like gen-ed, curricular affairs, instructions, and more. They won't have authority in those areas, only in student experience.
- Chair Hudson asked for a brief summary on developments over the Summer with UAGC such as those in integration, which Senators need to know about.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated, regarding the question about integration, he has had two or three conversations with President Garimella, and he suspects that his approach will be different than President Robbins.
 - Until President Garimella is at the UA, there is a real opportunity for in-depth discussion. He would not like to not get into the weeds on this, however, there is a plan for integration which would include academic review of programs in the colleges, deciding which ones are appropriate, and so on.
 - There is some discussion about whether UAGC faculty should be brought over as UA faculty. Those discussions are being conducted. He has told Gary Packard and his colleagues that he can have those conversations, but nothing will be done until there is more certainty, which it is believed that everyone knows that.
 - There is uncertainty with the U.S. Department of Education, and which is a "wildcard" in this. The UA is moving forward with integration, using the E-Wire report as a basis for that.
 - Until President Garimella is on the ground and certain about where he wants to go, and as he has mentioned to Gary, plumbing can be worked on but work on the house won't be finished.
- Senator Russell asked if the UA is waiting for President Garimella to get the principal strategy and impacts of the current ongoing budget cut challenges. She keeps reading the reports, with a lot of numbers, but she would like to know the principles including how things are being done, and the strategy that is being followed to ensure success, and proper metrics for impact.
- Senator Russell stated there are many faculty meetings being faced across campus and it is hard to know what should be discussed and whether there must be a wait until President Garimella arrives.
- Senator Russell stated there is certainly no budget model for FY26 moving forward yet, which she has ideas for. She was a champion of activity-based budgeting, and she would hope that in the next budget model, there is a component of activity since this is important to direct funds to where major expenditures are.

Vice Chair Hymel stated the last item of business will include a report from Senior Vice President and Chief Operating Officer, John Arnold and Vice President of Finance and Chief Budget Officer, Garth Perry which might help in addressing concerns.

7. INFORMATION ITEM: PREVIEW OF POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA (TO BE VOTED ON A FUTURE MEETING) – INTERIM CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL TBA. [REVIEW OF THE UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN INSIGHTS INTO HEALTHY AGING](#) [00:38:17]

Vice Chair Hymel stated this is a preview of a possible future agenda item which is a program still on the works and it is on the agenda in response to Senators' requests to see things earlier.

8. NEW BUSINESS [00:39:13]

A. [Student Affairs Policy Committee \(SAPC\) Update](#) – SAPC Co-chairs Kristin Little and Tim Ottusch [00:39:19]

Co-chair Tim Ottusch [00:39:21]

We would like to do a check-in regarding what we have been doing in the Student Affairs Policy Committee in the last couple of years. When we took on the Co-chair roles in Spring 2024, we thought about what we wanted to focus on this year.

We realized that the committee had a lot of guest speakers from various entities on campus such as Campus Health, and Parking & Transportation. We learned a lot, particularly things that aren't obvious, especially from a faculty lens, which might come in in on a listserv, but we aren't seeing it. An example is Night Cat who offers free Lyft tickets to grocery stores from campus, these are available to faculty and staff too. We wanted to figure out a way to consolidate all that stuff and understand where there were gaps which may be bridged in the Faculty Senate. Like a lot of things, when you start digging into what is the best way to organize it, we realize there are a lot of things already organized. A lot of this comes from the Student Success and Retention individuals who are amazing.

We wanted to share a couple of resources with you which applied to all students whether graduate, first-semester students, etc. Today, I will be talking about the Student Success and Retention Resources page and Kristen will take over and talk about the Student Stress Cycle and Bear Down Rundown. I should say that I serve on the Basic Needs Coalition too and we are working right now to update the Basic Needs website which should be up and running later this Fall. We're also working on a Faculty toolkit, and we will make sure that SAPC puts that in our report and that gets shared. I will also share the slide deck from today, with the Faculty Center to distribute.

Student Success and Retention Innovation has a lot of great resources on the "Instructor Resources," page. One of the pages I would like to share is the "SOS page," which I shared with my freshman-heavy class this week because I get a lot of questions from them on how to do the logistical things that we often don't think about since we've been here for a while. They have it where you can text, email, call, and chat with Support Outreach Success. They don't have Snapchat yet, but I am sure they will work on that. They are available for any type of question you have. I had several questions, which I am sure you all get from students, and you don't always know the answer.

Also on the SOS page, they created a searchable resource list which is really amazing. For example, if you were working with a student and you are trying to find cultural centers or something of that sort, it shows that you can click on a link for "cultural center." You can type in anything from food whether that be campus dining question or security question. We really wanted to share this as it is impossible to know where everything is available. If you are working with students, hopefully you know this exists. Links and slide decks will be shared and there is a QR code available for use.

Co-chair Kristin Little [00:44:11]

I am so happy to have this opportunity, Tim and I both, to speak with you all and share what we've learned over the last year of working on the Student Advisory Policy Committee. Several of these resources, I had never heard about, and I mostly teach Freshman composition. There are a lot of freshman and sophomores in my classes who have a lot of issues going on.

I wanted to point out the Student Stress Cycle actually more for faculty and it gives us guidelines for what students might be going through or experiencing every month of the semester, which I thought was really helpful. As I looked, especially at August and September, and again, working with freshmen mostly, many of these resonated with me and issues that I hear about my students whether it's financial concerns, basic needs concerns, and transitioning to college life. All of these details are entails.

Coming up in October, I was looking ahead and I thought, wow students are starting to feel the pressure with the classes, time management issue, and the FAFSA filing date happens in October. That is a financial stress for students, and I think this is a good resource for us as faculty members to look at this and consider some of these students might be experiencing some of these issues.

Bear Down Rundown is a weekly email that is sent to people who sign up for it. One of the committee members told us about and I immediately signed up and started receiving these emails that are really informative, mostly for students, but also for me. It gives announcements directing students to resources like the Think Tank. They have an events calendar that gives months of events upcoming, anything from clubs to sporting events. They also give a service and resource section. Directing students to CAPS is important if they need counseling help. At the end of every email, they email a future Wildcat. This is where a student gives their profile and picture. The weekly email is very student focused. As a faculty member who works primarily with freshmen, I found it helpful to glance at it and see what's coming up for them.

Questions [00:48:06]

Senator Bernick stated he is the President of GPSC, and he is excited to be here. He wanted to supplement the great presentation about student support services. GPSC is a main area of support for graduate students as they are notoriously bad at receiving and looking at their emails or other things, because they are busy and stressed.

- In the capacity as faculty, it is also important to direct graduate students to the GPSC website where there are

over \$800,000 worth of grants given each year. These range from grants for basic needs to travel to research funding. GPSC is a great support system for graduate students which doesn't look like the NSF or other institutional grant givers in the country.

- The council is also working on a bunch of issues like raising the wage, getting contracts standardized, and the biggest and most frustrating issue which is healthcare. Graduate students are routinely trying to get better health insurance and coverage which will be one of the things that will improve stress the most for graduate communities and there are efforts with ABOR this year.

B. Information Item about [Faculty and Staff Workload Group](#) – Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders [00:49:31]

Faculty Workload Comments

- Thank you for the opportunity to speak about Faculty Workload. In an email to Faculty last week, I described a Workload Working Group that was assembled by CFO John Arnold and CBO Garth Perry in February. I wanted to take some time today to talk a bit more about faculty workload issues at the UofA-what we know about the committee and some data that help us contextualize workload. Here is what we know about the committee: it has 9 members: 8 of whom are finance officers (various rankings) and 1 database developer. There are no faculty. The charge of the the committee is to create a set workload standard for both faculty and staff; create consistency in workload and improve equity of work within a unit and across the university. The Chair of Faculty (Leila Hudson) and I reached out to John Arnold in July asking that data and information be shared with shared governance leaders. This did happen. The committee members met with administrators from almost every college. In most cases, they met with academic affairs deans. They collected information about: Typical workload of faculty across each college including teaching loads; Assessed how workload is tracked and managed, asked about standards for teaching research and service;
- Committee members are currently working on a draft of the summary of findings.
- Stated simply: workload is directly linked to the quality of the education, research, and extension support we deliver across the state. And because we have weathered a storm of financial mismanagement and we enter a new academic year, we find ourselves in a very tough spot.
- Let me share a bit of data with you :
 - We are down 110 faculty this year. In Fall 2023 we had 3,423 faculty; our current number is 3,313. One of the first years ever we've done this. We are up 1780 more students this year.
 - We've increased students by 3.4% and decreased faculty by 3.2%. And then comparing across years (since 2020), we've increased student enrollment by 17% and only increased faculty by 5%.
 - But how do we compare to other institutions on faculty? Do we have more, or less? We can look at this with IPEDS data (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System), which is used to track student demographics across the country. This is publicly available data. Most recent data we have is 2022. And what you'll see here is the student to faculty ratio for the University of Arizona and for our peer institutions as designated by ABOR (see website) As you can see our student to faculty ratio is 18.7, so in 2022 for every 19 students there is one faculty. And you can see from the list that most of our peers, with the exception of 3, are well below this level. Our peer median is 11.2 and peer mean is 13.0. So compared to most of our peers, we are understaffed in terms of faculty.
 - One more data bit from across the UA within John Arnold's Budget document sent to us last week:
 - We lost 636 employees across the university from January 2023 to June 2024; but in the previous year, we added 227 employees.
 - Alongside quantitative data, I want to talk briefly about qualitative data that speaks to workload challenges playing out in real time. Last week I sent out a survey to faculty asking about changes to workload demands. It is still not too late to fill this out (so please do so), but I wanted to review some of the preliminary findings which are based on direct interviews and surveys. And important to note that about 80% of responses were from CT faculty.

Teaching:

- Many faculty report significant increases in class size (in some instances, course enrollments have DOUBLED - in one class it went from 200 to 400 students)
- Elimination or significant reduction of graduate and undergraduate TA support
- Shifting administrative service (including positions like program chairs or directors of programs) into the category of teaching with the elimination of course releases and stipends
- In some instances we've heard of the elimination of Graduate Director positions entirely

- Stalled hiring due to HR centralization - we are hearing about long drawn out processes
- FTE reductions over all - so that faculty have voluntarily redacted their overall FTE so that them self or others were not laid off
- And most importantly, with the increased course sizes, increased responsibilities, decreased grad student support, and decreased time, faculty across campus are reporting a loss of connections with students

[The changes to our institution are not just being felt in the realm of teaching and learning, however—we are hearing about changes to research and service.

Research:

- We have fewer folks in pre- and post-award services so long wait times on submitting grants and processing things like contracts; Hiring of research personal now taking 3 times the amount of time; Professional development and travel funds in departments eliminate; Reduced funding for graduate students, reduced graduate cohorts - which has real impact on our research

Service:

- To make room for more teaching, directors are eliminating service of faculty; Certain service isn't being counted; Elimination of service as a category in Faculty Portfolio (formally UA Vitae)
- While quite preliminary, these data, both quantitative and qualitative, suggests a few things about our ongoing financial challenges and administrative turnover. Loss of critical staff and faculty across our university. We have lost more than 600 employees in the past year alone. While our leaders may say this hasn't impacted the academic mission, that simply is not true. The pains of these changes are being carried by our most vulnerable and lowest paid faculty, the non-tenured and contingent faculty. Many CT faculty are subject to very tough working conditions. I believe the reduction of faculty represents the greatest threat to our academic mission and our reputation as an AAU R1 institution. The shrinking of the faculty is out of step with increased enrollment and, importantly, our ABOR designated peer institutions.
- I'd like to see the following things happen as we move forward: Administration work with shared governance leaders and representatives in anything related to faculty workload. That we work collaboratively to articulate the different ways that faculty serve the institution. So instead of workload evaluation process that generates criticism and critique of faculty, we focus on addressing workload in a more meaningful way— by refocusing the discussion on how workload demands relate to the *quality* of instruction in line with our land grant mission of excellence. Finally, that the workload discussion center around *equity and creating policy* that eliminates exploitive practices, especially for our CT faculty.

Questions [00:59:07]

- Senator Simmons stated his thanks for the presentation and data. He asked what “workload” means in regard to teaching specifically such as how that might be counted, how many courses per percentage, as there can be great variations seen between colleges. This is a great place to start and more understanding and can be great to understand more inequalities.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated the committee has covered some of those inconsistencies.
- Chair of the University of Arizona Staff Council, Melanie Madden asked if there can be more discussion on the motivation behind the working group which was established by John Arnold. She asked if Secretary Zeiders knows where this came from and whether it was a Regent's directive or if it is from him.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she does not know this information and only knows this was instigated and compiled by John Arnold but she can ask.
- Senator Rafelski stated it is important to look at the comparison with the group another time. As far as he was able to see, by model distribution and falling into a middle point, there are a couple of places where he is wondering if there is a difference such as at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Texas A&M University who seem to be in a different ball game. There are massive online classes and he wonders if these strangely large numbers are related to these universities offering those to a number of students. Other students are definitely more comparative to the UA who is at the tail end of distribution, seeing drops. He asked if Secretary Zeiders ever looked into the numbers.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she hasn't, and these numbers were found with the helps of individuals within the data teams. The specifics have not been dug into but this is the student head count by faculty head count. She asked if Senator Rafelski is saying that this may not be comparable as some students are online.
 - Senator Rafelski stated yes.

- Senator Schultz stated his thanks for the presentation and stated the data looks like headcount and he would be curious to see FTE data as it would be interesting to analyze the information and potentially see a different story. In the College of Fine Arts, there have been a lot of questions about TA's and thresholds for graders or TA support. He would like to see benchmarking and data for that across the University to understand. There is wide variation in how faculty members receive support for grading and he would love to see this dived into as it is a huge issue with faculty workload.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she would also like to stress that faculty workload is about faculty and also administration, knowing a Director and Deans have clear policies and everyone can be supported.
- Senator Ziurys asked if there would be a workload study for administrators.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated not that she is aware of.
 - Senator Ziurys stated this is something the faculty should institute as well as workload to salary ratio.

C. [Credit for University Service](#) – Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero, Vice Chair of the Faculty, Mona Hymel [01:04:09]

Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero [01:04:03]

Hi, everybody, Andrea Romero, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. I am happy to give a very brief overview about what we've been doing looking at faculty workload. We've been looking into faculty workload for a few years now. There are several reports that I will mention, and the PowerPoint will have links that go directly to each report pulled over the years, this will be attached to the agenda.

There are a few categories for faculty workload that need to be considered when we look at things like annual review and promotion, those include teaching, research, scholarship, and creative activity which are within one category. Another category is service. Separately, there is a category for clinical service, another for administrative service, work and extension, and one for other activities. Other activities is primarily used for faculty who are on continuing-status track who more of a job description that details what their job expectations are.

The faculty workload distribution is given in percentages and should add up to 100, not matter the FTE. Faculty workload distribution is used to guide the annual reviews, and for promotion and tenure evaluation. This year, there is a workload distribution tool in UAccess which will automatically go into the faculty portfolio. This will be used in annual review. For the individuals who have gone through promotion and tenure, it should be known that Section 2 provides workload distribution over multiple years. This information is first accessed when reviewers look at it.

Several reports have been done over the years. One started in 2021, and all of this information has been linked on the website since it was put out. A lot of the results were shared with the Faculty Senate over time or with quarterly leadership team meetings and in a variety of settings. In 2021, there was a preliminary examination into faculty workload. A few of the key findings were that there was a total number of faculty increased over a ten-year period by 23%. FTE only increased by 14%. This is to Dean Schultz's point in asking for not only the head count of Faculty but also what the FTE increase is. More people are getting hired but it is not proportionate to FTE. There are more people, usually more adjuncts or career-track who are less than 1.0 FTE. During that time, student enrollment increased steadily, and so did student credit hours. The proportion of faculty head count and faculty FTE were not proportionate to the amount of student enrollment and student credit hours.

The 2021 data also showed multi-year contract and career-track faculty were teaching the highest rates of student credit hours. There were some questions about this, but it was found there was equal distribution in terms of student credit hours between tenure-track and career-track faculty. The multi-year career-track faculty were teaching extraordinary amounts of student credit hours. In 202, through 2024, new Heads and Directors have been trained to use equity-minded workloads and transparent processes for determining faculty workload and making decisions about this during annual review. Work is primarily used by O'Meara, et al. for equity-minded faculty workload. This is a fantastic resource funded by federal sources.

In July 2022, there was a workload distribution tool instituted. This data is kept track of at an institutional level which has never been done before. The UA is at the forefront of their peer institutions in doing this. Faculty can access their information directly through UAccess which is put in annually by the Department Head and Business Officers.

In Fall 2023, there was a faculty workload based on the distribution tool and UAccess. This is useful and it is broken down by tracks and colleges. There are different workloads by faculty tracks and colleges. I recommend that you also look at the report. There has been work done with the Associate Deans to come up with a workload

guidance at the college level. There are drafts of this from most of the colleges, and a formal approval process is now being looked into. I appreciate the comment about shared governance, we will be looking at that to make sure those get online.

I also encourage the departments to do it but we want to make sure we have it at the college level again based on the O'Meara, et al. work to ensure there is equality and transparency to how those are determined. There is no way for this to be created at the university level because there is so much variation to how those courses are taught and the format of courses across all the different colleges. At the university level, it is not easy to say that 40% of teaching equals a certain number of classes. There is more ability to do that at the college level and at the department level. If you look at the faculty workload, some of the key findings are that for each of the different tracks and different workloads. For tenure track faculty, on average, 46% of their workload is devoted to research, creative activity, and scholarship, 35% of their workload is devoted to teaching, 17% to service, and 2% to administrative work.

Career-track faculty varies by the type of series they are in. There are professors of practice, there are lecture series, clinical professors, and research professors. The Lecturers are teaching the highest percentage at 83%, Professors of Practice have 68% of their workload as teaching, and instructors are at 69% teaching. Continuing-track faculty are not very engaged in teaching, 62% of their workload is devoted to other professional activities, and 23% to research does vary by college and track.

There are very broad workload definitions provided at the university level which are on the website and on different reports. There is more detail provided in the university dossier. Templates are provided for promotion where you can see a bit more of a breakdown in the CV and teaching portfolio for the kinds of things we are looking for consistently at the teaching level. The workload distributions will vary by career-track. Tenure-track, continuing-track, and career-track colleges and departments provide more workload guidance by track which we see in the annual review and in the Promotion Review criteria. It is at the college and department level where more detail is needed.

There were a few questions regarding service that came forward, in terms of all tracks, they consider service at the local level, college level, and university level. Everyone's work in Faculty Senate is absolutely counted as part of University service and should be included in everyone's CV. It also counts for annual review evaluation and promotion evaluations.

It is a bit different for those who are on the tenured-track and continuing-track because national and international expertise and participation is looked at. This is different for career-track individuals who can be engaged in this but are not necessarily expected to do so in the annual review and promotion review criteria.

I want to remind you, in terms of service and tenure review, there is a section 7 for leadership, extension, service or innovation. This is optional but does provide an opportunity for faculty to provide a portfolio of work achievements they have done in these areas of service, extension, and innovation. There are opportunities to document that and have it considered to be a part of their annual review or promotion review.

Questions [01:45:47]

- Senator Zeiders asked what the role of John Arnold's group is in faculty workload.
 - Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero stated the group has not been asked to be involved in John Arnold's working group. Once she heard about it, she reached out to the Chair who she shared all the background and resources with to ensure he is aware of the studies and data. She is unsure what he has done with it and she hasn't heard from him since. She is happy to work with CFO Arnold and his team
- Senator Russell stated she is thrilled to see evaluation of these things and loves that evaluation, and promotion is done at the unit level with people you know, love you, and are pulling the load when you're not, meaning there is skin in the game in each of our units. She is a Department Head now, but she taught 900 students last year and brought in over \$1 million in research. At that time, what really mattered at the time to my department is that she covered the 900 students because there were junior people who had big grants and needed to do things.
- Senator Russel stated when she looked at workload analysis like this, she is not seeing both the excellence part, like if the Fine Art's program, where someone goes to the Met and must take time off because they got to sing in the opera which she thinks is awesome. This might not look very good if their master class only had five kids because they were lost to a great production.
- Senator Russell stated with the way Vice Provost Romero's department looks at the workload at the unit level,

the way there is coverage for programs, and pushing hard to grow and be responsive, Secretary Zeiders's numbers show the hard work but not the excellence part in faculty workload. An example of this is how students were followed, service, and how other people were lifted because individuals are shoulders for other's burdens when needed. Overtime, there may be big research years, big teaching years, but this needs to be evaluated within each unit and she loves this and sees how this is working with faculty affairs. Senator Russell stated she does not understand this other workload analysis which doesn't include all of the richness of the rest of the data.

- Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero stated her and her team are happy to help the other committee.
- Senator Russell stated the question is why the wheel is being reinvented as they know who the experts are.
- Senator Ziurys stated she doesn't bring this up as a facetious comment but there is administrative bloat and too many people with high salaries. The Senate needs to take this up because it is important to look at whether the high paying jobs are necessary and what the workload is. She is unsure as to why this was not done earlier and why faculty are always under scrutiny. The faculty work hard, and it can be shown even when faculty numbers are down and student number are up. More and more administrators continue to be hired.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is no more time left for the item. There is an individual filling in for our usual tech person who is trying his best to help with the timer and such.
 - Senator R. Witte moved **[Motion 2024/25-3]** to extend New Business Item D by two minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.
- Senator Downing stated he knows from the Faculty Workload Committee at other universities such as Michigan and California, that faculty governance plays an active role in setting the faculty workload. This committee has no faculty representation and there is a question on if the committee is looking at the issue of ways to improve shared governance in the assignments of workload.
 - Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero stated individual faculty workload is set by the Department Head in conversation with the faculty. Anything that the CFO's workgroup is doing, she is not certain of how that will all work. There is work being done with Associate Deans to provide workload guidance which would be general, focusing on what the distributions represent within each college. A review or connection will be set up with shared governance, but these are just general guidance tools.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there will be continued work with Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero and her office, especially on all of the questions that have come up about faculty.

D. [**Faculty Rights and Resources – Chair of APPC, Keith Maggert \[01:22:00\]**](#)

My name is Keth Maggert, and I am Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee. A while ago, our committee was asked to assemble a guidebook that includes a layout of faculty rights and resources. I am happy to say that is now live and is about 24 pages long. From the table of contents, it can be seen that it is designed to be given to new faculty, but also to act as a resource for established faculty.

We cover university offices, the purview of those offices, and contacts at each of those office should faculty wish to know what OIE does, what HR does, faculty, etc. We also include a discussion of our guiding principles, including State laws, and ABOR and UA policy, and most importantly, academic freedom. This document is available on the faculty governance webpage which I put the link in the chat for. I will also quickly run through the slides so you can see the things we have put together on different information such as if you have grievances and want to know the place to start, FERPA and HIPPA laws, where you can get further information on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment, the role of the Faculty Center, etc.

The APPC committee has undertaken to update this yearly and will do so more frequently if changes need to be made. If there is anything that anyone sees such as gaps, we are happy to hear them and will include them in the next versions of this document. It is available and I hope that all of you use it, disseminate it amongst your constituents, and collect any comments for us and send those to me.

E. [**General Education Committee Update – Committee Chair, Mark Stegeman \[01:22:44\]**](#)

I am here because our charge as the ad-hoc committee on General Education, which currently has seventeen members from fourteen academic units, is to deliver a report as we were to report last Spring. We do not yet have that report although we expect to adopt one soon. I submitted a one-page letter from Mae Smith and me. I am noted as Chair of the Committee and Mae Smith is noted as Chair of one of the major subcommittees, which is the Program Structure Subcommittee.

This letter is not a summary of the committee report as it does not yet exist, and it is not trying to anticipate what the committee will vote on. The report will come and then we will report how the committee votes. The committee has voted no recommendations to put into that report which can change and potentially support recommendations. This may be due to any programmatic recommendations being premature.

Part of the point of the letter that Mae and I have put in the record is a heads up the Senate that they are collectively headed into a complicated set of issues that concern GenEd and will require serious engagement by the Senate to move into a positive than is already had, with broader support. The engagement will require some period of time and there will be a lot of collaboration, I am only speaking on behalf of myself, and this is not an official committee statement. The line of collaboration will be required among different groups and collaboration does require time and it has become more complicated because the situation has changes since a year and a half ago. We have no permanent Provost, although a stellar Interim Provost, but no budget model for General Education which is a significant resource item. So this is speaking for me and Mae Smith, that action should wait on any major changes in the GenEd program so those two situations can have more resolve.

One thing I am confident that will be in our future report is a summary of an anonymous survey that we did of undergraduate academic advisors over the summer. We received a lot of cooperation from the Office of Academic Advising within the Provost office, and we are very appreciative of that. In fact, it is probably an understand in cooperation, in many ways, they drove the train in a positive way.

We surveyed 207 advisors, had a 47% response rate, and we are hoping that we will resend it to those who did not respond. What we got was very informative and if we didn't get a response before, we compiled all of the results, we would like to, so we may do that. However that works out, we will surely report on those results. This is contingent on a vote from the committee, but it is most likely that is everyone's intention to report on the results of the survey. That will be in the spirit of following our first report where we provided some detail about the results of a much larger faculty survey we did on civics in the Spring. We might include a more detailed analysis of the data from that first survey which was cursory in the first report.

I just wanted to give you all a heads up on the report that is coming and a little bit about where we are. Thank you very much.

Questions [01:29:42]

- Chair Hudson stated in the spirit of more talk and being glad that issues are being addressed in GenEd, she received a note from a member of the committee who asked her to enter it into the record that they have issues with the letter and also serves as the chair of UGEC. Reading from note, "As a member of the committee, I would like to state that no draft version of the committee's next report, or even a consensus on what issues should be covered has yet been agreed upon or even formally discussed on the committee."
- Chair Hudson stated she believes Chair Stegeman has addressed. Chair Hudson continued to read the statement, "Although the chair indicates it will be delivered soon, there has not been any preliminary draft circulated yet to the committee and in this person's opinion, there are significant errors in the pre-report. The chair was supposed to be scheduling another meeting of the committee, but we have heard nothing about that."
- Chair Hudson stated she contributes this to the discussion and encourages that a meeting gets scheduled so there can be a consensus on the committee and these topics can be pursued in the Senate with the GenEd committee.
 - Chair Stegeman stated he did anticipate the reporting in saying that he expected the committee to summarize the result of the advisor survey which is not a result of a formal vote on the committee. He is getting ahead of himself and thinks he would be surprised if the data were not in the report. It is true that there is no draft yet, which he might be optimistic about the timetable of the report and has been known to be optimistic about these things in the past.
 - Chair Stegeman stated he did agree to meet every other week throughout the semester and expects to follow that schedule to get a report completed sooner rather than later with the committee's full vote.
- Executive Director of General Education, Susan Miller-Cochran stated her thanks for the work of the committee as asked if Chair Stegeman can describe how the GenEd committee of Office of General Education can work together moving forward. She would like to see these groups work together so both teams can work together in a productive way that is good for students.
 - Chair Stegeman stated he agrees with this idea and has never refused an invitation to work with the GenEd office nor the current Advisory Committee. He is hoping for engagement and hasn't heard much about it recently.
 - Chair Stegeman stated the general theme is that this is a huge item for the University. GenEd is a curricular item that dwarfs most other curricular items and there needs to be collaboration. The collaboration also needs to be extended to the Senate as a whole. He is unsure of whether that includes

- scheduling a separate meeting where interested individuals can talk about items. He is concerned about things coming to the Senate without a lot of preparation.
- Chair Stegeman stated he apologizes for not following up as there was going to be a meeting to discuss the historic revenue flows which the GenEd office collected data for, and he has not. He wants to have that meeting, get the data, and summary but he got distracted with another item over the summer and didn't arrange the budget-related meeting but will do so. He is sorry for the delay.

9. Report from the Senior Vice President/Chief Operating Officer – John Arnold & Chief Budget Officer, Garth Perry [01:35:02]

Chief Budget Officer, Garth Perry [01:36:04]

Hello, I'm Garth and I work in finance and budget. I wanted to go over a couple of topics today. The first thing is to orient you to our website. You all received an email that we published new documents. We published a new document called the budget book which is the unrestricted funds distribution and can be found on our website under budget reports. There are several things on here that I want to quickly go over.

A lot of people ask about how much money we get from the state and on the website, we go line by line on every item we receive from the state. The total budget that we submit to ABOR is on the right under "budget reports." Every year, we ask the legislature for funding and those reports are on the left of the website.

The Unrestricted Funds Operating Budget FY25 went out and is new. There is a great introduction letter and background from CFO John Arnold that I encourage you to read. I wanted to focus on the Sources and Use Summary sheet that a lot of people have been asking for. It breaks down the revenues that come into the institutions that are allocated through a budget process. We call those allocated funds, cleverly enough. This would include state appropriation general funds, state appropriate special line-item funds, and tuition. Tuition is broken down by what is collected institutionally and how much institutional aid is applied to that tuition and the net which is what is distributed. There is another series which is fees or F&A recovery, associated with that. Then, we break that revenue distribution down into two buckets. One is institutional funds that I hold in the Office of Budget Planning. Most of this is capital-related service on our buildings and associated costs. You'll notice it drops from FY24 to FY25. That is because we distributed the utilities budget to the University Facilities Services to manage, that is why you will see a decline of \$15 million. The rest is distributed to individual units on campus. The graph breaks down changes within the two years, there are definitions on the left-hand side.

If you want more of an explanation of what those funds are, you can find it in the Allocation Summary. These are the revenues that are going out to the individual units which is just over \$1 billion, then we break down every unit distribution by classification. What you may have picked up in the news stories and John's preceding memo that introduces this document is a budget deficit. This indicates that I am allocating \$78 million more than I plan to receive in revenue, that is what a budget deficit is from my perspective. Then, we have a series of auxiliary units where we're expecting to net some margin or income from those units just over \$13 million. The next effect combination of those two is a \$65 million shortfall. In general, unrestricted dollars that come into the institution, budget would indicate that we have a \$65 million shortfall. I will say this is conservative if we spend under our budgets in these areas or we generate more revenue than we forecasted, we can close that deficit more quickly. Each of the unit budgets will have a section that shows how much the institution has allocated to that unit whether the unit's moving money between themselves and another unit, and then if that unit generates what we call local revenue. This just means they are engaging in some sort of activity, usually sales and service. You have a conference or something to that effect, where money comes directly to you, it doesn't come to the institution, we refer to that as local.

There is a multi-year history of expenditures and an explanation of how the budget was set for this unit. All of the budgets, going into this year, were set using a forecast figure which I will discuss. Then, it is adjusted based on what the unit told us they thought they would spend in FY24, and we arrived at a FY25 budget and a calculated reduction. The Technical Changes column is a budget restructure between units. In this case, there were personnel in the Office of the President who worked in the finance function. We moved those individuals from the President's Office into finance shared services function. We did this for a handful of finance areas, most of the technical adjustments you'll see are related to IT, HR, and development officers. We also stopped charging University Overhead Charge, this year we call it Administrative Service Charge and you will see technical adjustments associated with that.

The budget process called all funds budgeting this year ran from January to May. The January timeframe is when units submit data. February will be the new FY, and units will be expected to submit budget data right before the winter break. This will give our office more time to analyze the data and correct data that was noticed during this year's process. There were a series of meetings held at various leadership levels in February and March where decisions were then made in April and May.

There are 659 individual departments that submitted data throughout this process. Those departments roll up to a level that is called a college or division. There were 81 individual college or division packets submitted. If you're on the

support unit side, you report once more to your appropriate SVP which gets us down to about 50 units that you will see in previous documents I showed you. This is where we held the executive meetings which included participation from Interim Provost Marx, CFO Arnold, and President Robbins. The units are expected to produce a four-year plan and map their plan to the University's goals.

This was approximately a three-month effort. This presentation was built off feedback. Data is submitted through a software, a packet is then produced in our office through that software, then there is a slide deck they are expected to complete. The packet and the deck show what the components of the meeting's discussions are about. In the PowerPoint, on slide titled, "College/Unit Next 5 Years," shows an example that everyone competes the same template. There was a question which asks what will be happening within major initiatives within the next 5 years where you get to select whichever metrics you think are the most important and relevant for your unit to discuss.

Regarding revenue growth opportunities in your area, there is a lot of focus on activity measures, student credit hours, enrollment, and F&A earnings in your unit. An example of an enrollment report in the College of Engineering is used as a baseline to give people an example of what is expected to be seen from program enrollment reporting. This past year, we gave them planning assumptions to come in with a discussion about how they could operationalize, a reduction in their budget at 5%, 10%, or 15%. Then we spent a lot of time talking about the largest component of everyone's budget which is personnel. This includes average cost of your faculty and staff, change in FTE over the years, and ratio, and on the staff, side ranging from managers to professionals. More ratio analysis is provided to faculty ratios, GA's to faculty ratios, and staff to faculty ratios. That comparison of staff to faculty ratios within your college, compares to other colleges and are assessed with and without sponsored funded research. This is shown on the graphs within the "Personal Services Background," slide. This specifically shows what units were spending on marketing and communications within their unit this past year, and a discussion of capital and space related needs.

If you were a college, you came in with a faculty hiring plan to discuss with the provost, areas where you wanted to invest. This is a standard report in all of the packets that talks about revenue expense and change in balance within your unit. If you were asking for additional funding, what would those additional requests for funding be? This is small but I am going to send it around so that everyone has a copy of it. This will include questions that go into the packet. Every unit answer all these questions, and it is further detail to what I presented here, what happened over the last year, your financial plans and outlook, and your space needs.

CFO John Arnold [01:46:59]

Thank you, Garth. I just want to compliment Garth and his team, that budget book was a huge list for them, and they did a terrific job putting it together. I hope you take the time to go through it, there is a lot of information in it that gives a good picture of how university finance works.

I wanted to take a quick moment and spend some time on good news that we got. Certainly, there has been concern over the last several months, about the reputational harm to the University in some of the new stories we have had out there, and the events going on at the University. We did a survey over the summer which looked at Arizona, specifically Tucson and Phoenix markets, and we looked at the Big 12 and some of the old Pac 12 markets. We asked people what they were thinking about the University of Arizona, and this will be an abbreviated look at the data. If you want a full presentation, I suggest reaching out to the Marketing Department.

One of the things we found is that people view the institution is strong and honest, with excellence athletics and excellent school spirit and school pride. One thing we specifically looked at is, "how would you describe the overall reputation of the school?" and what I have grabbed here is who responded, "good," or "excellent." From there, I went down from "moderate," "fair" or "bad." In the PowerPoint, the blue bar represents "excellent," and the red bar is, "good." You can see that 91% of people in the Tucson community labeled the University's reputation as good or excellent. There are the other institutions there, and you can see that ASU ran at about 75% versus UA at 91% in the Tucson community, this is not surprising. What surprised us is about UCLA, which people in the Tucson community rated poorly at 78%. Also in Phoenix, UA was the top-rated institution which just beat ASU. It seems that UCLA is incredibly unpopular in Maricopa County which I am not sure why.

We also asked, "What do you find good or excellent about the University?" and some of the things that came out were that 90% of individuals labeled school spirit as good and excellent, Athletics, Health Sciences, Space Sciences, and Academic Quality were also rated high. Well done to our outstanding faculty. One that surprised me were the Arts where I thought we would score much better, the score was 79% positive feedback and comes from the Tucson community. I gave these slides at a presentation the other day, and individuals asked if I have sat in Centennial Hall recently and I laughed because I have. I then asked them if they have sat in the dance studio because that experience is fantastic. I think the suggestion there is probably facility and not a program suggestion, but we will see.

Questions [01:51:19]

- Secretary Zeiders stated her thanks for the presentation and said she has a question for Garth Perry regarding carry forward balance. Earlier in FY24, he said that based on spending authority, units would keep half of that amount, and if the unit overspent, the full amount overspent would be taken away from FY25 spending authority, but that has since changed. She asked why that has changed and the status on carry forward.
 - CBO Garth Perry stated he believes the comment was about who would adjust the budget and not specifically about carry forward funds.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she believes the comment was about carry forward specifically, there were two units that asked about the amount and whether they overspent.
 - CBO Garth Perry stated Secretary Zeiders can read the language and he doesn't know that it stated anything about carry forward. Regardless of the outcome of that, they communicated that they would do an analysis of forecasts and that is what was done. The outcome of that was not good, units were either way over or under forecasted which created a dilemma.
 - CBO Garth Perry stated if a unit was under-forecasted and expenditures were \$3 million than said, a 5% budget cut was already given, and he gave them another \$1.5 million on top of that, it didn't seem fair or appropriate. If the issue was associated with the forecasting error the other way.
 - CBO Garth Perry stated he though the margin of error would be much smaller than it was in the short of it, but the forecasting range was very large. Him and his team have opted not to adjust budgets based on forecast data and allow the budgets to stand as they are.
 - CBO Garth Perry to speak specifically about the carry forward process, he does hold carry forward authority. The process for that would be to ask for permission to use balance if a college has them. There are several colleges that do not collectively have any more fund balance but if a college has them, a request would be put forward where the President would sign off on the use of said balance.
 -
- Senator Brochin stated her question is for CFO John Arnold, she heard from Associate Provost Andrea that their team of Faculty Workload Group was not invited or consulted onto is work that he has been doing, as well as the University of Arizona Staff Council (UASC). Senator Brochin asked if CFO Arnold will commit to inviting shared governance bodies and working groups, especially the groups in the Provost Office and UASC, to participate in the discussions around workload.
- Senator Brochin stated although she appreciates the good news ahead at the end, if he had a pulse on contingent faculty, faculty, and staff across the colleges, he would see morale is down, individuals have left, and people are working harder. She would like to know if he has a commitment to individuals that are still at the University, to faculty, staff, and graduate students who are now working above and beyond capacity. She asked if he does have this commitment, what this will look like.
 - CFO John Arnold stated during the course of the all funds planning process, there were a couple of academic units which came in and demonstrated some of the functionality of the data that were collected around staff and faculty workload. He asked the questions, "What is happening across campus?" "What is going on out there?" These questions were asked in terms of what tools are already available and that is what the committee did, they went out and surveyed with available tools. This information was looked for as a starting point.
 - CFO John Arnold stated the Faculty Workload Review belongs in the Provost Office and is not a function that should come out of the finance office. There is definitely interest in working with the Provost Office, UASC, the Faculty Senate, and other bodies on anything moving forward that surrounds that issue.
- Senator Ziurys stated she is curious as to what is being done at his level, to reduce administrative bloat. There are a lot of high paid administrators and units and colleges are supposed to conduct cuts. This calls a question for what is being done to administrators and whether there are being cuts done there too.
- Senator Ziurys asked if RII is also a part of the budget reducing formula.
 - CFO John Arnold stated he strongly encourages Senator Ziurys to look at the budget book that was posted as it goes through every single unit including administrative units, and it shows the reduction from FY24 actual spend to the FY25 budget. It can be noted the largest cuts were in administrative units like the President's Office, CBO Garth Perry's Office, his office, RII, and elements of the Provost Office. In this report, one can look at each unit, there are a couple of colleges that took pretty hefty reductions, especially when you look at the actual versus the budget. The forecast is currently being worked on.
 - CFO John Arnold stated he encourages individuals to go ack and look where the University made reductions between FY24 and FY25.
- Senator Rafelski stated he is unsure if these numbers were looked at carefully but between the 2022, 2023, and 2024 budgets, salaries doubled, and now there is 5% in savings. The fact is, the President's salary which is hard to see because it happened fast. A cut of 5% or 10% seems to be meaningless.
- Senator Rafelski shares Senator Ziurys opinion that there has been very little done to limit administrative bloat.
- Senator Rafelski stated returning to the survey regarding the perspective on the University of Arizona from the community, the results were mixed up by percentages and it was hard to see that academic values were among the top-rated items.
- Senator Rafelski stated the University of Arizona is seen as a good University because it's academic value, not only because of sports, which happen to be at the top, and there were multiple entries which emphasized this. He asked for the results to be sequenced by the outcome and not in a semi-alphabetic sequence the next time. This

will better help with understanding the University's value in the community.

- Senator Fink stated he rests his case.
- Senator Russell asked why F&A is listed as unrestricted when it is generated as part of research income, which she believes by contract, and is supposed to support the research and specific enterprises. It is not a fee, it is supposed to cover overhead and support research.
 - CBO Garth Perry stated overhead occurs largely in RII and in facilities. It is the facilities and overhead cost, which most is facilities. It is generally unrestricted dollars when it comes into the institution, that is general practice in higher education.
 - CBO Garth Perry stated it is an overhead charge that the Federal Government has agreed to pay to cover costs like facilities and administration which occur in unrestricted operating funds.
- Chair Hudson asked what CBO Garth Perry and CFO John Arnold are working on going into the Fall 2024 and how the Senate can most productively engage with them on questions of workload, unit issues, incentives to PIs, etc.
 - CFO John Arnold stated as the CBO explained, they have laid out their budget process for the year. They are going into the first quarter which ends in October. Meetings are being set up with every unit which will take place in October, and this is where first quarter performance, enrollments, and pressures will be looked at for each unit after completing this fiscal year. There will then be discussion about FY26.
 - CFO John Arnold stated by the end of October, they will put out FY26 planning assumptions. As the CBO noted, the University is operating with a \$65 million deficit and there is currently no forecast for FY26. They are beginning to see some of the things they will have to deal with in FY26. Those plan assumptions will be put out in late October and units will be asked to make submissions by mid-December, so the data is received by holiday break in order to start reviews and clean-up. Him and the CBO will meet with every department in February and March of 2026.
 - CFO John Arnold stated they are asking for units to submit investment opportunities where they can look at expanding programs and producing a strong ROI for the University over time.
 - CFO John Arnold stated he is happy to chat anytime and will continue to meet with academic leaderships of all front throughout this process and they engage closely with the Provost's Office.

10. **Reports from [President](#), [Provost](#), Faculty Officers, [APPC](#), RPC, SAPC, DEI, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, SGRC, Graduate Council, Undergraduate Council, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UArizona Staff Council, Gen Ed Office with UWGEC, C11**

11. **Adjournment [02:05:32]**

Vice Chair Hymel thanked everyone and stated conversation will continue. Senator Downing moved **[Motion 2024/25-4]** to adjourn the September 9, 2024, meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 5:02 PM.

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

Motions of April 1, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2024/25-1] motion to approve the September 9, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-2] motion to approve the minutes of April 1, 2024, and May 6, 2024. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-3] motion to extend New Business Item 8D by two minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-4] motion to adjourn the September 9, 2024, meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the minutes of [April 1, 2024](#), and [May 6, 2024](#)
3. Page 5, Information Item 7: Preview of Possible Future Agenda Item (To Be Voted On A Future Meeting) – Interim Chair of Undergraduate Council, TBA: [Review of the Undergraduate Minor in Insights Into Healthy Aging](#)
4. Page 5, New Business Item 8A: [Student Affairs Policy Committee \(SAPC\) Update](#) – SAPC Co-chairs Kristin Little and Tim Ottusch

5. Page 7, New Business Item 8B: [Information about Faculty and Staff Workload Group](#) – Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders
6. Page 9, New Business Item 8C: [Credit for University Service](#) – Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero, Vice Chair of the Faculty, Mona Hymel
7. Page 11, New Business Item 8D: [Faculty Rights and Resources](#) – Chair of APPC, Keith Maggert
8. Page 12, New Business Item 8E: [General Education Committee Update](#) – Committee Chair, Mark Stegeman
9. Page 14, Written reports from:
 - a. [President](#)
 - b. [Provost](#)
 - c. [APPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456