

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 7, 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=c41e113-c3cf-4216-889f-b2030009a409&start=1>

Present: Senators Baker, Barefoot, Bernick, Braitberg, Braithwaite, Brochin, Cheu, Cochran, Cooper, Cornelison, Diaz, Domin, Downing, Eckert, Figler, Fink, D. Garcia, Giacobazzi, Goetz, Gregory, Guzman, W. Harris, Hingle, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair) Joseph, Knox, Leafgren, Little, Marx, Meyer, Neumann, O’Leary, Palacios, Pau, Rafelski, Rishel, Rocha, Roche, Rogers, Russell, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, M. Smith, Spece, Stegeman (Parliamentarian), Su, Thomas, Torres, Waddell, Werchan, Williams, M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders (Secretary), Ziurys.

Absent: Senators Buxner, Cui, Coletta, F. Garcia, Garimella, Grijalva, Hall, S. Harris, Heileman, Medevoi, Nelson, Paschke-Wood, Schulz, Stephan, Tafolla, Willis Jr.

1. CALL TO ORDER [00:00:04]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the October 7, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:07 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA](#) – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:00:21]

Vice Chair Hymel stated there has been one change since setting the agenda in the Senate Executive Committee. Item 6: Welcome to President Suresh Garimella has been struck out as he was unable to make it to the meeting.

- Senator Fink moved [**Motion 2024/25-5**] to approve the October 7, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE [SEPTEMBER 9, 2024, FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS](#) [00:01:12]

- Senator M. Witte stated she would like to compliment Secretary Zeiders for the complete minutes she did with Faculty Center Staff, Jasmin Espino.
- Senator M. Witte stated the minutes do not have to be quite as exhaustive but the changes to the minutes were needed after the unprofessional and flawed minutes from the past two years. There was a motion passed where it was decided that the minutes should go out on the listserv for all faculty to see.
- Senator M. Witte stated she would like to compliment Secretary Zeiders on formulating questions.
- Senator Fink stated he likes the detail of the minutes as it doesn’t hurt to have more.
- Senator Fink moved [**Motion 2024/25-6**] to approve the September 9, 2024, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION. KEIRON BAILEY, LAURA MEREDITH, SENATOR JAMEY ROGERS, AND SENATOR LUCY ZIURYS [00:04:32]

Keiron Bailey, Associate Professor, Research, Innovation, & Impact [00:05:06]

I’ll take my two minutes today to address a topic of concern for many people which is compliance and safety in our workplace. I would like to begin by proposing pillar zero of a strategic plan. Something I proposed to President Robbins and the President of HR in 2018. I quote, from my email of October 2, 2018, “Pillar Zero needs to be a focus on creating a healthy workplace culture before any other considerations can be addressed.” No response to that.

Now, since that time, a number of things have happened. We’ve had changes in leadership. Unfortunately, some of the sources of risk to our workplace and our rights have not been addressed. I’d like to briefly sketch a concept, of how we, and I say “we” collectively, staff and faculty, might help ourselves to address vigilance. Three components of which are awareness, notification, and recourse.

So, what happens in the event that you believe process or policy has been violated against you? Well, you need to know what policies are. I’m going to quote UHAP 7.01 for example, “We honor our commitments and demonstrate

fairness and honesty in all of our professional duties. We follow laws and University and Arizona Board of Regents policies, and avoid real and perceived conflicts of interest.”

Examples of violations I have experienced include UHAP 3.02 which is targeting provision. Former Provost and the BPFA were sent a complaint about this on the 12th of August. There is a thirty-day mandated written turnaround to the complainant under that policy. It has now been two years and a month, and some since then and I still haven't had even an acknowledgement. Never mind a response, of course. In the meantime, I was dismissed and then dismissal was rescinded.

However, that is one example. UHAP 7.01 is another. Let's say for example, we have the President of Title IX, who, in providing evidence to legal inquiry, in response to my 6.9.14 complaint, stated that the former Provost met with me in 2022. That is false, her own appointment calendar will demonstrate she did not meet with me until 2023. This was the infamous meeting where she told me she preferred the meeting not to be recorded. By the way, if anyone says that you that we are a one-party recording state, it is time to assert your rights and remind the administrators to be careful of what they're saying because legal action could follow if they choose to continue to violate the laws.

Notification. Is that useful in a situation like this? Yes, because first of all, it demonstrates that you're aware your rules or rights have been violated, and second, it is for the record. Failure to respond to formal notifications in writing, are policy violations of the type I have just described, and they indicate not only bad faith, but awareness of liability. I have more than 30 examples of that over the past couple of years. By the way, when I contacted OGC with a litany of these very specific violations, I was informed that the role of OGC is to provide advice and guidance to administrators. So, think about it.

Laura Meredith, Associate Professor [00:08:57]

As faculty who become parents, we know that, along with the joy, we will experience additional financial and mental stress.

The US Surgeon General just released an Advisory on Parents Under Pressure, highlighting that parents today are breaking under the financial and mental stress, and that institutions must do all they can to support parents for the overall benefit of society.

Today, I bring up stress around professional travel with dependents through UA.

I am a single mom by choice to a delightful 2-year-old. Like many academic transplants, I have no family in the area. I am also one of the lucky few parenting a child with Down syndrome. And for years to come, everywhere I go, so will my daughter.

Every time I have an opportunity for professional travel, such as an invited conference talk, a request from a program manager to present at a PI meeting, or to conduct field work, I have to weigh whether or not the opportunity is important enough and whether or not it is even financially viable, for me to spend 1-2k of my own money to bring my daughter and nanny with me.

It has cost me thousands of dollars, and hours of mental and emotional anguish to navigate these decisions, logistics, and rules.

Funding agencies like the NSF and DOE allow reimbursement for these above-and-beyond costs, but the State of Arizona Accounting Manual prohibits me from being reimbursed by UA, even from my own external grants, which total over \$5M as PI alone.

Let's be honest, this burden is an issue primarily detracting from the professional participation of female faculty. Women may need to be with their children in early years and, even in partnered relationships, are disproportionately the caregivers of the young and old in their lives.

Other universities and other states have addressed this directly or set up travel grants. There is even precedent now, in Arizona, to allow reimbursement for those running for office. UA should support parents who are even willing to travel for work, rather than give in to bureaucratic impediments.

This is critical for UA to retain successful faculty who have made the personal choice for parenthood as a part of the fullest expression of their lives.

Senator Jamey Rogers [00:12:23]

Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Jamey Rogers, I'm an at-large Faculty Senator. I've been a career track lecturer and in the writing program for ten years. I am here today to talk about career track faculty. There have been

great advancements in the ten years I have been here, in the treatment of career track faculty but right now. We're headed down a slippery slope and we are regressing because many administrators have chosen to issue new, unreasonable and increasing demands on our career track faculty.

The stated purpose of the administration's reassessment of workloads is to avoid the hidden costs of an overstressed workforce but, we're already overstressed and students are paying the price. There is a student-to-faculty ratio and it is not beneficial and decreases student learning. Nowhere is this more evident than in the writing program where we are fighting to prevent yet another increase in our student workload count. That would be a 32% increase from five years ago. Teaching demands have been accompanied by the reduction of service. This fallout will be far-reaching and debilitating and compromises our ability to participate in shared governance mandated by Arizona law.

I could not be here today if service from career track lecturers FTE is eliminated. Equally injurious is that elimination of service will decimate faculty morale and our professional standing. The UA has a choice right now, to strengthen or weaken as faculty. A healthy career track faculty with fair working conditions will lead to better student outcomes. The alternative is to enable us and to make us less able to adequately educate students. Thank you very much.

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:15:00]

This builds on what everyone else is saying. There appears to be an unfortunate trend at the University where administrators seem to be constantly making rules and regulations that are pointless. Making a lot of busy work for the faculty and staff, and in some cases, they have really no authority to carry out.

A recent example is a group of professors that submitted a \$3-4 million grant to a funding agency, DOE. There was some minor deficiencies in the proposal, they submitted it anyway, the agency was completely happy with it, yet, RII moved in and withdrew the proposal without informing the PIs or Co-PIs. So, what is more important here, bringing funds to the University or checking boxed for RII?

Then there is this whole issue of centralization. For the sake of centralization, look at what's happening with the business offices in the College of Science. May I ask, what are the tangible goals and what are the benefits? There are also endless training and surveys for the faculty, yet we only get a few percent raise, if we're lucky. Administrators get between 60-100% raises. Now, we're told this is all wrong, we haven't calculated it properly, and no one got these raises. But number one, why were they released to the public if they were wrong? Number two, why hasn't the University put out corrected numbers? No answer from the University. Of course, if you start bringing up these sorts of issues, there is always the option that you might get retaliated against.

We seem to be living in a culture at this University where the administrator's main role is to suffocate the endeavors of the faculty. Thank you.

5. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [00:17:41]

Thank you, everyone and welcome. It has been one year since the Hamas rampages and massacres and those discussed in the Israeli press by the Israeli military on October 7, 2023. It has been one year of multiple, daily massacres by Israel that have made Palestinian life in Gaza unlivable. Now extended to the west bank and Lebanon. It has been one year of unquestioning U.S. provisions of weapons and funds or what the Lemkin Institute and so many others see as a genocide. We stand on the brink of possible regional or global conflict involving nuclear powers. Remember, it has been one year of challenges to our constitutional freedom to speak our conscience and discuss and debate freely. Remember that history did not start on October 7th and history has not ended. We care about every single atrocity, every single day, every single limb, every single life, it all counts.

I, like many of you, cling to the idea that a University like ours isn't the answer. The antidote to the temptation to unleash even more of the dots of war. We have the privilege, the distance, the expertise, the opportunity, and the obligation to analyze, debate, and yes, to change the world. To heal the world, engaging in what the Jewish traditional calls, "Tikkun olam." This October, our community stands at an important crossroads.

A new year, a new administration, and a new mandate to pull ourselves together. Behind us all, painful experiences as we just marked the second anniversary of Tom Meixner's murder, and many losses of precious lives on and around our campus. At the macro level, we face unfolding geopolitical nightmares that ensnare us. At the local level, a financial crisis has left many struggling and feeling betrayed in their own workplace, wondering if the solutions we are undertaking may not be as bad as the original problem.

At this juncture, we welcome President Garimella, determined to seize the moment, to align as a caring, responsible, accountable community. We need to make space for each other's pain, criticism, and we need to treat one another as we want to be treated, with integrity, care, and compassion. We must banish hypocrisy, or Wellian double talk, double standards, and dehumanization. The way forward is unfettered, critical, but very civil and respectful analysis and continuing dialogues on tough questions. I am confident that civil debate and discourse is our particular contribution to

a better world, and to healing the world.

Much of what we need to talk about here in Senate, and as a community, is how to align our finances with our mission, and our values at the local level. We have been told changes since last year have been effective in reducing our financial deficit. For reasons that I hope we'll discuss today, we can't trace those analyses, and we should be able to. The larger question is, at what cost? A couple of you here today that have already mentioned, chipping away at our academic functions, while always finding money to pay for auxiliaries and paying people off must end. This must end. This is one of the messages that I sent to President Garimella.

The following scenario is similar to what Senator Ziurys just described and it is playing out across the University. A brilliant young researcher brings in a \$3 million grant with both the formal and conventional understanding that 2% of that, or \$60,000 of the indirect cost returns will be available to them to pay a postdoc salary to lay the groundwork for the next multi-million-dollar grant. "Sorry," say the non-academics, currently running the show, demonstrating ignorance of the disciplines of grantsmanship and the incentives built into them. "Are you not a state employee with a fixed salary? Get back to your desk and your routine duties." Everyone in the room knows that colleague, outraged, frustrated, and feeling betrayed will be easy pickings for a rival institution that will be happy to take over the original \$3 million grant from our institution with all its indirect costs, and will provide the infrastructure and startup costs for a proven University of Arizona incubated winner to keep winning future grants elsewhere.

We watch this scenario over and over while we wait on our administration to stop it. The vicious cycle of contraction and shrinkage in our horizons means that those left behind must work harder. In classrooms, as Senator Rogers described, and in offices Secretary Zeiders will tell you more about the workload issue today. The hiring freeze was bad enough, but now when we seek to hire, we have to impose ridiculous implications that prevent us from offering basic hospitality to academic job candidates. This, of course, is counterproductive, if not humiliating. In contrast to what we've recently discovered is the average food and beverage expenditure in the second quarter of 2024, which runs to \$265 per meal according to State records, which we extracted with some difficulty. This too must change.

Our agenda today will try to focus on a few principles of what we can and must do to move forward under new management. 1: We need to question the blind logic of centralization in the service of a budget that has slowed us down and imposed red tape and inefficiency, and a number of the functions of the University. 2: We must insist on transparency, we do things based on evidence and when we cannot get the evidence easily or in a timely manner, it affects the functioning of the institution. 3: We must exercise responsibility to protect everyone's freedom of expression and conscience, and to make our campus a place where everyone is protected from hateful intimidation and silencing, no matter how uncomfortable the debate and the evidence may be. Other matters of equal importance will be brought by my colleagues. Today, we need to control our curriculum, especially general education. Our community needs assurance of every individual's political rights. As we approach a contentious election, we need fair working conditions and a fair workload for those who run the institution.

We must get our house in order, and I have told President Garimella that I will work with him to do this from day one. We must recenter our academic mission and the student educational experience first and foremost, the student's basic needs that make education possible, adequate work conditions and environments for those who do the work, incentives to do research, and a campus free from bullying and institutional violence. All of these things will allow us, in our small way, to help heal the world.

I wish for all of you, on this October 7th, peace, conscience, truth, and the courage to face our necessary discomforts. Thank you.

6. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST [00:26:59]**

I have a very brief report this afternoon and I will be back on the agenda in a moment to talk about the questions that were sent to me by the Secretary. My first part of the report is that, as we all know, the President Garimella appeared on campus last Tuesday. I have been working with him in transitions for the five to six weeks prior to that. I am very pleased to say that working with President Garimella has been a real joy, he is an interesting man, a faculty member first and foremost, he is very decisive and has asked me very hard questions and doesn't allow me to give stupid answers. I am very much pleased with our new President.

I have two items I want to discuss quickly which relate to data and they have to do with some of the issues raised by Secretary Zeiders recently. The issues have to do with faculty size. Some of our bureaucracies are really important issues to talk about, and I want to thank her for raising those issues.

Starting with Faculty Size, Secretary Zeiders made a report during the last Senate meeting which had to do with this and President Garimella reported some slightly different data and you may have seen me respond to a reporter on television where I also had slightly different data. I would like to go through some of the data to address this.

Over the last six years, from FY 2019 to the current FY, our faculty headcount complement went from 3,586 to 4,002. That is roughly an 11-12% increase in the size of faculty over that period. I don't have the student headcount, but I suspect it was greater than that and that it exceeded the faculty headcount over that period. From last year to this, by the way the data for this year are a little incomplete as this was taken earlier in the semester, we have dropped by 81 faculty from last year to this year. This is a 2% increase overall. If you take out faculty who don't teach, and look out faculty who teach, with respect to our teaching loads, that number is closer to one. It is a dramatic reduction, and I am afraid to say that I was partly responsible for that, and I am sorry for that. But we did try to address our budgetary issues. Those are points estimated over the years of course, there is variability across time. The next set of information addresses some of that variability across time. In this particular instance, we clearly have to turn this around. The Faculty are the heart of the intellectual mission of the University, and I am committed try to do that as much as I can under the finances we are living with.

The next item I want to talk about has to do with processing time for grant applications. All of you who are grant active, I am no longer but I was for a good part of my academic career, know that this is a complicated issue from the pre-awards process, from you reading RFP through deciding how you want to respond, writing your proposal, working within your units, and then through your college and up through your sponsored projects. I know this is a very laborious process for those with human participants, then we have IRB, and so on, it's a very complicated process.

Over the last four years from FY21, in sponsored projects, we averaged about 4,000 applications per year. That is plus or minus 2 or 3% from 4,000, it goes up or down a bit. So far, this year, we are on track to potentially process about 4,500, so it might be as much as a 12-13% increase in the number of grant applications. It is a laborious process and is very person-centric, taking a lot of time and effort.

Some irony us that there is a measure in sponsored projects which is how many days does it sit there before it is completed. It is measured in days and decimals. In FY24, it was 3.64 days. So far, in the three or four months of FY25, it is 3.29 days. The point estimate in the length of sponsored projects has gone down, not up. That is, of course, a point estimate and there is variability around that. I would discourage us all, when we respond to challenges, we have, not to overgeneralize from one incident. There are certainly instances where sponsored projects have not responded quickly but obviously, because of the point estimate with variability around it, there are times when they move quickly. The processing time for grant applications this year is not any worse, it is one hour faster than it was in the previous year.

I have another presentation that has to do with budget, but I can take questions about this particular issue before I sit down.

Questions [00:33:14]

- Senator Cochran stated their thanks for Provost Marx acknowledging his part in some of the challenges that have been seen in backwards time. He asked if Provost Marx has targets for what he would like the increase to show over the next twelve months while he is still the Provost.
 - Provost Marx stated he will not be Provost for the next twelve months. The answer to the question lies within the departments, and the Deans of the colleges. He doesn't think this is the business of central administration to tell the academics, who lead the agenda of the university, how many people they should be hiring. This comes from the deans, and he has already gotten requests for searches for next year.
- Vice Chair Hymel asked regarding the information on faculty numbers, is it segregated out between adjuncts as opposed to other tracks.
 - Provost Marx stated this is an excellent question, the major tracks are tenure track, career track, and continuing status. Adjunct is not really a track but there are a lot of people partaking in adjunct work, and that number has gone up this year.
 - Provost Marx stated this is not surprising because when the budget is constrained, which he helped constrain those budgets for colleges, it is less dangerous for commit to an adjunct rather than another full faculty member. He can get this data and send it to the Senate.
- Vice Chair Hymel asked, regarding sponsored projects, is it teaching? This is what she believed she read in the All-Funds process.
 - Provost Marx stated no, this is for grant processing.
- Senator Ziurys stated she does not believe anyone is upset about sponsored projects. Those people work hard to process things and are often very helpful. Centralization of business offices and putting people in RII in departments, doing people's grants creates loss in personal connection which one has had with someone they worked with for years. When a proposal is put in, people don't know what you want.

- Senator Ziurys stated for years, there was continuity. The person you worked with in the business office typically knew what you needed in a Grant agency, and that is no longer had. This continues to make things harder.
- Senator Ziurys stated she is currently writing a grant where she always puts a 4% cost of living increase and has done this for thirty years. Suddenly, it was submitted by her colleague to RII who is supposed to deal with grants, and they put in 30%. It is unclear where this figure came from. This now has to be corrected.
- Senator Ziurys stated this is a small example of how there are now many stumbling blocks one has to go through where things were once more streamlined.
- Senator Rafelski stated he always sees numbers, but they are not the real numbers. Real numbers for faculty is expenditure. It is a slightly different situation when one senior professor is replaced with two professors not on a track. This gives a small full-time equivalence but doesn't show the same academic field of the University.
 - Senator Rafelski stated he would love to see inflated collected, and expenditure on things expected in the future. His perception has continually dropped and he does not have the numbers.
 - Provost Marx stated he will get clarification from Senator Rafelski on this offline and will look into getting the requested figures.

7. **OLD BUSINESS [00:39:03]**

A. **Workload Issues - Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders [00:39:29]**

First, I wanted to give you all a few updates. Shared Governance leaders had the opportunity to review a draft of the written report from the Faculty and Staff workload working group. This is the group that was commissioned by CGO Arnold and CBO Perry. As I described last month, the working group does not include any faculty, and because of this, the members of the group collectively decided that they would not make any recommendations around faculty workload, and instead, they would just summarize the information that they obtained, which included how colleges assigned, tracked, and managed workload. I hope this report is eventually shared with all faculty.

Today, I wanted to briefly describe a few things that must be a part of our ongoing workload at Faculty Senate, and all levels of the institution. First, we have seen an alarming trend related to the ratio of category of service. In two colleges, several career-track faculty workloads have been restructured so that services eliminated make more room for teaching. The faculty affected by these changes have been deeply disappointed because they have conducted meaningful service within their departments and colleges. I'd like to note the importance of service, while elimination of service FTE may be a part of institutional changes to workload, it does not actually reduce the amount of work that our colleagues are asked to do. Faculty will still be asked to be on Zoom committees, mentor students, provide advice and guide their units and programs. So, service is not simply a work category, but how the institution actually functions. Most faculty, regardless of rank and category, recognize the importance of service to our students and our units in our discipline.

I've heard some administrators refer to service fatigue, but I would caution against this term for our faculty at the current moment. We're in a context where faculty are being asked to do more with less, and because of this, I don't believe it is service fatigue that our folks may be experiencing at this moment. It is more like a crisis. Folks are overworked and under sourced and this may be disproportionately impacting women and faculty of color. I urge the Provost office to think more holistically about what our faculty have been experiencing in the past two years and not to make changes to service FTE, including reducing service from 20% to 10%. This would not be helpful at this point and would take away critical hours of valuable work within our university.

The second topic, relevant to workload, centers around how units track and manage faculty workload. The working group asked each college administrator the approach they use when faculty do not meet teaching expectations. I'm not sure this is a relevant question as there are likely so few faculty at this point not meeting teaching expectations. What the committee did not address, and is arguably more important, is how units track and monitor when faculty are given workloads that exceed their assigned FTE or formally agreed upon workload.

As I described last month, many faculty, especially career track individuals, are being told to do more. This is not just in a few colleges, I have heard from faculty from 20 of the 22 colleges and there seems to be the same story. Faculty are experiencing greater teaching loads and larger class sizes. In many colleges, they have reduced or eliminated TA support. For instance, in one college, a 7-week course has always been counted as one course. Now, you must teach two 7-week courses, and it is counted as one. In another college, clinical hours of mentoring students no longer count towards teaching FTE, but faculty are still expected to do this work. Yet, in another college, the director of a program was already teaching a four, four-load but now because of limited faculty, they have been given an additional course and are now teaching a five-load.

It is quite clear that most colleges do not have clear policy tracking to monitor course overloads for faculty this is leading to very challenging working conditions and environments for our career track faculty in particular. This is a

critical piece of workload discussion, and I urge the Provost office to start the process of implementing policy and guard rails that ensure that faculty can't be exploited in these situations.

I do want to end by saying that I had the opportunity to sit down with Provost Marx and Vice Provost Romero two weeks ago and Provost Marx did indicate that his office would be working on workload issues. I look forward to hearing more about this. He indicated that he knew there needed to be college specific policies to ensure that exploitative practices did not continue, and he stated that faculty should be able to come to him with concerns, not fear of retaliation. I don't think that is a realistic expectation. When faculty remain on yearly contracts, retaliation remains a concern. So, I urge the Provost office to do more work on their own, to identify what is happening in colleges, and to not put the burden on faculty.

An additional related topic, the Provost Marx and I discussed is the minimum faculty pay. Many of you know that our starting salary at the University is \$46,000. The minimum starting salary at ASU and NAU is \$60,000. This is a \$14,000 difference. Provost Marx agreed how dire this was. We have writing program faculty experiencing food scarcity, homelessness, and yet continue to teach the critical skill of writing to thousands of our undergraduate students each semester. He informed me this would be something he would address and would be talking soon with SCSD.

Questions [00:44:57]

- Senator Cochran stated this means a lot to him as a career-track faculty as he has been working in higher education for twenty-five years. He asked is the faculty can create a needed policy change to ensure the faculty workload does not slide any further.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she believes this is a question for the Provost's office. In their meeting, the Provost's office did recognize there are college specific teaching needs.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she believes this is the job of the Provost's office but as faculty, she does believe there can be a working group created to help advise some of that policy.
- Senator Russell asked if faculty senate will tackle multi-year contracts for career track individuals because multi-year contracts do not cost anything, and they provide security to those who may need it most.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated this is something that should be tackled. There are colleges who have prioritized career-track faculty needs including in her own, CALES, who has really pushed multi-year contracts. This can be done at the college level.
- Provost Marx stated under ABOR policy, the institution has not come close the limits set for multi-year contracts and he would encourage more of this.
 - Senator Russell asked for figures on how many multi-year contracts there are per college.
 - Provost Marx stated he would have to play around with the numbers as it is important to consider the workforce and ratios of each college.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated per UAIR Analytics, there are 192 faculty on multi-year contracts, and it should be close to 400. ABOR policy states no more than 30% of the number of tenured faculty can you have on multi-year contracts.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated there is data in this regard, on the faculty affairs website.
- Senator Ziurys stated there was a mention on retaliation against the faculty, and she asked if this is something the Senate should start looking into because she continues to hear more instances of this.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she did not mention instances of retaliation and only stated that to bring these concerns to the Provost office, puts faculty in a tough position. There should be other means by which they find out information about working conditions.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she thinks this is the beginning of a longer conversation with more detailed information and it seems that a lot of people have similar questions. There will be work done to ensure everyone gets answers to their questions.

B. [Response to letter](#) from Mark Stegeman and Mae Smith – UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter [00:50:34]

Greetings, I am Jeremy Vetter, I am an Associate Professor in the History Department, and I am in the middle of a term as the faculty chair of the University-wide General Education Committee (UGEC). For what I am about to say, it may be important to distinguish three different groups which are involved very heavily in General Education here that sometimes get confused by people who aren't deeply involved.

One is the committee I chair, UGEC, which is the Faculty Shared Governance Committee that reviews gen-ed course proposals and policies. Another is the Office of General Education which is the administrative office that administrates and manages general education, directed by Director Susan Miller-Cochran. The third is an ad-hoc gen-ed committee which exists temporarily right now, under the chairmanship of Senator Mark Stegeman.

I think it is no secret to those who have been closely involved in this that there has been a lot of tension in the world of gen-ed at the University. This is in fact, part of the reason why the ad-hoc was set up, to help promote collaboration, better communication, consultation together between the general faculty and the institutions of

shared governance, and the Office of General Education. I'd say we're still a long way from reaching a common communication. I've developed really good communication with the Office of General Education as Chair of UGEC, but we have had a lot of tensions over other issues, especially with the ad-hoc gen-ed committee which is going to give a report later today.

I do want to recognize that the Chair of that committee, Mark Stegeman, did, in fact, invite me to elaborate, more specifically on the concerns I had about their letter that he and Senator Smith submitted about the last meeting, and specific statements that I wanted to correct. I think this just goes to show how different the kind of understandings of our gen-ed program are depending on where you are. I deal with the Office of General Education a lot, and I have developed a kind of common understanding with them about what is happening with gen-ed and as of late last Spring, I have now been added as a member of the ad-hoc committee.

I find that the beliefs about what is happening in gen-ed are very divergent between these two groups and I think we have a lot of work to do to promote collaboration and communication, and I hope to be involved in that going forward. I'm very much a person who believes in transparency, lots of open discussion, open debate, and deliberation. So, I am glad we can try to clarify these things here at the meeting, and my specific concerns about the last letter. I would also like to note that there are more documents that the Office of General Education has presented, and me as Chair of UGEC, later on the agenda if you want to learn more about our perspectives. I'm, in fact, one of the dissenting members from the committee statement that will be given later today. If you would like to read more about my concerns, which I have already shared with the committee, you can find them at the very end of that statement.

I was concerned about three areas and wanted to make sure the Faculty Senate had a better understanding of what is going on. One is the natural science requirement. There is a natural science requirement in the new gen-ed, it is called. "exploring prospective natural scientists." In addition to that, students are able to take natural science content in courses in the building connections category, which can be any of the three courses. I have more details about this in the statement. The second has to do with attributes and the idea that they had been delayed or have not been implemented. The attributes are mostly implemented and are in courses. They must be implemented in order to get GE credit for them. One thing that is not yet happening, which is unclear of whether this will be a big deal, is that students don't have to track them for graduation as percentages. Although, they still take attributes in all of the GE courses they take in EP and BC. The third has to do with civic learning, which I have a different interpretation of than what the Office of General Education has been doing with it, whereas the letter said they omitted it. I have noted the long efforts to engage with civic learning over the last three or four years, and I want this document to help us start moving towards a shared understanding of what is happening with gen-ed.

I expect that Senator Stegeman and Senator Smith may continue to disagree with me, but I hope we can air our differences openly, in the spirit of open discussion, and around all of the gen-ed issues. I have been eager to get input from the ad-hoc committee. I tried without great success in September to get them to be some of the earliest group of people weighing in, and to give early input on civic learning models that will soon be discussed with shared governance. I haven't had as much success with that as I hoped but I am still hoping that we can move forward together.

**C. [Review of faculty governance work products on centralization](#) – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson
[00:56:29]**

We are currently in the course of our budget repair process, experiencing several different fields of centralization. One of them is IT centralization and I believe that we have appended to today's agenda, about a sixty-page report that was carried out last spring by our ad-hoc general faculty committee on IT Centralization. There are slides from the presentation, and there should be an attachment to the agenda, if it is not there, I can certainly get it to you.

I put it there by way of demonstration, what I hope to achieve as we try to evaluate the effects of centralization in the particular areas where it is being introduced as part of the budget redress. We need sophisticated, faculty-led, evidence-based evaluations of our centralization projects, so that we are not simply arguing from anecdote, as I did earlier today in response to Provost Marx's provocation.

We really need to study effects of human resources centralization have been on the different parts of the University. We need to continue to talk actively about the effects of the information technology centralization which I understand at this point, has gone so far that there are no faculty members at the highest level of information technology policymaking. That is a situation that needs to change. We need the people for whom these systems are in place, to be participating in them.

Finally, we have heard at some length, especially from Senator Ziurys about the business office and sponsored project centralization. So it may very well be, I have no doubt that Provost Marx statistics, on the shortened timeframe to getting to a project, are in fact true. The question that we must keep asking is at what costs of the

local expertise, the access, disciplinary specialization, funding specialization, etc. I want us to take a good look at all the centralization projects underway, with evidence led by faculty. I'd like to propose a joint shared governance task force, to develop evidence along the lines of the IT report. Contact started during COVID to look at deficiencies

Questions [00:59:54]

- Interim SVP of Research and Innovation, Elliot Cheu stated there is no such thing as a sponsored project centralization, but he believes what Senator Ziurys is referring to, is a project that was directly developed between the College of Science and RII to look at deficiencies. This was a joint effort between the College of Science and RII is not a central thing across campus, there has actually been more of a push from the College of Science. There has been a dramatic increase of grants.
- Chair Hudson thanked Interim SVP of Research and Innovation, Elliot Cheu and stated this is exactly the type of conversation that is needed, which is to systematically address the effects of these efforts and debunk any myths that might be out there, and to move towards efficiency by much focused conversation about when centralization creates efficiencies and when centralization comes at high costs in terms of local access, localization, and local relationships between faculty and staff.
- Chair Hudson stated she doesn't have much more to say other than there is a question of centralization versus decentralized decision-making in the colleges is something that needs to be addressed.
- Senator Ziurys stated that it seems that a lot of centralization is occurring because that is what is invoked. As she said in the previous Senate meeting, she thinks Chair Hudson's suggestions of carefully looking at centralization and the real benefits, drawbacks, and costs is important.
- Senator Ziurys stated when things are working fine and people are getting things done, why is there a need to change it? The minute there is change, there is disruption. She is not sure if anyone else feels the same, but it is becoming harder and harder for her to get a grant proposal done because she doesn't have the personal connection, she once had to someone who knew NASA and what to do with NASA. It is important for there to be personalized relationships between faculty and staff.
 - Chair Hudson asked what the cost savings will be that will emerge over time.
- Senator M. Witte stated there has to be distinction between decentralization that goes to the college and deans, and decentralization that goes to the departments. She believes Senator Ziurys is talking about decentralization coming down to faculty, and it is not adequate to say decentralization is coming down to college deans.
- Senator Barefoot stated she is the representative of Staff Council, as the Vice Chair and she would be happy to collaborate on a shared governance centralization task force. She believes this is a really important question across multiple areas and it affects staff tremendously but also affects the ability to support faculty.
 - Chair Hudson stated she thinks this would be a great idea for a shared governance collaboration between faculty, staff, and admin to take a look at the data on this, which can happen in Spring 2025.
- Senator Russell stated she would like to see the goal of centralization and specific metrics. The big issue is that the University of Arizona is the biggest employer in Southern Arizona, it matters, and it is the community. The institution is not in the largest city like at ASU, and it's not possible for just anyone to be hired, whenever, to do amazing work. The staff at the UA helps to make everything more down here.
- Senator Russell stated she is deeply concerned that centralization is pulling pit crews apart and pushing them out the door and trying to recentralize. This inevitably means that there is not the longstanding, incredible staff that have been with the UA, trained from possibly right out of school, like in home department, and is now on track to be the next business manager. This is through hard work, effort, and intense study, as well as incredible experience.
- Senator Russell stated training up has to be completed at the UA since it is not located in a large metropolis, with a lot of people to pick from. Staff need to be higher-trained, and individuals need to be good to them because it is not possible to replace them at the same level like at ASU.
- Senator Russell stated she is concerned there are no real metrics because the upsetting overturn is big and hitting at the bottom line of both happiness and satisfaction.
- Chair Hudson stated all of the items that have been discussed relate to new business, she has a brief introduction to make about access to public records and access to data which is not unrelated to these questions of how efficiency and changes being made are measured.

8. NEW BUSINESS [01:06:42]

A. Access to Information: Public Records and FOIA request issues, Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:07:06]

I want you all to know that June 30, 2024, I submitted twenty-five public records requests to the University. It is now October 7, 2024, and not a single one of them has been fulfilled. This is very familiar to those of you who have tried submitting public requests, including journalists in the room, and it is a really big legal and institutional problem if it is not addressed. There is going to be no recourse but to go to the State of Arizona Ombudsman, and eventually the State of Arizona Attorney General to address the question of timely production of public records,

and the question of failure to produce public records. Many of you that have submitted public records requests know that they will often come back as being non-responsive, or with the information being redacted, "in the best interests of the State of Arizona." This is a public records issue and is affecting the ability to hold ourselves accountable, and to inform the community about the state of the University.

While we're talking about the internal data production within the University, which is so helpful in assessing these questions of workload, FTE, metrics, efficiency around budgetary solutions, etc. It is also extraordinarily frustrating, I compared it, when I ask for internal data within the University to trying to go to a cranky, old vending machine, that requires lot of banging, and works much better when you bring an engineer, someone who knows how to get the item out. Senator M. Witte pointed out that on matters budgetary and personnel, there is a simple piece of technology that would work well, and that is a book. A very thick book, line by line, that would indicate statistics down to the micro level and it would be statis, and you would not need to extract it from a series of very tricky menus and other portals that require you to know a series of codes, how to interpret the data, and how to get it out. This is a huge problem, and I want to put it on the record whether it is external data via public records, or internal data via an extremely difficult to use, system of codes, access, and connects, you actually need to know somebody. As we've just heard, the business officers are very busy these days, and if you don't have a business officer, you don't know how to extract data from the system.

In order to make good decisions, and move forward together, the external and internal data issues need to be fixed at the University of Arizona.

Vice Chair Hymel [1:10:49]

Thank you very much, Chair Hudson. Before we move on, I would also like to put my two cents in before we move on. A couple of weeks ago at a faculty meeting, I think we spent over an hour just trying to understand how to do the expense reports. I am not sure anyone walked away with any understanding of how to do expense reports, and I'll tell you we have a fantastic financial officer. Regarding the digging down for the data, I feel this is not our responsibility and is another time waster, especially if you worked and worked to get the data and never made it there.

B. Political Activities: Rules and Requirements, Senator Ted Downing [01:13:09]

To help everyone, I sent an email with some links of what I will be discussing just a minute ago. 41 days before critical, national elections, and amid expanding international conflicts, the University released its interim policy on political activities. This policy regulates Arizona Revised Statute 15-1633. This law prohibits specific activities such speaking on behalf of the University or using your work time or resources for political ends. But, under our goofy universal policy production process, an interim policy goes into effect immediately with comments to follow. It is kind of the reverse of all of the other State agencies.

This interim policy fails to state major parts of the state law, which bothers me a lot. This makes four serious omissions that threaten your freedom of speech. To begin, the policy states that employees need University permission for actions that are constitutionally protected. This subtle policy maneuver is called permissive fiction, was long ago identified by Ernst Cassirer in his 1946 analysis of the rise of authoritarianism in the third Reich, in a book called, "The Myth of the State."

Listen carefully to the policy, and I am sending the link. "University employees may participate in political activity outside the scope of their employment but must first allow their interest in a particular party, candidate, or political issue, not to affect their objectivity of teaching or performance of their regular University duties." The policy goes on with examples that I won't go into detail, but it says again, "University employees may engage in political activities," then it gives a list such as, you may vote, contribute to candidates, put a bumper sticker and badges on your car, attend meetings, and put yard signs in your card.

The University and its administrators cannot grant, permit, or assume authority over our inherent rights or freedom of speech. I just read a list of what we call permissive fictions. Employees and students have no need to ask permission, alert a supervisor, or file paperwork to exercise their constitutional rights apart from those explicitly described, and the use of university compensated time. The university cannot grant itself constitutional rights and privileges guaranteed by overarching state and federal laws. The Arizona law explicitly says, "It shall not be construed as denying civil and political liberties to any person as guaranteed by the United States and Arizona." This phrase was omitted from the interim policies that were just given to us. The interim policy also admits parts of the law forbidding administrative violations of free speech. Arizona law makes it illegal for a University employee to use the authority of their positions to influence the vote or political activities of any subordinate employee. Remember that the university has failed to protect the campus and this critical voting related period, but get to

informing us about this legal necessity and legal provision. It is not in that interim policy. Was this omission accidental or partisan?

The policy designates a university office to enforce this activity, or to oversee this activity that includes former republican government appointees with little or no previous higher education experience. Third, the University warns employees of personal consequences for policy violations with fines up to \$5,000. This cannot be reimbursed by university funds. You heard this discussion in April, here in the Senate from the Vice President for Research. Again, the policy strategically omits stating that neither the Board of Regents, any department, office, or personnel within the university has jurisdiction on these violations. The law, not the policy, says, to the contrary that University employees who feel pressured, have the right to denounce violations directly to the Arizona or County attorney. Finally, the most critical political activity of all is omitted, voting in 2024. Thank you.

I did refer this and already had interaction with APPC, because it involved deeper policies, academic freedom, and greater ideas than academic freedom. We can go to the right of free speech of employees and American citizens.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated she sees there is a hand from the audience, and the individual must reach out to their Senator in order for them to speak on their behalf.

C. Draft Resolution on a [First Read of Resolution on condemning hate speech: Rights and Responsibilities](#) – Chair of the Faculty [01:19:13]

I was asked whether the Faculty Senate would take action on the difficult question, one I have wrestled a great deal, of how to discourage hateful speech and aggression without infringing on our constitutional freedoms. I have come up with a draft which is attached to the agenda today, and as a procedural matter, I would like to start encouraging us to have first, second, and third readings of proposed resolutions as our colleagues at ASU and NAU do in their Senates.

What I present to you today is a draft that seeks to walk this fine line of discouraging hateful speech while encouraging and guaranteeing freedom of speech. I hope that in November, we can have a discussion when everyone has a chance to read it:

“The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona, condemns, abjures, and is dedicated in principle and practice to nonviolently combatting all forms of identity-targeting hateful aggression, harassment, intimidation, supremacism, and discrimination on our campus.

In this moment of turmoil in the world and on college campuses around the country, we have a particular and heightened obligation to be vigilant and proactive about recognizing, discouraging, reframing, deescalating, and - when appropriate - reporting to the Threat Assessment Team (TAMT) all Middle Eastern conflict related aggressions - specifically but not exclusively antisemitic, islamophobic, and anti-palestinian harassment.

As faculty and community members, we urge a campus culture of

- respectful engagement across difference,
- centering critiques of structures, actions, and ideologies rather than attacks on individuals, groups, or identities,
- civil discussion and debate,
- precision of expression,
- inclusive pedagogy,
- evidence-based inquiry,
- de-escalation and deconfliction,
- neighborly respect, compassion and reciprocity across differences.

The exercise of protected first amendment rights of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition on our campus and of academic freedom in the classroom will at times make community members uncomfortable. That is the nature of education. While students and others should never be required to endure unwelcome or non-consensual conversations or demonstrations and should never be punished for withdrawing from situations that create discomfort, they cannot be systematically protected from intellectual or even emotional discomfort by this public state institution without encroaching on our shared core values.

For that reason, it behooves each faculty member, and indeed all members of the community, to exercise mature judgment, model tolerance and civility, practice measured and precise speech, refrain from personal attacks, recognize, deescalate, and report when members of our community are targeted for who they are or who someone assumes them to be or when passion crosses the line into hateful intimidation or hate speech.”

- Senator Rafelski stated it would be easier to have a short and easy to read statement for everyone inside and outside of the University.
 - Chair Hudson stated this is a reasonable proposition and she will consider that.
 - Senator M. Witte stated that the best remedy to hate speech is to discuss it, and she believes this should be Faculty Senate's approach. It is difficult to find documents on hate speech and it doesn't cover every kind, but when saying hate speech will be counteracted by more speech, this reaffirms going against it.
 - Chair Hudson stated she appreciates both Senator Rafelski and Senator M. Witte's suggestions and she will try to incorporate them in the future.
- Chair Hudson stated she enters this into the record as her personal effort to frame these issues, but she will entertain any and all suggestions and agrees that brevity of a resolution and the encouragement for more talk is very simple and much less didactic expose on this topic.
- Senator Cochran stated he has a note of affirmation and thinks what Chair Hudson is attempting to do in this draft is appreciated to speak on these matters. He agrees that there can be discussion on this, and some may find that reworking and revision is effective.
 - Chair Hudson thanked Senator Cochran for his acknowledgement and stated it wasn't easy to do, nor was it her inclination to do, but she feels it is her responsibility to state what the consensus as the Faculty Senate is. She looks forward to suggestions, revisions, and cutting down her personal expression in this draft.
- Senator Fink stated he is hung up on the English perspective on the first line of the statement as the words, "condemn," and "is dedicated in principle and practice to" is stated but seems to be contradictory at first, even though he knows she means to condemn the hate speech and to non-violently, violently combat the issue.
 - Chair Hudson stated she understands, and she appreciates the specificity and precision, and it will be addressed.
- Senator Slepian stated to address the instance mentioned by Senator Fink, there can be a semicolon inserted, this should diffuse the negative and positive connectivity issue raised.
- Senator Slepian stated as a team, the Senate is their own group, and he thinks it would be a useful addition to seek parallel statements of institutions if this hasn't already been done. This can help the Senate to see where they fit in other public funded institutions.
 - Chair Hudson stated she thinks this is a great suggestion and thanked everyone for tolerating her interventions.

D. Statement and [Update](#) from Gen Ed *ad hoc* committee – Chair Mark Stegeman [01:29:59]

First, I want to thank Professor Vetter for his comments. I don't so much perceive tension in the gen-ed process, I perceive civil disagreement which I think is fine. One of the things that ABOR wants us to model and teach students is how to say disagree civilly and I think this is a great forum to model that, and that applies to all of our processes. There are some areas of disagreement, and I think that is natural. One good way, in my experience, to mitigate tension, is to talk about the underlying issues and focus on that set of individual entities. I think that is what thousands of faculty, and other stakeholders partake in and it has a positive effect.

My purpose here is to deliver a statement which was sent to the Faculty about fifteen minutes before the meeting, adopted by the committee. This is only the second time in our year-and-a-half existence that we have made a statement, and we do take it seriously. This statement was adopted by a thirteen to one vote, with Professor Vetter being the opposed. I love the committee, and I love them partly because we don't always agree, but most of us agree on this particular thing. We have one Vice Dean of a major college, two department heads, several former undergraduate advisors, two members of UGEC, four senators, and two members of the President Search Committee. All thirteen of these people are very well regarded in their home units, and I am probably one of the least distinguished people on the committee, I appreciate their tolerance of that. This is absolutely an A list committee, and that doesn't mean we're right, people can be wrong. I would not like to see the service of these people whose time is very valuable, anyway disregarded. I think they're doing a great job. I think the thirteen votes for "yes" positions says something and I would like to say something about what that is. There is a lot of diversity on the committee with eleven colleges and academic units. This means there are a lot of different political viewpoints which typically don't normally matter, except it might when addressing civics.

I've said this many times, to many people, I think Professor Vetter does an outstanding job of running UGEC. I am really impressed that it is a difficult committee to run. This is a good opportunity for me to say he has done an outstanding job on the committee, and I suspect every member would agree. I would also like to complement the Office of General Education, which is a difficult thing to bring over the line and we are in adverse circumstances in the University in many ways, and there are difficulties. It is hard, and there is not an obvious solution. I complement OGE for it's efforts.

Some of the difficulties we have had with this refresh was that it was developed under a different Provost and some of the things that have rolled forward have caused issues. I don't think anyone in this room is accountable for that. We deal with the past by moving on. The OGE has also created a civic knowledge and civic learning task force at the end of last Spring which I am very happy about. They will meet again this upcoming Wednesday and I think this will be a great vehicle to discuss these issues involved in developing a civics curriculum.

The issue behind our five-and-a-half-page statement is that the Office of General Education has proposed and filed a report, which can be found within the agenda, proposing to develop a civics curriculum, taking it through the approval process, and will have every undergraduate student in seats, to have sufficient capacity by Fall 2026 (twenty-two months). The main point of the statement is that this is not realistic and carries many hazards, which we feel strongly about. This is a separate issue about what this will look like. One of the reasons that carries hazard is that there is not yet a consensus about what civic education may and should look like. It may never be that there is a consensus on this as it is a very strong issue. If more time was spent on this, everyone should be able to get to a much higher degree of consensus than if it were rushed through.

On the schedule proposed by OGE, the Senate may be approving this in February 2025. I think this is a huge institutional issue that will affect the spending of tens of millions of dollars, and tens of thousands of students. This deserves full senate engagement over a period and is not analogous to some wanting to approve a new major, which the Senate has been accused sometimes with justice, of getting too deep in the weeds with reposing a new program. Senate is always entitled to do that because that is our responsibility. This is an enormous change, and it may coupled with other changes in the refresh. If there is anything the faculty senate should be engaged with, it is curriculum and program development. Gen-ed is the biggest singular curricular item. There should be a lot of Senate engagement over a period of time, and that won't happen sufficiently if there is approval in February 2025. This is because there are several proposals for how to implement civics floating around, which have been posted by UGEC and Professor Jeremy Vetter, but there is no consensus.

One of the things we point out in our statement is that there aren't complete proposals, there are sketches of proposals with important details not included. To ask which proposal you prefer is a premature question because there are a lot of pieces missing. I suggest there is some form of a study session where Senators are able to have a discussion on this, without taking any action.

E. Research funds and budget changes: Elimination and freezing of IDC funds and fixed cost funds – Interim Provost, Ron Marx [01:41:25]

At the Senate Executive meeting two weeks ago, when we were planning the agenda for this meeting, a number of questions were raised, spurred by Senator Ziurys, about some of the budgetary changes affecting faculty. These particularly had to do with research funds and so on. There was an interesting set of questions Senator Ziurys raised and out of that meeting, I asked Secretary Zeiders if she could organize the questions for me so that I can answer them as best I could. I am now going to answer those questions.

There are three areas of questions, one of them having to do with the distribution of money, that is facilities and administration which used to be called IDC. The second one had to do with funds related to fixed price complete contracts. The last question was about the allocation and extension of startup funds. If I make mistakes, Interim SVP or RII is in the back of the room, and he will correct me.

Regarding F&A, faculty have been told that this policy is no longer being followed. This is the 2% of F&A funds that were allocated to PIs. The answer is, yes, it has been terminated in the current budget system. As an editorial comment, as said earlier in the evening, he was a very active researcher in his career and was allocated 5% of the F&A faculty. This was used for a lot of great things such as hiring people, sending graduate students to conferences and more. I am a champion of this and understand that in a way, faculty members are entrepreneurs and are operating little organizations within the University, and having "funny" money to continue their work is a good thing to do. I am a champion for that and will try to get it back. A challenge for this money, and any kind of money, is having accountability and predictability about expenditures. There may be new rules about how long those funds are available to you, but I don't want to go into that because it is all speculation. Any money that faculty already had in F&A accounts is yours to spend and has not been swept. Within the budgetary expenditure authority of the college, it has to be factored into the total expenditure of the college.

Regarding fixed price complete contracts, as background this is faculty members in a unit had a contract to do X, and

they're going to pay a fixed amount of money to X, an example is them paying a \$1,000 to do X, if it costs \$80,000, there is \$40,000 left over which goes in their pocket to spend. There is a fair amount of money in the University in fixed price complete contracts. As of June 30, 2024, the balance was \$15.5 million. I might add, however, there is a lot of variances across colleges, and some have essentially none. There are colleges with significant deficits in their fixed price complete contract. Therein lies one of the colleges. These funds are frozen, but not indefinitely. They have not been swept and are still in the college budgets. My suggestion is that if there is an urgent need for expenditure having to do with a fixed price complete contract, that the proposal be brought through the Dean, myself, and Mr. Arnold, and we will see what we can do. That is not an open invitation, but nonetheless, the money is there, and it has not been swept.

Startup funds are complicated. They are essentially contracts that we make with faculty members when they come here, and most of the money and startup funds are unrestricted, that is that they come out of our state grant and tuition and are not restricted the same way that research funds are, except for TRIF funds which are treated somewhat differently. The money is available to be spent with some restrictions, and expenditures on startup funds are not restricted. Startup funds are being spent within those expenditure authorities in the college. If the college has \$50 million to spend, and they want to spend startup funds that have been allocated over the years and exceed the \$50 million, they must go to me and Mr. Arnold to explain the spending of the funds more than the funding authority. Startup funds have not been swept and it is hoped that all deans, department heads, and unit heads with new faculty can use those startup funds wisely.

- Interim SVP, Elliot Cheu stated there are a lot of startup funds in TRIF which are restricted. Most of the funds are F&A and not tuition dollars but are treated as unrestricted.
- Senator Ziurys stated it has to be known when the University stopped giving the 2% F&A.
- Interim Provost Marx stated this began at the beginning of the fiscal year.
- Senator Ziurys stated it would be useful to put this in writing instead of the faculty hearing rumors. She has had faculty say they couldn't spend what was left in their F&A, and she hasn't tried yet, but she will soon.
- Interim Provost Marx stated he will work to get communications out on this. There may be deans or unit heads who are saying this, but that is not the central administration's desire.
- Senator Ziurys stated it would be useful to have a document on this in case there are questions, or inconsistencies on this. She thanks Interim Provost Marx for supporting F&A return and believes people appreciated it.

9. **Reports from the 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](#), [CLCK Proposed Implementation Timeline](#), [Proposed CLCK Models to be discussed October 9](#), [UWGEC](#),**

10. **Adjournment [01:51:23]**

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2023/25-7]** to adjourn the October 7, 2024, meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. Vice Chair Hymel thanked everyone for attending the meeting, especially with the technical difficulties, the meeting was adjourned at 4:58 PM.

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

Motions of October 7, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2024/25-5] motion to approve the Agenda of the October 7, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-6] motion to approve the minutes of September 9, 2024. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/25-7] to adjourn the October 7, 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 [September 9, 2024](#)
3. Page 7, Old Business Item 7B: [Response to letter](#) from Mark Stegeman and Mae Smith – UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter

4. Page 8, Old Business Item 7C: [Review of faculty governance work products on centralization](#) – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson
5. New Business
 - a. Page 11, Item 8C: Draft Resolution on a [First Read of Resolution on condemning hate speech: Rights and Responsibilities](#)
 - b. Statement and [Update](#) from Gen Ed *ad hoc* committee – Chair Mark Stegeman
6. Written reports from the
 - a. [Provost](#)
 - b. [SAPC](#)
 - c. [Constitution and Bylaws Committee](#)
 - d. [Gen Ed Office with UWGEC](#)
 - e. [CLCK Proposed Implementation Timeline.](#)
 - f. [Proposed CLCK, Models to be discussed October 9](#)
 - g. [UWGEC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456