

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 4, 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=5ffe9643-9aa8-4029-beb1-b21f00082d29>

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 [00:00:10]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called November 4, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 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 [00:00:41]

Vice Chair Hymel stated there has been one change since setting the agenda in the Senate Executive Committee. The Item to Welcome to President Suresh Garimella has been moved up to Item 3 due to the President having a short amount of time to present.

- Senator M. Witte asked for a moment of silence for Jose D. Garcia, who passed away on October 14, 2024. He served as a Senator, Chair of the Committee of Eleven, and was iconic Chair of the Faculty at a time when the voice of the Faculty was the strongest it had ever been.
- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024/25-8**] to approve the November 4, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. WELCOME TO PRESIDENT SURESH GARIMELLA [00:02:46]

Chair Hudson [00:03:06]

Hello, it is my pleasure to introduce our new President, Suresh Garimella. We all know him already as the former President for the University of Vermont, former Senior Vice President for Research at Purdue, and a Distinguished Professor of Mechanical Engineering specializing in heat transfer & exchange, and microchannel heat exchange optimization.

Those of us who have had the opportunity to begin to get to know him know that he is an extremely quick study, decisive, deliberate, and appreciative of all the complex diversity of our institution. I believe he also believes deeply in shared governance and going forward, will honor our traditions, our old memorandum of understanding, and craft with us a new memorandum of understanding. He intends to join us at least once a semester here in Senate and to work closely with Provost Marx. We hope he will love it so much here in Senate that he will come here often.

Please join me in welcoming our new partner in excellence, President Garimella.

President Suresh Garimella [00:04:18]

Thank you, Leila, quite the introduction, the decisive, deliberate, those things sounded good. Thank you all for giving me a few minutes and for adjusting your agenda. I have been here about a month and I just want to say that I’ve always been a faculty member first. I have been one for thirty-five years. I have done the research, the teaching, the engagement, and so on. Shared governance and our faculty colleagues are very important to me, as are our staff who

support us, and of course, the students.

Just a quick report, I have filled my first month with a lot of meetings with the Deans, Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, Donors, Governance Groups, Alumni, Legislators, and Governor Hobbs. I have also been to really fun events, the best part of the month so far has been the Homecoming Bonfire, and the Diwali festival that my wife and I were at on Saturday night. It is nice to be with students. There were some research centers that were inaugurated who invited me and that was wonderful too. The symposium on pain and addiction, and things like that, meetings of the community. It has been a very full and diverse set of meetings, a lot of fun.

I have been working very closely with Provost Marx and the CFO, John Arnold. Some of you probably know that they've moved into offices closer to me so we see each other about fifteen times a day and that is how I like it. This is a very large, very complex role, as you know, most of you have big roles and no one person can do this on their own. I intend for this very much to be a collective, inclusive team that works together which is why I think having folks close is good. The entire leadership team and I have to be aligned, along with our governance groups of course. This also informs my philosophy on communications. I suspect no one would disagree that one of the hardest things on a university campus, or in the community today, is getting communications across. It doesn't matter how much you try, you'll never get it as good as you like, but we should keep trying. My hope is to be open, to be authentic, to be consultative with you in my communications.

I also believe that those closest to public communications in terms of internal and external issues have the greatest expertise and should do the communicating. For example, on some student issues, it might be Chrissy, Amanda, Ron, etcetera. If it is a budget issue, it is John Arnold. But there will be times when I need to speak and so you'll hear each one of us communicate with you. I do hope that you see it is a unified leadership, and we are all working together. At this first meeting, I just want to share, I have always understood the work of a University. It is a simple sort of time tested construct. I welcome your thoughts, not just today but moving into the years that come.

I would like to engage with the campus community on this construct and that is the way I view my work as a University professor or University President, we are all about student success and their experience. By this, I mean that we offer them the most excellent education possible, they have research internships available to them, paid internships, and company internships, or at museums, they have service-learning opportunities, have opportunities to study abroad, and more. How can we enrich the experiences of our students while they're here? That is our North Star. We wouldn't be professors if we weren't interested in teaching. That is the central thesis.

We're an amazing research powerhouse. There are so many good things that this University, research, creative endeavors, and more. How do we invest in those distinctive strengths? How do we stand out from the crowd? How do we impact our community with our work?

The third part of one of the main reasons I like the University of Arizona is that it is a public, land-grant, flagship university. I think we owe it to our community to uplift it, to bring significant resources, technical, social, and intellectual to bear on our community. I guess that is how I view my work at the University. I would love in the coming months and years for you to think about that with me and let's construct this together. The Provost and I will be meeting with the faculty-center leadership as well as with the other governance leaders regularly. Some will be deep dives into topics of interest, some will be updating each other so that we are aligned on the same page, other than that, I hope we will have a few minutes in which case I am happy to answer easy questions.

Questions [00:10:10]

- Senator Ziurys stated she has read in the newspaper that thirteen vice president positions have been removed but there are still almost one-hundred remaining. She asked if the University intends to cut more of these high-level vice president positions.
 - President Garimella stated he does not know what the thirteen positions are. He is trying to understand the senior leadership team and has met with most of the Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, and Deans. He will be joining the Dean's Council to chat with them. He wants to understand the structure of the University and hopefully continue to iterate on the organizational structure which seems like at most schools, to have been clerged together, band-aided over time, and may need a fresh look.
 - President Garimella stated he told the senior leadership team this morning that if and when belts need to be tightened, he wants to ensure the administrative side tightens more before affecting the academic side. He is very partial to that and more of that will be seen.
 - President Garimella stated he will get a better understanding of the structure soon and will get back to Senator Ziurys.
- Senator Rafelski stated he has been in the Senate for five to six years and has a burning question. He stated he

knows the President has a lot of experience in University administration and there is a number of students per professors. He is wondering how one determines the number of vice presidents per student, per professor, or per institution.

- Senator Rafelski asked if it is necessary to have 25 vice presidents run a university, or if the number is 10 or 200. He stated there must be some institutional experience that President Garimella has and he would love to hear more information about this.
 - President Garimella stated in general, as a faculty member, he believes that universities have too many vice presidents. He does not know the story at this university but at the University of Vermont, there were eight people in senior leadership. When he came to the University of Arizona, there were eleven and he reduced it to eight.
 - President Garimella stated to not use their ratios as he is not promising anything as it is not about numbers but about functions. This includes whether the students are being offered safe environments, what that takes, whether student success is being ensured, whether research function is being carried out in terms of keeping the trains running but having IRB, and others working. It is also important to consider what is being brought to corporate partnerships and international partnerships to bear.
 - President Garimella stated sometimes titles are offered to retain people, sometimes it is easier to offer a title than a salary, and there are many things that go into these matters. He doesn't believe anyone should get hung up on numbers and there should be a look taken at how well the university is functioning and whether critical functions are being responsibly addressed. It is important to ask whether the University is being as efficient as possible.
 - President Garimella stated he will focus on the efficiency of the administrative side, and if he is given a little bit of time, results will prove that.
- Senator Slepian asked about surprises, specifically in his first month here, what were the top three positive surprises that he has encountered, and the negative ones that he would like to lean on in order to move forward in a positive way.
 - President Garimella stated a positive surprise was that the weather cooled down. Regarding the culture on campus, he likes the openness of the students as it seems less performative, dogmatic, and ideological. He is happy to hang out with students and he hopes that he can contribute. Other surprises include the administrative structures which he will do his best to bring some order to. He believes that systems and software, including human systems, can be used smoothly. Specifically, this includes travel expenses and other things that don't get attention, work done on this can make everyone's lives easier.
 - President Garimella stated a reaffirmation he has noticed which he is not really surprised by is how strong the colleges are. He has said to the deans that he believes the colleges are doing fine, there will be adjustments here and there, but it is from the administrative side that better partnerships need to be made with everyone.
 - President Garimella stated he has been impressed with the amazing research and offerings. It is a super-land grant with twenty colleges, or twenty-one, depending on how it is counted. There is the ability to do law, medicine, journalism, or art.
 - President Garimella said the university should be able to stand out and help the community more than it does.

4. **APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES FOR THE OCTOBER 7, 2024 FACULTY SENATE MEETINGS](#) [00:17:16]**

- Senator M. Witte stated she believes on the first page her first initial was left out but there are two Senator Witte's, while they share DNA, they are not the same mind.
- Senator M. Witte stated she would like to complement Faculty Center Staff, Jasmin and Secretary Zeiders which contrasts with a second phrase of the flawed minutes that were not approved over the past several years.
- Senator M. Witte stated there was a discussion regarding this matter more than a year ago and she would like to be assured that at no time, should the minutes be edited after they are factually reported by Faculty Center Staff, Jasmin and Secretary Zeiders. The minutes should not be edited by the Senate Executive Committee or anyone else, they should come straight from the factual reporting to the Senate in an open session to be corrected.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated that it is the process that has only ever been used.
 - Senator M. Witte stated in the past there were instances where it didn't happen. She would like to go forward and continue to complement Secretary Zeiders on the minutes and have the minutes corrected.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she will make the change requested by Senator M. Witte but there are also three additional changes that will be made to Senator Downing's political activity speech. These changes are very minor such as replacing the word "amid" with "amidst," adding an "a," and capitalizing a letter on another word.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she would like to proceed with approving the minutes and the amendments will be made under her direction with Faculty Center Staff, Jasmin.

- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024-25/9**] to approve the minutes for the October 7, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting as amended. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

5. OPEN SESSION. KIAN ALAVY, SENATOR DUARTE DIAZ, SENATOR LUCY ZIURYS [00:19:56]

Kian Alavy, Director, Strategic Planning & Initiatives [00:20:14]

Hello everyone, my name is Kian Alavy, I am a staff member in the division of Undergraduate Education here. In the spirit of communication and connecting with the students, I do have a student here to talk about Hack Arizona. The students asked me to facilitate getting in front of the faculty and coming to speak with you about this Hackathon event that is taking place January 24th through January 26th of 2025. I will let Daniel, one of our co-Chairs take over.

Daniel Gallardo, Hack Arizona Co-Chair [00:20:47]

Hello everyone, my name is Daniel Gallardo, and I am excited to announce the return of our university's signature hackathon event, Hack Arizona, after a five-year break. This student-led event is a hands-on opportunity for students to tackle a variety of real-world challenges, encouraging creativity, collaboration, and interdisciplinary teamwork.

One of our main goals for Hack Arizona is to make the event accessible to students from all disciplines, not just those who typically participate in hackathons. By incorporating diverse themes and challenges, we're creating an event where students from a wide range of fields can contribute their unique perspectives. To accomplish this, we'd love for faculty to be involved in this process, whether by helping shape the challenges, creating new ones, or bringing in ideas that reflect the real-world complexities within your fields. This variety ensures that participants from STEM disciplines, but also areas like humanities, social sciences, business, and more can find a meaningful role in the event.

There are also other ways to directly support our event, which is our request of you, whether that's serving as a judge, hosting a workshop, offering mentorship to students, or showcasing research! Not only would this be invaluable to our students, but it's also a chance to see your students apply what they've learned in your classes to solve real problems—skills they can carry back into the classroom and beyond.

To make this event a success, we'd also appreciate your help in spreading the word. We would love to share a brief, less than five-minute pitch, of this event in your classes to encourage student participation – or if that's not possible, simply posting a flyer on your courses' D2L announcement page would help spread the word immensely.

Thank you all so much for listening. Please let us know if you have any questions or if you are interested in getting involved in any way. You can contact us through our email hackaz@arizona.edu. We're excited to make Hack Arizona an unforgettable experience for all!

[Hack Arizona Collaboration Package](#)

Senator Duarte Diaz [00:08:57]

Today, I wanted to discuss an important issue for me and my colleagues in Cooperative Extension:

Central Administration has imposed a spending authority on Cooperative Extension funds, including capping expenditures on state-line funded programs.

This is particularly alarming since it demonstrates the administration's has some lack of understanding of the land grant mission in delivering critical programs across Arizona and their lack of understanding in Cooperative Extension funding and allocation of state and federal monies.

Although extensions upper administration still believes that we will get the funds back (optimism that many of my colleagues and I don't share), the reality is that statewide programs are already being impacted in real ways across our state.

This includes tribal extension programming being canceled or reduced, uncertainty in delivering 4H youth programming in the future, hiring freezes of extension staff and faculty, and canceling Agriculture and Natural Resources producer workshops

As your Cooperative Extension Faculty Senator, I feel it's my duty to alert you all to this situation. Our legislative mandate is to service our statewide community as part of our land grant mission.

Yet, CFO Arnold doesn't seem to understand that withholding state dollars specifically allocated by legislators to our programs is not something he should do. This continued withholding of funds from Cooperative Extension is already having profound consequences on our statewide programming. And given that cooperative extension funds generate a

return on investment of \$5 for every \$1 state investment, the continued withholding of allocated state funding to our programs will also have profound economic consequences.

I urge CFO Arnold to reconsider this decision immediately and eliminate all expenditure controls for state-allocated Cooperative Extension funds.

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:25:15]

The question I have that I am sure is in many of the faculty's people's minds today is, "why remain at the University of Arizona if you can go someplace else?" We seem to be in a situation where administrators at the University are simply taking over roles and decision-making processes that the faculty should be doing. Once in these roles, the administrators typically hire an expensive outside firm to make decisions that they don't seem to be able to make. This is a real travesty considering the financial crisis the university is in.

With the fact that many of these administrators have very high salaries already, why are they hiring an outside firm? An example is the Ernst & Young study of the College of Science which the University paid \$2 million for. Ernst & Young appears to not have gotten the correct information in their report. It is my understanding, for example, that the report said Steward Observatory and the Department of Astronomy had no postdoctoral fellows. I think the number is more like 30, very active in postdoctoral research. To make matters worse, the administrator will not release the Ernst & Young report so the numbers can be checked by faculty. Why not? This is a public institution. This report should be released.

Another example is the grant proposal that was withdrawn by the RII administrators because it was "too risky" without consulting the PI who had no knowledge that this was happening. We hope that rebuilding trust with the faculty is the goal of the new administration but to do this, you've got to put trust in the faculty themselves to make decisions, including financial ones. I hope and look forward to working with our new president and his administration, to rebuild this trust and achieve this goal.

6. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [00:27:57]

Thank you, I'll try to be brief. We welcome President Garimella almost exactly a year since the financial mismanagement crisis reared its ugly head, I hope. I hope you sense as well that the first responders have arrived and are showing us, if not yet quite able to tell us exactly what the plan is. At this point, we assess the situation, it is important to collaborate as much as possible with the incoming administration. I know it is strange to hear me say that, but I think we really are at an inflection point where we need to synchronize and adapt ourselves to a faculty that works with the new administration as far and as deeply as we can to dig ourselves out of the whole. As a group, I think we should be prepared with all the information, data, specific narratives, and the analyses that will help the person who holds the power, that is the President to ride the ship.

I hope that we have a Provost search very soon, that respects the spirit of our current memorandum of understanding with the administration. I intend in the Spring, to start crafting a new memorandum of understanding that reflects all the things that have happened, all the things that we've learned over the last couple of years and enables a real working partnership between a faculty-led institution, and those we've hired to administer the whole.

If you'll indulge me for a second in a little analogy, shared governance and statutorily mandated faculty governance in particular, is a little bit like President Garimella's specialty of heat exchange. Our institution consists of 20, 21, or 22 (nobody seems to know) academic colleges, and many more vertical silos. Simple requests for routine spending require frantic emails up and down the chain of command for authorization from precarious employees afraid to goof up and potentially lose their jobs. Other processes that have been described here today are also happening. Heat and friction build up in these silos and the deans and central administration don't always have eyesight or understanding of the heat and friction build up in our colleges. Very often, they don't even understand how themselves contribute and their role in the production of blockages, heat, and friction. This is exacerbated by the financial crisis and the blanket types of measures that are being imposed that have produced the kind of centralization that we often talk about here and the bureaucracy that is draining our life force.

We, faculty, and more broadly, shared governance, are the heat exchanges of this university machine. Coming in a variety of different configurations and viscosities, we channel information and friction away from the cores of our silos and form a critical element of increased performance. Interestingly, the byproduct of our information exchange, friction, and heat exchange is sensitivity, knowledge, and most importantly, trust, which can be recycled for still more nuanced faculty-led development.

I think we'll have an item on the agenda today in which the chair of the ad hoc faculty committee on the Academic Climate will share some preliminary data about what this feels like in terms of the restrictions and limitations that we hope to dismantle and be free of, as we perform our duties.

On another topic, on October 28th, I think most of you were there as we met in Executive Session to hear from all the elected representatives around the different colleges. We will do this again soon where we can talk amongst ourselves. An executive session without the spotlight of the press upon us, and that will help us process some of the many jobs that we have to do, including curriculum. I am hoping that our next meeting will take some of the back and forth that you will hear today about general education, our arguably most important single curricular mandate, and begin to process it in the space of the Senate so that we can make the best use of all the hard work put in by all the different parties working on gen ed, not least of which being the Ad Hoc Faculty Committee on General Education led by Mark Stegeman.

Also, in the October 28th meeting, the overarching theme that came out, and which I think everybody appreciated was that our academic mission is the goal, it is the end, it takes priority, and that finance is a means to that end. Once we stabilize ourselves, serving our students through education and training, and through our students, community, doing our research based on outcomes and world-changing knowledge product, not exclusively on dollars, will again be our North Star.

In the meantime, the workload issues are a viscous cycle that drains us, and I hope we will be able to communicate this effectively to our senior administrators. We also need high-level attention to the balance of precarious faculty for who, in the current configuration of chaos, feel exposed, vulnerable, and underappreciated, and wonder if we value all the hard work that they do. Most are not paid appropriately and are lucky if they don't have to think twice or three times before expressing themselves on the matters of the day. Retaliation and the possibility of retaliation is a real feature of life for many in our vertical silos. That is why one of the most important things on our agenda today is Secretary Zeider's work with the Provost Office on incentivizing and maximizing multi-year appointments for as many of the faculty as we possibly can under ABOR rules.

The financial emergency still being handled across the board by blanket, one size fits all rules made by people without a deep understanding of the academic mission has resulted in a whole range of issues from the small embarrassments of being unable to properly host academic job candidates, the positions going unfilled, opportunities left on the table for want of a nail or a screw, to what we heard about already today, projects that our legislature has seen fit to fund with line terms but having their funds redefined, stopped, or redirected. The list goes on and on, and you don't need to hear me reiterated.

This is why working collaboratively with our new administration, as far as we can go, is going to be the key to what I hope is the last year of our current time of trouble. So, let's hope that is the case and you can be sure that as far as I am concerned, everyone knows that we can bring it. We're going to have one chance to show that we can collaborate and work effectively and we will bring all our honesty, critique, and observations to that table as well.

7. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST [00:36:44]

I have a very brief report today. The first one I want to speak to is the question that was raised earlier about the Provost search. I have talked with President Garimella and now that an announcement has been made about a new Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact, he is turning his haze on the Provost search and that will be beginning, shortly, I hope. He will be announcing that, sometime in the next month or so, I would imagine. He started to think about that, and it will be underway. He promised me he would do it and I believe his promise.

John Arnold and I have spent many hours over the last three weeks having meetings with all of the deans on first quarter budget and we all know what we went through last year, which was a very trying year. We pulled \$110 million out of our hold which still leaves us with some deficit to deal with this year. In our first quarter review of the college expenditure, I can say with confidence that all the colleges are well within their budgets for the year. So that was good to hear. We know there is some slow uptake on hiring, the hiring freeze was lifted at the end of last fiscal year and that might be one of the reasons why some of the budgets seem to be under budget. In fact, all of the colleges are reacting very well to the new budget realities, and I am very pleased with that. We have, I think, one more year of real belt tightening, this year, and then we will be back at even keel and be able to make more investments in all that we do. So that is very good news, and I want you to know that I sit in all those meetings and when academic issues come up, I am there to speak to them so that all of the decisions are not made simply on the basis of money.

We're a few hours away from the opening of the precincts for election. I just looked up on my failing device that about 75 million Americans have already voted. Last president election, there were 158 million voters, so we are about halfway through to last elections number. I am hopeful that here on campus, whatever happens with the election, the Presidential election, Congress, State, the House, local elections and so on, that we will have a calm response to that. One never knows, but one would hope that our community reacts calmly and respectfully with the outcome of the election. That being said, I have asked all the vice provosts and deans either to be available for the next week or two, or to have a delegate in case there are difficulties that we have, so there are people with authority available to respond. Starting this afternoon, we will have a response team meeting every afternoon for the next couple of weeks, might

hopefully cancel today because nothing was going on. At any rate, we are going to be ready for whatever might happen.

Regarding Dean's searches, you have seen that we have had a couple of departures of deans. I have met with the College of Fine Arts and I have worked on beginning a search for fine arts and Arizona Arts and that is going pretty well, I believe. We will be naming the search committee in the near future. You might have noticed last week that Mark Miller, the Dean of Law, for the last twelve years is stepping down in January. I am working with leadership, and in fact, all of the faculty in the College of Law to name an interim dean and to begin a search probably in the new year. Not surprisingly, faculty in the College of Law feel very empowered, thankfully to write their provost and make suggestions about that particular office. I would rather have advice than not have advice.

Finally, we had the Provost Investment Fund reinstated for this year. We allocated a million dollars for the fall. We have received eighty-seven applications with a total budget for those eighty-seven applications of \$13.5 million, so we're going to fund \$1 million of it. I might round up a little bit and see if I can find money because I'm sure there can be more than a million dollars' worth of really good projects to fund. So, we will be doing that and making the announcements in December.

Questions [00:33:14]

- Senator Russell stated it has been one year of the unmarked list of who was under the hatches. She asked when there will be an update on it and if transparency can be increased as the faculty would like to help. It is hard to provide help with no numbers.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he will speak with CFO Arnold about the matter and follow up.
 - Senator Russell stated she did not know until the Ernst & Young report was done for the College of Science that the University brings in \$167 million but only \$160 million is given back. She pays attention to SPBAC reports and faculty would like to help but it is hard to do so if the problems are unknown.
- Interim Provost Marx stated things are going pretty well this year.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is an ABOR meeting coming up on November 7, 2024 and CFO Arnold promised to have any report he gives to ABOR, to the Senate, prior to the meeting in April.
- Senator Russell stated "that plot freaked everybody out, it would be nice to see the follow-up.
- Senator Brochin asked what colleges should expect in terms of cuts, if cuts are coming, and what those percentages might be for this year. She also asked if Interim Provost Marx can reassure the Senate that the President with shared the shared governance memorandum in the Provost search and seek input from faculty and shared governance leaders.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated regarding the shared governance memorandum, that is the President's prerogative. He and the President have discussed this matter and the President will put together the process, it was discussed with shared governance leadership earlier in the morning.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated regarding the planning for FY26, he is not CFO Arnold, but what he believes to be the case is that this year, the University came into about a \$67 million deficit. There was \$110 or the \$177 million retired which leaves the University with \$67 million.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated the revenues for Fall 2024 were up and CFO Arnold was very conservative in his estimates of revenues last year as he did not want to overstate what the revenues might be. It is always better to find money than not. The \$67 million is now down to about \$50 million, which is still a problem.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated when he met with the deans over the last two weeks to discuss budget planning, such as the first quarter budget expenditures and budget planning for the next year, they asked deans to come up with new ideas about an additional cut that can be as much as 3%.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated everyone just heard the President discuss trying to pull as much of that money out of central administration as possible which are the current scenarios. Things will not happen across the board, it was not done this year and won't be done this year. There still has to be \$50 million found.
- Senator Ziurys stated Provost Marx stated there would be instances where he made the academic decisions over CFO Arnold and asked for examples of when these decisions were made.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he wouldn't say "over" but where he contributed to the decision was when there were some colleges that had to return to discussion with himself and CFO Arnold due. This was due to the spending authority given to them which was insufficient to mount course needed for students. This money was reallocated to those colleges to open sections, and this will happen again in January when the Spring 2025 semester returns.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated there are investments being made in colleges to ensure that students have access to courses.

8. OLD BUSINESS [00:39:03]

A. Draft Resolution Involving Speech; Rights and Responsibilities, Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson

[00:47:49]

Thanks, everyone. This is the second reading of the policy that I brought to you last month. I am still collecting feedback on it, although I did tailor it specifically to some of the comments that came in last month. I am going to read it very briefly again for those of you who might not have had a chance to look at the shortened version. I think one of the critiques when we're talking about the delicate topic of freedom of speech was that even well-meaning attempts to put down lengthy guidelines may in fact have the inhibitory element that is inimical to freedom of speech, so I shortened that. I took away a lot of the text and I think there will still be some comments.

A couple of you reach out to me in the interim so I don't think we are ready for a vote yet, on the final draft, but lead me to read what I have got to see if there are any more comments that I can incorporate as we move towards a third reading.

"The Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona condemns, abjures, and is dedicated to nonviolently combatting all forms of identity-targeting hateful aggression, harassment, intimidation, supremacism, and discrimination on our campus, specifically including but not limited to antisemitic, Islamophobic, and anti-Palestinian threats, silencing, incitement to violence, or breach of the peace.

Simultaneously, the Faculty Senate emphasizes and reaffirms that the exercise of Constitutionally protected First Amendment rights to freedom from/of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of the press and freedom to petition shall not be infringed upon by our public state institution or its agents.

The Faculty Senate endorses the principle that the solution to speech with which one disagrees is more speech and encourages a culture of vibrant civil discourse and lively debate."

That is the shortened, condensed, distilled version that we might be ready to vote on, but I do want to open it up for questions and comments once again.

Questions [00:50:33]

- Senator M. Witte stated while she can certainly agree with the latter part of the resolution, she would caution the Faculty Senate that they should not be weaponizing policy that has already been set by the administration. The Faculty Senate should not be the arbiters of what hate speech is or what love speech is. A form of love speech happens in the Faculty Senate when some of the administrators are "loved up", hateful things are said softly, and very truthful things said loudly,
- Senator M. Witte stated she would be careful about doing so and she thinks that Chair should be sensitive because she herself was falsely accused of anti-Semitism by several law professors in a letter sent to all of the senators and sent to ABOR. Dealing with false, baseless accusations is not a role that votes are taken on in the Senate.
- Senator M. Witte stated there should be a broader discussion of protecting the latter part of the resolution, the different kinds of speech, and selectively taking people and accusing them of bad speech like Ted Downing when he was in the legislature.
- Senator M. Witte stated these are very complex issues brought up into Columbia University. She lived through the McCarthy era of hunting and name calling. She has lived through the civil rights movement where there were protests that at time, would be considered somewhat violent. She has lived through the feminist movement and the Vietnam protests.
- Senator M. Witte stated it urges everyone, and faculties haven't gotten involved. Columbia University recently suspended two professors for anti-Semitic speech. A few weeks later, there was a professor suspended for pro-Semitic speech. The faculty at Columbia University have not acted in those cases except to protest the suspension for speech.
- Senator M. Witte stated she urges the Chair not to weaponize an administrative policy that is already had, they can do it, but the faculty should not be their agents.
- Senator M. Witte stated she has been fired for free speech. The CAFT ruling said she was fired for that reason and fighting for a chairman who the university had to pay a million dollar in punitive damages because his free speech was violated. She urges everyone to not allow this weaponization of free speech in the Senate
- Senator Downing stated his thanks for Chair Hudson attempting the impossible which is to put together this statement and resolution. He is concerned there is a link. Free speech of faculty is defined in many ways by a new policy which he went into last time, this is the interim policy on political activities which was designed and written while ignoring state law that guarantees free speech on the University. This is ARS 15-1633 which explicitly provides the faculty, students, and staff with certain constitutional rights and repeats those.
- Senator Downing stated he will look at the final resolution, but he thinks that faculty should not get focused on the outer university when within their own presence, a person who has directly violated free speech has produced a policy that ignores state law. He believes the person has to answer that and as APPC would say, the policy must be rescinded immediately as it ignores the law and affects every senator.

- Chair Hudson thanked Senator M. Witte, Senator Downing, and everyone for pointing out the sensitivity and the perils of the task of trying to address contentious questions by Faculty Senate resolution. She is deeply aware of that and will continue to not bring this to a vote until there is something that most of the Senate's friendship critics believe passes the bar of constitutional freedoms.

B. Department Head queries re IT/HR centralization, Senator Shufang Su [00:56:02]

My name is Shufang Su. I am the head of the Physics Department. I stepped into this role a little bit over a year ago, and my experience has been like taking a roller coaster in the past year. On one hand, we need to keep the day-to-day operation of the department and fulfill our mission of education and research. On the other hand, we are deeply impacted by the decision and plans that are made at central level, in terms of the budget, IT, HR, etc. Today I will focus on the IT and HR centralization part, from a department head perspective (only representing my own personal view).

Communication

Since March 4, when the decision of IT/HR centralization was announced, and reporting structure of IT/HR staff changed overnight, not much was communicated to the department level and college level. It hit all of us as a surprise. No plan was communicated at that time and no plan was communicated afterwards.

Now 8 months later, about 2 weeks ago, an IT centralization structure has been circulated around, again, with no input/feedback/discussion at unit level before such a plan was presented, to both the unit leadership team and the IT/HR managers in the units. The earliest implementation of that plan is going to be today (Nov 4). Units have only 2 weeks to prepare for this implementation.

We were told that Deans were very happy about it when UITS presented this plan at deans meeting. However, when we asked our dean, we were told that there was only 8 min at the end of the meeting left for the IT centralization plan presentation. Deans are not given enough details to either be happy or unhappy about it.

We heard about things through rumors, which sometime is not accurate. We have to seek information ourselves from UITS, instead of UITS approaches us to seek our inputs or feedbacks ahead of time before decisions were announced. This is supposed to be a two-way communication that is NOT existing. Currently, it goes like either UITS tell us what is going to happen, or we hear of something through rumors and ask UITS what's going on. Most of the time not a straightforward answer is given.

HR

The primary frustration is that University HR Leadership is **not making and/or communicating decisions**.

Central HR pulled the people centrally, but still (after 8 months) have not communicated what *work* will be done centrally and what will be left behind for the rest of us to have to pick up.

Central HR don't have enough people centralized to embed back into the colleges to be able to fully provide support of central HR functions, and they have not communicated a plan for solving that problem.

Central HR have made no move to replace people who were centralized and have since terminated, putting a greater burden on the remaining people who were not centralized.

It might be true that HR were given no chance to create a plan before it happened on March 4th. However, they have had 8 months to figure out a plan to move things forward and have completely failed at doing so.

IT

Physics (35 faculty, 300 undergraduate students and 100 graduate students. 20K SCH, \$8M research fund) only has 0.75 FTE IT support (2 person, shared with HAS. One person also carries additional 0.25 FTE in building manager responsibility). Under the new structure, one person (0.25 FTE IT + 0.25 FTE building manager) is pulled away to central as infrastructure support, which takes care of servers and unix/linux system. What about the other IT responsibilities that the person currently is doing? No plan has been communicated. Also, nothing is mentioned about the building manager part of that person's responsibility. Both the money and the person are taken away. Who is there to look after our 70 year old PAS building that has never been renovated.

The IT centralization plan that was communicated 2 weeks ago includes a new management structure (New Matrixed Service Teams) which include a NEW VP position (A1 level), who will oversee about 5 NEW M5 level IT managers. Currently UITS has total 4 M5 level positions — so doubling the executive leadership positions in UITS, which is a massive blow of management and money (M5 starting salary is about 220 K). It is not clear if such structure is needed. Those positions are said to be funded by attrition, which means that current vacant positions (mostly at unit level) is not going to be replaced since money is being pulling away to hire those managers. This leaves a hole, or rather, many holes at the unit level, both budget-wise and personnel-wise, and ultimately IT service support, even with possible internal hire for those M5 positions.

Currently, there is no external audit or governance structure for UITS. Lots of decisions are made at internal level with lack of communication with units.

Recommendations

Strong communication

Involve colleges and departments in both the planning stage and implementation stage, with both the leadership team (deans and department heads), and the experts (IT managers, HR managers).

Plan well

To have a well thought out plan before making hasty decisions. We understand that no plan is perfect. But at least we should try our best to come up with the best possible plan before carrying it out.

Adequate support

If the centralization goes on well, each unit should have more support and more efficient support to cover all the IT needs.

Consistency and flexibility

Consistency across campus units while being flexible and ready to make adjustments when carrying out the plan. Each unit has its own unique features. It is important to recognize and preserve the values of specialized expertise during the centralization process.

- Senator R. Witte moved **[Motion 2024/25-10]** to extend the time on Old Business Item 8B by three minutes. Motion was seconded.
 - Senator M. Witte requested an amendment to **[Motion 2024/25-10]** which is to increase the time by five minutes instead of three minutes, three minutes for completion of the report and two minutes for discussion.
 - **[Motion 2024/25-10]** passed by unanimous consent.

Questions [01:04:34]

- Senator Russell asked where the research computing support is shown on the diagram in the presentation.
 - Senator Su stated the research aspect of this is that the new CTO will hire five more people.
- Senator Rafelski asked who controls IT.
- Senator Ziurys stated it is about time the Senate did something seriously about centralization because it is sabotaging the faculty with their IT support, and she is tired of the mind cast emails. HR is being sabotaged so people are unable to hire off of their grants and get their work done. Now, the finances are being sabotaged. She asked what the Senate will do about this as Senator Su gave a small snapshot about the issues arising, but the Senate should confront this head on.
- Senator Rafelski stated he would like to ask the Provost and the Vice President for Research to comment on how they see the situation which he considers to be a great crisis for the entire University. He asked if Interim Provost Marx would like to proceed with artisan transaction.
- Senator M. Witte stated Senator Rafelski is asking a question, inviting other people to present and there are only two minutes for discussion.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the Senate will return to this topic for further discussion.
- Senator M. Witte stated this should return to the Senate in the next meeting for thirty minutes as it is affecting virtually every department and college and it is destroying the University.

9. NEW BUSINESS [01:07:15]

A. Proposal to create a separate Department of Dermatology from the Department of Internal Medicine, Dr. Clara Curiel and Senator Marv Slepian [01:07:43]

Dr. Clara Curiel [1:10:49]

Good afternoon, everyone. I am Clara Curiel, the Chief of Dermatology and the co-Director of the Skin Cancer Institute for the Arizona Cancer Center at the University. I want to thank you for the opportunity to present this plan that we would like to move forward on implementing. We are planning to submit a formal request to transaction the division of Dermatology into a department within the College of Medicine – Tucson.

It is important to clarify that this is restructuring, it is an operational change that we're planning to implement, and it is a strategic move we have in mind. This will not require additional financial investment from the University, and I want to make that point very clear, it is a strategic reorganization within the College of Medicine – Tucson. A reason for this change is that there are multiple prongs for this. We are really looking forward to getting dermatology to expand its current clinical footprint across the state of Arizona. The rationale for this expansion is because in the State of Arizona, there is currently twenty-four academic dermatologists, out of which 60% have restraints on coverage for insurance which is at the Mayo Clinic. The College of Medicine – Tucson dermatology is

the only academic dermatology program in the state of Arizona that serves everyone. This leaves one academic dermatology unit for 900,000 Arizonans to be able to quality care at the levels of clinical trials and complex diseases.

In addition to that, about 72% of all dermatology programs in the US are departments today. The reason behind that is because of the oversight of organizational structure. We respond to the American Board of Dermatology, not the American Board of Medicine, therefore, we are distinctly different than the rest of the specialties under internal medicine.

One last point of justification is to level the field across College of Medicine – Phoenix and College of Medicine – Tucson. Dermatology in the College of Medicine – Phoenix is a department, and the FTE is one as a qualifier. The College for Dermatology is a division and there are currently seventeen core faculties. Therefore, I think we need to level the field and impact dermatology across the State of Arizona. This request will be submitted later this month, and we will be expecting to be here in the Faculty Senate in Spring 2025, and for implementation to happen in FY26.

Senator Slepian [01:10:37]

I would like to emphasize what you said, it is a lopsided situation and there is tremendous need. I think what we have been trying to do for the last year, and again this year, is to follow the rules. We want to bring it to the attention of the Senate first and then we're going to go through the whole map of processes just like we're doing with the medical device technology department which will also come forward later in the Spring.

Questions [01:10:34]

- Senator M. Witte stated she would like to speak strongly in favor of this proposal as it is a longtime coming and Dr. Curiel has done everything requested by the Faculty Senate. She mentioned Dr. Curiel mentioned she is a quadruple threat, a super teacher, extensively funded researcher, and a great clinician. Dermatology is one of the most popular choices in the medical school and Dr. Curiel has mentored many students personally, despite the busy rest of her career.
- Senator M. Witte stated she strongly endorses this proposal and Dr. Curiel.
- Senator Ziurys stated she always hears in people's proposals that there will be no cost and asked if this will really be the case moving forward. It sounds like a good program, but she would like honesty.
 - Chief Dr. Curiel stated this is a fair question and she would ask the same one. Looking at the budget, the college would be moving forward with the estimated operations that currently live within the Department of Medicine being transferred as a pod within the College of Medicine. Therefore, FTE will be shifted which is currently being spent in the College of Medicine.
 - Chief Dr. Curiel stated in addition to that, anything that has to do with recruitment and expansion is already a part of the packet of how spending would happen in the healthy chief packet.
 - Chief Dr. Curiel stated there is an aim to partner with Banner in the extension of the clinical footprint which doesn't cost anything on the University's side. This is where expansion is fundamental, coming from the healthcare side. More core faculty can be had on the clinical front, and it is important to increase education, engagement in research, and expansion of clinical trials to move forward.

B. [Multi-year appointments](#), Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders [01:13:38]

Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders

Thank you for the opportunity to speak about Multi-year appointments (MYA) today. Last senate, there were questions about ways we can support our Career-Track faculty in workload demands and job precarity. And Joellen brought up MYA and asked about the data. So, Provost Marx and Chief Data Officer Ravneet Chada were so gracious to provide me with the data on MYA. So today I'll present that data and I've asked Senator Kristen Little to join me in this presentation. Kristen is a Career-track faculty in the Writing Program, a SBS Senator and the Chair of Committee on Career-Track Faculty Needs.

Kristen is going to talk about the importance of MYA and I will provide information about the data. Senator Kristin Little is a career-track faculty in the writing program, an SBS Senator and the Chair of the Committee on Career-track faculty needs. K

Senator Kristin Little [01:14:49]

There are many benefits to multi-year appointments but as I thought more about them, for me, many of the benefits tie back to job security. What does job security mean to career-track (CT) faculty here at the UA? Overall, it can provide stability, which for some, means having the confidence to invest in the larger Tucson community by buying a home here. For others, it may mean not having to continuously search for other positions, or not having to continue

teaching classes at several colleges just to keep their foot in the door in case their one-year contract at the UA is not renewed.

How does having stability benefit CT and the faculty? If people feel their place of work has invested in them, most people will want to be a part of that community and work towards bettering it. One way of improving our workplace environment here at the UA is to have continuity in our faculty so that they feel their time is well spent when they serve on committees, take part in professional development opportunities, and participate in shared governance. Most importantly is how stability in one's job can benefit our students. If instructors have a multi-year appointment at the UA, they can focus more on the classes they teach here which can mean investing time to reflect and revise their courses as needed. This ultimately provides a better learning experience for our students. Supporting students, particularly underserved student populations relies heavily on building relationships.

In my own personal experience, working with mostly freshmen and first-year writing students, there are always several students from every class who remain in contact with me for the remainder of their time here at UA. Some ask for a letter of recommendation, advice on other classes for graduate school, and some just want to talk to someone who they have gotten to know and trust. I treasure these relationships and they're one of the many things I love about being an instructor. However, these relationships would not be possible if I wasn't here year after year.

If the University wants to equitably support all students through graduation, they need to invest in their faculty, but especially those who have little job security. Multi-year appointments are one of the best ways that the University can show support and investment in career-track faculty.

Again, many thanks to you, Katie, for continuing to work on this important issue.

Secretary Katie Zeiders [01:17:38]

Let me first set the landscape for our current UA faculty numbers. As of Fall 2024 semester, we have 3,313 active faculty and we can categorize them into 4 groups: 48% are Tenure Track or Tenure eligible; 5% are Continuing or Continuing Status; 36% are Career track, and 11% are Adjunct faculty.

When we talk about multi-year appointments, we are only focusing on CT faculty at our university. But, if folks have questions about the proportion of different categories in their colleges, you can email me.

So I want to first talk about multi-year appointments across the university: How many career-track faculty are currently on MY appointments and how many are on a year-to-year appointments? Here are the numbers (or headcounts) across the university since 2018. And what you can see is that currently, we have 1005 career track faculty on year-to-year appointments and 187 faculty on multi-year appointments. This is the percentage of career-track faculty who are on multiyear appointments - so this is just dividing the number of faculty on MYA by the total number of CT faculty.

So, in 2024, about 16% of career track faculty were on MYA. And the good news is that we have seen an increase in MYA over time. But we have room for improvement. Right next to these totals, I have listed the total number of Tenure track/Tenure eligible faculty. And I've done this because this number is important in determining how many MYA can be issued. We have ABOR policy 6-201 and it states the following:

At each university, the total number of multiple-year appointments as lecturers, senior lecturers, principal lecturer, professors of practice, teaching professors, research professors and clinical professors may not exceed fifteen percent (15%) of the number of tenure track faculty, both tenured and tenure eligible.

BUT in 2022 ABOR approved an exception to this policy stating:

"The board approved the proposed exception, through June 30, 2028,to allow the universities to award multiple-year appointments to non-tenure eligible faculty members up to a number equal to 30% for ASU and UArizona, and 40% for NAU, of the headcount of tenured and tenure eligible faculty at each campus."

So, this is why I have this last column here - this percentage is the number of multi-year appointments in comparison to the number of TT/TE faculty. This number can be as high as 30%, and you'll see that it is only 12% this year. Said differently, we have 1,575 TT/TE faculty, and 30% of that number is 472. So we could be issuing 472 MYA and still be within ABOR policy; But our number is 187. We have a lot of opportunity here to increase the job security of our colleagues.

Now I want to talk briefly about College specific data. Here is a list of colleges, their total faculty counts, their % of faculty who are Career Track and the % of Career Track who are on MYA. I've sorted the data by the % of CT faculty on MYA. And I won't review this line by line - you can view this on your own college and decide how they are doing. But I just want to point out a few things: Colleges in green are ones with the most MYA - Top 3 are Honors College, CAPLA, and CALES; Those in red are those who have the fewest MYAs. So we have colleges who did not issue a multi-year appointment to any faculty in their college. I think it's important to look at the MYA % and also think about faculty size, and % CT faculty. In my opinion, we want to see colleges with a large percentage of CT faculty utilizing MYA. And if you look for instance at the College of Nursing - 78% of their college are CT faculty, but only 4% receive MYA. or College of Pharmacy - 52% Career track, but 0% on MYA.

Finally, I want to show you trends in % of MYA by college since 2018. Again, not something I have time to review in detail, but each of you can see this historical data for your college.

These data are interesting - they show colleges who may have not issued a lot of MYA appointments early on but have really risen to the occasion - my own college, CALES. Only 8% in 2018 but now close to 40% - and this was really because of the work of shared governance and our administrator. Our Faculty Council stressed the importance of MYA and we worked closely with Jeanie Mclain, our Associate Dean, Faculty Advancement to make this happen. The data also show colleges who used to issue more MYA but have now reduced the number - SBS. And then it shows colleges who have never issued MYA - Humanities, College of Medicine-Phs, Optical Sciences, College of Pharmacy.

In summary, we (UA broadly) are underutilizing MYA for career-track faculty. And as Kristen reported, this is something that provides job security, more buy in, and better learning environments for our students. I believe there are a few things that we all could be doing to support university efforts of MYA. First, greater awareness of MYA and the ways that they are important for CT faculty. Second, making sure that Unit Heads, Academic Affairs Deans and deans of every college are aware of MYA and that they are supported in the MYA process. This is the work of The Provosts Office. Third - developing clear guidelines and/or policy for determining who gets MYA. This is again the work of our college shared governance teams and administrators. Finally, streamlining the MYA process and making sure our college administrators have the support to do this work.

C. [Timeline, Current Priorities, and Upcoming Issues in General Education](#) – Susan Miller Cochran, Executive Director, General Education [01:24:52]

Thank you so much for the time to speak here today, I know there are a lot of important things on the agenda. Thank you, Katie and Kristen, for that presentation about such an important topic.

I wanted to start by providing some context for those of you who haven't had the opportunity to closely follow the development and rollout of the new general education over the past five years. The Office of General Education, which I direct, is housed under the Division of Undergraduate Education and reports to Vice Provost Heileman. We're a consultative and advisory unit. It is a new unit that was established when we rolled out the new general education because there wasn't really a unit watching what was going on, looking at things across colleges, and trying to coordinate general education in the past.

I wanted it to be clear that we are consultative and advisory. We support various aspects of general education, and we consult with colleges and faculty on issues such as advising, enrollment management, course development and revision. We collaborate as colleagues, but we do not have authority over offerings in general education. We do not determine the schedule, we can request colleges or departments to offer seats when those are needed, and we're always trying to look ahead and see what the needs will be based on what students have taken and trying to be anticipatory about that. We have no control over budgets for general education and those are distributed according to instruction.

We do, however, have responsibility for ensuring that the UA's general education program meets all of the requirements of ABOR related to curriculum and assessment. We work very closely with our colleagues at NAU and ASU on a Tri-university committee which I chaired from its inception in 2020 until this past fall, when we decided we would rotate that across the three universities. One of the attachments in the agenda is the report that the committee will be giving on Thursday to ABOR regarding the critical thinking assessment, I wanted to make sure Senators had that available.

The Office of General Education is one of three established bodies involved in general education. We're technically an administrative unit responsible for things that I have mentioned. We oversee the UNIV courses and the professors of practice who are housed in the Honors College and provide support for them, and all of the contract instructors for UNIV courses.

UGEC, the University-wide General Education Committee is a faculty group that reports to UGC and the Senate. It is chaired by Jeremy Vetter tight now, a faculty member in history. It is an established part of faculty governance that reviews all of the courses and policy proposals related to general education in an advisory capacity to UGC and Senate. My office works very closely with and supports UGEC on a daily basis helping with specifically staff support because that is a large task that they have. The ad-hoc committee was established by the Senate and you will hear from Mark Stegeman, the chair of that committee directly following me.

One of the greatest challenges with revising general education is establishing effective communication about the many moving parts In our office and in the program, as a whole. So, to that end, last month, we began producing a monthly report that contains updates on general education data. We have received requests, or sometimes have just heard that people might be interested in upcoming issues for which we would like to see input from faculty. October's report, which was attached to the October 7, 2024, agenda included data about gen-ed enrollment across colleges. There have been a lot of conclusions drawn about those enrollments and we thought it would be

helpful for people to actually see the data about enrollments across colleges. The November report is attached to Item 10 on the agenda for today and that includes data about students' completion of the attributes, which has been a great interest for many of us since those are not currently graduation requirements. We welcome any requests for data that you all have. We want to make these reports as useful as possible, both to Senate but also to faculty, staff, and administration. We also give copies of those reports specifically to UGEC, UGC, UCAC, and the academic deans. We're happy to share those with anyone who might be interested.

Last month, I also attached to the Senate agenda, a proposed timeline for the last part of general education that we need to implement to be in compliance with aware policy and that's the civic learning, civic knowledge, or what we've been calling CLIK requirement in general education. In addition, I attached four brief descriptions of models that the CLIK advisory group has been discussing. That's an advisory group that we created that has approximately 40 to 50 faculty, staff, and administrators across the University. Those models were developed initially and discussed by a task force on civic learning which both Senator Stegeman and Jeremy Vetter had ^{served} on a couple of years ago.

I wanted to explain to you all to contextualize that those four were models are intended as conversation starters, that's how we talked about them in the advisory group meeting. They're not by any means the only options available. The feedback that we've received has actually shown the most interesting examples coming to the surface that people are showing interest in are kind of mash ups or combinations of some of those different ideas that are potentially more effective for student learning and better implementation as a whole.

We want to make sure that we do this right it's a brand-new area and the proposed timeline, which I offered, because it was requested by the ad hoc committee, was a proposal based on what we would need to happen should we implement a civics requirement by Fall of 2026. I want to be very clear I'm not advocating for that timeline. I have some concerns about the timeline, I always have. Shared government is a democracy in general, I probably don't need to say this, but it's a messy process and sometimes conversations take a little longer than we think they will, and that is okay.

The challenge is that we have to balance the priority that ABOR has placed on this component of the curriculum with our capacity to design and implement in a thoughtful, responsible way, considering the impacts on students in the academic units that would be offering those courses. My hope is that the three groups that are working on general education will be able to meet and communicate more effectively than we've been able to do thus far. I hope that the monthly reports from our office which are shared with these various groups will be helpful to start more dialogue in a productive and transparent way. I've also heard that some other concerns have been raised in the ad hoc committee that I would like to hear about more soon and include all relevant parties in those conversations. Those are issues such as the UNIV courses, the reduction in the emphasis on natural sciences in the curriculum, the complexity of the curriculum when the attributes become graduation requirements, and recertifying courses in general education.

I invite any senators, faculty, or other stakeholders to reach out directly with questions or concerns that you have about general education.

Questions [01:32:58]

- Senator Downing asked how it is determined what is up and down on general education and whether there are metrics or intellectual impact measures, not how many courses or how many things are done, the actual output. The President stated he wants to improve student experience, but the question is how to match that.
 - Executive Director Cochran stated there are a lot of different ways that is measured and that must be continually done. One is through looking at student learning outcomes to ensure students are learning what the UA says they would be learning under general education. Another way is to look at student and faculty satisfaction which is something the task force with Gail Burd put together in either 2017 or 2018.
 - Executive Director Cochran stated it is important to revisit some of those metrics and see whether or not students are understanding the general education curriculum, that the purpose for taking those classes are clearer and their satisfaction with that.
 - Executive Director Cochran stated they also look at a range of things related to the impact on the community, budget enrollments, and how things are impacting different parts of the University.
- Senator Simmons asked how Cochran's office works with both UGEC and the ad-hoc committee because the ad-hoc committee is within the Senate and the other committee is part of the faculty bylaws with representatives from each college, a representative style of shared governance. It seems there is a bit of redundancy there and he would like clarity for why there is an ad-hoc committee and one in the bylaws. He would also like clarification on conversations amongst the two are prioritized.
 - Executive Director Cochran stated regarding the purpose for outside groups, it is outside of the scope of

her responsibility. She would like to clarify that their work with both UGEC and the ad-hoc committee technically is on an informal basis. She has been advocating for about three years to have the bylaws revisited so there is correlation between what happens in UGEC and the fact that the Office of General Education exists, which is not currently included.

- Executive Director Cochran stated the fact that the way her office works with UGEC is that there is a staff member who is specifically assigned to support UGEC and receives proposals. The staff member meets with Jeremy Vetter on a weekly basis so they can look over what has come in and make sure they're following up on courses that need to be followed up on and put together the agenda for meetings. The staff member takes minutes and provides staff support to UGEC which has been passed around to different offices in the past and was a bit of a challenge.
- Executive Director Cochran stated there is currently not a formal way that her office works with the ad-hoc committee.

D. **Report from ad hoc General Education committee – Chair Mark Stegeman [01:29:59]**

Thank you very much, that was a great report. I don't really perceive the back and forth. I agree with everything Susan said, I think we are all pulling in the same direction which is to create an excellent pedagogical experience for students in a way that causes as little stress as possible for the academic units and the faculty. I do not perceive that. I am here specifically because we are charged with delivering a report once a term to the Senate.

I am here with one of my committee members. I have a very excellent committee of sixteen people from eleven units and it's constructed to have a lot of smart people, and tell me when I have my head screwed on backwards. Joellen certainly does that and she's going to correct me when I go off the rails here.

I want to thank Susan for a part of the October report she mentioned, the student credit hours report, which she said has to do with the historical allocation of student credit hours from Gen Ed. I think that is important context for future discussions about budget and how we have a reasonable revenue impact for whatever we do in gen-ed and we can focus on pedagogical outcomes instead of who gets the money. We would like the money to follow the pedagogy, not the other way around, and I think we probably all agree on that.

We have a report on the agenda, and I am here to describe the main points of that.

Regarding the advising resource center, there was a survey of the undergraduate advisors that ran over the summer which reopened in the fall. 207 academic advisors were surveyed anonymously and there was a little over 50% response rate. The biggest item in the report is summarizing the survey, there was quantitative data like Likert scale questions, and there is a section that summarized those questions. There were also six free response questions, just like in the faculty survey done last year. There were 250 responses to the free response question and repeated verbatim is attached in the appendix in report. As done with the faculty survey last year, it is very interesting to read and I suggest you read that if you would like, everything is unfiltered by us and there are pages of responses to those questions. We are not trying to interpret that, you can do that better than we can.

We do have some interpretation of the quantitative part. If you put the quantitative part of the report together, there are a couple of things that come through. There is some concern about the University 101 and 301 course that we got from the advisor population. There is concern about implementation of the four attributions scheduled for Fall 2026. One thing I noticed is there is some concern, which I didn't expect even recently, was being able to all of the required courses students need. Some advisors have no issues with that. This is all good data to have. This section of the report was produced by three people editing it together. We discovered today there were some editing errors there, a couple of things got left out so we will clean that up over the next day or two but there is nothing wrong with it. You may want to wait until you get an optimized version of that section.

The second thing in the report is the agreement with the Chair of the Faculty that there should be a meeting with a general senate discussion to get input regarding the proposals that have been put on the table. The committee was going to suggest that the committee leadership meets with faculty leadership. A way to make the discussion fruitful is to have a template where the proposals that come forward can have organized features. We can say how the proposals deal with each issue and make side-by-side comparisons, and we will decide how to construct that with faculty leadership. Our committee will probably put forward two proposals which will be following the general pattern of what the OGE posted but also adding detail to those.

We hope that other people will encourage proposals too, one of the advantages of a broad outreach process, people come up with a lot of ideas and can put them forward too. Every time we do a survey, we learn more. Getting feedback from the Senate will be an illuminating discussion.

In the report we talk about other sources of input, following up on the advisor survey which is pretty successful. I think the Advising Resource Center may organize a focus group of the advisors so we can continue to discuss

that. We want to get input from the colleges as this goes forward. Normally program proposals come from colleges, and they know how the funding is going to look and how it is going to be staffed, then it goes through that process. In this case, something done in central is something the colleges have to then implement. We have to be sure they have an input process. Like what they would have with a normal program proposal, there is a lot at stake here. I think the committee would like to do a follow-up survey of faculty informed by things like the Senate discussion, the undergraduate advisory focus groups, and we would like input from students. We have hired a student to reach out to student groups and student government to discuss how we can best get informative input from students and how we can get students interested and engaged in civics. It is not obvious to everyone that students want to learn a lot about government and civics when they're worried about getting here. We will find out tomorrow. We would like to find a mechanism to get input from students both about gen-ed and generally what would be good strategies to engage them in civics.

The third part of the report is we do think certain things need to happen before we go through with civics implementation. We do think to some points repeated in some of the statements of Senate posted last time that it makes sense to have a new Provost in place rather than ask a new Provost to implement a huge program that they didn't have any input on. We think it would be a for a Provost to be able to weigh in. It would be good to know more about the budget model than what is currently known so that the colleges understand the implications of that. It would be good to have the input we have been talking about.

As Senator Downing said, I think there was a feeling that it may make sense to seek an academic review of the gen-ed programs as some other public universities do. There hasn't been a refresh in five years so we are not talking about a full-blown APR but some sort of academic review of student achievement and student evaluations.

The fourth thing that should happen, which also came through in the advisory survey, is a concern about incremental changes. This regards changing something and then two years later coming back and making a different change which causes different cohorts of students to be under different rules. There are other changes that may happen. The Office of General Education has spoken of possible changes to the attribute rules expected to come in Fall 2026 which I think there is a lot of support to.

I think when we're discussing civics we need to be talking about those things so we can put something together as a package, ad not subject advisors and everyone else to a rolling regime of changes. I think all of those things take a little bit of time which we do have in this case. We're not unplugging a big budget hole where money is draining out that we have to stop. We don't have a pressing security issue that could lead to someone being hurt. We don't have someone threatening litigation on us for not moving fast enough with us. We have to get adequate input and put something together that works well for everyone. I am very optimistic about the process and what OGC is doing. I appreciate the new reports. Thank you very much.

Questions [01:49:03]

- Senator Simmons stated his thanks for the presentation and the work the committee is doing. As everyone knows, he loved a good, appointed committee but he would like to hear a bit more about the relationship the ad-hoc committee has with UGEC. It seems that a lot of the data Chair Stegeman has stated a lot of the data intended to come back to Senate raises the question of how the lateral communication between OGC and UGEC can be made stronger to utilize all of the wonderful data.
 - Chair Stegeman stated the chair of UGEC is on the committee and he can share everything. The ad-hoc committee wanted to get the report together but the data is available and he believes it will be posted to the UGEC website, and the report to the Senate is available to everyone.
 - Senator Russell stated the faculty committee is meant to be separate not UGEC. By student credit hours, it is one of the biggest colleges on campus, but it only has Susan Miller-Cochran, not a Dean, and was not approved here as a new college. Having faculty Senate as an ad-hoc in short term to get work done, not to replace OGC or OGEC, gives a better look from faculty senators on how gen-ed is doing. It is important, affects the budget and reputation
- Senator Russell stated she is concerned she hasn't seen SCSs come out by college for gen ed since before and after transition in the gen-ed program. In her department there is a yearly review and annual retreat where issues are tackled. She assumes Miller-Cochran is doing this in between getting ready, a big academic program review, but if not, she would like to see it. If it is not happening, she is happy to work with Chair Stegeman ongoing. This is not to say there is anything wrong but to get a full look as the Senate didn't get a chance to vet this.
- Chair Stegeman stated the ad-hoc committee has no decision-making authority. OGC, UGEC, and Senate are in a decision chain where all everyone does is talk and no one is obligated to listen. The ad-hoc committee is present to advise the Senate because the last go-round it didn't go very well.
- Executive Director, Miller-Cochran stated there are many since she would like to respond to since the first time she saw the report was today. There are a lot of items that would be really helpful for dialogue. She is delighted of

all of the things the ad-hoc committee is saying that need to happen, of everything listed, they are all things being worked on in OGC. It would be helpful if there was communication because there would be meaningful impact from the faculty on the ad-hoc committee on how OGC can proceed with some of these items.

- Executive Director, Miller-Cochran discussed with Gilbert about doing an academic program review of gen-ed before it was even launched. She felt this was important and never happened but needs to.
- Executive Director, Miller-Cochran stated this is challenging because of the SCS data issue brought up by Joellen. All of the classes offered in general education are owned by the units where they are offered and are not owned by gen-ed, she does not have any authority over them. This is a tricky balancing situation.
- Executive Director, Miller-Cochran asked Chair Stegeman if the OGC and the ad-hoc committee will start meeting regularly and having conversations.
 - Chair Stegeman stated he doesn't believe he has ever declined an invitation to meet.
 - Executive Director, Miller-Cochran stated he has declined and she would like to be very clear and public about stating it is very important that the three groups work together and meet.
 - Chair Stegeman stated he thinks there will be a wide Senate discussion.
- Chair Hudson asked for consent to add five minutes to hear the last presentation.
- Chair Hudson stated they have come to the point where these three groups will be brought together under Senate sponsorship, and it will begin with conversations under her auspices.

E. Update and Presentation from the *ad hoc* Committee on Campus Climate – Chair, Matthew Abraham [01:55:35]

Good Afternoon. It has been nearly a decade since a faculty-led committee has assessed the state of UA's institutional climate. In 2014-2015 an academic freedom committee chaired by a Faculty Senate individual, Lynn Nadel, brought together a group of faculty to look at the state of academic freedom at the UA. It brought together figures like Gary Rhoades, Elaine Richard Ruiz, Roy Spece, Amy Fountain, Miranda Joseph, Amy Newhall, Linda Ritchie, and yours truly. That committee held two campus forums to share results of a survey that circulated on academic freedom. At that time, 58% of 778 respondents reported that academic freedom was insufficiently protected at UA along with controversial research, speech critical of institutional policy, and institutional leaders were also listed as areas of concern. Respondents did not believe or receive adequate protection.

On October 3, 2022, I address this faculty senate body in the wake of a controversy around the nomination committee and the process it employed to select names and presented them to President Robbins and the faculty chair as part of the previous year's selection process. At that time, I called for a systemic analysis of what was happening in the institution, noting that those of us who have a reputation for criticizing the university and administrators found themselves and administrators frequently labeled as troublemakers and rogue faculty, even though protecting such individuals, might be vital to safeguarding the health of this institution.

In the wake of these previous efforts and the last several years of controversy, we offered these survey results about campus climate as the beginning of the conversation that is long overdue. While the response rate for this specific survey on institutional climate was a bit over half of what it was for the academic freedom survey a decade ago, the committee's work is nonetheless important because of the questions it asks. For example, there are 3,313 faculty at the university, and we received only 371 responses. Out of the whole, we got like a 10% response rate but that is consistent with the response rate for most elections. Few people can devote more than twenty minutes to respond to a survey given the number of surveys faculty received during the semester.

We hope others will join this committee in the months ahead as we prepare future reports on the state of academic freedom at the university. I want to recognize the colleagues who are on the committee which brought together a mix of tenure-track faculty and professors of practice. We are pleased to have Professor Emeritus Lawrence Aleamoni, Psychoeducational and Disability studies to join us to help with the survey. His expertise was invaluable. Other members of the committee have expertise on constitutional law, academic freedom, and have served on CAFT, C11, and other important committees. In this sense, the committee brought together people who have not only relevant experience in terms of academic expertise but have endured through retaliation and hard-won experiences. They are at the center of the survey.

There were several questions asked in the climate survey which could have led to fifty others, but this is just the beginning of the process. What I wanted faculty to take away from the survey was the protection of whistleblowers which is wholly inadequate at this institution. ABOR 6-914 is actually a carve out of a bigger statute, ARS 38-532 which exempts University of Arizona, ABOR employees from whistleblower protections under state statute. This makes it all the more important that internal ABOR policies protect whistleblowers and that they are recognized and given due course in the institution. The survey revealed that whistleblowers are given the run around when they try to file complaints within the institutions. I look forward to continuing the conversation in December

10. 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](#), C11 (2 minutes)

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

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2023/25-11]** to adjourn the November 4, 2024, meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

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

Motions of October 7, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2024/25-8] to approve the November 4, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024-25/9] to approve the minutes for the October 7, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting as amended. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-10] to extend the time on Old Business Item 8B by three minutes with the amendment to add three minutes for report, and two minutes for discussion. Motion was passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/25-11] to adjourn the November 4, 2024, meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 3, Action Item 3: Approval of the [minutes of October 7, 2024](#)
3. Page 4, Item 5: Open Session, Kian Alavy - [Hack Arizona Collaboration Package](#)
4. Page 7, Old Business Item 8A: [Draft Resolution](#) Involving Speech: Rights and Responsibilities
5. Page 10, New Business Item 9A: [Proposal](#) to create a separate Department of Dermatology from the Department of Internal Medicine, Dr. Clara Curiel and Senator Marv Slepian
6. Page 11, New Business Item 9B: [Multi-year appointments](#), Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders
7. Page 13, New Business Item 9C: [Timeline, Current Priorities, and Upcoming Issues in General Education](#), Senator Susan Miller-Cochran
8. Page 15, New Business Item 9D: [Report](#) from *ad hoc* General Education Committee, Committee Chair, Mark Stegeman
9. Page 17, New Business Item 9E: [Update](#) and [Presentation](#) from the *ad hoc* Committee on Campus Climate – Chair, Matthew Abraham
10. Page 18, Item 10: Written reports from the
 - a. [Provost](#)
 - b. [APPC](#)
 - c. [SAPC](#)
 - d. [Gen Ed Office](#) with [UWGEC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456