

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
JANUARY 27, 2025**

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=e00eec29-78ae-4a4a-9db5-b2730006e6b0>

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 [00:00:07]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the January 27, 2025 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](#) [00:00:18]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024/25-20**] to approve the agenda of the January 27, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES FOR THE DECEMBER 2, 2024, FACULTY SENATE MEETING](#) [00:00:48]

- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024/25-21**] to approve the minutes for the December 2, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION [00:01:23]

Rob Jackson, Research Professional II, College of Medicine Tucson [00:01:56]

Good afternoon, senators. My name is Jackson, and I am speaking on behalf of the University of Arizona Postdoctoral Association, also known as UAPA. Our ask today is that you consider creating a voting member position on the Faculty Senate for postdocs as we are currently not self-represented.

I came to the UA in 2019 as an international postdoc and as the previous chairs of UAPA, our goal as an association is to connect postdocs, support their professional development, and the wider university community like yourselves to advocate on their behalf. We’re a postdoc run organization, and we work in collaboration with postdoctoral affairs.

Our experience as postdocs is often dictated by our individual research groups or labs and the faculty that we train with, as well as our units, like departments and colleges. We often have to find one-off solutions for problems related to funding, like loss of benefits, additional complexities for us international postdocs, which are over 50% of the postdocs here, on temporary work visas.

Creating ad-hoc solutions takes time and effort from our faculty supervisors and our departments to ease the burden so that we can optimally perform our research duties. We strive for system-wide changes that consistently support postdocs and their mentors.

To conclude, we ask you to consider creating a postdoc requisition as exists for students and staff. Faculty Senate committees already include non-voting postdocs. Many of us are training to be faculty and this would be valuable experience, and we hope that our perspective can be helpful to your efforts here in improving the university for all. Thank you very much.

Holly Andrews, Postdoctoral Research Associate, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences [00:03:30]

Good afternoon, senators. My name is Holly Andrews. I'm a fourth-year postdoctoral research at the University of Arizona and have been affiliated with the School of Natural Resources and the Environment as an NSF postdoctoral fellow, and with the School of Geography, Development, and Environment as a postdoctoral research assistant. In my role as a postdoc here, I have served as a mentor to undergraduate and graduate students, moved research forward through publications and conference presentations, provided administrative support to faculty in matters of research, and guest lecturer in multiple courses across campus.

My story is not unique. Many department and university initiatives depend on contributions of postdocs for their success, although, we are often overlooked as more transient staff with short-term contracts, the average post-doc contract being two years. Due to the supportive network, I have built here, and the unique facilities I have been able to access, such as Biosphere II, for example.

My personal tenure at the University will end up being the same as or longer than an undergraduate student. Further, having an external NSF fellowship has meant that I and at least fifty-five other current postdocs have contributed to the university under the status of designated campus colleagues, a broad catch-all status that is very restricted in its access to university proceedings. We as postdocs are invested in UA's success and provide services that complement but are separate from faculty and staff. Part of this continued investment should include involvement in decision-making processes occurring in the Faculty Senate. Therefore, we advocate for the creation of a new and permanent seat in the Senate to be filled by a postdoctoral representative that aligns with our needs and views. Thank you.

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:06:04]

I would like to bring to the Senate's attention to a long, ongoing, serious problem at the university that affects almost everyone: moldy, decrepit buildings. This is a problem often buried because of fear of retribution. Many buildings have no heat, leaky plumbing, and the growth of toxic mold. It is only getting worse with the budget problems. The mold issue is a nationwide problem at many universities and even hospitals, it can be lethal, and people have died because of it. Some people are more sensitive than others.

The mycotoxins released from toxic mold attack the DNA in everyone, causing many forms of illness. From my personal experience, I have developed a histamine intolerance for many years of mold exposure at the Steward Observatory. My body no longer processes histamine in my bloodstream properly, so I can go into histamine overload where I get violently ill. My problem now cannot be cured, but I wish to prevent others from having a similar fate at the university.

Our President, I hear, dislikes Zoom meetings. I would agree that in-person meetings are better, but we need safe buildings. I recommend that the Senate form a committee to examine the mold problem in our buildings and also to find a more modern building to hold meetings.

Senator Cochran [00:08:01]

Dear colleagues, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'd like to share my thoughts on the qualities and expertise that I believe are essential for our next Provost at the University of Arizona. As many of you know, public universities in Arizona have faced decades of declining state funding which has placed increasing financial burdens on students and families, strained our ability to attract and retain top faculty and limited investment in research and academic programs.

Additionally, recent political developments including targeted actions against DEI initiatives at federally designated HIS's have compounded these challenges. Given the landscape that we're under, it is essential that our next Provost possess deep academic leadership experience as well as a proven ability to advocate effectively with legislators and build coalitions. We need a leader who can work collaboratively with the Arizona Board of Regents, the Governor's office, and state lawmakers to articulate the value of public higher education, and secure increased funding to our university system. This requires exceptional negotiation skills, a clear vision for the future of higher education, and the ability to cultivate bipartisan support.

I urge all of us to prioritize candidates who have demonstrated success navigating complex political environments and advocating for public higher education. If a candidate lacks experience working with elected officials, governing board, or state leaders to secure funding and advance higher education, we should carefully consider whether they are the right fit for this pivotal role. Now is the time for Arizona's legislators to reinvest in higher education, and we need a Provost with the proven ability to lead this charge.

Thank you for your time and dedication in this important process.

5. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [00:10:39]

Happy New Year. Welcome to the turbulent 2025. If you feel nervous, remember that we have practice at turbulence. We thrive and improve in turbulence. As I tell my friends, be brave and confident. We got this.

Since we last met a lot has happened, especially in my world where a tyrannical regime fell in Syria, wildfires caused LA evacuations, a fragile ceasefire in what most experts consider the Israeli genocide in Gaza still holds and hundreds of thousands return home. My world reminds us that life and hope are stronger than the forces of hatred and destruction.

Here on campus, we face dramatic changes that cause uncertainty. New administration, and a raft of executive orders will test our work and community. It is a scary time when public figures exuberantly give Roman salutes that in my opinion and those of any educated person look like nazi salutes, when Harvard restricts free speech and academic freedom by imposing the IHRA definition of antisemitism and is defended by those who should know better. Deep seek and AI But I am convinced that we as a community and an institution are well placed and well-conditioned to handle this reset with aplomb. We have recently reaffirmed our commitment to free speech in the Senate aligned with FIRE and our bonds of community are such that the Senate didn't feel the need to formally legislate them.

The elected faculty leadership had a very good conversation this morning with Tomas and looks forward to collaborating closely as his office provides guidance on federal grants and research compliance in light of recent executive orders as well as on a longer-term project of re-incentivizing research, especially interdisciplinary research. I am very optimistic about this collaboration and research across the institution. Researchers with general and specific questions can reach out to the office of the Vice President for Research, and also to us - your elected representatives with specific questions on research programs. If you have more specific or personal or sensitive questions on research programs, we have the networks to get these questions answered.

Along with the integrity of our work and knowledge production we are also committed to the integrity of our community. We will make sure to educate ourselves and everyone in our community about our constitutional rights and responsibilities, not only as faculty members, but as citizens, and also as non-citizens. We will continue to center our values of merit, meritocracy, and equal access to for all, to all our programs. We have a resilient network of communication of dissent and solidarity that most universities are envious of.

Goals for next period...

- Continue our work advocating for amplifying ordinary faculty - no one is alone in facing a difficult workplace situation.
- Work to get the institution to observe public records law –
- Continuing Katie's work on workload, multiyear appts, faculty membership, bylaws
- We will endeavor to create parameters for working with our new President and a new Provost to increase the trust and collaboration between the faculty elected representatives and the administration.
- I would like to work within the Senate, on a subcommittee to have all of the incredibly passionate people working on General Education at the same table, so that we can pass the Gen Ed curriculum in the coming months, one that endorses Mark Stegeman's vision of a civics program and a Gen Ed program that will be a national leader. It will be enhanced by the non-political, non-partisan, civic challenges we are working through right now.

Again, I am optimistic that we can weather whatever is ahead, together, as a strong, resilient community. Thank you.

6. REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT – PRESIDENT SURESH GARIMELLA [00:16:48]

Thank you, everyone, and I enjoyed the interventions earlier. I am very glad to be here, and I hope that you find the report we submitted to the Senate office informative. I will just take a few minutes to share some thoughts, mostly about where I see us being today, perhaps where I believe we're headed. So, as I shared with SPBAC last week, I think we obviously have some challenges, and they seem to change every day. I don't want to lose sight of the fact that the University of Arizona is rooted in excellence, right? We have a lot to build upon, as in a lot of foundational stuff that will keep us going.

One of the reasons that I was so attracted to this space is that we're a powerhouse. A billion dollars in research that Tomas will double, I understand. Over 50,000 students, large staff and faculty, we're the state's flagship with a land grant. Our mission of service is something that I believe in deeply. I believe we have limitless potential now. The University of Arizona is also a cherished asset in our Tucson community which extends beyond the economic impact. It extends beyond athletics, arts, and culture which are important, including the fact that we're a Hispanic-serving institution. For many in our community, a college education represents the opportunity for a better life, for themselves, and their families, and all the folks they affect. As a land-grant university, I think the mission of access and affordability is one that I hope we all continue to center and prioritize.

I share some of my top areas of focus since I arrived, in my recent video message to the University community. I hope

you have seen that. Let me just underline the first, and foremost. It is about raising and sustaining the morale of our staff, faculty, students, and our community. I'm hoping that when we start the coming year, with no deficit, that this will help. We will have salary increases that we'll be communicating to you about in the coming fiscal year. I also think that direct engagement of not only me, but various administrative leaders, and more two-way communication is critical. So certainly, formal opportunities like this one, but also informal ones.

Earlier today, I sent out a note inviting faculty to sign up for breakfast. We will have several dates, and I am not curating those breakfasts. Anyone who signs up can come and share your thoughts, feedback, and guidance with us. I am hoping that we have a staff picnic to thank all of our hardworking staff soon. Certainly, I have been stopping by as many students event as I can. This weekend, I was with undergraduate research, biology research projects group, amazing effort. I will try to do my best, I think we should all do the best we can to celebrate the students' success of our faculty, staff, and students, and nominate each other for national awards and raise morale in that way. We will do what we can, I know Tomas is working on that, and Honor's College does a good job, and the Provost Office does as well.

The second piece is enhancing operations. I think you'd agree that the more we can do to remove irritants and barriers to success, by providing clear guidance to our hardworking folks in travel, procurement, and contracting. I don't think the folks doing that work are at fault. I think it's the guidance we provide them, the right to operate, to make decisions and such. So, we're hoping we can make some progress there. We also need to share more consistently our work to coordinate and improve systems, including in HR and IT and communications and compliance. There are all these areas that can just be irritating and frustrating. I think Elliot Cheu is a great example. He's working on sort of a monthly cadence of updates on what we're doing with IT coordination, et cetera. So, I hope you'll see more of that.

The third piece is that this, like any other large university, is complex and big. No one individual, however good that person might be, can do all of that. It's critical that we have a strong leadership team. So, building a strong and experienced leadership team, and I agree with the comments on the provost, although I've been doing a lot of that work too. So, you should know that we're building new bridges there.

We have a new Chief of Staff that started a week back, so don't ask him too many questions just yet. He came back to the University, of course, you all know him from many years of service in the medical school and great service to the community through the Pima County work that he did.

A Provost search is well underway. You know that Cindy Rankin and David Hahn are leading that. Kris Wong Davis, our Enrollment Management Leader, will be joining us soon. Tomas, of course, you've been working with and hearing from including the big idea challenge that I suspect he will talk about, in terms of the transdisciplinary research that was mentioned.

So briefly again, I think where I see we're going, is a relentless focus on student success. So, I really appreciate the gen ed topic. In my previous institution, we did a forty-two-unit core which I am a big fan of, and supporting our university's significant research strengths, scholarship strengths, and serving our students and our community. In terms of student success, I've said this before, I say it every time, anywhere I speak, that we would not be a university if we weren't focused on our students. To me, they're our mission, they're our North Star, and we need to create an environment where all kinds and types of student's flourish. This includes graduate students and postdocs. In December, I hope you noticed that we announced that we're not increasing tuition for in-state students. That's our small contribution to our community, I wish we could do more, but at least we're keeping that flat.

In terms of investing in our distinctive research strengths, we bring together science and technology and arts and humanities and innovation etc. to solve the grand challenge problems, and respond to the needs of our community, our state, and the world, with many areas of strength. This is a huge powerhouse as I said, this is in Medicine, Health Sciences, Engineering, Science, and Space Sciences, I'm sure you all know that this is a point of longstanding strength for the university and a source of important economic impact in our community and a source of opportunity for Southern Arizona. Clearly climate science, water science, policy, defense, and security. There are so many areas that we're so good at, and we're already beginning to take steps towards enhancing opportunities for faculty to pursue big, innovative projects and ideas with the transdisciplinary big idea challenge.

The third piece is serving the state and our community. I've been at land-grant universities for most of my career, and it's a mission, as I said, I believe in strongly. In part, this is a focus on the affordability piece that I mentioned, but it also means our historic land grant mission. I was in Yuma for a day recently. One of the most exciting days I've spent there, where we do a lot of good work to support Arizona agriculture, we teach there. This workplace, not just in Yuma, but throughout the state, and it's critical to our mission, in particular, our support of rural and underserved areas. This is something that I care a lot about. I will visit to the extent I can and support that. Certainly, our colleagues in Extension are a very important part of that, but it's much more than just Extension, every part of the university is engaged in that. I think it's degree and non-degree offerings, it's credit and non-credit offerings, it's certificates, badges and things like that.

So, there's educational research and engagement opportunities in a land grant mission. Those are the messages I conveyed in my three-minute video. I will try my best to continue that communication. If you have ideas about how I communicate better, that is the final frontier and is very hard to do. I'll try to do that informally and formally.

Questions and Comments [00:26:49]

- Senator M. Witte stated she has a general question regarding the bright future prediction and asked what the role of the Faculty Senate is, related to Shared Governance in making decisions in the future. On the one hand, there are draconian budget cuts. In her view, there is a slash burn, and sweep into central administration where this has been identified as the reason for the deficit, which can be defined as the dense, impenetrable central administration account.
- Senator M. Witte stated on the other hand, related to double research grants, she has been a part of it and has contributed greatly to research grants and teaching for over a century. The budget cuts are bringing departments that would be putting grants into a bare bones budget and can hardly function, let alone put in grants.
- Senator M. Witte stated that the Faculty Senate and faculty have had wisdom throughout the past several years, but it seems they are never listened to. The University has gotten itself into this situation and she wonders what the President will do, to take advantage of the Faculty Senate and Shared Governance to reach a bright future which ASU and NAU are not experiencing similar issues with.
- President Garimella stated he came to the University three or four months ago, into to the situation that the University has been in for the last year and a half. He said, as Senator M. Witte is aware, he is in a significant deficit situation, so his approach is to do his best to work with the deans and colleges. It is hard for him to go back to attributing blame, or the reasoning for the situation, but his focus is to start the new year with no deficit which is a tall order. There is a goal to make raises and invest in important things.
- President Garimella stated the all-funds process has asked for colleges to plan for a 3% reduction in their budgets and they are working closely with the deans. There is a hope to not have to use it all, but it might have to happen. There is a reality to face, which is that the University is in a budget deficit going forward and he will do his best in resonating with some of the comments made earlier, to advocate with the state for undoing some of the cuts. He has met with the Governor's office, the legislators within certain committees, and others. He and others will do their best to raise more money from friends, donors, and alumni. They will do their best to tighten belts in the administrative side more than they are done on the academic side, but there is really a reality to face.
- President Garimella said they are hoping that the new year can be started with putting these conversations behind, and thinking about building big things as opposed to going backwards. The budget was very challenging and there will need to be hard work done to get out of this difficult situation.
- Senator Eckert stated she hopes this is the first of many visits in the coming year and thanked the President for attending the meeting. She said more importantly, given the sweeping changes occurring in the federal government now like cancellation of NSF and NIH review, UA research faculty are very worried about research funding, among other things. They are worried about abilities to do research and be promoted if there is no funding. They are also worried about institutional support for research focused on a range of topics that the federal government is not happy with right now. The faculty needs guidance and reassurance about the safety of the research and academic freedom. There needs to be weekly, if not daily communication concerning such guidance and reassurance as the federal landscape is swiftly changing.
- Senator Eckert asked if the President's office is developing a plan for addressing these kinds of concerns of the faculty and if there will be communication of that soon.
- President Garimella stated his thanks and said the Arizona State Museum is a fantastic asset which he visited and hope it can be opened someday but there is a lot of money needed to do so, and he has advocated for this with the state.
- President Garimella stated he believes there was a communication that went out from the SVP's office regarding what was mentioned, and they will do their best to continue updating the website. He said, as mentioned by Senator Eckert, it is a shifting landscape and there are changing regulations, so it is hard to fully know what is happening at his level, but as information becomes available, there is the goal to be as supportive as possible. All research faculty and RII employees should've gotten a communication regarding the best advice on how to handle the current situation.
- Senator Slepian said he wanted to echo Senator Eckert's point, he has many emails from colleagues from around the country where some universities are sending out daily, or twice daily notices, where others are in a panic and fear. He thinks it would be good if the powers within the President's office can dig deeper and find out more since so many are concerned, and fearful of whether they should submit grants now or write papers now.

7. REPORT FROM THE PROVOST [00:34:49]

I have several items to talk about later on the agenda. Vice Provost Romero and I will be making a presentation about multi-year contracts so I normally would have talked about that, but since we have that as an agenda item, I'll pass on that. Several updates on several different issues.

We have two dean searches underway right now, I think I mentioned that earlier, but those searches are purely

underway with committees at work. In Optical Sciences, Dean Iman Hakim from Public Health is chairing that committee. In Fine Arts, Dean Nancy Pollock-Ellwand from CAPLA is chairing and I am very eager to get finalists in this semester so we can make appointments in those two fine deanships, in those two fine colleges. Jason Craig has been appointed as the Interim Dean of the College of Law, he started at the beginning of the month, and I welcome Jason to that role. It's a very important role. He'll be serving in that role for a year and a half. We won't start the search for a permanent replacement for the Dean of Law until the Fall.

Similarly, the Dean of Education, Robert Berry III, will be leaving the university at the end of March. I'm in the midst of appointing an interim dean who also will be in that role for a year and a half or so. We'll begin a search for a permanent dean of education next year. You know, these are just the natural rhythm of how leaders come go at universities, and I want to thank the outgoing deans for their service.

The fires in Los Angeles were devastating to Angele, I grew up West LA, not far from Pacific Palisades, many of you probably are from that area. We still don't know exactly the full consequences on our students, but we had communications out and provided resources for students, including some temporary relief through wildfire support and temporary financial support for students if they needed it.

The Provost Office will be consolidating downstairs. I think I may have mentioned something about this earlier in the year, when I moved out of the administration building into this building, it was great to be near the President. He and I talked many times during the day. We walk up and down the hallways to chat and get the business of the university done. That meant I was separated from the team of senior leaders in the Provost's Office, so they're moving downstairs. We did a switch with enrollment management who are over in administration, and we will be moving in the beginning of the month, I believe do please come by and say hello and see our new digs. In addition to the Vice Provost moving be downstairs the Senior Vice President for Native American Advancement, Levi Esquerro will be moving back into Old Maine and will be with us on the first floor. So, I'm very excited about all those things.

We have P&T reviews underway. Thank you all for all the work that you and your colleges have done on that. Vice Provost Romero and I spend a lot of our time in the spring going through those files. It's one of the great privileges of being a senior member of the faculty to read those files, the dossiers of our talented colleagues, and I'm looking forward to doing that, fairly soon.

As the president mentioned, all-funds meetings will be beginning soon, and he mentioned that we are asking all deans and unit heads to model 3% reductions. John Arnold was with us this afternoon and we also asked when there are really warranted needs for new investment in units, for unit heads to submit those requests for investment. We don't have a lot of money to invest, but we do want to make sure we are mission specific and we're supporting important missions of the university.

Finally, Arizona Online was recognized as being one of the leading programs in the country. Caleb, congratulations on that, and for all the faculty who contributed.

Questions and Comments [00:40:05]

- Senator Ziurys stated that the online program receives these accolades and asked for the basis of this rating.
- Senator Simmons stated his thanks for the question and said it refers to the US News and World Report, which is like some of the other rankings. He is happy to share the full data, but it has to do with everything from retention enrollment, number of faculty members that are full time, number of graduate students teaching part-time. It's about a 150 questionnaire in collaboration with UAIR to pull all the data for.
- Senator Simmons stated one thing he and his team are extremely proud of is a peer reputation survey which makes up 20% of the ranking and they are ranked number eleven by peer institutions overall.
- Senator Ziurys stated she was wondering if there is a criterion for academic excellence.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the comments are now out of order and hope that Senators Simmons and Ziurys can take their conversation offline.
- Senator Cooper stated she has a lot of questions from her constituents who are concerned about academic freedom and how it will be approached, hopefully guarded. In the coming couple of years, she has questions about whether they need to disband committees, change names of courses, regarding the DEI issues and the way the federal government is possibly coming after those. She wonders if Provost Marx can address if there are plans to safeguard academic freedom and scholarly research, and which directions should be taken.
- Provost Marx stated this is an excellent question, and said he is sure the President would sign onto the fact that they'd go to the wall on academic freedom issues as they are very important to defend. There have been strong approaches to academic freedom at the University and he doesn't anticipate that changing anytime soon.

- Provost Marx stated it is hard to speculate on hypotheticals about what may happen down the road, but he will stand by principles in the Vice Proost for Faculty Affairs. Andrea Romero has an entire page on the website which pertains to academic freedom which will need to be updated soon.

8. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA *Proposal UG Minor in Food Science and Fermentation, Request to Establish Minor in Food Science and Fermentation (Information only), Proposal Minor in English Applied Linguistics, Request to Establish UG Minor English Applied Linguistics (Information only), Proposal BS in Integrated Business Engineering, Request to Establish BS in Integrated Business Engineering (Information only), Proposal BS in Medical Pharmacology and Toxicology, Request to Establish BS in Medical Pharmacology and Toxicology (Information only), Proposal BA in Public Relations, Request to Establish New Academic Program BA in Public Relations (Information only), Proposal UG Minor in Insights into Healthy Aging*** [00:43:44]

Chair Hudson moved [Motion 2024/25-22], [Motion 2024.25-23], [Motion 2024/25-24], [Motion 2024/25-25], [Motion 2024/25-26], and [Motion 2024/25-27] to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

9. **OLD BUSINESS** [00:45:42]

A. **Multi-year contracts – Interim Provost, Ron Marx, and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero** [00:46:08]

Provost Marx [00:46:13]

We've been working on this all year at the request of Secretary Zeiders. As you might know, in the past we have not appointed career-track faculty to the percentage allowed by ABOR and Andrea will go through all of that data. I thought the issue that Secretary Zeiders brought to us was a really important issue. Career-track faculty are an important type of our resources on campus, and we're allowed to have 30% of our tenured faculty to have multi-year contracts and we are way below this number. We are working with her to develop a new approach to doing so. I have mentioned this issue with the deans and there is wide support among them to do this.

There were some issues that were raised, and we adjusted our approach to make sure that we took advantage of those issues. I think we are ready to go now, and Andrea will present our proposal.

Andrea Romero, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs [00:47:42]

Thank you, Ron, Secretary Zeiders, and Senator Little for continuing to bring this up as a discussion topic. We've had many positive strides with the career track faculty model since about 2013 where faculty have been advocating for the development of this model across campus and to the point where in 2018, it came into policy finally and really got started in 2019 with official positions. All of that came along with developing promotion and the review criteria within departments, within colleges, and since that time, we've had hundreds of career-track faculty who have gone through the promotion process successfully, really seeing great results with that.

In 2020, we really started more university level awards for career-track faculty. Then in 2021-2022, we had the title harmonization process. It really made sure that everyone was in the right rank and track, and getting the resources that they needed. In 2023, we published the Career-track Faculty Report which is still on our website if you are interested in seeing what that data looks like, and the overall summary of that, as well as the history and background into more detail. We also received, as a university, the prestigious Delphi Award for our progress in this area. Many of our peer institutions look to us as a model for all the strides we have made.

In FY 2024, ABOR increased the cap on multi-year contracts from 15% of all tenure track university positions. That is considering everyone at the entire University, who is on tenure-track, not just within the unit, to 30%. The cap of 15% of tenure track faculty went to 30%. We had been encouraging this and working with the deans to make this all come together, and you can see over the last several years that we have seen several increases.

Certainly, as of Fall 2023 and January 8, 2025, we're not even close to the 30% that we could be at, after this change came through ABOR. I think with the advocacy of Faculty Senate and through a lot of discussion and thoughtfulness, Provost Marx has agreed to really push this further with the deans and make sure all the colleges and units do a systematic review for faculty so that we can get closer. Right now, we're looking at about 1,588 tenure track faculty. 30% of that would be 476. So, you have approximately 290 additional multi-year contracts that we can push forward, our goal is to get as close to 30% as possible. That is what we have seen at ASU and NAU. What Provost Marx has already talked about to the deans, and agreed to move forward is to recommend that all

colleges review all career-track faculty who are at full tank. The expectation is that faculty have already made it through promotion, they have received the recognition of the highest rank, they really are our best and brightest and they should be recognized with multi-year contracts in a consistent sort of manner.

We are expecting that all units will be doing this. I think Ron has agreed that our goal is by May 2025. They can use the annual peer review from last year, so there's no additional levels of burden or peer review to go through. There will be some expectations, primarily for faculty who their salary is on fixed funds. Those may be on external grants or other kinds of external funds, like those that are fixed, which we're not able to make a commitment to beyond the funding that they have for now. Those are the only exceptions. Mostly that will be research professors and perhaps some clinical professors, but anyone who is on fixed funds. Deans and department heads will also have discretion to allot multi-year contracts for faculty at other ranks. This does not mean that we can't consider these for people at the assistant and associate ranks, but we really want to make sure that those that we've recognized with the full rank, really are moving onto multi-year contracts. We have also talked with ASU, and they have a very simplified process for renewal of multi-year contracts for career track faculty, basically with multiple levels of review, and is a form. We have been reviewing that and drafting something that we might be able to use going forward.

The other big thing we'd like to do going forward, starting with the next promotion cycle in 2025-2026 is to make it the expectation that faculty, not those on fixed funding, but faculty who get the promotion to full rank will receive multi-year contracts. As you move through the promotion cycle, you get the full rank, and you will be getting a multi-year contract.

10. **NEW BUSINESS [00:58:02]**

A. **Update on considering alternative voting software for University Elections – Chair of the Committee on Elections, Senator Lee Medevoi [00:58:27]**

Good afternoon, everybody. I'm Senator Lee Medevoi and I make up the elections committee along with Paul Bennett from the law school and Nadia Charles from the College of Humanities. We shouldn't take up too much of your time today. I think I may actually be the only member of the committee who was able to make it today. We got a bump from our last meeting. Our committee is responsible for a few different things, asserting the eligibility of candidates who want to run and for ensuring that elections are conducted fairly and accurately.

As you may know, at the U of A, we conduct our elections using Qualtrics software. Qualtrics is basically a survey that is used for many different purposes. It's very flexible software but it is not dedicated to election software. When it comes to elections, there are certain liabilities. Some have to do with making sure that the settings are correct so that people cannot vote twice and so forth. The most serious liability that's come to our attention is that it's neither software that can guarantee anonymity for the voter nor absolutely ensure secure results. When you're designing a survey, the designer can theoretically go into the back end, examine data, see how someone's voted, alter results. We obviously have no reason to think anything like this has ever taken place, but we've consulted with other faculty senates and other universities are beginning to move away from Qualtrics for this reason. We also had several senators reach out over the last three years expressing some concern about the issue at a time where political tensions at every scale are so acute. So luckily there is dedicated election software out there and that software can allow you to adjust voter eligibility during a cycle and at the same time guarantee the anonymity of every voter's ballot, to make sure that the results are unalterable and so forth.

Our committee's been working very closely with Jane Cherry and the Faculty Center. Last semester we began to identify some of these software options and to meet with their representatives to evaluate whether they could work for us. Our priorities are basically we need software that doesn't create extra labor of creating a different ballot for every college, some of them seem to do that. We need software that can code voters easily, like Qualtrics, but we also need software where we're very confident that will ensure anonymity and security. We need software that can code voters easily, like Qualtrics. We also need a software where we're very confident that it will ensure anonymity and security, and that's compatible with the university's authentication system. That's crucial. Finally, we need software that we can afford. So, we're in the process of exploring our options. We've been looking at four different software possibilities and Jane has very kindly agreed to test them for us so that we can make the most informed decision.

The one thing that our committee foresees, and this is one of the reasons we also wanted to give you an update, is that whatever software we end up choosing is probably going to cost something. We're estimating at this time, just from conversations, that it may involve an annual budget line of maybe \$500 to \$1,000 which is a pittance at the level of the university budget, but still an expense for which we'll need to request permission. Once we have a software that seems to be the best choice for us, what we anticipate is that we will want to make a motion in

Faculty Senate that makes a formal request on behalf of faculty that the cost of the selection software be covered and we hope to have that request readied for you either by the end of this semester or possibly in the fall. So that's all we have to report at this time, but I'm happy to take questions.

Questions and Comments [01:02:42]

- Senator Cochran stated thanks for the presentation and that this is an important topic brought to the Senate's attention. He asked if Senator Medevoi was suggesting that Qualtrics would be obsolete for other purposes at the or if this change is primarily for voting.
- Senator Medevoi stated Qualtrics is used for all kinds of purposes, it is very useful for all sorts of studies, and the committee is just talking about finding dedicated software for the purposes of conducting elections. Senator Fink asked how the current semester's general election will be handled. Senator Medevoi stated he doesn't anticipate a change this semester as there still needs to be smaller testing done, and a potential pseudo election ran for testing. The election software may be able to be rolled out next academic year.

B. [Update on the Shared Governance Review Committee](#) – Senator Russell Witte [01:04:17]

Hello, everyone. Shared governance, certainly has been a buzzword of late, but what is shared governance and how do we assess it? Many of you may not know there's a committee and it's unusual, ASU, NAU doesn't have this kind of constitutionally mandated committee to look at specifically shared governance and I'm co-chairing with Mona, these are the kind of things that we can look at: budget and strategic planning, academic personnel policy, selection review of academic administrators and VPs, and position searches.

This comes from MOUs that were agreed to previously over the last 25 years by faculty, administration, and others, to reinforce more details of how that policy works. When you look at the distribution of the members on this committee, I think you'll realize that this is probably the most diverse committee on campus considering it's constitutionally mandated. It kind of gives you an idea of how important shared governance is, specifically to the University of Arizona, and who is supposed to be involved in the decision-making process related to those topics I just mentioned before. Notice that about a third are either staff or students and almost half are budget related or elected faculty members, the President has two appointees, and it also includes the Provost. I just learned about five minutes ago from Provost Mark said Andrea Romero is going to take one of those slots. If you're listening to this from the SPBAC committee and are interested in serving on this committee, we'd like to fill that slot before our next meeting in about two weeks and then we'll have 13 members on this committee.

So, what do we do? Well, I mentioned it's in our Constitution, and I'll go into a little more detail shortly, but we can actually take grievances, especially major things that we could be preemptive of, but we can also be looking backwards at a decision that's made where we think that there may be a violation of shared governance. We have a collective body, we're all now adept at what this is about and how to evaluate it from different perspectives, and we can vote and make a determination, for example, if something violated shared governance.

Of course, we don't have executive powers, but that could then go back to the faculty senate as well as the President to resolve a decision that's made by this committee. Generally, we shouldn't be ignored if we were to do that. Just to point out that these are the things, included in the slide, are what we're kind of we're responsible for at the University. This should be the go-to shop when it comes to shared governance because we can delve into something in more detail. I'll share these slides, I won't go into them, but these again come from MOUs over the last 25 years, to make it a little clearer the kind of things that we can do.

I'll just point out that it's ironic for about 10 years, even though we're required to meet, and I only joined the committee about a year and a half ago, this committee did not meet and did not publish annual reports, and it was only resurrected around 2020. If you don't have a functioning committee, what might you expect to happen? This shows how important this idea of shared governance is. It's built into state law. This slide is from 1997 and ABOR policy. Some people like to make a big deal about the law. I like to just say this is common sense, we want to make decisions with collective intelligence. Ted Downing kind of broke down the law into the three areas. The key here is active participation and that doesn't mean listening or raising your hand and giving your opinion. It generally means a vote in some way, either directly voting or voting to put people on, for example, a search committee. We should all have that power and ability.

This is just describing the atmosphere, the kind of things that you might want when you come together and participate together collectively. I'll ask a rhetorical question, who wouldn't want these kinds of things to create an atmosphere that fosters trust? We're different people, students, faculty, staff, and administration come together to make these decisions. Under what circumstances might you not want that to happen? I can say, for example, speed, you have to make a decision very quickly and you might not get approval. I can understand why you might want to bypass some of that.

A passage taken from our most recent MOU in 2020 and highlights the budget and strategic planning to kind of

formulate into more detail the importance. Again, one sixth of the committee is from SPBAC which tells you that budgetary decisions really need involvement, inclusion, and participation from people, especially when you talk about even the larger visions of strategic plans in addition to maybe acute purchases or decisions that are being made.

Budget and strategic planning, academic and academic personnel policies have been dealt with a lot over the last couple of years in terms of new academic units and others that come into this. These slides will be shared in a folder where you can all actively participate in reading this and provide feedback.

The last one I'm going to highlight from the MOU is selection and review of academic administrators and VPs. Notice here it says there was an agreement in place specifically that says search and review committees must be comprised of half or more faculty of at least half are recommended by their elected faculty peers. Selection of faculty to serve on these committees shall be determined through procedures decided by the faculty of their respective unit and there should be a direct role in this process. You can go back to your colleges or units and decide if this is being followed and you can either look at your bylaws, in some cases, bylaws have been changed, to make sure they're consistent with what the law says, in terms of state law and also the MOUs that might be in place. You can certainly bring that to the committee, and we can look at it.

The Selection/Review of Academic Administrators is just highlighting why it's important to include faculty in the decision-making process. I'm looking here at the most powerful body on campus, the Faculty Senate. When you make motions and you pass motions with your vote, you have tremendous power and authority, and a president is much more reluctant to overrule a decision here at Faculty Senate when you take that power and do that. Of course, the president, for example, would have to justify that. I think that's written in I believe the ASU Constitution, that if a president overrules a motion in the Faculty Senate, they must act publicly and give an argument of why they did that. The key is this body has tremendous power to assert it to assure us that faculty governance is being followed at the university.

These are just some things that we're working on within the committee for this year, of course, coming here and defining what shared governance is. We're doing a survey internally on the committee right now, but you will also be able to give us feedback on strengths and weaknesses that you're familiar with over the last couple of years or currently. We hope to be able to make recommendations and think about ways to enforce and make sure that we can assume shared governance here at the university.

Finally, there is a QR code within the slide where you can send directly feedback, but we also have a couple of files where you can insert what you think are strengths and weaknesses and make suggestions based on these various topics.

Questions and Comments [01:13:13]

- Senator Rafelski asked if the Senate is still bound by the previous MOU although there has been a change in administration, the Presidency.
 - Chair Hudson stated there are different views on whether the MOU is still enforced or not, it is not a policy document. Some believe that it is enforceable as the last signed document, others point out that all the personnel who signed it in 2022 are out of the picture now, there is non-binding. This all goes to the larger that Senator R. Witte is pointing out which is that there needs to be a body to adjudicate such differences of interpretation and opinion and the repopulation and reactivation of SGRC is welcomed.
 - Senator Simmons thanked Senator R. Witte for the presentation as it was very informative and said he has been thinking about the relationship between faculty governance and shared governance as it seems these are used as synonymous terms, but he doesn't believe they are. He asked if the committee could dive into the rhetorical to provide clarity when discussing these things, so there can be more precise language.
 - Senator R. Witte said he will report on this to committee and can share his own thoughts with Senator Simmons.
 - Senator M. Witte stated as many remember she voted against the MOU since it was continuously violated, and she thinks it is a weak view of the law. The law still exists, and it doesn't matter whether it was signed or not, the MOU is weaker, and that is her binding view.
 - Senator M. Witte stated the original law was called the faculty governance law and it was changed to shared governance immediately. The administration said that every committee of the faculty had to have half administrators which should be detailed in past minutes. This is a response to Senator Simmon's question, and she doesn't think this is co-governance, or shared governance, it is co-opted governance and is weakening faculty governance to have half administrators on all committees. She thinks her prediction has come true.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated this committee will be back to the Senate with more information and asked Senators to look at the climate survey when it is distributed.
- C. Student Basic Needs and Services – SAPC Co-chairs, Kristin Little and Tim Ottusch, and Assistant Director, Basic Needs and Services, Bridgette Riebe [01:17:56]**

Assistant Director, Basic Needs and Services, Bridgette Riebe [01:18:05]

Hello, everybody and thank you to the Student Affairs Policy Committee for having us here. My name is Dr. Bridgette Rebe, and I'm the Assistant Director of Basic Needs here at the U of A. There's a couple different programs that we have that I was going to mention. On campus, we have Campus Pantry, Campus Closet, very simple. Food and security programs provide clothing items for students. We also have a great program called Fostering Success, which works with students who have aged out of foster care, experience housing insecurity, homelessness, and emancipated minors or youth on their own. We have the Dean of Students Student Assistance Team. We have care coordinators, which are a part of CAPS, which are the individuals who help us with SNAP benefits on campus. We have a wonderful website called basicneeds.arizona.edu that has a lot of resources on campus and in the community. If you have students who are online, for example, I always recommend Arizona 211, but there's also a government 211 site for any state and they can type in their zip code and find any type of resources that they need.

Very briefly about some of the programs, Campus Pantry has existed since 2012, and this is one of the primary programs on campus that's supporting students who are experiencing food insecurity. We have a rooftop greenhouse. We partner with organizations like Community Food Bank and Midwest Food Bank to provide our resources. We provide supplemental groceries to students, faculty, and staff. "Supplemental" is a major key word here. It's not our end all solution to be providing all food to students, but we do the best we can. We also provide food to staff members and faculty as well, they must just have a CAT card. We also try to connect people with outside resources such as the ones that I've already shared.

A couple unique parts about our program, include the fact that we have a Bulk Food program, we have pop-up pantries around campus, food bag pickup programs, emergency food bags at the Dean of Students, all in addition to our food bag pickups that we have at our main location and Campus Pantry North, and three days per week that were already open.

What I want to spend the bulk of the time talking about today is that we have over 5,200 unique individuals that utilize the campus pantry alone each year, even more individuals that are utilizing Fostering Success and the Campus Pantry. Within my role, I do not have information on the Dean of Students office, but that's a large additional group as well. We see over 65,000 visits and we distribute well over 475 thousand pounds of food each year. It's important to note our funding comes from a lot of different sources. We receive some funding for student services fee, which primarily provides the staffing. We have some money from the university that solely goes to food costs. We also really rely on alumni and community member donations, which is about thirty or so percent of our funding is just that. What I want to share with you is we just completed our first ever pilot study on data with faculty and staff members, specifically academic advisors, only within a few colleges. There are really some interesting things I want to share. 41% of those respondents had little to no knowledge of food insecurity at the U of A. 25% of them think that there are sufficient resources on campus, which more importantly means that 75% of faculty and staff that were part of the survey do not feel like there's sufficient resources. 86% of faculty and staff did not feel confident in recognizing the signs or symptoms of food insecurity if it was not outright told to them and that's really a problem. It's important because last year's survey was on students and students said that where they want this information is number one from their academic advisors and number two from faculty members. Instead, they're learning from their peers and student clubs.

I just very briefly, you're going to get all this information hopefully by email afterwards, but the slides just show some of our growth since we started our data collection. We have expanded exponentially. As you can see from all of those charts, about 39% of our students on campus are experiencing basic needs and security, which is huge when we think about how many individuals we have, and these are only the individuals that are on the ground, not the individuals who might be experiencing food insecurity and are still Wildcats, just maybe in an online program or a global campus program.

Since I have a very short period, a lot of the information is going to be sent out in some reports. We have a great executive summary that highlights all of the information of the data collection we've done since 2019 and some other ways you can support. Of course, donating, however, the need is greater than an individual can most likely support. We need additional advocacy for basic resources support, and we think Faculty Senate and Student Affairs Policy Committee could be great resources for that. Basic needs syllabi are not mandatory on campus, however, there is a draft of it in the faculty syllabi toolkit, which I believe that's the correct name. We ask you all to familiarize yourself with UA and offer campus resources. You are all faculty members and so we'd appreciate all helping to refer that. We also have a basic needs benefit dinner coming up on February 22nd that we ask colleges and staff members to purchase tables for. There are many colleges that have not yet purchased a table this year and so that's something that you all as Senators can help advocate for in your college.

Questions and Comments [01:24:11]

- Senator Cochran asked how faculty can be educated about the signs of food insecurity and specifically for example, if there is a student in class experiencing these signs, what to do in that instance.

- Assistant Director, Basic Needs and Services, Bridgette Riebe stated thanks for the question and explained that the Basic Needs Coalition is working this summer on trying to put together training like the one career services or safe zone one. This will be basic needs champion training that hopefully faculty and staff members might be interested in attending.
- Assistant Director, Basic Needs and Services, Bridgette Riebe stated her program is very short staffed, and kind of prioritizing this advocacy work while also maintaining how busy the programs are is a stretch. There is no additional funding right now to support doing outside work to buy out that time. It is something that's on the docket, but it's taking a little longer to complete than hoped for.
- Senator Simmons his thanks for the wonderful presentation and the work you're invested in as it benefits so many students. He said for others in attendance, if people haven't attended the benefits dinner, it is a wonderful experience, and he suggested bidding on the items in the back of the room.
- Senator Simmons stated as a suggestion, he loves syllabus statements but doesn't think students engage with the syllabus as much as faculty would like them to. He suggested a D2L announcement in the widget that he can help facilitate that in any way and also discussion about resources outside of the U of A for distance and online students.
- Assistant Director, Basic Needs and Services, Bridgette Riebe stated her thanks for Senator Simmons's comment as it is something on the docket as well. The subcommittee group within the Basic Needs Coalition is focused on classroom work and includes Dr. Ottusch. That committee has put together a toolkit that will be sent out this summer that has a guide for what to post on certain weeks of classes like weeks three and five. She hopes for more streamlined ways to be promoted and is happy to provide these statements.

D. Code of Conduct and Political Activity Policies – Chair of APPC, Keith Maggert [01:27:41]

Hi, my name is Keith Maggert. I'm a senator and I represent the College of Science. I'm also the Chair of the Academic Personnel Policy Committee or APPC. I'm here today to discuss two issues from the APPC. The first is the political activity policy interim, and the second is the professional conduct policy and its bearing on academic freedom. Regarding the first issue, the university community is currently held to the political activity policy interim which has replaced UHAP 2.10. As normal, APPC reviewed this policy, but unlike normal, since this policy was enacted as an interim policy, APPC and in fact nobody from the university community was able to give comments or feedback prior to its inaction. It's not clear why this policy was not subject to regular policymaking process, but what is clear is that the university community has been under some form of interim political activity policy for four and a half years, well beyond the maximum of one year as mandated by our university policies.

APPC has discussed these matters with the policy office. However, some of our concerns are urgent and weighty enough. There is sufficient misinformation being voiced by both administration and faculty And the policy has been used to reprimand faculty that I felt an urgency to voice them here to the Senate today. Our concerns on APPC are threefold.

Concern one, the interim policy is insufficiently clear in its discrimination of what exactly is political activity is. According to state law, the only actions that should be considered by policy are those that are, "intended to influence the outcome of elections, to advocate for or against a candidate for political office or to advocate support for or opposition to proposed or pending legislation." It goes without saying that such activities are fully allowable by university employees should they be on a university employee's own private time. Unfortunately, the interim policy does indeed go without saying that. In fact, in APPC's assessment, it is implied that the university has control over an employee's private actions and political activities. It's also important to underscore that other political speech analysis, discussion, opinions, complaints discussed, apoplexy, expressions of joy or anger are all fully protected unless university resources are being used. For example, the interim policy document mandates that personal speech, though an employee is allowed to identify oneself as a university employee, it requires additional statements disavowing views is not representative of the university or ABOR even if it's clear that one speaks on his or her own behalf. Another example, in both the Senate and Senate Executive Committee, faculty have been told by two vice presidents that speaking in front of a legislative body requires a conflict of commitment filing an approval.

First, the statement does not appear anywhere in policy or law. It is incorrect. Second, such a requirement could not exist as it would violate state law that protects the university employee, in fact, any state employee from influence by their employer.

Concern two, the interim policy bear statements that are legally dubious Our full report was filed with the Senate in October, but it bears repeating that some aspects of the policy documents simply misstate state law. First, for example, by suggesting that the university can find an employee in violation of the law. It cannot. Second, fines may be levied or collected by the university against employees. They cannot, only the state can do that. Third, as written, the policy extends to foreign nationals in foreign countries for exerting their local rights in local private political activities. Fourth, that providing invited legal testimony or guidance must be approved by the university government and communities relations office, it does not. Fifth, that political speech or activity of any kind requires filing and approval of a conflict of commitment form, it does not.

Concern three, the document disseminated as interim policy contains statements that materially alter that policy, despite the clear statement that frequently asked questions are not part of official policy. The facts section nonetheless attempts to clarify and add guidance but instead alters the policy by extending limitations and extending requirements. APPC thus recommended three things. First, that the interim policy be immediately withdrawn and reliance be placed strictly on state law for the time being. Second, that a policy be submitted that goes through the regular approval process with public discussion. Third, APPC has noted that many FAQ sections alter or extend university policies, therefore, we recommended that FAQ sections be removed entirely from policies. It is our understanding from the policy office that that third one, the removal of FAQs, is under consideration right now.

APPC has been working with the policy office on this interim policy and as of now, the interim policy stands, though it is our understanding that the policy sponsors human resources and government, and community relations are considering our concerns. APPC has been told that FAQ sections will be phased out of policy documents.

I am aware of two faculty who are removed from the classroom despite clear state law granting them the right to express their opinions on political issues regardless of whether that opinion is expressed inside or outside the classroom. This is a right guaranteed by state law that cannot be taken away by university policy. One faculty member was accosted as he spoke at the Arizona State Legislature while on his own time for not obtaining university permission to do so. He subsequently issued a warning threatening further action.

I ask that the Senate broadly disseminate our report on the current political activity policy interim so that the university community can better understand their rights and be better informed of ways that this policy may improperly violate or misrepresent state law.

The second issue that I'm bringing is about the university handbook for appointed personnel, UHAP 7.01 Professional Conduct. In 7.01.01. The first section of that policy, one of the sections reads, "we are inclusive and respectful, we are committed to freedom of expression, academic freedom, and collaborative inquiry, we support creativity and innovation by valuing all voices and engaging in respectful discourse. While we may not always agree with the ideas and opinions of others, we honor their right to express them. In multiple cases, the term respectful discourse has been interpreted by administration to mean any discussion that does not offend or disagree. This situation is compounded by two additional factors. First, that findings of violations of UHAP 7.01.01 the first section of that policy can be included in annual reviews. It is odd to APPC that violations of only part of this policy include the respectful discourse but not the subsequent sections that detail the terms of academic freedom and freedom of speech are included in annual reviews. This notable exclusion includes the Memorandum of Understanding that specifically protects comments on university policy and governance. This exclusion also includes the Chicago Statement, which allows the same. In fact, according to former President Robbins, the faculty support of the Chicago Statement was an endorsement of general principles not a particular policy regarding academic freedom. Further, he said the right to comment on university or unit governance without fear of retribution is not absolute or unfettered, rather, it is subject to the statement on professional conduct which expects respectful discourse. We certainly hope that President Garimella sees this situation more in line with our stated values.

The second aggravating factor is that 7.01 has no mechanism for determining violation. The policy itself is mute. The Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs has stated to APPC that only the Office of Institutional Equity and Human Resources can make such determinations. However, the Office of Institutional Equity and Human Resources can make claim that they cannot make such determinations. To compound the confusion, APPC has accumulated evidence on grievances, many of which stem from this section, that the Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact has made that determination though refuses to explain any process he took. Deans have unilaterally made that determination without any process, input, or oversight and department heads have made the determination similarly unilaterally. Claim violations have led to letters of concern, reprimand, poor annual evaluations and years long remedial action, including threats of tenure revocation and termination.

Currently, the right to comment on university governance and policy is predicated on whether any single administrator determines the tone to be sufficiently respectful to him or her. Currently, APPC is working with the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs to rewrite this policy. I ask that the Senate support this rewrite and support the forthcoming rewritten UHAP 7.01 and a new policy on academic freedom. They're intended to remove this troublesome, respectful discourse statement, enable a robust review process and elevate the memorandum of understanding and Chicago Statement to official university policies, to align our written policies with our purported values. Thank you.

E. [UA Staff Council Report](#) – Staff Council Vice Chair, Danielle Barefoot [01:39:24]

Hello, and thank you so much. I am delighted to be here this afternoon to share with you on behalf of Staff

Council, as the Vice Chair that we have the 2024-2025 Workplace Climate Survey results available. I have already requested that Jane update the Senate meeting agenda website with the URL so that you may access and review the report at your convenience. I wanted to let you know that at the March session, we will be giving an in-depth presentation on this report and the results. You can navigate to the staffcouncil.arizona.edu website, click on resources, staff surveys, and then you can find the report that is linked with "read the survey report". I'm very pleased to announce that this survey had a 21% response rate. Just over 2,600 respondents out of over 12,000 staff, including our UAGC counterparts that are now part of staff here at the university.

Additionally, I'll just give you a brief overview. The PDF does have clickable sections, so you can select a section and go down to it if you would like, in addition to the executive summary, that's about six or so pages long. We have shared this survey report with senior leadership at the University of Arizona, and we've received some positive feedback. Garth Perry, who is the Vice President for Finance, has also reached out to us and requested a meeting. I would also like to encourage Faculty Senate Executives and other senior leadership who may be in the room, and online to consider meeting with Staff Council as well because a variety of different units on campus are represented in the responses. The issues that are discussed in the report represent the totality of issues here on campus that staff are facing. I think it's very important for leadership, even down to the unit and department level, to make sure that you review the report and consider positive changes that you could make at your unit level for staff. I'll be happy to take any questions currently and we look forward to giving a more in-depth presentation at the March meeting.

Effects of HR and Business Centralization – Senator Lucy Ziurys [01:42:25]

The Research Policy Committee has been looking at the effects of centralization on research and I'd like to point out some of the things that have been happening, but I'm going to describe this with the idea that we intend to propose a motion to suspend centralization process until it can be fully assessed. It is very much hurting research and none of these decisions have been made with any shared governance involved, they were just made, and we have to live with them.

This motion, therefore, is to suspend centralization process until it can be evaluated to date and discussed with shared governance. This motion was unanimously recommended by the Research Policy Committee and is also supported by various regents and distinguished professors. I'm speaking on behalf of the RPC. We feel that the centralization experiment has failed in many ways and it's time to stop it and evaluate it before further damage occurs. Positions and people have been pulled out of departments and put into some big pool, therefore, making no one accountable or responsible for various things like whether a proposal gets submitted or not. This is killing motivation and imagination of our staff to solve problems. Things do not get done and the buck is just passed around the pool. We really don't want any updates. We want solutions. We want the research process and IT process to be simpler. I'm going to give some examples in a moment of what is going on. With the current attack on federal funding, as we've seen and heard about, any destabilization in our research effort will make things worse, and this destabilization has to stop.

Here are a few examples of what's happening that has hurt research efforts at the university. First thing, IT centralization, now the number of IT staff has declined and there's less support for faculty, but an increasing number of barriers that faculty have to overcome to get anything done. For example, simple data analysis software cannot be downloaded from the web on individual computers, but an IT person must do this. The IT personnel are overloaded due to the decline in staff numbers, and it takes days to get someone to download software. What should have taken a few minutes, an individual just goes and downloads the software, can now take days. This is very inefficient. Then there's the whole Mimecast software. Daily, various emails are held back and have to be manually released by the faculty individually through this software. The holding back of email simply has not been an effective way to block spam. It has blocked Senate committee listservs, for example, and messages from professional organizations, but then it fails to stop spam. Moreover, links provided in emails undergo a suspicious vetting process before they're actually and released to the individual on their email. In some instances, this information has been distorted. So, for example, people are working on a grant proposal together through a cloud and when they try to get the information off of it, it gets distorted, doesn't help research, terribly inefficient.

Then there's HR centralization. We have found that PIs have received federal grants cannot hire personnel stated in the grant and thus cannot accomplish the goals specified. There's also the instance where raises are put into the grant. It's been approved, the money is there, and people can't give their personnel raises even though they're doing more work. It gets blocked. There is even talk that some of the federal agencies are thinking of suing the university for violating contracts. In an era where we're being attacked on the grant proposal level, this is preposterous. This is just giving the federal government excuses to stop the grant flow.

Business office centralization. This is dealing with writing grant proposals. We're having difficulty getting grant proposals processed in a timely manner with the centralization of RII providing pool proposal personnel. For example, in a recent proposal deadline in a certain department, there was a deadline at one agency, a whole bunch of proposals were submitted. Several proposals were not submitted on time to sponsored projects. They were submitted late. As a result, the proposals were not fully vetted before submission to the federal agency, and

we're not prepared in accordance with federal guidelines. The lack of personal action between the proposer and the processor leads to such mistakes and understanding. When you work with one individual and they are responsible, things work better instead of ten individuals, everyone pointing the figure at someone else when it comes to these things.

Then there is the question of human subject's research review. This has become more and more centralized, and it turns out that the faculty who work with human subjects that require approval from the university to conduct their research, the process has become terribly burdensome, where it can take months to receive approval for studies that present no risk to the research participants. The university is centralized all, it's called RIB functioning, where every protocol is sent to a main OS and reviewed by administrative staff rather than faculty who are deeply experienced in conducting human subjects research.

These are the sum of the problems this centralization has brought to the research efforts and I would like some discussion about the possibility of a motion to ask for research central for centralization to be suspended until these problems can be dealt with. It keeps rolling like a train along the track and more and more problems are created and faculty are getting more and more frustrated with what's been going on in IT, HR, and other things.

Questions and Comments [01:49:59]

- Senator M. Witte stated as a member of the Research Policy Committee, which proposed this motion to go forward, said this is just a partial list of particulars but they received an endless list. This is an experiment that the faculty warned others would happen. It is time for everyone to stop complaining and put a motion on the floor that the Faculty Senate recommends halting this process, until damage that has already been done can be seen and reversed.
- Senator M. Witte stated she is calling for a vote rather than for discussion.
- Senator R. Witte raised a point of order and said there is no motion on the floor.
- Senator M. Witte said there is a motion on the floor to halt the process.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she does not believe Senator Ziurys proposed a specific motion.
- Senator Ziurys stated she is proposing a specific motion but there is not much time for discussion and believes this should be moved to the next meeting to be properly discussed.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she would also like to clarify the motion.
- Senator M. Witte stated the motion was to halt the centralization and to look at the damage done and to see how further damage can be prevented and so on. There was a committee dealing with this that warned the Senate about this, and this is an experiment that shouldn't be undertaken.
- Senator M. Witte stated the centralization process is probably the reason that problems were happening in central administration that led to the deficit and now things are being pushed back to where the problems were.
- Senator Simmons stated he thinks this is part of the previous discussion from Senator R. Witte regarding shared governance and he believes there should be a clear delineation. It is possible to make recommendations all day, but understanding the limits of where those become actionable is a larger discussion.
- Senator Simmons stated the main point he would like to raise was that anything brought forward in Senate as a resolution should be mindful of staff working in the units, and their hard work is recognized as they are doing it under very difficult circumstances. They may not feel they have a lot of power and agency in this, and it is important that criticisms aren't directed to them, but to the overall process.
- Senator R. Witte stated if someone is going to make a motion it must be clear and there needs to be a second, at this point that hasn't happened, so it seems this is just a discussion. It is also important to consider the impact of suspending centralization, regarding what it means, and how that can be implemented. At this moment, there is not a specific motion, and he believes there needs to be further thought on how this would work. This can include how long it would be suspended and what it means.
- Senator R. Witte stated he has many things to add to what Senator Ziurys just said, including the fact that his college had a professor come from UMass and they looked at how finances are being done using Excel and he said the University is forty years behind what people are doing on the East Coast.
- Senator R. Witte said he thinks it is overdue to do something, but he thinks Senate must think about how this would manifest if it were suspended.
- Senator Cochran stated his thanks to Senator Ziurys bringing this discussion to Senate. He agrees this is in the discussion phase and needs tangible steps to move this forward, and perhaps a committee to assess the centralization process.
- Senator Cochran stated from his personal experience that the IRB process is enormously frustrating for low-risk human subject's research. There is currently a watchdog group to check and balance what there is with IRB. There needs to be some kind of committee to put pressure on IRB itself for low-risk human subjects research to move it forward.
- Senator Ziurys stated that her understanding is there is no committee or watchdog, it just gets decided on by people.
- Senator Maggert stated with respect to Senator R. Witte, he doesn't believe there needs to be given an alternative, or a plan to stop or disassemble what has already happened. The Senate can barely say that this is

the disaster that needs to be stopped. The people that initiated it can come up with the actions to undo it. The Senate's vote is not going to enact the end of it, it will merely express the Senate's opinion that it should stop, and the damage should cease.

- Senator Eckert stated although she agrees that centralization has been an issue and continues to be an issue, she doesn't think it is straightforward enough to just say, "stop." Some places are in the process of doing it and if the Senate says to stop it, then the university is in limbo that is even more problematic than the current situation.
- Senator Eckert stated she does think this needs a little bit more discussion and clarification because Centralization is a huge topic and there's numerous offices that are being centralized. She thinks the Senate needs to rethink this a little bit more before there is a vote.
- Senator Ziurys stated she agrees, but there was an IT Centralization Committee that seems to no longer be running, and she is unsure what happened to it. It seems that things keep getting worse and worse and a message needs to be sent to people about what centralization is doing to the faculty's research efforts. If research is an important part of the university and centralization is wrecking it, like a wrecking ball, it needs to be pointed out to the administration, and they need to be asked to stop.
- Senator Ziurys stated she agrees with Senator Maggert that there doesn't have to be a plan outlined of what to do, but a message needs to be sent to show them how hurtful it is to faculty morale.
- Senator M. Witte stated this request is only asking to stop things now, and not to undo anything. If something happens going forward, the faculty want to look at it. The faculty wants to have an action by making a motion which is shared governance, not just to express complaints that are ignored.
- Senator M. Witte stated she calls for an up or down vote, and if people want to discuss further details, that would be the next step.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she did not understand a motion on the floor and understands that Senator Ziurys described a motion supported by faculty and other individuals, as opposed to an official motion or resolution to vote on in the Senate.
- Senator Barefoot stated she has a word of caution based on the fallout seen from federal changes over the past week when things were halted immediately, and she would like everyone to think about what happens when things like centralization are already in process and are ordered to halt immediately. She would like everyone to think about the ramifications like experiencing delays or issues and would encourage conversation rather than a halt.

11. **Adjournment [01:57:39]**

Vice Chair Hymel adjourned the January 27, 2025, meeting at 5:01 PM.

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

Motions of January 27, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2024/25-20] to approve the January 27, 2025, Faculty Senate Agenda. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-21] to approve the minutes for the December 2, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-22] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Minor in Food Science and Fermentation. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2024/25-23] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Minor in English Applied Linguistics. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2024/25-24] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, BS in Integrated Business Engineering. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2024/25-25] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, BS in Medical Pharmacology and Toxicology. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2024/25-26] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, BA in Public Relations. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

[Motion 2024/25-27] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, UG Minor in Insights into Healthy Aging. Motion passed by thirty-nine in favor, none opposed, and two abstentions.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)

2. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the [December 2, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting](#).
3. Page 7, Action Item 8: Consent Agenda
 - a. [Proposal UG Minor in Food Science and Fermentation](#)
 - b. [Request to Establish Minor in Food Science and Fermentation \(Information only\)](#)
 - c. [Proposal Minor in English Applied Linguistics](#)
 - d. [Request to Establish UG Minor English Applied Linguistics \(Information only\)](#)
 - e. [Proposal BS in Integrated Business Engineering](#)
 - f. [Request to Establish BS in Integrated Business Engineering \(Information only\)](#)
 - g. [Proposal BS in Medical Pharmacology and Toxicology](#)
 - h. [Request to Establish BS in Medical Pharmacology and Toxicology \(Information only\)](#)
 - i. [Proposal BA in Public Relations](#)
 - j. [Request to Establish New Academic Program BA in Public Relations \(Information only\)](#)
 - k. [Proposal UG Minor in Insights into Healthy Aging](#)
4. New Business,
 - a. Page 9, Item B: [Update on the Shared Governance Review Committee](#)
 - b. Page 13, Item E: [UA Staff Council Report](#)
 - c. Page 14, Item F: [Effects of HR and Business Centralization](#)
5. Written reports from the
 - a. [President](#)
 - b. [Provost](#)
 - c. [SAPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456