

## MINUTES FACULTY SENATE FEBRUARY 3, 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=7a56f71a-d656-46f9-873e-b27a0006f9da>

**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 [00:00:09]**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the February 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 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 [00:00:25]**

- Vice Chair Hymel announced that the next Faculty Senate meeting will take place on March 3, 2025.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated that when one makes a motion and it gets seconded, she will repeat the motion to ensure everyone has heard it. After, she will turn debate over to the maker of the motion, while aligning with the allotted time on the agenda.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated deviations from the agenda include removing the February 27, 2025, minutes from Item three. Additionally, regarding item number five, the President nor a representative on his behalf will attend today's meeting. The item title, "Report from the President," always stays on the agenda to welcome the President if he would like to attend the meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated under New Business, Item E: Introduction of Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact, Tomás Díaz de la Rubia has been moved up to Item A.

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2024/25-28]** to approve the agenda of the February 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- Chair Hudson stated SVPRI Tomás Díaz de la Rubia will be able to use the President's time allotment of five minutes for his introduction.

### 3. **OPEN SESSION [00:01:23]**

#### **Keiron Bailey, Associate Professor, Research, Innovation, and Impact [00:04:42]**

Following up from last week, from Keith Maggert, who is the Chair of APPC's report, I would like to focus on what we might do, collectively to reestablish compliance with ABOR rules, UA policies, and federal law. As some of you know, I spent two hours interviewing with the FBI and DOJ at the end of November. Following my complaints to the governor, the DOJ, and the FBI regarding the abusive process and violation of rights against me, which included my dismissal from a tenured post with no cause offered, using a previous address, and the fraudulent deployment of UAPD against me without cause under state law by administration. One of whom wished to remain anonymous while doing so. That part you have heard before, you'll be hearing more of it again.

I think one of the things that has come to my attention recently is in the search for the Provost listening sessions, people talk about bad publicity. That bad publicity is here. There is a causal link between bad publicity and violation of rights. I think that clearing up violations of rights would help to restore better publicity for everyone on campus. To that degree, I do believe that there are things that can be done to reestablish rights. I'm going to read you here, a brief

section from the Attorney General's response to my amended complaint that was filed in federal court, this is from page nine:

"Defendants do not dispute that in his Amended Complaint, Bailey has pleaded sufficient facts to support the first three elements of a heightened risk claim. But he still has not alleged facts to support the crucial fourth element of the cause of action."

I should point out that is 20 USC Section 1681 Heightened TITLE IX risk. I am self-litigating the Attorney General's Office with multiple attorneys in conducting the defense. Pretty remarkable, I would say, a self-represented litigant is able to do that.

#### **Senator Mark Stegeman [00:07:04]**

I address you not as parliamentarian, but in my frequent capacity being involved in General Education. I took this spot to encourage the Senate to engage seriously with major structural changes that are coming to the general education program. While decisions are still fluid, the Senate has addressed many issues over the past several years that are outside its normal focus, such as security and centralization. These are appropriate discussions when serious problems arise, but across many states and universities, it is commonly agreed that academic curriculum policies are among the most important focus for the institutions of the faculty governance in any year and at any time, few academic curricular programs are larger or have wider impact in general education.

The implementation of the Regent's Civic's requirement has probably received the most discussion. But the initial implementation of the refresh has raised significant other structural issues in whether and how to address those issues is not yet resolved. They should be addressed together to the greatest extent possible to avoid confounding circumstance of closely sequential cohorts of students being subject to different rules.

These issues include whether the natural science requirement be strengthened to something closer to the old tiers requirements, or to those of our peers? Should native nation's governments be required as part of the incoming American institutions curriculum? Should the one-unit courses 101 and 301 courses consider continuing their present form? Should changes be made to the governance of general education, including the activity of the university-wide General Education Committee, of which I happen to be a member? Should some or all of the four attributes be Scheduled to take effect in Fall 2026 be reversed or eliminated as requirements? And should steps to ensure that the availability of seats in various categories matches more closely, the required demand?

I believe that students, faculty, and the processes of shared governance will all benefit from substantial Senate engagement with these questions.

#### **Senator Joel Smith [00:09:47]**

I'm here today to talk about speed bumps. My name is Joel Smith and I am an at-large Senator and an Assistant Professor of Practice for the UNIV and gen-ed programs. I've read

#### **Senator Cochran [00:08:01]**

I'm here today to talk about speed bumps.

My name is Joel Smith, and I'm an at-large Senator and Assistant Professor of Practice for the UNIV and Gen Ed Programs. I've read our President is a fellow film lover, so with apologies to Kubrick, I might title these remarks: *Dr. Gen Ed Love or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bumps*.

In Fall '22, our team rolled out two 1-unit courses that now reach 11,000+ students each year: UNIV 101: Intro to the Gen Ed Experience and UNIV 301: General Education Portfolio.

While time-to-degree matters, college is not and should not be the autobahn, a thoroughfare designed for limitless speed and zero detours, even if some students, advisors, and administrators might prefer it that way.

Really what we want for our students is to survive the drive, make it to graduation as a Wildcat. The Fall '22 first time/full-time cohort reached historically high one and two year retention rates of 87 and 80%, and one of the biggest changes that year was that they all took UNIV 101. This course supports retention. Full stop.

Now, onto speed bumps. Why do we have speed bumps? To slow us down. For one kind of student, it feels like an unnecessary obstacle on their way somewhere else. A better response might be that speed bumps require us to pay attention to what's around us. Learning how to pay attention is a central tenet of UNIV 101, where students produce reflective writing that improves their metacognitive skills.

A second question might be where are speed bumps? In neighborhoods and around schools, where people live and learn. Yes, they slow us down, which for a subset of advisors and students, may be behind the critique that UNIV 101 is a “waste of time.” Please note that this course (like those any of us teach) is not perfect (yet), and I invite you to teach it or at least read our free textbook, *Wildcat Perspectives*. There you’ll find chapters like “A Tucson Testimonio” by my former Writing Program colleague and 8th generation Tucsonan Melani Martinez, which drives Week 4 of the curriculum, and examines the UofA: its purpose, place, and people. That is just one week in a class that is **not** a “waste of time.” So, I suggest we learn to love the bumps. Our students’ shocks can take it.

#### **4. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [00:12:04]**

Hey, you all have heard a lot from me recently. So rather than take up a lot of my allotted time, I just want to give a very brief a little statement here today and then I can either take any questions if anyone has questions for me or turn it over to Dr. Garcia and Dr. Marx who can help answer some of the questions that might be on your mind.

Because our last two open session speakers both referred to the very important process of our handling of gen ed, I want to thank everyone who has been involved in that process on the ad-hoc general faculty committee, as well as in the other gen ed offices and just give you all a heads up that we will probably be hearing, one last time, a dedicated session from the ad-hoc faculty committee. Putting in some of the structural changes that Dr. Stegman was talking about, specifically handling gen-ed in a Senate ad-hoc committee that Vice Chair Hymel and I will compose as soon as we stop trying to drink from the fire hose of this moment that we’re in right now.

Regarding the current uncertainty around federal tests of executive power, let me once again reassure you from my personal and collegial perspective that if your work is part of our collective mission of research, teaching, and service, and is dedicated in full or in part to achieving the excellence that comes from multiple perspectives and positions, or that is dedicated to making sure that no one is unfairly excluded from our work or our workplace, then you should not feel cowed in the face of challenges. We have a rich stock of words and we are all well prepared to use them to describe and defend the value that we bring to dispel misperceptions about what it is we do as an R1 university and to justify what we do in our pursuit of excellence and as an ultimate meritocracy that does not exclude anyone.

As we’ve seen with the federal funding freeze, which was rescinded after about two days, the tariff with Mexico, which was postponed this morning, and just as we came into this chamber, the tariff to Canada, which was perhaps postponed. I haven’t had a chance to read all the news. What we’re seeing is an expansive test of federal presidential power that serves as a stress test, a challenge to perceived adversaries, and most importantly, an opening bargaining position. Let us not censor each other or self-censor as we collectively move towards a better understanding of what our new legal cultural parameters are. Don’t panic. Don’t silence yourself or others. And don’t comply in advance with efforts that fly in the face of mainstream understandings of law and common sense.

That is my personal collegial advice to a community that is struggling to interpret in real time and I offer that to you from a personal perspective. Now, that said, I’m ready to take any questions that you might have for the remainder of my time. And if there aren’t any, I would be happy to turn it over so that President Garimella’s new Chief of Staff, one of our own, Dr. Francisco Garcia, can introduce himself at whatever length he would like to do.

#### **Questions and Comments [00:16:29]**

- Senator M. Witte stated this topic wasn’t addressed by Chair Hudson but over the past few days there have been frenetic activities to meet some of the issues brought up by Senator Ziurys. She knows that faculty leaders have been meeting sort of behind the scenes to figure out what can be improved, and she would like to point out that it’s good, but she believes the Faculty Senate should be getting the information and should be involved in decision making. In some ways, if this is not the case, it can delay the direct dealing with some of the issues by the Faculty Senate.
- Chair Hudson stated she will try to redirect the communications from the small circle of faculty leadership to the Senate at large. This month, they are in an interesting situation because of everything that has occurred within the past week, but she has noted Senator M. Witte’s point.
- Chair Hudson stated considering discussions that occurred the past Monday regarding centralization, there were some interesting developments which will come up in the first item of Old Business or even in the second item. This will be brought to the Senate and not handled in private.
- Senator Miller-Cochran stated she would like to ask a clarifying question regarding one of the points that was made about an additional meeting regarding general education. Chair Hudson mentioned hearing further from the ad-hoc committee, and she asked if that meeting would also include perspectives from the university-wide general Education Committee and Office of General Education like the last one.
- Chair Hudson stated she believes this can be arranged. She has informed Chair Stegman that the ad-hoc general education committee that he chairs will not be renewed by her. She is aware that the committee has work underway and she thinks they would still like to present this work, publicly, with the Senate, and she would like to ensure they have this opportunity.
- Chair Hudson stated no other details such as a date has been determined, other than that it should be in public and

she believes everyone will have a chance to ask questions and make comments, but she doesn't believe it will be structured the same as the last meeting.

- Chair Hudson stated this is leading up to a Senate subcommittee meeting that she hopes Senator Miller-Cochran, Senator Stegeman, Senator Russell, Senator O'Leary, and others who have been very engaged in this work, will come together and produce an entire package address many of the issues that Senator Stegeman has brought up, for it to be passed. She hopes this can occur in the Fall of 2025, if not sooner.

#### **FRANCISCO GARCIA, CHIEF OF STAFF TO THE PRESIDENT [00:21:07]**

Chair Hudson, members of the faculty, it is a real privilege and honor to be here in your company today. I have to tell you that being thirteen days into the job, I am still figuring out where I am going, and where I am not going. I do not have any prepared remarks, and I certainly am not ready to provide some sort of report or summary.

I am happy to share a little bit of my background. I am a product of this institution both as an undergraduate and as a graduate student. My career at this institution started in this building in the New Start Summer Bridge Program. I'm a proud alum of the New Start Program and Head Start. I had very successful and happy times here thanks to the mentorship and support of some of our faculty colleagues, some folks who've become my colleagues. I want to recognize Dr. Marlys Witte, who really encouraged me to pursue an academic career when I really wasn't that interested.

I've spent a long time, 13, 14, or 15 years in the College of Medicine. I have tenure in Obstetrics and Gynecology as well as in Public Health. I had a very traditional surgical medical specialist career as an academic physician, as somebody who worked on cervical cancer prevention and HPV prevention doing everything from molecular marker discovery to early phase clinical trials, to community and policy interventions. Our team span that gamut of everything about HPV from molecular, to applied, so I am very pleased.

I had the opportunity and for a lot of reasons, it made sense at some point in my life to go over to the county, to leave the academy, for the purposes of leading a health department. I was happy to do that for about four or five years. The administrator, Mr. Chuck Huckleberry, asked me to come up to administration to do more than just public health, to oversee the portfolio of human services. That was everything from public health and behavioral health, the Office of Medical Examiner, and Animal care, but it also included things like housing and economic development, workforce development, libraries digital equity and inclusion, as well as environmental quality and emergency management. So really a broad portfolio.

Based on that experience, having those relationships, having served as a staff to our administrator, now Ms. Jan Leshner, and our board of supervisors, I bring to the institution those relationships, those processes, those different ways of approaching items. To be clear, I think the main job of the chief of staff is to listen furiously, to listen intently, to listen to, as I tell my children, you must listen with your big boy ears, really paying attention to what people are saying both verbally and non-verbally. I think that that is what the job entails, to try to take all that information and to synthesize it for the purposes of supporting the president and his leadership team.

I think that the most important thing that I can do in this role is to try to come up with creativity that is elucidated from the faculty, from our students, from our employees from our staff, from our community at large, and to help it bubble up and percolate to the President and our leadership team.

That is all I'm prepared to say today, but you can see me pop in on these meetings, if you don't mind, and I may just sort of sit quietly because again, I really do believe that there's a lot of wisdom in listening, and in trying to extract those kernels of nuggets of truth. Regarding Senator Smith's column, for instance, I heard something today that I had not heard, and I thought, huh, that's something that I need to keep in the back of my mind as we're thinking about general education and how we frame the issues around gen-ed. I think that was an interesting frame that I had not heard before. So, count on me to be in the back, a person who's listening, hopefully taking a lot in, feel free to reach out to me. You can reach out to me anytime. Many of you already have my cell phone number. Happy to be available in that capacity. Thank you for the time, though. I really appreciate it.

#### **Questions and Comments [00:26:35]**

- Senator Rafelski stated he knew Chief of Staff, Garcia's predecessor, and he has always had a question in his mind which he would like to pose now, he would like to know if there is a clear, defined role for his position, such as a job description. He asked if there is some type of document that states what the Chief of Staff or what the President of the University of Arizona is supposed to do, and he wonders if he has any connection with his predecessor to gather insights on how he viewed the position.
- Chief of Staff, Garcia stated there is a position description that is available to Human Resources which describes in detail what the expectations are for the position, and a lot of it is synthesized to what he has said which is listening and providing counsel. He doesn't know his predecessor, nor did he have a chance to interact with him so he does not have that benefit. He does know other people who have been in this role, both for University presidents, and for

governors, agency heads, and other complicated organizations. He does have a good sense of what it feels like to know what a good relationship with his predecessor would be.

- Senator M. Witte stated that she would like to certify to the Senate that he is an immaculate conception. She asked if he would convey to the President that having breakfast with the Faculty, while a nice gesture, and one initiated by President Robbins early in his tenure, does not substitute for faculty leaders meeting in huddled back rooms about budget decisions. It does not substitute the decisions and rationale for them to be brought to the Faculty Senate, for shared governance input, which if it was had at the time when all the issues arose, they wouldn't have arisen.
- Chief of Staff, Garcia stated he believes what Senator M. Witte is starting to see is the University's ongoing and nascent efforts in terms of engagement. She is right that no one vehicle will serve every purpose, or every single stakeholder. The idea is to have as many of them as possible, on as many avenues, with as many stakeholders, and certainly the Faculty Senate is one of those critical stakeholders that the President's Office remains focused on. This is part of the reason he will be attending the meetings.

## 5. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST – INTERIM PROVOST RON MARX [00:30:36]**

Having subsequent Monday Senate meetings means reports are brief. So, mine is as well. Before I begin my remarks, I want to underscore my appreciation of Dr. Garcia's joining the leadership of the university. I think it's great that we have a Chief of Staff who has an academic pedigree who knows what we do as a faculty, teaching, providing service to the community, writing grant applications, publishing. It's important that that kind of experience is in that office right next to the President. Francisco, thank you for joining us. I really appreciate it. I should also add that I know Francisco mostly not from campus, but from my involvement in civic affairs at several different boards and advisory groups and that's where actually I got to know him best, so he's very, very effective in that context as well.

I have a very, very brief report here and it has to do with our experience over the last 15 days, since January 20th. I recognize that these last couple of weeks have brought a lot of uncertainty to all of us. It has occupied untold hours of my time, responding to what's happening in our country. Our approach, and I say our, I mean my meeting with other senior leaders at the university is to remain engaged and closely to monitor the developments as they unfold, and they unfold by the minute, by the hour. We're going to try to provide updates based on what we understand, what we understand the facts to be, what our knowledge is after doing careful analysis. We're going to try not to speculate. We're going to try not to respond to hypotheticals. I think that gets us in dangerous territory if we try to do that because the landscape is shifting so quickly. We want to provide where we can, clear, accurate information without adding to the myriad confusion that's out there right now. There have been, to-date, over 70 memoranda, proclamations, and executive orders that our Office of General Council had to review. I've been reading some of them. It doesn't really help because some of them are so confusing, but I do nonetheless, and we will provide updates as we need to.

There is one public-facing piece here at the university, and that's been put together by RII, they created a website as a central hub for research related guidance. I've been looking around the landscape around the country. Most universities that have been responding have been doing exactly that. There are very, very few universities that have been making general proclamations because they're so dangerous these days. SVP Tomas Diaz de la Rubia will be speaking momentarily, and his team are addressing individual concerns as they as they come up. Make sure if you have those kinds of concerns, you read his website and contact RII. A faculty can access the updates at their website.

That's where we stand right now. Our approach, including my meeting with ASUA representatives this afternoon is to try to reassure people as we can. We can't reassure as much as everybody would like us to, but we're trying to stay on top of these issues as best we can.

### **Questions and Comments [00:34:46]**

- Senator Russell stated she is connected to her network of colleagues across the country, and even the world, and is very grateful for the reason of not being provoked into making mistakes early. She appreciates the way the university has been dealing with this, the updates as they come, and the approach to wait until the whites of their eyes are seen before responding.
- Senator Russell stated it is best to look after one another, to make slow, steady progress, and to be prepared to respond when needed. She cannot express how thankful she is for that as she has colleagues at other universities who are not as well served.
- Interim Provost Marx stated his thanks for the comment and explained the landscape is changing so quickly as there are lawsuits, temporary restraining orders, and the University wants to be as cautious as possible.

## 6. **CONSENT AGENDA – CO-CHAIRS OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, JOOST VAN HAREN AND LISA REZENDE – [Policy revision- Bachelor's Degree Requirements, Multiple Majors and Degrees.](#) [00:36:18]**

- Seconded **[Motion 2024/25-29]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Policy revision- Bachelor's Degree Requirements, Multiple Majors and Degrees passed by unanimous consent.

## 7. **OLD BUSINESS [00:36:58]**

### A. **Effects of HR and Business Centralization – Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:37:17]**

I'd like to continue our discussion of the burdens of centralization on research. I really would like to point out that the University of Arizona is a research one university, and that research is one of our very important core missions, upon which our university's reputation is hinged. Of course, there are many problems going on right now. It's very complicated at the university and we just can't attribute everything to centralization. There are budget crises and so forth, but the Research Policy Committee considered it a major obstacle for research success.

I don't want to say too much more other than read a few things from an independent memo from the CALES Dean's Advisory Council and their comments on centralization, just to show you how widespread it is. A quote, from their report to their Dean, "Centralization has proved inefficient causing significant delays and significantly increased barriers to completing most research-related HR and business tasks supported by restricted funds. Basic travel reimbursements, hiring undergrad students, posting positions for new hires, responding to time sensitive questions, et cetera. The breakdown or significant slowdown of processing of basic communication and research-related support tasks from the centralized HR and business teams has resulted in faculty redirecting more of their time towards managing these tasks rather than managing their research responsibilities or exploring new funding opportunities."

One example is this Smartsheet system, which, according to the memo, increases the time needed to file a reimbursement for travel from 10 minutes to two hours. This is ridiculous. Anyway, it's not just the Research Policy Committee, other people are concerned. I was hoping to use the rest of this time to get comments from other people.

### **Questions and Comments [00:39:34]**

- Senator Cochran stated his thanks to Senator Ziurys and said he would like to open a discussion. I'd love to hear from my colleagues on Faculty Senate regarding the IRB challenges. He said he should mention that the Vice President of Research at the University of Arizona did reach out to Lucy and I himself after the last Faculty Senate meeting just last week to request a meeting which was a good sign regarding IRB specifically.
- Senator Cochran stated he raised the topic last Monday of some kind of watchdog group or whether there should be a committee perhaps formed, and he would love to hear his colleagues' perspectives on whether there should be a Faculty Senate committee to address issues with IRB. He is sure Senator Miller-Cochran can address some of the challenges with IRB that graduate students have had in terms of getting approval and the rate of graduation for PhD students.
- Senator Hingle stated her thanks for the presentation and asked if the report is on behalf of the entire Research Policy Committee.
- Senator Ziurys stated the report was unanimously endorsed by the committee and these discussions have been occurring for some time. The committee plans to meet with the new SVPRI to discuss these topics and those related. The committee plans to work with administration to form resolutions.
- Senator Hingle stated her thanks and explained she was wondering how the committee is working with administration on potential solutions as these issues are being faced by many. She also does research and has struggled with some of these things. She was concerned with specific comments as they sounded very anecdotal and wasn't sure of how the data was collected on the topic.
- Senator Hingle stated regarding what was mentioned by Senator Cochran, IRB has Faculty Committees, and she thinks if there can be more collaboration with them, or more interaction between them and the SVPRI, this would be a great start as they are part of the process. This may not address some of the bureaucratic hurdles, but this may be better than initiating another committee.
- Senator Ziurys stated RPC has invited Sangita Judge to their next meeting regarding this issue, and Senator Cochran has also been invited. The details are still being worked out.
- Senator Hingle stated she hopes the same for IT because she was reading in the report that there were concerns about emails and there was a strange statement at the end regarding a "big brother moment," and it sounded very conspiratorial. She was hoping that Dr. Chue was present at the meeting as she doesn't see this as an issue, and she is concerned on what is being represented as faculty opinion.
- Secretary Zeiders thanked Senator Ziurys for her consistent voice on the matter, and she would like to thank RPC. She was concerned about some of the conversation and parts of the memo in relation to the idea of pausing all centralization. She believes it conflated a few things such as centralization efforts with decisions at the Office of Budget and Planning, (OBP), and financial budget cuts. She knows these are three consistent issues and there are centralization issues.
- Secretary Zeiders stated the memo referenced by Senator Ziurys sounded like it referenced HR or centralization around travel reimbursement, but it also discussed issues about decisions of OBP, the restrictions of PI service accounts, and IDC and restrictions on carry forward funds.
- Secretary Zeiders stated there are spending authority caps that limit unrestricted funds, some of which are state line items or designated by state lines for specific use. There is a system in place and a plan that is still struggling to do simple accounting of mapping of college expenditures onto college spending authority.

- Secretary Zeiders stated there are the issues of financial cuts with fewer people, greater workload, fewer individuals doing HR and financial services, and staff are strapped. She does not think this is an indication of their efforts but an indication that they are overworked and there will be challenges ahead, or ones that everyone has been under.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she doesn't believe centralization is one big swoop and saying that it is the problem is not very helpful currently as it does not get to the heart of the issues of challenges that many are facing.
- Secretary Zeiders stated regarding IT centralization this has mostly paused under the leadership of Dr. Cheu. He is taking a careful and thoughtful process on how to proceed forward, and he is seeking shared governance input from the IT Centralization Advisory Group. RII has reached out to Shared Governance leaders and this information will be brought to the Faculty Senate as soon as possible.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she would like to thank Senator Ziurys for bringing this to the forefront and at this moment, she thinks there are big challenges being faced in higher education and the UA has one of the strongest shared governance structures across the state, and maybe even in the U.S. Now is a critical time to use these strengths to help resolve issues she has mentioned, and she believes that this will be done in the ongoing work of the Senators.
- Senator Ziurys stated she agrees with Secretary Zeiders and stated there are so many issues and centralization is just one complex topic RPC cares to focus on because it has directly impacted a lot of researchers.
- Chair Hudson stated she believes discussing centralization this way, and then having the challenge of disaggregating all different puzzle pieces has been helpful.
- Chair Hudson stated she is ready to share the RII memo that was addressed to the faculty leadership, with their permission, to the entire Faculty Senate. This memo has already been shared with RPC. Some of what is included in the memo is very specific to processes and interactions in the College of Science and it needs to be broken down further.
- Chair Hudson stated to follow up on comments by Secretary Zeiders, Dr. Cheu, now in charge of IT, requested a faculty governance representative for his bi-weekly working group on IT centralization. She checked with Tyson Swetnam and he will be serving on this group. He was the lead author and Chair of the Faculty Senate IT Committee that produced the very comprehensive and long analysis of how centralization and decentralization can be better used in IT.
- Chair Hudson stated she is optimistic that there are better structures in place and these issues will be discussed publicly until they are no longer had.
- Senator Ziurys stated she has seen a lot of committees that meet and discuss these issues, but the issues are still in place, and she would like to see action. She believes this resonates with a lot of other researchers as they are finding difficulty doing things such as hiring off their grants due to issues with HR centralization, and others. She values Chair Hudson's optimism but does so cautiously as there needs to be faster change.
- Senator M. Witte stated she agrees with Senator Ziurys as these are very complicated problems, there are a litany of them, and they are affecting everyone. These issues are traceable back to bad decisions made without shared governance, and once the faculty hears that the issues have already happened, they say there are ways they could have been avoided.
- Senator M. Witte stated what is happening seems to be little bandages on a giant abscess that is leaking, and it will continue. It is more like septic shock than an abscess.
- Senator M. Witte stated the Faculty Senate needs for the President to come into the Senate to hear the issues, and where they stem from, to work collaboratively before the issues create irreparable harm and a clearly negative trajectory of the flagship university.
- Senator M. Witte moved **[Motion 2024/25-30]** the Faculty Senate calls for an emergency meeting with President Garimella and whoever he chooses to bring, to avoid further irreparable harm and reverse the negative trajectory of this flagship University of Arizona. Motion was seconded.
  - Parliamentarian stated he believes it is out of order to make a motion that appears to compel any action by an individual. He believes it is proper to formulate an invitation to the President.
  - Senator R. Witte stated what he heard and seconded was a call for an emergency Faculty Senate meeting with President Garimella to address the Senate's concerns and work together with him to fix many of the issues that have come up in the last several meetings. Some of the issues go back to the last couple of years.
  - Senator M. Witte states she believes her motion is in order.
  - Senator Ziurys stated she believes the point is that the RPC has met with and had discussions with people. ABOR and distinguished professors have met, and these things still occur. No one in RPC can stop things from happening and the only one that can do so is the President.
  - Senator Ziurys stated she believes President Garimella needs to be aware of the issues and the disruptions they are causing because she is unsure of if he knows of these issues passed down from the previous administration. She feels the best way to communicate the faculty's concerns and get action is by having an in-person meeting.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated her thanks and said she believes the President would prefer an in-person meeting.
  - Senator R. Witte stated he believes it is only the President working with the Faculty Senate that can result in solutions as quickly and effectively as possible, not other committees.

- Senator R. Witte stated it is important that this body works with the President who has Executive Power as he needs to understand what is happening. He believes these issues are left over from the previous administration's policies and action and everyone needs to be brought to the table as quickly as possible as this is urgent, and people are being harmed.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she has thought a lot about whether anyone conducted an economic analysis on the value of faculty time spent on administrative tasks unrelated to research or teaching.
- Senator M. Witte stated she calls for a secret ballot included paper voting.
- **[Motion 2024/25-30]** passed with twenty-seven in favor, twenty opposed, and one abstention.

B. **Resolution on Political Activity and Code of Conduct** – First Reading, Senator Ted Downing [00:59:47]

Thank you very much, for the purposes of expediency of time, I will read the motion. To explain the origins of this motion, APPC and Chair Keith Maggert gave a very detailed and clear explanation of the issues concerning Political Activity Policy (Interim) UHAP 2.10 that was put forth back around October. Chair Maggert explained the difficulties of that policy and based on discussions with him regarding the policy, I wrote the following **[Motion 2024/25-31]**:

"The Faculty Senate expresses strong opposition to the Political Activity Policy Interim UHAP 2.10 issued on October 25, 2025. The interim policy imposes sweeping restrictions on faculty and staff political freedoms that conflict with US and Arizona constitutions, as well as with the statutes it proposed to regulate accordingly.

The Senate respectfully calls on President Garimella to:

1. Immediately rescind the Political Activity Policy (Interim) UHAP 2.10.
2. Develop a new policy that aligned with the political rights guaranteed under the U.S. and Arizona Constitutions and state law, particularly ARS 15-1633. The redrafting process must actively involve elected faculty representatives in compliance with ARS 15-1601(B), which mandates faculty participation in university governance and policy development.
3. Eliminate non-policy sections, such as "Frequently Asked Questions," from the new Political Activity Policy and ensure that all future and existing university policies exclude such non-binding content.
4. Distribute this motion along with the Academic Personnel and Policy Committee's Report on Political Activity Policy (Interim) (dated October 25, 2024) to all University Employees and Designated Campus Colleagues."

That is the motion there itself. There is a lot of background on this. The policy was instituted by Steve Voeller who was the former Chief of Staff and House of Representatives member, as well as the State. Senator Flake, he knows fully well what the regulatory process is which is usually to be consistent with the law itself. In this case, there were additions and embellishments put into the Law, as well as things removed. Some of these are very critical to the campus, some we just heard from the Chair of the Faculty. There is a reference to what the issues of day, and the position the University should take which is state law. This is not a university policy.

There is also a reference inside that was omitted concerning their responsibilities of administrators which I will read, "*Employees of a university may not use the authority of their positions to influence the vote or political activities of any subordinate employee.*" That particular issues I know personally because I am under probation at the moment, for speaking before the State Senate and was subject to an extrajudicial procedure involving the President and Vice President Cheu without going through the provost's office and was found guilty of violating 7.01. I am currently on that probation-like status. These things can happen, they are ongoing now, and there are other people affected. There needs to be a clear policy on what political activities are permitted. I have a right to speak to the state legislature on my own time, which I did. I can do that without fear of publishment, and without fear of retribution.

**Questions and Comments [01:05:06]**

- Senator Simmons stated he thanks Senator Downing for the presentation and has questions about the process as he assumes that since it gone through, there was legal counsel involved and it is interpreted that it was acceptable based on their interpretation of Arizona and federal law. He is curious if Senator Downing knows about that process that took place.
- Senator Simmons stated if this policy is rescinded before developing a new one, that means there is no policy in place. His understanding of interim policy is because it is there to be in between an old and new policy. He asked what the interim policy would be in this context.
- Senator Downing thanked Senator Simmons for his question and stated he will refer it to Chair Maggert of APPC.
- Senator Maggert stated there has been no policy for about four and a half years, it has been interim all long. The current policy merely reflects the interpretation or one person's interpretation of state law. It seems to go beyond this in APPC's opinion. If the policy were to be rescinded, then State law would prevent individuals from inappropriately using University resources or fraudulently claiming to be representatives of the University.
- Senator Stegeman asked if there was a known formal opinion of OGC on the legality of this policy.

- Senator Maggert stated he is unsure, there was nothing filed at the policy office, nor any of their routing paperwork.
- Senator Stegeman stated he believes this would be an appropriate inquiry.
- Senator Downing stated there is a routing sheet which is attached to the creation of a new policy, and others know, if they create a new policy there has to be a sponsor. The routing sheet asks if the policy is an existing procedure which the sponsor answered yes, whether there is compliance with the law which the sponsor answered yes, and if there is general public interest which the sponsor answered no.
- **[Motion 2024/25-31]** passed with thirty-two in favor, four opposed, and two abstentions

## 8. **NEW BUSINESS** [00:58:02]

### A. **Introduction of Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact - Tomás Díaz de la Rubia** [01:14:23]

I have met with some of you already, before. I was here last week, delighted to be here again today. I think I mentioned the other week; it has been a great two months since we've got to start it. I have been learning a lot by coming to these meetings and meeting with your executive officers of the Faculty Center. I have been learning a lot about the strengths and weaknesses of the university, the great things going on, the challenges, and the opportunities we have. I don't have a lot of prepared remarks, and I am on listening mode like mentioned by Francisco. I have been learning about the place.

I am willing to meet with all of you anytime, come to your meetings, and I also plan to meet monthly with your officers so that we can have a cadence of interactions. We had a first meeting, and we will be doing this regularly. We have asked Senator Zeiders to be a part of the Tiger Team In Sangita's office that is looking at the response to all the executive orders and court orders that are coming down to us. We have had direct interaction with the faculty, and direct input from shared governance into how we handle all these very difficult issues that we have in front of us as Provost Marx said before.

We're trying to reach out, and certainly in my previous institution, at the University of Oklahoma, we had a very strong shared governance tradition. I was very close to the Faculty Senate there. We had something called the Faculty Senate Exec which was a group of about ten senators that formed the Executive Committee. I met with them regularly, and with the Faculty Center chair often and I intend to do the same thing here. It is really important for me to hear the voice of the faculty to understand what your pain points are and the successes.

Hopefully many of you saw the big idea challenge, I am not sure if I talked about this the last time I was here, last week. We launched that about two weeks ago. I think my hope is that it gives you a sense of how I think about the RII office is supposed to be doing. We launched it about two weeks ago. My hope is that it gives you a sense of how I think about what the RII office is supposed to be doing. The big idea challenge is about incentivizing and motivating transdisciplinary groups of faculties to go after grand challenge scale programs, to come together and get resources to help us think about tackling major societal issues that we face as a planet in the 21<sup>st</sup> century where the power of the can works together across transdisciplinary boundaries and put holistic solutions on the table. I think that is what the big idea challenge is about. I am hearing good things about the amount of interest in the webinars and Q&A sessions. Faculty groups are putting proposals together and I am very excited about this and hope we have a good response.

I ask you to help us in working with the rest of the faculty by talking to your colleagues about being a part of this, putting teams together, and helping orchestrate some of these teams. You have the pulse of the faculty, you know everyone on campus a little better than I do, and that I will for a long time. So, I am asking for your help in also driving that. There are a couple of other things that I have been talking to the Provost's Office about, and a couple of others.

I also want to bring your attention thoughts that I have in my head that pertain to faculty recognition, this includes how we recognize faculty for their accomplishments and their achievements. Just two weeks ago or so, it was announced that three of our faculty members received the President's Early Career Award, for a scientist and engineer. That is a big deal and is probably the most prestigious early career award recognition that is given in this nation to scientists and engineers. There are other categories in teaching, mathematics, and others. From a research perspective, there were three of our faculty that received this recognition this weekend and I spent a couple of hours writing emails to these faculty to recognize their accomplishments to say this is fantastic and I am supportive of what they are doing. I feel like we need to do a lot of that.

I have talked with the Provost's office, and this is something Senator Rafelski and I discussed when interviewing. I think we need to have a faculty analytics committee which goes around the entire campus identifying faculty members who we should be nominating for the highest, most prestigious recognitions, and awards that the academic scholarly community across the board in all areas has to offer. This can range from memberships in the

national academies, fellowships, Harvard Awards, the Nobel Prize, or whatever it is. Let's get together and to put a Faculty Analytics Committee together and have representation from across campus that will identify and create those nominations for major awards that go out across the country. This was something I found was very much needed at the University of Oklahoma and from the conversations I have had there with several people. I found this is something that is well received and that I think we can operationalize very quickly. It won't cost a lot of money, it is just about volunteerism and getting together people that will do the work and put some resources behind. It takes a lot of work to get the nominations done, and we will put some resources behind that. This came out of conversations I had and things were brought to my attention when I was interviewing.

At the University, there is a series of high-level awards that the university does internally. I am also interested in a conversation around creating a Research and Creative Activity Excellence Award that would recognize faculty across all scholarly areas of research and creative activity with a yearly review process, nominated by peers. Yearly awards at this high-level scale of the University Awards will have a stipend associated with them. There would be an annual research and creative activities celebration even where everyone can come together, get invited, and recognized in front of their peers for these kinds of accomplishments, by selection of peers and faculty. This is also something we're thinking about, and these are some of the early ideas on how to help incentivize and motivate the celebration of the research excellence that we see every day.

#### **Questions and Comments [01:02:42]**

- Senator Russell stated she has two related questions and loves the idea of nominations but would love to see it more broadly on the service side. The fair share of roles are not filled in the FACA committees, and she recognizes there is churn at this point on the federal level. It is important to ensure people are keeping track of who is sitting on larger federal advisory committees, this currently isn't done, it is only done in individual areas but not overall. There is no support staff to keep track of everything and to ensure people are getting onto the right committees. This also goes for the National Academy Committees and others.
- Senator Russell stated most of the peers at Caltech, Princeton, and others have support and she has been asking about this for more than a decade.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia thanked Senator Russell for bringing this up as he is 100% supportive of this idea. It is important to know who is on the committees but also to nominate colleagues onto those committees. This was done a lot at his previous institution with Lewis-Burke Associates, there were many people involved in the different FACA committees, the Department of Energy, and other places and this is his intention at the UA.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated he serves on two FACA committees in Washington which are totally paralyzed at the moment.
- Senator Russell stated she read SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia's climate report from the fall and it was excellent, and is one of the reasons why she is a big fan of him.
- Senator Russell stated in addition to nominating for committees, she would love to see SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia working with the federal relations team. This is the state of Senator John McCain which means Oklahoma is a completely different environment for work with federal relations with the congressional representatives. The UA is incredibly well-positioned with the Senators and representatives on both sides, yet, the yield on this has been absolutely zero and not broad enough. There are many areas where the University is truly exceptional and can add to the nation's prosperity and it is not happening.
- Senator Russell stated she would love to see this improve and part of that is not just because it is Senator McCain's state but also that there is not a strategy the way other universities are leveraging their connections.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated he is in very much of the same mindset as Senator Russell as he been up to visit with the University's delegation in Washington, D.C. twice since he has started, and this is something he is very passionate about and plans to spend a lot of time on.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated he has met with Senator Kelly, has met with Congressman Ciscomani, and several other representatives in the house. Congressman Ciscomani is a young appropriator and has been named Vice Chair of Homeland Security appropriations. He knows his boss very well as he was the congressman in Oklahoma. Congressman Cole and him have discussed the potential to do things in Arizona with Congressman Ciscomani's leadership.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated he agrees 100% with spending time with delegation and they are discussing ways to strengthen government affairs partnerships and the government affairs approach. This is an ongoing conversation that he is leading.
- Senator Russell stated the UA is the number one in the world in water and the NOAA Water Center went to Alabama.
- Senator Ziurys stated she would like to applaud SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia for wanting to form committees to get faculty nominated for things like the National Academy and others. There has never been a concerted effort on campus for this, and as others are saying, schools like Caltech and Harvard does this and UA should be doing this too as there are exceptional people. In the College of Science alone, there is nothing done, and it is not gone.
- Senator Ziurys stated she hopes in SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia's tenure as the new SVPRI, she hopes he tries to ease the burden on faculty in getting grant proposals in because the amount of red tape that people must go through is slowing people down from getting proposals in and taking away the enthusiasm from writing them. Faculty used to work with one person to get a grant proposal submitted and now it is spread over many people.

She hopes for this process to be streamlined and for it to be more faculty-friendly and less burdensome.

- Senator Brochin stated that beyond her college, faculty have been getting notices from their Associate Research Deans asking them to stop with DEI or DEIA components of their grants and activities, and if faculty are struggling to categorize their work as DEI, or non-DEI to reach out to RII. She asked how RII is defining DEI and how the federal agencies are defining this, and what guidance he can give to the faculty as well.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated rather than provide guidance on what DEI is or is not, they have been advising individuals that if they have received a stop order from their federal sponsor, to follow that order, and if one is not received, continue working. He has said this in various meetings and forums. At the end of the day, the only person that can define what DEI means is the federal sponsor. This is the safest answer.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated some PIs have gotten directives from federal sponsors whether it is NSF, NIH, or DOE, and those directives must be followed. If such a notification has not been received from one's federal sponsor, the recommendation is to continue working which is also on the RII website and other communications. This is because the agencies have sixty days to implement the Executive Order and to review everything. Agencies like NSF have taken a strong approach, to halt everything, and other agencies are taking the time to review grants, and they are the only ones that can guide people on what pieces of work can or cannot be executed.
- Senator Downing stated regarding the comments on awards, there was an icon, Willie Nelson who said he loves the music, but he is not above the money. Regarding what SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia did at Oklahoma, which has really caught his attention, is that he recognizes that a lot of undergraduates think research means Googling, or they don't have a lot of research. SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia supported an NSF grant that reached out and tried to give every undergraduate a chance to understand the research experience. He hopes that there will be a comment on how Díaz de la Rubia would like to bring that skill here to UA where many undergrads don't have that hands-on experience.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated discussion has begun on this, involving fellow colleagues about the undergraduate research experience and he is getting a sense of how extensive it is. He has heard of goals of as much as 50% of all undergraduates having the opportunity to do research during their four or five years at the university which he is very supportive of.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated undergraduate research changed his life and it is where he learned to become a scientist and where he found his passion. He is extremely supportive of putting processes in place and going after NSF grants to help drive undergraduate research experiences.

**B. Resolution on Provost Search Committee – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:33:49]**

Chair Hudson stated she will give back her time on this matter.

**C. Update on Campus Connect Initiative – Joe Harting, Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services [01:34:20]**

Good afternoon, I am Joe Harting, Executive Director of IT in UITS for Business Affairs. Again, I am grateful for the opportunity to brief the University Faculty Community on a very exciting project that we're working on relative to the University Cat Card. You may have noticed that our Cat Card got a face lift at the start of the semester. We did this for a couple of reasons, to make the picture larger for identification purposes, but also to ensure it was aligned with an innovation we're going to introduce later this year.

So starting just in time for move in Fall 2025, the Cat Card is going to be available to all faculty, staff, and students on the Tucson main campus on their mobile device through either the Apple or the Google wallet. So to be clear, this is not a compulsory change, anyone wishing to opt for the physical card may do so. The mobile Cat Card will offer some significant enhancements beginning with better security. It will leverage the NFC chip, which is a chip that lives inside all our mobile devices. This will give us the same level of security used by Apple Pay or Google Pay. It is the most secure RFID technology in the industry.

Regardless of which version of the Cat Card a person will opt for, one of the goals of the Campus Connect Initiative is to eliminate all magnetic swipe readers. There are simply too many security vulnerabilities that are associated with that legacy technology. Additionally, mobile Cat Card will significantly reduce the number of fraudulent transactions or unauthorized access that can result from a loss or a stolen physical card. We are all much less likely to lose our mobile devices than we are to lose track of our cat card. I can testify to that. I've been on campus for almost two years, and I've lost track of my Cat Card probably three times but our phones, we are pretty unlikely to lose track of those, and when we do we can pretty much take immediate action to disable our online credit cards or lock our phone down.

The mobile Cat Card also has a number of other advantages, it's much more environmentally sustainable than plastic cards. There's also going to be no more replacement fees for lost or stolen cards for those people who opt to go mobile with their Cat Card. The primary feature that appeals to everyone who uses it is the convenience of it. Instead of digging around in our wallets, purses or backpacks every time we want to access our building, or a residence hall, or when a student wants to use their cat cash or a meal plan, they can just reach for their phone or

their watch and tap.

Future Wildcats who are preparing to come to campus for the first time are going to be able to provision their card right from the University of Arizona app before they even arrive to campus. When they do arrive to campus, they're going to have immediate access to their meal plan or their residence hall once they check in. One of the goals of this project is to make coming to the University of Arizona easier for our incoming students.

One of the other objectives of this project is to make sure that the mobile Cat Card is compatible in as many places as possible as the physical card and that's really one of the reasons why we're reaching out to you. As you can see from the graphic, there's dozens of obvious uses for the Cat Card, but there's also many other less obvious uses, and we want to make sure that we engage with important groups on campus like the faculty community to ensure that all of the use cases are uncovered and then work with you to ensure that suitable, sustainable solutions are identified.

Another reason we wanted to speak with you is obviously you represent one of the most important groups on campus. We think it's important to not just raise awareness, but we are also interested in receiving any feedback you may have or to answer any questions that you may have well in advance of the planned project rollout, which again is going to occur just prior to the start of the Fall semester.

We have already reached out and we've already met with several individual colleges, and there is a good chance that any use cases you may be thinking of may have already been thought about, but we know that the different colleges represented here are very diverse. So what we're going to ask is that you take the information that I've shared with you here back to your teams and discuss internally and then help us make sure that we don't overlook any important use cases of the university ID card.

On the screen, you can see we have places where you can send feedback. The special email address at the top is one that we've established specifically for this project, [connectingcampus@arizona.edu](mailto:connectingcampus@arizona.edu). You can also see my email address and the email addresses of our project managers, Chris and Alexa and they're probably going to have much more intimate, specific knowledge on the project itself, but they are very happy to answer any questions that you may have and they will most likely be the ones to take point on engaging with your questions and your feedback.

Additionally, we have set up a website with FAQs where you can find answers to the most commonly asked questions. There's a series of questions that seem to arise every time any sort of mobile ID is discussed and this website probably has the answers to most of those questions. That address is [catcard.arizona.edu/mobilecatcard](http://catcard.arizona.edu/mobilecatcard).

One final thing I'll mention about the project is that we have released this technology to a very limited number of beta testers. This beta is specifically for iOS users. We have an Android beta that is going to be coming right around spring break, and we wanted to connect with all of you and extend the invitation to anyone who may be interested in participating in either our Android or our iOS beta testing. We have some faculty participating but we would love to enlarge that and invite more to participate in our beta testing. So, if you're interested in that, or again, questions, feedback, use cases, please leverage those email addresses on your screen. Thank you very much once again for giving us a few moments of your time.

#### **Questions and Comments [01:42:15]**

- Chair Hudson asked if there is a primary contractor or vendor involved in the project and whether there is a budget for the project.
- Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services, Joe Harting stated there are several contractors involved in the project, one is HID who is responsible for all the readers that are seen around campus. Anytime someone taps their card to open a door, there is a reader associated with that. Apple and Google are both partners in the project. They have also opted to go with a company called SwiftConnect who specializes in mobile identity and the mobile identity space.
- Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services, Joe Harting stated there is a budget allocated for this project which is about \$1 million and that was largely utilized to upgrade the access control infrastructure, which is a critical piece of campus safety. The project itself encompasses many dimensions, and one of those is the need to standardize the security infrastructure on campus.
- Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services, Joe Harting stated he mentioned safety but didn't get a chance to dive deeper into the subject but one of the advantages is that there will be standardized and more modern access control readers to help with better securing buildings. This was likely the most significant expenditure related to the budget.
- Senator Cochran asked how much it costs for the mobile card.
- Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services, Joe Harting stated the mobile card will be the same cost as the physical card. One of the primary requirements of this is that Apple insists upon no additional fees being associated with a mobile ID versus a Physical ID. Students pay a \$25 fee wrapped in some of their

admission costs, and it covers the cost of either a physical or mobile card. One of the advantages of the mobile card is that if someone gets a new phone or upgrades their phone, there is no cost associated with getting a replacement card as it simply transfers. Physical cards get lost, stolen, and damaged, when that happens the student is responsible for paying for a \$25 replacement fee.

- Senator Russell stated this is one of the most exciting things she has heard about the Cat Card in a while, and it is exciting to see a shift to new technology. She said there is several City of Tucson bike stands that faculty and staff use and asked if Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services, Joe Harting's team has considered working with the City of Tucson to have faculty, staff, and students able to use their Cat Cards on this.
- Executive Director, IT Business Affairs Technology Services, Joe Harting thanked Senator Russell for her question and said this is one of the reasons they wanted to speak with the Faculty Senate as those are excellent opportunities. His team has not reached out to the City of Tucson for that initiative specifically but he will make not of that and it is an excellent suggestion.

**D. Update from Career Track Faculty Working Group – Co-Chairs Romi Wittman and Kristin Little [01:46:21]**

Co-Chair Kristin Little stated it would be better if Secretary Zeiders gave her presentation as she is allotted ten minutes, and the meeting will end in less than ten minutes.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated she will move this item to the top of Old Business for the March meeting.
- Unknown Senator moved **[Motion 2024/25-32]** to move New Business Item D: Update from Career-Track Faculty Working Group to the March 3, 2025, Faculty Senate Agenda under the first Item on Old Business. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**E. Constitution and Bylaws Update with timeline of changes from 2020 and revised Bylaws – Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Katie Zeiders [01:48:10]**

Hi, everyone. A quick update from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. So, one of my roles as Secretary of the faculty is chairing this committee. When I took over this Fall, I went through a semester-long process of better understanding our Bylaws and our Constitution. Almost nothing was passed down to me in terms of documents or history of changes, so, I spent some time trying to dig up the changes and events that occurred in the past four years and was supported by the larger committee. I did this because there seemed to be friction between the Senate, the Secretary, the President, and the process of bylaw changes. I reconstructed all the changes and decisions that were made under the previous two secretaries, and the timeline is attached to your agenda.

The review of the previous work allowed me to better understand the issues and possible solutions moving forward. So, a full report is in the agenda, it's in a memo form, and I'm going to give you the brief version now. First, in terms of issues that emerged in the past years, I found a breakdown in communication between Faculty Center, Secretary of the Faculty, and the President, there were times when the Secretary was completely unaware of changes in Bylaws that were being sent to the President for approval, despite the Secretary being the Chair of the committee. Second, the previous President did not respect the process for changes outlined in the Faculty Constitution, and this resulted in a flawed process that continued within the committees and under the secretaries. Third, under the previous Secretary, housekeeping changes were often used, and in some cases misused. Finally, the organization and stewardship of the Bylaws and Constitution were not prioritized, leading to confusion of which version of the documents was even correct in the historical events and votes that changed the documents.

Moving forward, the committee and I will be doing the following:

1. Ensuring that communication about any changes to the bylaws and Constitution are communicated from the Secretary of the Faculty.
2. That housekeeping changes are used very sparingly and only to make small grammatical shifts or name changes.
3. We're asking for two things that our new President respect the process of bylaw changes, including the timeframe, and provide adequate communication about this. We're also requesting better support from the Provost's Office for Shared Governance activities broadly but specifically around organization
- 4.

**Questions and Comments [01:51:01]**

- Senator Rocha stated her thanks for Secretary Zeiders presentation and said the only problem is regarding Staff Council and asked who she can talk to about making updates as the information is currently somewhat wrong.
- Secretary Zeiders stated Senator Rocha can communicate with her directly and she will pass the communications onto the committee.
- Senator Rocha stated she copied the text and will meet with Staff Council, then she will collaborate with Secretary Zeiders to make sure these Bylaw changes should be implemented.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated regarding the attached Bylaws, she would like to know if these are concluded as current.
- Secretary Zeiders stated this is correct and they are based on all of the information the committee went

through and they are the most up-to-date, and ratified version of the Bylaws.

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

10. **Adjournment [01:52:47]**

Senator Russell moved **[Motion 2024/25-33]** to adjourn the February 3, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. The February 3, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 4:54 PM.

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

**Motions of February 3, 2025, Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2024/25-28]** to approve the agenda of the February 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2024/25-29]** to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Policy revision-Bachelor's Degree Requirements, Multiple Majors and Degrees. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2024/25-30]** the Faculty Senate calls for an emergency meeting with President Garimella and whoever he chooses to bring, to avoid further irreparable harm and reverse the negative trajectory of this flagship University of Arizona. Motion passed with twenty-seven in favor, twenty opposed, and one abstention.

**[Motion 2024/25-31] Text of the Resolution:**

"The Faculty Senate expresses strong opposition to the Political Activity Policy Interim UHAP 2.10 issued on October 25, 2025. The interim policy imposes sweeping restrictions on faculty and staff political freedoms that conflict with US and Arizona constitutions, as well as with the statutes it proposed to regulate accordingly.

The Senate respectfully calls on President Garimella to:

1. Immediately rescind the Political Activity Policy (Interim) UHAP 2.10.
2. Develop a new policy that aligned with the political rights guaranteed under the U.S. and Arizona Constitutions and state law, particularly ARS 15-1633. The redrafting process must actively involve elected faculty representatives in compliance with ARS 15-1601(B), which mandates faculty participation in university governance and policy development.
3. Eliminate non-policy sections, such as "Frequently Asked Questions," from the new Political Activity Policy and ensure that all future and existing university policies exclude such non-binding content.
4. Distribute this motion along with the Academic Personnel and Policy Committee's Report on Political Activity Policy (Interim) (dated October 25, 2024) to all University Employees and Designated Campus Colleagues."

Motion passed with thirty-two in favor, four opposed, and two abstentions.

**[Motion 2024/25-32]** to move New Business Item D: Update from Career-Track Faculty Working Group to the March 3, 2025, Faculty Senate Agenda under the first Item on Old Business. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2024/25-33]** to adjourn the February 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**Attachments Within the Minutes**

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#) .
2. Page 5, Action Item 7: Consent Agenda
  - a. [Policy revision – Bachelor's Degree Requirements, Multiple Majors and Degrees](#)
3. Old Business,
  - a. Page 6, Item A: [Effects of HR and Business Centralization](#)

- b. Page 8, Item B: [Resolution on Political Activity and Code of Conduct](#)
- 4. New Business
  - a. Page 13, Item D: [Update from Career Track Faculty Working Group](#)
  - b. Page 13, Item E. [Constitution and Bylaws Update](#) with [timeline of changes from 2020](#) and [revised Bylaws](#).
- 5. Written Reports
  - a. Page 14: [SAPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456