MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 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=7
1746108-abe4-403f-a28f-b296000094cf

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

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

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

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the March 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:02 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 [00:00:10]

Vice Chair Hymel stated there were a couple of changes since the last Senate Executive Committee meeting as speakers have changed. Item: Report from President Garimella and Interim CIO Elliot Chey – IT Centralization Update is now a combined report from Dr. Cheu and the President, they will have a total of twenty minutes to report.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2024/25-34]** to approve the agenda of the March 3, 3025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 27, 2025 FACULTY SENATE MEETING [00:01:35]

Vice Chair Hymel stated that individuals must be recognized to be able to speak and she will do her best to take people in the order they raise their hands as this has been the procedure. She encourages anyone who has opinions to speak. Time limits will be strictly adhered to. The Senate meeting will move into Senate Executive Session directly at 4:30 PM where Secretary Zeiders will provide instructions on who is allowed in the meeting and who needs to leave.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2024/25-35]** to approve the minutes for the January 27, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION [00:03:17]

Senator Ted Downing [00:03:34]

Greetings, everyone. Is the University of Arizona preparing to defend against the upcoming existential threats to higher education? No Iron Dome protects us from the hailstorm of anti-woke pushback, research cutbacks, bulk layoffs or political demands for DEI. Expect discomfort watching those you thought were your allies scurry for personal survival or trusted institutional leaders instinctively seeking appeasement as a safe hope, as a safe strategy.

Trump's executive orders for DEI and associated tax are an insidious attempt to institutionalize their political agenda. Don't take the bait. It's a trap. Attacks on critical race theory, evolution, gender, or DEI, are attempts to define the playing field, to institutionalize a political type of thought. If we knock one down, another one will come back up.

Our institutionalized unfretted freedom to explore is what is and has always had been the foundation of learning knowledge and the university. Our power lies in the diversity of ideas, innovations, arrangements of people, space, movement, and sound. I suggest the Senate and the administration together answer the DEI inventory request and other incoming tax by demonstrating true diversity, equity, and inclusion. Rent a fleet of U-Haul trailers and deliver a complete inventory of all of our published books and articles, our patents, copies of all of our works, and music scores along with an alphabetical list of every single faculty, staff, student, and administrator, and including the names

of the Arizona Board of Regents. Deliver them with a shipping label that says, welcome to diversity, the University of Arizona.

Individually and collectively, we are diverse. Which parts of the University are DEI? The answer is simple. All of it. Time. All of you. To paraphrase Professor Popeye, "we am what we am."

Senator Mae Smuth [00:06:13]

Last week, the University-Wide General Education Committee, UWGEC, took two straw votes on the structure of the upcoming Civics curriculum, based on the results of a Survey conducted and reported by the Office of General Education through its CLCK advisory group, which rarely meets. The Survey Report did not describe who was surveyed, what questions were asked, how many persons responded, or the methodology for mapping the responses into the summary.

This is a pattern. UWGEC has a Constitutional obligation to "[disseminate] General Education information to the campus community and its partners." However, it has effectively surrendered this shared governance function to OGE and rarely seeks input from the General Faculty or their elected representatives.

The bottom line is that a tiny number of persons are driving decisions on proposals that will greatly affect the education of tens of thousands of undergraduates and all of the academic colleges.

The Senate ad hoc committee on General Education has worked to fill this gap, conducting two major surveys, eliciting hundreds of responses, and reporting these results to the Senate in detail.

In 2021, the Senate was asked to quickly approve a complex proposal that it had barely seen. This led to a contentious meeting and severe questions of credibility. We should not let the past scenario unfold again.

I urge a special Senate session, as soon as possible to give all interested Senators a chance to ask questions and provide input before proposals advance too far. Senator Stegeman listed seven specific issues that will have significant impact and are clearly appropriate for the Senate's consideration.

Dr. Matthew Abraham, Professor, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences [00:08:18]

I'd like to bring to the Senate's attention how the concept of "conflict of commitment" is understood at the U of A and possibly being deployed to target and marginalize critics of the institution under the pretense of responsible disclosure. These remarks can be viewed as an extension of my remarks as the chair of the ad hoc committee on academic freedom and climate last year. I noted at that time that faculty expressed concerns in the survey that was the informed the ad hoc committee's report that institutional rules are far too often ignored or reframed to suit administrative purposes. The conflict of commitment policy is a case in point, as under its current implementation it limits a faculty's range of influence on issues of public interest and concern.

Conflicts of commitment are defined as time investments outside our formal roles as faculty members at the University of Arizona. As the explanation goes, this evaluation is necessary to ensure that fiduciary duties are being fulfilled. Note, however, that U of A's definition of CoC is drawn from Presidential Memorandum on United States Government— Supported Research and Development National Security Policy, which deals with R and D in the context of technology transfer and information sharing for national security issues.

One potential conflict of commitment is outside employment and consulting, can be incompatible with our academic work and that interferes with our ability to discharge our institutional responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. Of course, what constitutes "compatibility" and "interference" are far from clear with zero policy guidance around how these factors should be measured. Our ABOR and UHAP policies recognize, however that outside employment can be a credit to the institution and the faculty member, especially when such outside employment solidifies the connection between the University, business, and industry. Whether driving an Uber to make ends meet or working at a local office to develop a new skill set, the University requires faculty to disclose these time commitments so they can be evaluated by the Office of Responsible Outside Interests and approved by an administrator.

5.   **STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR [00:11:07]**

Thank you. It's great to see a full house here today. It's been an unsettling few weeks. We've spent much of it working on emergency projects as we try to keep ourselves from being canceled, as they say, in this brave new world we now inhabit. Helping our colleagues understand and defend against the encroachment of executive orders, federal agency changes on the big part of our operations that comes through grants and federal contracts. Not to mention federal student loans and working to protect our core values which inform and animate student success and institutional excellence from the Hobb's new wrecking balls unleashed in Washington.

Never let a good crisis go to waste is an expression I learned from administrators during the pandemic, but let's rephrase that and say, let's let this crisis be an opportunity to reaffirm our values and our goals. Let it be an opportunity for collaboration.

I'm delighted to see President Garimella and his team here today. We appreciate his surrounding himself with experienced academics, his delicate pruning of Vice Presidents, his elevation of our Provost, Ron Marx, to his right hand, and his commitment to eliminate our deficit fixing broken systems and even beginning to reinvest in our world-class workforce rather than using it as an energy source. We appreciate all of that.

When I say a few words on behalf of the faculty at his installation later this month, I want to be able to recognize his commitment to a memorandum of understanding that recognizes the faculty's role as stated in Arizona Revised Statute and a commitment to the unique role of an active faculty governance, and keeping this abused university punching above its weight class. No more exclusion of the elected faculty representatives in favor of the people one might wish were the elected faculty representatives. In any case, we are delighted to have him here for the next three Senate meetings to discuss with us and unpack piece by piece the complex of stuff we have called the centralization issue. We do appreciate him being here both as a senator and as the guy with whom the buck stops. Today, we will spend 20 minutes with President Garimella and Interim CIO Elliot Cheu talking about the Information Technology centralization component and that will be a very good use of our time.

Now a word about DEI, although Ted has stolen my thunder. If you've been in a critical discussion lately with any of our fantastic, compassionate and intelligent students from a variety of different backgrounds, it won't take long for them to home in on and critique the bad DEI, which should, in fact, be reformed. Our students, especially those most at risk of being excluded, but not exclusively them, can tell you with precision who is working to support their success and make them feel as if they belong, and who is a cynical careerist or a hapless token of power. We should listen to those students and take this opportunity to address the bad DEI. There's also bad DEI behind our entanglement with UAGC, where the name and reputation of the University of Arizona have been used to attempt to launder a historically discriminatory predatory business model that lures those students who haven't typically had access to University education into crippling debt that fuels a business which turns out useless degrees. There too, we should look for bad DEI and take this opportunity to address it.

If you're still with me though, let's talk for a minute about the baby. The wonderful baby that gets thrown out with all that nasty bath water all too often. As the interim President of Harvard, Alan Garber just said in a Harvard meeting, diversity is a condition of academic excellence. Let me say that again, diversity is a condition of academic excellence. Enriching our intellectual life, enhancing our ideas and our disciplines with the widest variety of contributions and testing them with the widest variety of perspectives is how we do what we do. Any intentional or unintended curtailment of that key component of our excellence puts us at a disadvantage with everyone from our neighbors up the road to Harvard itself. How do we get diversity? Well, of course, through aggressive inclusion. Making the effort to reach every corner of our state's population, every state of the union, and every country of the world. Not excluding people is a good start, but it's not enough. We need to recruit, serve, retain, and put out into the world, students and colleagues who bind us to every community, every population, including those that you know and those that you don't yet know.

For inclusion to be the engine of diversity and diversity to be the engine of excellence, we do need equity. Too few of us have it all. With our unique experiences, perspectives, cultural capital, aspirations and potential. Most of us also bring some needs and deficits that together, as a community, we can mitigate. International students might need English language help. Parents and professionals might need extra time and flexibility. So many of us need grants and scholarships to make up for lost and families foregone income. Veterans and survivors of violence of all kinds need care and respect. Neurodivergent and disabled students need access and accommodation. First-gen students of each and every linguistic, socioeconomic, religious, and geographic background need to know that they belong at our table. Their voices in our dialogue and debate. Everyone with teeth needs dental care, and students and colleagues who fit any or all or none of these descriptions need to know that they are part and parcel of the world and need to know how to navigate that world in ways that we can help them realize.

President Garamella has been doing listening tours, asking numbers of us, in various groups, to come up with new slogans and ideas for the University. I've got one. Diversity. Let's diversify our portfolio of excellence and potential. Inclusion. Let's include every voice and perspective in our discourse and debates. Equity. Let's not disincentivize putting in the sweat equity that we need to put value back into this badly used old university. Thank you very much.

Questions and Comments [00:19:42]
- Senator M. Witte stated there was a memo sent las week regarding a motion that was passed by Senate which called for an emergency Faculty Senate Meeting and for the Vice Chair to send a letter to the President with suggested dates. She stated the Senate has not received the letter and requested that the Faculty Center distribute the letter after the meeting. She also asked whether the President has suggested dates for the emergency Faculty Senate meeting which was due to a litany of concerns and complaints.

- Chair Hudson stated she apologizes for the oversight and will ensure the letter is shared with the Senate. It was sent a couple of weeks ago by the Vice Chair and she did propose a number of dates.
- Chair Hudson stated we live in a world where everything is now a negotiation, and on behalf of the faculty, she accepted the President's proposal to meet with the Senate on three different meetings, which the first would be today and will commence as soon as discussion begins. The President will join the Senate again in April and May for other parts of the centralization complex. She has accepted President Garimella's proposal on behalf of the faculty.
- Senator M. Witte stated the Senate made the motion, not the Chair.
- Chair Hudson stated she agrees with Senator M. Witte and appreciates the comment, she believes the more the President has the chance to experience the Senate's proceedings, the more likely he will offer up an extra meeting.

6. **REPORT FROM PRESIDENT GARIMELLA AND INTERIM CIO ELLIOT CHEU IT CENTRALIZATION UPDATE, IT RESTRUCTURE PRESENTATION [00:22:02]**

President Garimella [00:22:02]
Thank you so much, Chair Hudson for your kind remarks. A.letter I wrote to you all, and to the entire campus just went out a couple of hours ago which I hope you all got, it regards strategic imperatives conversations. Honestly, I really, really, really enjoyed them. It's been the best part of my time here so far. We've met with very different audiences, undergrad student groups, grad students groups, Staff Cuncil, Faculty Senate Executive Council, some Regents, Distinguished Professors, community members, different committees, etc. The largest of them was the community member group. We had 70 people in this room, including Mayors of Sahuarita and Tucson, the tribal leaders, school leaders, Pima County, Pima Community College leaders, etc. It was just such a rich discussion.

If nothing else, it underlined the community's engagement with us and what they expect of us and how much they count on us to be partners and such. So, these have been wonderful conversations. John Pollard and Amanda Krauss have been helping me with facilitating those conversations. As I wrote in my letter, we will be trying to sort of capture that very broad set of inputs. We're not looking for slogans, Layla. So I think we're looking to see who we think we are, what is our identity? The values that are listed on our website versus what we all recognize. I'm hoping that the good people that are assisting, will be able to reduce the broad discussions into a two, three, four-page thing that we share with campus and get more feedback.

In that memo, I also shared the good news with you that thanks to the Board's support, we've been able to invest $20 million in special, sort of deep, broad university-wide initiatives. I don't want to spend all my time on that because I really want to give most of the time to Elliot but t I'm excited about that. Tomas is here. I know that the Faculty Senate leadership speaks with him regularly, and we'll work more with you all on how that's going.

Another piece of that, of course, as we've mentioned before, is the Big Ideas Challenge which apparently is engendering a lot of excitement. I think there were 350 people at the first orientation session and a lot of inquiries on how to participate in those proposals coming in. Fundamentally, the hope is that it brings faculty across multiple colleges, hopefully three or four colleges, maybe more, in each proposal.

I have also mentioned that earlier last week, we sent a note about adjusting the salaries upwards. I hope you noticed that we made an effort to raise the floor for the lowest paid folks. Thanks to good suggestions from one of our conversations at the Strategic Imperative's meeting, one of the groups suggested giving a little more to staff than faculty so we went back and changed the average we were going to use and did slightly more for staff than faculty this time. The details are in there, and I'm thankful for all of the folks that have helped us, and from the University, we will keep the University going and will continue to do what we can.

Just a few updates, the Provost search is going well. I believe they're going to be recommending, they have had Zoom calls for interviews, and I suspect they will reach out to the community with names of individuals that will be visiting campus. I think Spring break slows things down so as I understand, the candidates will be on campus after the break.

We're also searching for a VP for Communications and a lot of feedback that we have been receiving is about telling our story better. I think that is a critical role. The search committee is progressing rapidly on that and I am hoping that we get to a good point there.

In terms of Centralization, there were three topics that you all raised, IT, Finance, and HR. I'm sure there are others that we can talk about. In general, centralization is perhaps not a particularly good word, and I am not using semantics here, but we'll never centralize everything. Centralization implies that it is all coming together, but when it comes to communications, IT, HR, or any of these, I think there will be things that are distributed and things that are done in a more centralized way. The point is about aligning these and all of us being coordinated, typically for better performance, and hopefully for efficiencies and cost. You have all talked about administrative bloat, reducing numbers of administrators, et cetera. One way to go about doing that is to see where we can get some efficiencies there as well. In the case of IT, it is also better for It. Elliot probably has numbers about how many times we were attacked through

cyber security channels every day, and it is very high. So, there are reasons that we need to bring more coordination to these things, and you'll hear a lot from Elliot today. Next meeting, we'll hear from John Arnold on the finances because that was what you raised. In the May meeting, you'll hear about HR. With that, I want to turn it over to Elliot. I think he will present for a few minutes then we will take questions.

Interim CIO Elliot Cheu [00:28:46]

Thank you very much for letting me come. While they're bringing up the slides, to what Dr. Garimella has said, security is a big issue. I don't think we want to go into all of the numbers but a University like the University of Arizona is a huge target for bad actors, just to be blunt. If you look at the top list of entities that are regularly attacked, higher education is up there. In a place like the University of Arizona, we do research, defense, and other types of very intricate research. We're also a very open enterprise. To give you one number that is interesting, 90% of the emails that gets sent to the University of Arizona is never delivered. Most of that is either span or hackers. I know that you're confused and upset about that emails that you do get sometimes, but most of it you never see.

I also received about twenty questions or so and I am going to go through them and give you answers. While we're waiting, I will go through the first one. In Spring 2024, Tyson Swetnam presented. He is the Chair of a committee to look at the impacts of restructuring on IT. They presented a sixty-page report or so, and there were a number of recommendations.

One thing Dr. Garimella mentioned, security was a big driver for this, but if we look at the benefits that we can gain from something like restructuring IT, regarding customer service, generally speaking we think this is something that will give you a better result. As an example, our IT is spread across the University unevenly, we have a number of IT shops that what we call one team, which is one person. That person often can't take a vacation, or if they do, they're always on call. One of the things we can do is give a more uniform experience across the institution. Not to belittle it, but we sort of nots in IT at the university. There's some departments and colleges that are very, very well staffed, and there are others that have almost nothing. That creates a very different experience depending on where you live within the University.

The last one is there's an opportunity for us to streamline and optimize the types of things, and the reality is it's actually true. We have a lot of duplication of efforts. We have some inefficient ways we purchase. In unites, we have at least nine ticketing systems on campus. There is a large number of things that are being duplicated across various entities.

Regarding of the guiding principles, we do want to make sure that the priorities of colleges and divisions are at the forefront. We're not trying to subsume your authority in that, instead, we want to make sure that you're still having the same sort of conduct. For instance, in my own department, I work with a guy named Mike. I am still able to work with Mike through this process as we go through centralization, and they are still able to be that kind of resource. We're also ensuring that we really have a continuity of IT services. The last one's really important in that we don't want to have a one-size fits all solution. I know that was the vibe coming about a year ago, and we're moving back from that. That vibe created a lot of angst around campus.

We started with a group of about 400 professionals in UITS and now we're at almost 1,000. When you take that number of people in at one time, and in one swoop, without knowing who they are, it creates a lot of cultural issues. There's a huge structural issue because the units may or may not have had a management structure. We also had a number of units that didn't have any structure that all had to be brought in, we had to figure out how to manage that, and that has taken a lot of time.

Also, as I pick on one of the things, we found through this process that a lot of teams were very understaffed. We had one-person teams, and places that had no or little resources. Looking across the University, UITS is now serving the entire campus and not just parts of it, in all service, that is a very interesting thing to manage. That is probably part of the reason you have been seeing more of the structural problems that have happened.

We have stood up an IT Restructuring Advisory council. The purpose of this is to get input. There are twelve members. It was more of a Republican type of structure. I reached out to various leaders across campus, including Layla. The Provost provided me with two names of faculty members, Staff Council provided a name, and those people are now engaged with us. We had a robust conversation.

Ongoing activities include metrics. We hadn't really driven conversations on data. Some of this stuff has already been in place, but wasn't published, and we're going to make sure they're well seen. We have to be a little careful in security. We don't want to advertise to the whole world, our level of insecurity.

We have this Restructure Advisory Council meeting bi-weekly. I have spent the last eight weeks doing this process. I just met with the Dean's Council last week, the Research Computing and Governance Committee (RCGC), and others. We're starting to develop a regular cadence for communication around this. We're not restructuring the entire

University, as Dr. Garimella said, we're focusing on four key areas.

The first area is networking infrastructures, which is the thing you put on the wall, Wi-fi infrastructure are basically servers. These are the machines that used to do email. We've centralized that to be one place instead of many. Some of you know that a lot of that structure has gone onto the cloud. The University has actually been a leader in moving into cloud-based services. There are a lot of reasons we want to do that, and some reasons that we're not going to have everything in the cloud, not having a one-size fits all.

The second area is support services whether you're calling 24/7 Support, or you're coming to us. The reason this is important to us is that we want to make sure we have like-teams of people supporting activities that allow both communication across those teams as well as support. This is so that if someone leaves the University or goes on vacation, we have someone to back them up.

Web platform is another area. Strategic connections and specialized services is the last one, and an interesting one. This is where you have a unit that is developing their own application. Whether it is in the Med School, or CALES, there are types of specifics needs that these colleges need that no one else can provide and want to create a custom application. That is an area where there is still conversation, especially within advisory groups.

The biggest complaint that I think we're getting right now is on-ground support. Support is a very interesting thing. We use to support a limited number of IT activities, we now support the entire campus and we didn't really know who all of those people were. If you call 24/7 Support and you say, "I need someone to help me with my machine in physic." Right now, we might not know exactly who to call because we haven't been able to create that process. We're currently accelerating that so we know the processes, so that it is built into the system so that when you call from physics, we know who the physics person is, and if they can't help you, it goes to the next person. We're in the middle of doing that right now, and it will improve.

Research computing is another really strong area. This is a place where we've slowed things down a lot. We're trying to figure out exactly what the right model is for research computing. It is everything from the person who has a fancy microscope with a Windows 95 machine attached to a big high-performance thing that has a lot of GPUs on it. It is the whole range of activities. We're still learning what that looks like and we need to figure out a way. In my own research, I do particle physics, and we gather petabytes of data on a weekly basis. I think we have the world's largest data set. So, I completely understand the need for high-performance computing, as well as the need for data storage and access to it. On the same hand, there is a real fine line on being able to be secure while providing these kinds of services. We have this infrastructure team, these are people who are supporting your network and servers, that team is still taking these 500 people and putting them in the right places. One of the challenges is that when you had a team in a department, that person might be doing a little bit of server maintenance, support, and programming for you. You can't break that person into three pieces, so the question is where do we put these people while continuing to support you at the same time. We need to make sure that we have a robust support system for the university, and we will continue to update things as we go forward.

I will answer one question which I think is key to people. There was a committee put forward by Tyson Swetnam and his group, and he asked, "where are we on responding to that report?" There were basically four recommendations, and it turns out that through this process, we've actually been answering all of those recommendations and are aligned with that. The first one was encouraged in the Office of CIOs to engage with faculty researchers to develop new committees around IT decision making. We have set up our new committee. "We encourage a hybrid approach to the centralization of IT security." What this means is that not everything will be on the cloud, we agree with that. The cloud is really an interesting thing, it allows us to surge. When we have people enrolling in classes, which is coming up, there is a huge surge in need. We don't need to buy new servers to do that. We grow the cloud, get a little bit more resources. When we're done, we just roll it back, and it is very cost effective. The third recommendation was to enhance service and opportunities for the University of Arizona Community through strategic centralization and so forth. What they say is that we think adoption of cloud computing and commercial cloud providers is not a service company or all or nothing decision, that hybrid cloud on-premises and HP solutions for research computing are the recommended framework. We agree, we'll move in that direction.

Finally, the last thing I do want to push back was saying that the UITS usually provides an annual fiscal financial report showing there were all these kinds of savings through all this stuff and they said in the report that you've already done such a good job being efficient, why does that need to drive centralization? The answer is, of course, that it's always good to look, there's no reason not to continue to have that look. In terms of procurement, we have a contract with a company that gives us a very steep discount on purchasing desktops, right now only about 15-20% of the University uses that resource. Recently, a college or division came, and we were able to save 50% for the exact same thing. We're not offering a different implementation, we're giving the same thing, but we can get a discount and that saves everyone. There are really good things to come.

Questions and Comments [00:43:16]

- Senator Downing stated he has a question regarding procurement, earlier on, when the Senate looked at it, it was discovered that the centralization of procurement involved in a company that excluded the bookstore. Part of the profits from the bookstore went to student services, and by not allowing the bookstore to be able to be a part of the process at the time resulted in undercutting student assistance. He asked where that currently stands as this was a viscous and unfortunate consequence although he knows that one side doesn't know what the other is doing at times.
- Senator Downing asked if the University is limited to one vendor or if that situation was a competitive and open bid.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated his team just met with the CFO about this last week, and his understand is that the University went through the RFP process, and it was an open bid to have someone do the computer procurement and bookstore declined to enter that RFP. He doesn't understand what the bookstore's current agreement is, but he is looking at their agreement. Currently, his agreement and the bookstore's agreement are moving in parallel, but they do not own an exclusive agreement to purchasing.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated there is an agreement that individuals can buy into, for example, if there is a department that wants to utilize services, they can reach out to him, give their specifications, and he can return to the company to see if that will be appropriate. They can choose whether they'd like to opt in and are not pressured.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated he believes that because only 15-20% of campus are involved in that from faculty and staff, there are good Spring savings. His overall understand is that when the University went into the RFP process that the bookstore declined to utilize the contract.
- Senator Downing asked if he thinks it is fair that student resources we're cut into.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated he does not understand why Senator Downing thinks they are cutting into students.
- Senator Downing stated the bookstore uses some of this money to support some of the student organizations and now their budget is being cut into based on a UITS decision.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated he does not think that is exactly what happened, but he can find out more. He said he believes the contract is about $1.5 million and isn't sure where Senator Downings figure of $6.5 million comes from.
- Senator M. Witte stated she has a request for Dr. Cheu, and she understands data analytics has taken over the Intuitional Research Office. She would like to informally request that they provide the annual all-funds budget for both main campus and health sciences. The all-funds budget lists each employee and all funds each employee is paid by. These two books were in special collection and were in the Faculty Center. She asks that this book be provided to both special collections and to the Faculty Center for the current year.
- Senator M. Witte stated her comment for President Garimella is that the strategic perspective sounds like the fourth industrial revolution with a lot more details. There was a lot spend on that and there were a lot of concerns. She has always felt that sometimes the motto of the University is more about it.
- Senator M. Witte stated she relives every day at Columbia University which is in Lumine Two Videbimus Lumen, in thy light, we shall see the light, and she makes sure to do that and knows her mentors did it for her. She said the Barnard President was pioneering and she said to each girl that Columbia University was to make the world a better place, and she says to herself every day that she thinks the alumni of Barnard have lived up to that.
- Senator M. Witte stated maybe the University should have a better motto rather than strategic initiatives that don't reflect the nature of what a true University is.
- Senator Russell stated he would like to thank President Garimella for convincing Dr. Cheu to take on this job as he is one of the faculty and knows how to dig in and find out what is best.
- Senator Russell stated it feels like an enormous land grab as there were five-hundred people yanked out of departments and units and now supervised by UITS. She said it feels like it is a huge budget and authority, and to now turn it around to say more people need to be hired for supervision feels like the definition of chutzpah, when the kid kills his parents and turns around to the judge and says he is an orphan.
- Senator Russell stated is where high-level individuals will be hired to supervise and organize but these people were trained because areas are poor. She said she loves her pit crew as they are essential. She makes climate models for a living, and she is totally dependent on IT at the University, if it didn't work as amazing as it does, she wouldn't work here.
- Senator Russell stated she is thrilled but terrified because her people are unhappy as they are being yanked out of their homes and threatened with reassignment by people who don't know them and nurture them the way they have been for decades. Most of these individuals come in young and are trained up, and they are given love and support because they are amazing to the unites.
- Senator Russell stated it is great that Dr. Cheu is providing reassurances that things will be reassigned, and four new managers will be hired but this is worrisome and looks like bloat.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated his department is using the exiting budget to ensure the right structure is in place, and there are three people which are heading the restructuring efforts who now have fifty or more people who report to them. There is currently not a structure in place to make sure this adequately works so the department is basically hiring within. Some people are being taken and moved up to create the right structure, and through the process, special attention is being paid to ensure things aren't getting dropped as they go. If people feel like things are getting dropped, they should reach out to him.
- Interim CIO Cheu stated over the last Summer, UITS had a large focus group to have a discussion with all of the

IT people. Surprisingly, there were a lot of happy people, and he can share the focus group People feel like they are no longer on an island, and they are now a part of a bigger team. This is definitely a two-way street, and he understands what Senator Russell is saying and doesn't want to drop the ball on this. He is confident that he has a plan that will provide better support in the long run. There may be short-term pain, but it is not anticipated to last too long.

- Interim CIO Cheu stated his team is committed to getting some of the things on his agenda done in the next few weeks and hopes to see improvements. If there are any concerns, individuals should reach out to him, and he is happy to address them.

7. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST** [00:56:11]

Vice Chair Hymel stated the time for this agenda item will be allocated to the SVPRI's presentation.

8. **REPORT FROM RESEARCH, INNOVATION, IMPACT – SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH, INNOVATION, AND IMPACT, Tomás Díaz de la Rubia** [00:56:38]

Thank you. This will be very brief, I mean there isn't really a lot to update, you all see the news every day. We are intensely tracking everything that is happening. What I can tell you right now is that we have nine stop work orders from federal grants for a total of $3 million that are impacted and seven terminations. Those are mostly at the State Department and USAID. Seven grants have been terminated, and there is no going back to that. The other ones are stopped, and we don't know what will happen with them.

We are in constant communication with folks in Washington, DC from various dorm and affair consultants, Lewis-Burke and Associates, and others, we're in communication with colleagues at the agencies. As I always say, for all the faculty that have research projects, please be in touch with your program managers, they're the ones that know the most about what's going on.

Today you probably saw the news, the National Science Foundation started hiring people back that they laid off a week ago. That's a good thing, I don't know what it means long term, but a friend texted me it is a gleaming of hope. NSF is rehiring the people that were fired. This is all we know, we are keeping track of every project. We have a campus advisory group which is an administrative group that meets three times a week. Listen to all of the issues that are coming up, and all of the concerns.

The National Institutes of Health, the federal registry is still closed. Study sections are stopped. New awards are not coming. We have faculty who have received very good scores from NIH who are waiting for the grants but right now it's frozen. In some of the cases, we're looking at graduate students and I the one thing I am looking into and working with my team on right now is to have mechanisms to bridge graduate students in situations like this. You will be hearing a lot more about that from my office. There was one case with NIH where a grant received a very fundable score of about 16 and the graduate students were supposed to start on April 1st and I don't think that will happen. We have to figure out how to keep those graduate students working in the interim, and we are looking for ways to bridge ourselves in situations we are finding ourselves in.

With respect to the F&A rate, we're still operating as always, at 54.5%. There is no decision from the judge on the final resolution of the 15% for NIH and so far, none of the other agencies have officially said anything with respect to lower F&A rates. So, calm is the word, stay calm, continue operating. If you put in a proposal, send your proposal. If the portal is open for your agency, we will put in your proposal with the negotiated F&A rate.

That is where we're at. It is something new every day, but we're trying to be agile and deal with, and provide as much information as we can on a daily basis.

Questions and Comments [01:00;54]
- Senator Maggert thanked SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia for his comments and said he is one of those people with a pretty good score from NIH and program officers will not return emails or communicate so the SVPRI's advice to do that leads nowhere. The webpage that was set up was informative, but now it repeats the same advice that if one doesn't get bridge funding, they will have to shut down their lab in two or three months. He has graduate students that can't be paid and organisms that need to be fed but he hasn't heard anything about the bridges that are being discussed.
- Senator Maggert stated there may be these discissions happening in the SVPRI's office, but it is not matriculating out to people's research programs, faculty, staff, and students who relies on the support. He asked what specifics can be given rather than broad statements that are yet to be turned into action.
- Senator Maggert asked how the University of Arizona can support the research infrastructure that it has created, invested in, and that individuals lives and careers depend on.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated his office is looking at bridge funding mechanisms now and expects to have something to announce to the University very shortly as his office understands the impact including the impact. When he hears from faculty that these issues are affecting, this is what prompts his team to create the bridge

funding mechanism.

- Senator Maggert stated his department is in the red because it is covering its faculty through bridge funding. He said the Vice President for RII is not doing anything as far as his department can tell and the President has not announced anything to help with research. It has been down to the department who is the least able to cover this.
- Senator Maggert asked if SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia can give a specific date on when he plans to release a bridge funding mechanism.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated he cannot provide a specific date at the moment, but it will happen soon.
- Senator Ziurys stated she would like to encourage the bridge funding program to get in place as soon as possible as other universities are doing so, such as Yale University. It has to be put into place so that graduate students don't have to be fired midway through their PhD careers.
- Senator Ziurys stated the frustrations expressed by Senator Maggert are real and action needs to be taken as it is impossible for the departments as they have already been squeezed dry of their funds, and RII needs to step in. She thanked the SVPRI for his efforts.
- Senator Eckert stated she would like to echo what was said by both Senator Ziurys and Senator Maggert, but to also expand on that. There have been budget crises before at the University which she has been present. Normally individual units have multiple plans that are going simultaneously because they understand the landscape is fast changing yet there has been no plan provided by the SVPRI.
- Senator Eckert stated she isn't only looking for bridge funding although it is exceedingly important, but the SVPRI's office and the President's office should be creating multiple simultaneous working models to plan for the possible federal and state level changes which should plan for the IDC reductions, termination of grants, future of study sections, and graduate students. The multitude of plans should be shared with faculty and from what she is hearing, the SVPRI's office doesn't have a single one.
- Senator Eckert stated faculty are not just panicking, but on the verge of shutting down the ability to do research and to support graduate students with is the main aspect of an R1 University. She understands this is all new administration, but she expects that they get going and have more plans in place.
- Senator M. Witte stated she echoes the previous speakers since everything comes down to the local department and the faculty are bearing the brunt of everything.
- Senator M. Witte stated from an informational viewpoint, there is a very narrow window that NIH has funded. As of May 1st, her college will be officially funded for renewal of the Medical Student Research Program which Dr. Garcia participated in. It is a five-year renewal of about $1 million because it has 8% indirect costs. NIH is funding brands that have lower indirect costs and there are very few of them. The T-35 mechanism is one of them which they are processing, and they have been in communication, and given the award. Most people may not know that there is a very narrow bit of business that NIH has conducted.
- SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia stated this is good information.
- Senator Barefoot stated she keeps hearing concerns about faculty's labs and grad students and in addition to her being a Senator, she is the Vice Chair of Staff Council. She would like to echo that she is not only concerned about the labs, and graduate students, but it can also mean that a lot of staff members who are research support staff will lose their jobs. This can further hinder the university's ability as it is losing knowledge on how to run specific machines, more broadly than the individual graduate student training. This is a retention issue for the university.
- Secretary Zeiders thanked SVPRI for joining the meeting, and she has been sitting on the RII Advisory Committee and has appreciated all of the conversations. The committee has been meeting daily for some time, and other times, three days a week.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she would like to echo the concerns about needing a plan and some preemptive financial modeling on the impact of the university. More importantly, she thinks there needs to be guidance for deans on how they handle sudden termination of awards, or awards that are frozen. It's not only leaving PIs and staff in difficult positions, but college administrators as they try to navigate what to do financially and through HR.
- Secretary Zeiders stated one idea is to think about how faculty are supported, not just in their immediate research and what to do if a grant is shut down, but future looking. It is important to think about how faculty move forward with the new administration, and the ways that we can support them in the priorities that the new administration sets.
- Secretary Zeiders thanked SVPRI Díaz de la Rubia for coming and for the inclusion of shared governance in his advisory group.

9. **CONSENT AGENDA – CO-CHAIRS OF THE UNDERGRADUATE JOOST VAN HAREN AND LISA REZENDE, AND GRADUATE COUNCIL, PHILIP WADDELL AND SANLYN BUXNER –** *PhD MINOR IN SPORT, RECREATION, AND LEADERSHIP, UG MINOR IN MUSICAL THEATRE, NEW ACADEMIC UNIT-DEPT. OF ENT COM-P (INFORMATION ONLY)* **[01:09:28]**

   [Motion 2024/25-36], and **[Motion 2024/25-37]** to approve the consent agenda were passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

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

A. [Update](#) **from Career Track Faculty Working Group – Co-Chairs Romi Wittman and Kristin Little [01:10:51]**

Co-Chair Romi Wittmann [01:11:28]
Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for having us. Today, Kristin Little and I, Romi Wittman are going to update you on the career-track faculty report. I just wanted to give you a little background, in March 2023, the Chair of the Faculty, Dr. Leila Hudson, solicited career-track volunteers to serve on the CT Faculty Needs ad-hoc committee and it is chaired by myself and Kristin. It was a nine-member committee that represented all areas of campus. Dr. Katie Zeiders also assisted with some of the crunching of the data, even though she was not on the committee.

On the background slide is all of the members of the committee which was convened in March 2023. The survey was sent out twice, once in 2023, and once in 2024. I will explain the survey momentarily, but I am going to pass it to Kristin who will update you on National Adjunct Walkout Day.

Co-Chair Kristin Little [01:12:58]
On February 25, 2015, the first ever National Adjunct Walkout Day took place on many campuses around the United States. Here at the University of Arizona, contingent faculty from the writing program held a teach and rally on the campus mall and several hundred people attended. We had many speakers, including the Chair of the faculty and several of our students. We were fighting for better working conditions such as multi-year contracts, a livable way, pathways to promotion, and shared governance to name a few.

One week ago, was the 10-year anniversary. When my colleague, and one of our fellow senators, Joel Smith, suggested that this would be an opportune moment to reflect on the last 10 years, Romy and I agreed. We need to remind ourselves where we were, where we are now, where we need to go. For example, we are still fighting for reduced class sizes, a wage commensurate with the cost of living, and academic freedom. Our presentation and the one following, which will be given by Senator Jamey Rogers, are ideal places to start.

Co-Chair Romi Wittman [01:14:17]
Our goal was to find out about working conditions for career track faculty. As I said previously, we initially sent out a survey in Fall of 2023. We re-sent it in spring of 2024. It's important to note that respondents could only answer once. All responses were anonymous, and people could skip questions. We had 1,192 career track faculty who took the survey, with 690 completed responses.

We examined several key areas, including workload and job security, promotions and pay, as well as recognition and support. The narratives that emerged from this, paint a complex picture of career track faculty, academic life, and it revealed the many professional challenges that are unique to career track faculty. While these faculty members are crucial to the university's mission, teaching undergraduate classes, supporting research, keeping academic departments running, they are often undervalued and overworked.

The good news is the UA is doing some things right. Annual performance review is one of them, 55% of the folks responding to the survey felt that the performance review criteria are clear and achievable. 60% reported that they had the resources they need to do their job. The people were happy that the process for multi-year contracts exists. Although, we did find that sometimes that doesn't filter down to the faculty, that's a departmental unit kind of thing.

Major areas of concern are not going to surprise you, compensation is a major concern. 31% of career track faculty report working additional jobs to make ends meet. Morale is quite low, with only 14.3% of respondents reporting high job satisfaction. A major concern is contracted workload not matching their actual workload. 43% reported that they work significantly more than what is listed in their contract. Finally, job security is a major concern for career track faculty, with some 60% of respondents reporting fear of non-renewal.

In the "MOST IMPORTANT TO CT FACULTY" slide, you can see these are the top issues. We've got most important rated one, two, three, and it goes all the way down to number nine as least important. These were the issues that came out on top. No surprise, salary versus cost of living. 70% of respondents rated this a a top three issue. Workload, 51% said this is a top three issue. Promotion Career Advancement Opportunities, 42% ranked that a one, two, or three issue. Multi-year contracts, again, 44% rated this a one, two, or three. Sometimes the process to get a multi-year contract isn't getting down to the college level. Finally, Value & Respect Within the Department or Unit, 39% reported this as a one, two, or three issue. With that, I'd like to hand it over to Kristen, who's going to go over some more of the results from the survey.

Co-Chair Kristin Little [01:17:55]
On the next few slides, I will review some of the main issues and concerns that were expressed in the survey and then we will look at some of the recommendations that the CT Faculty Needs Committee identified based on the responses. As we can see here, CT faculty responses regarding workload and job security indicate a challenging

environment for faculty, one that is characterized by high workloads, concerns about job security, and financial stress. Calls for improved recognition, compensation, and support are prevalent throughout the responses.

Many responses paint a picture of faculty members stretched thin and often working well beyond a standard 40-hour work week to meet all their responsibilities. You can see on the chart, on "WORKLOAD & JOB SECURITY," how many CT faculty feel that they're contracted, and actual workload don't align. The survey shows that in many colleges, there has been an undermining of career track faculty by increasing their teaching responsibilities without adjusting their other responsibilities. One respondent noted they spend 60 hours per week on teaching and one hour on service, and we ask, "how is this best negotiated?" If service is reduced and teaching loads are increased, then CT faculty have less time to participate in shared governance and their voices are lost. If faculty are required to teach more classes, the quality of instruction is diminished.

On the next slide, one chart shows that 64% of CT faculty worry about keeping their jobs. Regarding workload and non-renewal fears, the survey shows many CT faculty agreed to take on more work than their FTE reflects because they are concerned about job security, and they don't have tenure. The other chart showed that 31% of CT faculty have to work additional jobs. This indicates a couple of things; one goes back to salary. Some faculty need more income because they can't make enough working here at the UA. Second, many feel that they need to keep their foot in the door at other colleges in case they are non-renewed here. These are real fears of CT faculty.

Shared governance, another important topic for CT faculty. About half of those surveyed reported that they could participate in faculty governance, but roughly one fifth felt they were not able to for various reasons. Additionally, 70% of CT faculty respondents have not participated in hiring committees for administrative level positions. One participant said, "Ths survey is a good start, but I think that the U A talks the talk, but it doesn't always translate into walking the walk at the unit, department, and college levels."

Academic freedom, as we can see on this slide, CT faculty are roughly evenly divided about whether they feel like they have as much latitude as tenure track faculty concerning academic freedom and instructional autonomy. A significant percentage, 40% feel they do not. Job security, academic freedom, fear of retaliation, these all go together. Approximately half of CT faculty reported that they fear retaliation when voicing their opinions. Many indicated that when they speak up about inequity, they are worried that they could be let go for no reason, even if they have a history of a strong performance reviews, merit raises, and a multi-year contract.

Before we look too closely at these slides, I want to mention that Romi and I spoke with Vice Provost Romero and her staff at Faculty Affairs and we discussed data from their survey, we were excited to see that they had some similar results. I believe that they will be sharing those at a later date. We hope that we can work together to see some action taken on the following recommendations that come from our survey data.

For time's sake, I won't review all of the recommendations, but I do want to point out a few positives that we've seen in the last few months taking place, and.a few areas where we need a little bit more. These recommendations are mostly about job security and workload. I do want to thank Katie, Secretary Zeiders, for all the work she's doing. She is pushing for better workload conditions for CT faculty and of course has been instrumental in helping us with many, many other issues.

Regarding multi-year contracts, Provost Marx and Vice Provost Romero gave a great presentation in January, and they are pushing to get more multi-year contracts. We really jope that we can reach the percentage level that ABOR allows next year. These recommendations really focus on recognition, support, and professional development, which, as Romi pointed out, some of these areas are we're making strides towards. I know Faculty Affairs already offers workshops for promotion and they are also working on getting promotion criteria aligned between departments and colleges in the university which is a positive. We also learned that if we can have more than one person in each college to support faculty and communicate with them, that would be really helpful.

Our last slide of recommendations addresses shared governance. There is a need to be able to speak without fear of retaliation, and we need to be able to voice our own concerns for pedagogical quality, academic independence, and working conditions. Without fear of retaliation, we believe these are tangible and manageable action items that the University can take to improve the working conditions and morale for CT faculty.

Questions and Comments [01:24:48]
- Senator Downing stated his thanks for the exceedingly good report, especially for the tenured faculty to understand that there is almost an apartheid situation at the campus which is extremely tragic. He asked if a 2.5% increase will address any of the questions or satisfy anyone that the issue of career-track faculty has been addressed.
- Co-Chair Little stated she would like to return the question by asking what the inflation rate has been as 2.5% is not keeping up with inflation, and she doesn't want to knock a race because it is wonderful, but the University is still behind and there is ground to be made up.

- Co-Chair Wittman stated she would like to add that Senator Rigers will be speaking about this same issue.

11.   Adjournment [01:57:39]

Vice Chair Hymel adjourned the March 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting at 4:29 PM as Senators moved into Executive Session.

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

Motions of January 27, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2024/25-34] to approve the agenda of the March 3, 3025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-35] to approve the minutes for the January 27, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2024/25-36], to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, UG Minor in Musical Theater. Motion passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

[Motion 2024/25-37] to approve seconded motion from Graduate Council, PhD Minor in Sport, Recreation, and Leadership. Motion passed with forty-three in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1.   Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the **Agenda**
2.   Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the **minutes of January 27, 2025**
3.   Page 4, Report from President Garimella and Interim CIO Elliot Cheu – IT Centralization Update, **IT Restructure Presentation**
4.   Page 9, Action Item 8: Consent Agenda
   a.   **PhD Minor in Sport, Recreation, and Leadership**
   b.   **UG Minor in Musical Theater**
   c.   **New Academic Unit-Dept. of ENT COM-P** (Information only)
5.   New Business,
   a.   Page 10, Item A: **Update** from Career Track Faculty Working Group – Co-Chairs Romi Wittman and Kristin Little
6.   Written reports from the
   a.   **President**
   b.   **Provost**

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456