

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
APRIL 7, 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=4247cb5b-dc58-43c6-a75a-b2b9000465af>

**Present:** Senators Barefoot, Braitberg, Braithwaite, Brochin, Cheu, Cochran, Coletta, Cooper, Cornelison, Diaz, Downing, Eckert, Figler, Fink, D. Garcia, Garimella, Giacobazzi, Goetz, Gregory, Guzman, W. Harris, Heileman, Hingle, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair) Joseph, Knox, Leafgren, Little, Maggert, Marx, Meyer, Miller-Cochran, Neumann, O’Leary, Pau, Paschke-Wood, Rafelski, Rocha, Rogers, Russell, Schulz, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, M. Smith, Stegeman (Parliamentarian), Stephan, Su, Thomas, Torres, Waddell, Werchan, Williams, Willis Jr., M. Witte, R. Witte, Zeiders (Secretary), Ziurys.

**Absent:** Senators Baker, Bernick, Buxner, Diaz de la Rubia, Domin, F. Garcia, Grijalva, Hall, S. Harris, Medevoi, Nelson, Palacios, Rishel, Roche, Spece, Tafolla, Van Haren, Wittman

**1. CALL TO ORDER [00:00:01]**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the April 7, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

**2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL](#) [00:00:18]**

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024/25-38**] to approve the agenda of the April 7, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE [FEBRUARY 3, 2025](#) AND [MARCH 3, 2025](#) FACULTY SENATE MEETING [00:00:48]**

- Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024/25-39**] to approve the minutes for the February 3, 2025 and March 3, 2025, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**4. OPEN SESSION [00:01:23]**

**Matthew Abraham, Professor, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences [00:04:01]**

Following the Foundation for Individuals Rights and Expression extensive coverage in the fall of 2022 of my and two other faculty members’ exclusion from fair consideration for the CAFT, Faculty Chair Hudson distributed in January 2023 the Committee of Eleven’s very important report documenting the Office of General Counsel’s intrusion into the Nominating Committee’s process of selection. That report identified the OGC’s Elizabeth Miller as imparting supposedly disqualifying information to the Faculty Center to exclude me, Keith Maggert, and Wei Lin Hua based on our supposed “hidden agendas,” prior interactions with committees, and confidential information from the OGC. This exposure revealed how the OGC had been operating behind the scenes for many years, influencing decision making that all of us believed was under the exclusive control of the faculty.

I have come to develop a deeper understanding of how the OGC has seemingly gone rogue against whistle blowers, civil-rights complainants, and private litigants. On March 24<sup>th</sup>, I was dismissed from the Arizona Attorney General’s Office with no explanation after working there as an assistant attorney general for nearly three months. This followed on the heels of a March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting with Provost Marx about the lack of an appeals process around conflict-of-commitment assessments at the U of A and my demonstrating in an email dated 3-17-25 to President Garimella that the Senior Associate General Counsel, David Wagner, misapplied the Arizona Rules of Professional Conduct to suggest that that I (as a U of A faculty member and as a private litigant against the University) had possibly failed to disclose conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment to the AG’s Office.

It appears based on all available evidence that the Office of the General Counsel or the Board of Regents likely conveyed false information to the AG to get me fired in retaliation for my public records lawsuit against ABOR, which is being considered by the Arizona Supreme Court. Think about that: the University’s lawyers and/or the Board were

worried that I—in my capacity as an attorney representing the Department of Child Safety to protect vulnerable children in Southern Arizona—might access ABOR’s litigation tactics, even though 1) the AG’s Office has not represented ABOR to date in my case; 2) I would never have been adverse to ABOR in Pima County Juvenile court; and 3) I never previously represented ABOR. Thus, Wagner’s concerns were non-sensical. *Could it be that the OGC requested that the AG fire me as a preemptive strike, out of fear that the OGC’s own role in lawbreaking could be exposed by the AG or through the judicial process?* This is very troubling....

**Holly Andrews [00:06:22]**

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

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

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

**Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:06:04]**

We are really facing bad times, deadly times, as the administration in Washington launches major attacks on the universities, and in turn, on the United States Constitution. Federal funding, so crucial to researchers like myself, is being withheld in exchange for nebulous and sophomoric concessions on matters such as DEI, student visas, and so forth.

Hypocrisy and self-delusion are rampant. For example, the administration says that merit and qualifications are the most important thing in hiring practices, but are they actually themselves following these guidelines? Would we say that the people hired in the current administration are all extremely qualified for the job, and the most qualified? I asked that questions.

Federal money for grants, where does that come from? It comes from the taxpayer, not from Washington, D.C, per se. So why is it that taxpayers money can be used to extort the taxpayers? The current administration is attacking science, the arts, education, free speech, free thought, the free world. Easy workings of the police state.

My relatives came to this country to escape this country, those that stayed behind, many met horrible deaths. This is what is in store for us if we continue our current practice of appeasement. History has shown us that appeasement doesn’t work, just look at Munich 1938. The University of Arizona and other universities across the country must work together with their alumni, many of which are in very important positions, and resist the intimidation from the people in Washington. And deal with Washington in matters governed by the rule of law, not just someone’s arbitrary whims. We need to defend principles, the statues of the Constitution of the United States of America. I’m not saying this is going to be easy; it is going to in fact be very hard, but we really need to stop and face the gathering store.

**Senator Cochran [00:09:06]**

On March 7, I ended my 5 ½ year journey as the Executive Director of General Education. On the same day, the Chronicle of Higher Education published an article titled, “The Campus Cold War: Faculty vs. Administration.” The article highlighted a problematic impasse between faculty and administration that we know all too well at UA, and we were presented by the author as Exhibit A. While I was certainly feeling some of the tension mentioned in the piece, I also recognized a false binary that higher education has bought into, but it is not one that we need to epitomize.

Shared governance and collaboration are not easy or (often) fast, but they work when all interested voices are welcomed, valued, and respected. When we listen to different perspectives and consider them in decision-making, we are better together, even—and especially—when we disagree.

So how do we work together to change the narrative?

One of the cornerstones of our General Education curriculum is helping students understand how to engage in perspective-taking. It serves as a constant reminder to instructors and students of the importance of seeking a range of expertise. And when you read the student reflections from UNIV 301, you find thousands of examples of the value of this approach.

We can learn from our students. During my fall sabbatical, I will analyze the writing from our 301 students, drawing on both my experience as the administrator who helped facilitate our General Education revision and as a scholar of writing studies for nearly 30 years. Both perspectives are essential for making meaning from the data—just as multiple perspectives are invaluable for making wise, thoughtful decisions for UA that will keep students' experience a top priority—especially at such a crucial and contentious time for higher education.

**5. APPROVAL OF 2025-2026 FACULTY SENATE SCHEDULE [00:10:39]**

Vice Chair Hymel stated the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate calendar is similar to this years as the meetings will occur on the first Monday of the month from 3-5 PM. Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2024/25-40**] to approve the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Schedule. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**6. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON [00:12:40]**

Hey, welcome back, everybody. Disruption of Universities continues and so does our local response. When you are attempted to despair, remember we have been training at high altitude for at least five years. We are ready for this. Unlike some of the administration's earliest Ivy League targets, we are not a private equity or hedge funds with a vestigial elite academy attached. Interestingly these types of institutions have been quick to bend the knee after watching them as we see, as my colleague Lucy Ziurys points out, that appeasement by sacrificing our values is not the way forward.

We are a trust of the people of the State of Arizona with a mission to that people. We are an engine of the local economy, and we have obligations to our state and our communities, like I said, we have been training at high altitude.

Let's take a moment to acknowledge the frustration I know many of you feel, that the authors of our current deficit and cash crisis are continuing to enjoy their accountability free salaries in many cases. Once we have acknowledged that, let's thank God that they're not in charge anymore. We together are together, in charge.

There have been bumps, there continue to be bumps in the road as a self-governing, decentralized, and complex institution meets its new leadership. But we are working hard, as are they, to establish trust.

When federal funding was threatened and slashed, we worked with and even pushed a little, VPR Diaz de la Rubia to set up a bridge fund which has already provided assistance, I am told, to seven projects and redirected a couple more to the appropriate college level funds pockets of money available. University of Arizona is already being recognized, in the press, as a leader among public R1s in pioneering this kind of temporary bridge fund

Contemplating the reduction of F & A payments across the board in our future, we are always in conversations about new business models to develop our profile with state government to increase our access to philanthropy, and to work in industry partnerships to support our operations, even beyond the bridging of projects that threaten to be disrupted in the short term.

Working closely with Provost's office we have been in dialogue, and occasional disagreement, but productive dialogue about the kind of student support that is, has been, and will continue to be most crucial to our student's success. Resources, human and otherwise, that make sure every student knows that they belong on campus, from veterans to survivors of violence, to the wide variety of students blazing new trails for their families in our academy.

The latest stress point, as I am sure you all know, is international students visa revocation In faculty governance we have informally heard of several who have had their student visas revoked. We will not share any information about individual students publicly, but here is what we have heard and what we think we are learning. The cases we have heard about come from student reports and they cannot be confirmed. The University is exercising the highest degree of confidentiality and discretion under FERPA, and so again, this is me reporting what we think we know. We have heard from a handful of students, a fraction of the number you might hear about from ASU who have had their student visas revoked. The majority of the cases that I have heard about have already had to use euphemism, "self-deported." The majority of students that I have heard about have secured legal counsel on their own, not through offices of the University.

Visa revocations come from the Department of State. They come in the form of emails to the student using the email

address they originally applied for their visa from which may be old or inactive. Some revocations appear to be visible to the university through the SEVIS system. The categories of students affected include non-criminally charged pro Palestine protesters. Our students seem to have their visas revoked for traffic violations, moving or non-moving. Once notified of visa revocation, legal status is withdrawn. Students with legal representation may choose to file in federal courts and, or, to self-deport as majority of the cases that we have heard about seem to do.

After that, after a period of a few days, there is the possibility that immigration and customs enforcement may detain them in and send them to Louisiana like the uncharged- pro-Palestine protestors. In spite of rumors that have circulated recently, we have not seen ICE raids on campus and cannot confirm any students in detention.

Our international students depend heavily on their alma mater, literally "nourishing mother", to stand in for family, friend, and professional networks during their studies away from home. International students and colleagues boldly, and often at great personal expense, entrusted themselves to our care and counted on U.S. constitutionally guaranteed freedoms for all residents when they decided to pursue a degree or a job with us.

I recently read that international students contribute not \$44 billion, but \$50 billion dollars a year to the US economy, when they accepted US visas and educational opportunities, not a single one of them would have expected to find themselves vulnerable to tactics of disappearance and deportation that the US government has historically criticized in Russia, China, or Iran. That \$50 billion makes higher ed one of the United States top 15 exports or export sectors to the world. On our campus, international students bring in approximately \$90 million a year and we have over 7,200 of them on campus and in our micro campuses abroad.

As we fight four our research business model, for our continuity of operations, we must also be the alma matter, the nourishing mother, that defends and protects these important members of our community. .

Here is a kit t

- Vice Chair Hymel stated she would like to mention that she has received an email with a resource which is Lexis, it is a president executive action tracker which she can post on the Senate website.

## 7. **REPORT FROM CFO JOHNN ARNOLD AND PRESIDENT GARIMELLA [00:21:58]**

### **President Garimella [00:22:55]**

Thank you. I want to give this time mostly to John, and I've submitted a written report. So take a look, please, I shared some updates through that. I did want to mention a couple of items, we're close to writing up all of the feedback we got from the strategic competitors conversations. I am hoping soon, in the next few days to get it out to the entire campus to receive feedback, so look out for that please. We will get a message out. Regarding the Provost search, many of you are anxious, we are very close to closing on that and I should have an announcement to campus very soon, in the next day or two.

The third thing is that I am very pleased that we are able to nominate three of our colleagues to be regents' professors, The ABOR meeting is coming up this week and I will be at the meeting. Individuals include Dennis Zaritsky from Astronomy, Janko Nikolich from Immunobiology, and Jiang Wu from East Asian Studies. We are thrilled. I have seen their profiles, great people. There are many more but we'll put them in the queue. I am very pleased to be doing that.

For the rest of this time, it was requested that three topics were discussed which include IT which Elliot Cheu talked about last time, John Arnold who couldn't be here in person, but he is joining us on Zoom which is to discuss finances. The third one will be Helena Rodriguez on HR at the next meeting.

### **Questions and Comments [00:24:57]**

Afternoon, everyone. Sorry I couldn't be there in person; we have been preparing to refinance some of the University's debt for a long time and this was the week that was scheduled for that. Turns out, thanks to the tariff initiatives, that this has turned into one of the worst and most volatile weeks we could have picked. So, we are monitoring the situation closely and hopefully we'll be able to get a deal done, but if not, we might have to delay a little bit because what is going on with the federal government and the impacts on the market.

In some ways right now, people are just uncomfortable with where the world is at. Sitting on the sidelines trying to see what is going to change over the next few days may cause postpone anywhere from days to weeks, but this decision hasn't been made yet. We will see how the market changes tomorrow.

Today, we have decided to review the budget situation of the University. We get a lot of questions on that front and we thought it would be worth spending some time to walk the Senate through some of the foundational pieces of the

budget and how we're making decisions around the budget.

I wanted to start with a picture of the total budget in FY 25, just under \$3 billion at \$2.99 billion, and the different revenue sources that create the \$3 billion. You will see number one is grants and contracts. These dollars that we bring in through our research enterprise are incredibly important to the University. Number two is net tuition fees which is about 27% of our total revenues. Then, state appropriations at 13%. We do count UAGC revenues as part of the overall University revenues. Auxiliary revenues are things like the student union, athletics, parking, campus store, residence halls, other revenues. This would be like department salaries, some revenue sharing agreements, gifts, financial aid and Pell grants, that is all federal dollars in that category. Then TRF at 1%. That is the total University budget, the three biggest pieces are grants, contracts, net tuition and fees, and state appropriation.

The University dollars are divided into two big chunks. One chunk is local and restricted funds and one chunk is allocated revenues. Local and restricted funds kind of operate by themselves, and in many cases they're either at the unit level, and in some cases down to the faculty level where these restricted contracts come in and are managed at that faculty level. Local dollars are managed at the college, sometimes departments, sometimes below that.

We will dive into the revenue sources that feed into allocated sources. Allocated sources are the dollars that we talk about all of the time. This \$1.27 billion that runs through the University's budget system that are allocated back out to the colleges and different units. When we talk about a deficit, this is where the deficit sits, it is in these allocated revenues. These generally operate on a break-even basis. If you get contract revenue in and you spend the contract revenue, you have local dollars in and you spend those local dollars. This allocated revenue is where we have trouble, and I will explain that. Where do allocated revenues come from?

Number one is net tuition fees, about 56% of total allocated net revenues. You will note \$700 million here, if we go backwards, total net tuition and fees is about \$800 million. About \$110 million of tuition and fees are considered local funds, and they go straight out to certain departments. Examples of that, include mandatory fees that we collect. Those are allocated automatically out to their supporting or sponsoring units. For example, we collect a library fee, and that money goes directly to the libraries. It doesn't run through this allocated process; it just goes straight through.

State appropriation is actually the second source of allocated funds. F&A recovery, admin service charge, and we eliminated the admin service charge last year for all units except the auxiliaries. The auxiliaries that really operate as businesses on our campus, we charge them overhead costs and they pay it out of their revenues they produce. The Campus Store pays an overhead fee back to the University to use our space. We pay their utilities, and a few other things in that fee.

Investment income is on university cash. This is not foundation dollars. We have cash reserves and invest them, then generate interest. Compared to the overall University picture, this is straightforward. Five revenue streams are going to make up those allocated dollars that we disperse back out to campus. You'll note again, \$1.27 billion.

On slide "FY 2025 ALLOCATED BUDGET BY UNIT TYPE" shows where those dollars go. You note that we allocate \$1.35 billion. Again, \$1.27 billion in revenue, \$1.35 in allocations, thus our deficit. Where does this allocated money go? About 56% to the colleges, 11% to other support units including the President's Offices, Financial Services, the Provost's Office, HR, and OGC, and a handful of other offices that most consider the administrative arm in the University. There are institutional costs, we set aside some money for deferred maintenance, debt service payments, insurance payments, that kind of stuff. I am making more debt service and will hopefully save money on debt service. There is about \$100 million in University facilities services and utilities as it is all paid through Facility Services, and it is over half of the \$100 million. UITS is \$99 million, Student Support Services is \$51 million, and Investment Funds is about \$40 million. That runs through the Provost Investment Fund and the Research Development Fund. RII has about \$37 million in their operating budget, and this is where university allocated revenues go.

Back to the deficit issue, total allocated revenues is \$1,267,000,000 and we get what we call the auxiliary net margin. As I mentioned, the auxiliaries operate as kind of an independent business. When we talk about a deficit, the way parties external to the University and ourselves measure that deficit, is the change in University cash reserves. We look at our total cash on July 1<sup>st</sup> and what we started with this year, and we compare that to what we're going to end with this year. Since our total cash reserves is likely to be less at the end of this year, we're operating with a deficit.

The auxiliaries operate and they are generating money, they have expenses, pay the University for the overhead, but most of them operate at a slight profit margin. Their cash tends to rise every single year, they have cash reserves, including Parking & Transportation, Student Union, and Residential Life. They use those cash reserves from time to time to invest back in those businesses. The increase in those cash reserves count towards our total cash. We get to

use this \$13 million that they're projected to earn this year as an offset to our losing cash on the University side. We pick up about \$13 million in reserves there. Allocated budget at \$1,346,000.000 leaving us this \$65 million deficit.

The \$75 million deficit was planned, we knew we were going to operate with a deficit in FY26. We felt like the deficit we had in January 2024 was too big to eliminate in just five months. We said we would eliminate this over 18 months. We brought down some of the deficit from January to July, went into FY25 with the \$65 million deficit, and we continue to operate at about a \$65 million deficit. We're still projecting we're going to close the year at that level. Then in FY26 which starts July 1, 2025, we plan to be operating with a balanced budget. The current FY ends on June 30<sup>th</sup> and we start a new FY on July 1<sup>st</sup>. The steps we are taking to plan to operate with a balanced budget as we go through the all funds process includes meeting with all of the deans, business officers, and division leaders to set a budget for FY26. The plan is to have that budget balance during FY26 so the total university cash will rise instead of shrink.

I get a lot of questions about F&A spending and where the dollars go. If you'll recall from the revenue slide, there is just over \$130 which is right here in F&A return. Where does that money go? On this slide is the budget for FY25. About 40% of that money is returned back to the colleges to support their budgets. RII gets about 21% of those dollars to support their budget. We spend about 14% of that money on debt service and other capital investments. These are debt services tied back to our research enterprise. Utilities at \$12 million. There is about \$3 million that goes to the other support units that we discussed before.

You might ask, "why are they getting \$3 million in those support units?" That is actually kind of a leftover relic from AIB. Some of the other support units generate research. Hispanic Serving Institutes is a good example, they generate contracts. In AIB, there was an allocation of F&A back to those units, and we just have left it there for now. We figure we will deal with it when we set up a new budget model. Then a few dollars run over to insurance.

As many of you spoke about in the beginning of the meeting, there have been disruptions to that plan and risks to that plan that we have been working through. There has been a significant attack on higher education across the country that we're dealing with and that has created some financial risks and uncertainty around budgets in FY26. Some of those challenges, certainly potentially major changes to federal agency budgets and staff. We have already seen that come to fruition and we don't know how this will impact the flow of grant dollars and other funds to the University. There can be potential changes to F&A rates. There have been a lot of reports about the federal government wishing to change how F&A works including changing the rate structures. Stop work orders, and rescinded grants, as Leila noted, we have had some of those and are dealing with those the best we can. Reduction in grant amounts, it is not always a full stop, sometimes it is just a reduction in those grant amounts.

There has been some uncertainty around Pell grants, both discussions about reducing Pell grants, and the administration of the Pell grant process, and how well that will happen with changes with USDA. There are certainly impacts from the state budget. An analyst today said we are already in a recession. The state is certainly going to have to weigh the impacts of economic change on the state budget and how that will impact university budgets. As we noted in the allocated funding budget, which is about 30% of state funds. With any impact, there is a risk to the University.

#### **Questions and Comments [00:42:25]**

- Vice Chair Hymel stated Senators have asked questions ahead of time which CFO Arnold may have seen.
- Senator Cornelison asked on behalf of her constituents at the College of Pharmacy what the projected impact to the University from federal government proposed cuts to indirect research costs? Will the loss and revenue impact faculty and staff FTE? Will it impact research and non-research positions?
  - CFO Arnold stated this is a difficult question to answer because it is uncertain what the federal government will do. They have modeled out various scenarios and they are trying to prepare the best they can for those scenarios. Fortunately, the University of Arizona is better situated than some other universities due to the diversity and depth of the research portfolio. He would speculate, if there are deep cuts to research and federal dollars, his guess is that it will impact all aspects of the University.
  - CFO Arnold stated regarding whether it will impact both research and non-research positions, there is a lot of crossovers. A lot of times, faculty have both research and non-research funding, and he believes there will be crossover from the research budgets that were looked at over into the allocated side of the budget.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she understands there is uncertainty and asked when CFO Arnold has a chance, if we can provide estimated or ideas. This may be informative in terms of how federal budget cuts can impact the University.
  - CFO Arnold stated you can see the F&A is around \$130 million so you can guesstimate a percentage cut and how much those are worth. The other piece being considered is that when grants are cancelled, what is the impact on the operating side of the University. You look at fixed costs that aren't going away when

- a grant is cancelled versus variable costs which may go away when the grant is cancelled. Those are being sorted through and in many cases, it is unique to each grant. Some grants are isolated from the operations of the University, others are not.
- Senator Rishel and her constituents at the College of Nursing asked whether the College of Health Sciences is going forward and how this can be justified for staff and faculty with just three programs and no students until 2026?
    - CFO Arnold stated this is a great question and this wasn't on the list of questions so he would like more time before there is a response.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated there were several versions of this list sent out and that is fair.
  - Senator Torres, Hingle, Diaz, and their constituents at CALES stated there have been rumors of sunseting under enrolled majors and asked if this will happen, if so, what is the threshold.
    - CFO Arnold said this is a great question and it would be better directed to the Provost. He doesn't have a huge say on the academic offerings to the university.
    - Provost Marx stated he will speak about this question during his report.
  - Senator Torres, Hingle, Diaz, and their constituents at CALES asked why the University is spending \$20 million on a select range of topics instead of creating a bridge funding program list most of the R1 universities to assist PIs with the uncertainty of the federal funding at the federal level. Additionally, if there is \$20 million, why can't the state accounts be unfrozen to support programs? As CFO, doesn't he feel it is unethical to report a drop in the deficit when by freezing state accounts, this is artificially creating the appearance of more funds? Finally, how can the CFO accept a bonus when so many are struggling and the task, he was hired for is deficit reduction?
    - CFO Arnold stated regarding the \$20 million for various projects as opposed to bridge funding, he is not sure which \$20 million is being referred to in that question.
    - An unknown Senator stated the TRIF money.
    - President Garimella stated the TRIF funds have been approved for a particular vision around research areas and that is not fungible money. He personally thinks it is very nice, just like the big idea challenge that they're investing. There were 72 proposals as he understands, and he believes that energizes the campus especially during very difficult times. It is nice to be able to work towards something big and visionary. The funding was meant for that; therefore, it is being used for that. He doesn't think it can be redirected elsewhere.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated the other question had to do with artificially appearing as through the university has more funds because of frozen funds.
    - CFO Arnold stated they haven't "frozen" funds, they have asked people to expend funds within their allocated budget which is college by college, and they have allocated spending authority. If a college wants to allocate expenditure authority against a particular fund, they can do that, and that hasn't been frozen.
    - CFO Arnold stated what he has to do is controlled total cash at the University and what they are trying to do is not have any surprises. Over the last couple of years, what has happened is because things were so decentralized and there was individual decisions to expend dollars. The Administrative, central administration of the university did not have insight into how much cash was going out the door, and there cannot be that situation.
    - CFO Arnold stated one of the later questions noted one of the things he was asked to do was to get the deficit under control. One way this has been done is that information is needed on what is being spent and people are asked to live within this amount of expenditure over the course of the next year. The money can be spent however one chooses, but only this amount can be spent.
    - Vice Chair Hymel asked if those figures were set when the all funds process was finished.
    - CFO Arnold stated 2025 as set a year ago, and 2026 is being set now.
    - Vice Chair Hymel asked when will the Senate be able to see information on those.
    - CFO Arnold stated he hoped to release college budgets in late April.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated she has more written comments and she will provide this list to CFO Arnold and will ask live questions at this time.
  - Senator Brochin stated following up on colleges getting their budgets soon, will they get a 3% cut as it is being rumored, and whether he can discuss the ways that will impact the community as staff and faculty. She knows in her college, any cuts would be detrimental to the ways of operating.
    - CFO Arnold stated it has been a very difficult couple of years, and he admires everyone in the colleges and throughout the university that continue to work and excel in this difficult time. He has asked each unit leader, whether it was a college or administrative unit, to present a plan for FY 26 which included a 3% reduction, and they are working through each of those. They also asked them to come in and say what they need. This information has been gathered, deans, financial officers, and division leaders have been met with.
    - CFO Arnold stated him and his team are working through how to prioritize spending at the university

- where there can be additional income generated and where expenditures can be reduced, but there is no question that expenditures will have to be reduced. Some units will take cuts, and some units will have growth in expenditure authority. There are fast growing colleges on campus that need additional faculty to support the students that are coming in and this process is being worked through.
- CFO Arnold stated there will not be across the board reductions but they are trying to weigh each situation in, and all of the circumstances, and make the best decisions that can be made in conjunction with academic leadership.
  - Senator Ziurys stated CFO Arnold stated funds weren't frozen but a big concern in the College of Science is the fact that fixed price complete contracts were frozen, and a lot of that money disappeared. Researchers come screaming to her because they expected to get \$20,000 back to pay a student loan and it is gone. She would like to talk through some specific examples potentially offline.
    - CFO Arnold stated nothing that him and his team did would take money from an account. He has had this conversation specifically with the College of Science leadership, they were given expenditure authority and the college was asked to use it. If they chose to use it in certain ways, he could see they may be asking the faculty not to expend out of certain accounts and he believes this is what happened. This is really more of a local decision, but he is happy to look at specific circumstances, especially is money has "disappeared," he would like to better understand this.
    - CFO Arnold asked for Senator Ziurys to reach out.
  - Senator Ziurys stated the stock market is crashing, university assets are going up in smoke, federal agencies are talking about 50-60% cuts to their grants programs, and she asked how can there not be layoffs at the University of Arizona.
    - CFO Arnold stated as he noted at the end of the slides, there are significant risks that are being talked about and threatened. Some of those have come to fruition, and around specific grant cuts. Unfortunately, there has been some terminations related to some of those grants going away. Fortunately, they have been small so far and, in some cases, they have been able to work something out with staff and faculty, but not in all cases. If the massive changes that are being bandied about come to pass, then there will be more changes.
    - CFO Arnold stated the University is in a bit of a holding pattern with the federal continuing resolution. He thinks everyone knows that the federal government extended their budget under the current rules and levels through October 1<sup>st</sup>, and he will see what happens. Hopefully during the Summer, there will be more hints to how to prepare.
    - CFO Arnold stated he is also nervous about what the federal government might do post-October 1<sup>st</sup>. He is trying to best prepare the University for those scenarios. He thinks one of the most important things that can be done is to not lose heads, remain calm, have clear thinking, not panic, and not make decisions before the most information can be received and best understood how it impacts the long-term health of the University. The University will prepare and have scenario building but until he really understands what is happening, he thinks what can be done will be limited.
    - CFO Arnold stated he doesn't want to point fingers, but he thinks during COVID, the University took early actions they ultimately didn't need to take and that was probably unfortunate. He wants to avoid this, learn that lesson, and be wise as this is approached.
  - Senator Russell stated she understand that the budget will have to be balanced to pay bills but she doesn't understand the criteria being used to decided which units get increases and which get the big whack. She said everyone would like to know that the values are reflected in and that there is some sort of efficiency meaning individuals are not being rewarded who profligate, and those who are efficient and fabulous are punished.
  - Senator Russell stated, "we don't just want to eat our own, we don't want to bite each other to death, we are in this boat together." Best practices, best sport, and best outcomes need to be incentivized. Right now, no one can tell from the way the budget is presented, what is working, what isn't, and how those criteria will be applied in future spending authority.
    - CFO Arnold stated that is a great and fair comment. The Provost and him have been working on this together and they have developed a series of metrics. They are not perfect, and it includes everything one would think which include measures of efficiency and academic outcome. This is both an art and science process and he loves how Senator Russell included values in there because there is aim to direct resources which are precious and limited into the highest and best use for the University. It has been a process of listening and learning, and it is still occurring and is not easy. This is the competing priorities at the University which are all valuable and it is difficult to get to it.
    - Senator Russell stated the tiny risk is that if there isn't criteria which can be articulated to the University, then it can appear like there are favorites. Criteria versus favorites is important to keep everyone happily pulling together in the same boat.
    - Vice Chair Hymel requested that the list of metrics be provided, and she will touch base again.
  - CFO Arnold thanked Vice Chair Hymel for the invitation and said he enjoyed the questions and interests in



partnership.

8. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST [01:05:29]**

Regarding two points that came up earlier, one of them is the small program issue that came out of CALES. The President asked me earlier in the year to give him a list of the distribution of program enrollments across the university. My office has been doing that, and we have been working over the last few weeks. It turns out this is actually a complicated issue and we're looking at program enrollments right across the university in every major and minor, degrees granted across all those programs, enrollments, and so on.

Why are we doing this? Part has to do with Joellen's last question and that is how do we spend our money on our instructional side and what is the yield from that investment? We are a university after all, and what does it mean to be a university? That seems to be the fundamental question, and it doesn't mean that, in my view, that every single program has to be cash positive, if you will. We have many programs at the University that have modest enrollments, yet, they're really needed for us to be a University. The intellectual work of those programs is important when you think about the vast intellectual questions that we ask of ourselves as humans. We are in fact doing that, the report is nearly done. We will be sharing it with the President and once it is shared with him, I'm sure we would be happy to share it with you.

There will be no surprised there, we have several programs across the University that have low enrollments. The Regents, of course, have regulations about the number of graduates per program over three-year running totals, and some of our programs do not meet those minimum requirements. The Regents had not been bothering us about that this year. Last year, I did get a request from one Regent to talk about that issue and I talked about it with them so that is underway. I don't know if that answers the question from CALES.

As far as efficiency, I just wanted to speak to that and this gets to John's point about an Art and Science. One of the things that we're looking at is SCH per Faculty track, per college. That is a set of data that we have presented to all of the colleges in these all-funds budgets. So for those of us, like myself who are in the tenure track, how much SCH do my peers, my tenure-track peers in my college produced on average per year? Then we have career track faculty, what do they produce? It is stunning to look at those numbers across colleges.

One would look, for example, at college A that produces maybe 800-900 SCH per career track faculty and 400 per tenure track faculty, and some other college where the numbers are. Much lower. But there are, what my great colleague and mentor, Lee Shulman from the Carnegie Foundation for teaching called, critical pedagogies that different fields have. I am looking at the Dean of Fine Arts sitting in the back and if we're going to have a dance program, music program, we're going to have ratios of students to faculty that are very small because the signature pedagogy in the Fine Arts is a sage and a student. A piano teacher is going to work individually, more or less, with piano students. In my teaching field of educational psychology, I could teach a course with 100 or 120 students, it is not much difference when teaching a course with 60 students. This metric can turn out to not be very helpful in judging across the colleges, it is useful, but it can't be used algorithmically. It has to be used in an understanding of how the college's economies work. I don't know if that helps Joellen Russell, but that is sort of what we're doing. We thought maybe section sizes would help, so we asked for those, but that is not at all helpful because we use it administratively to isolate different small groups and so on. That turned out to be a useless datum. Those are speaking to the earlier conversation.

I have some prepared remarks which speaks to the issues that Chair of the Faculty Hudson spoke to earlier:

We are facing unprecedented challenges that impact all universities across the country. I want to assure you that we recognize and share the uncertainty and concerns felt by many of you. We take seriously the potential impacts the recent changes may have had on our students, faculty, and staff in both their personal and professional lives. On our federal landscape page, you will find useful information and links, including access to mental health support should that be needed.

We are taking a measured approach to address the new federal guidance impacting higher education institutions nationwide. We have a responsibility to comply with the laws and guidance that apply to our public university. I say that as Provost, not as a Professor.

As a Professor, I would behave quite differently than I do as Provost because my responsibility as Provost is for that \$1.3 billion on the allocated side and what that delivers for our community with hundreds of million dollars in federal research grants, more than \$380 million in total state funding, and nearly \$71 million in Federal Pell Grants supporting 22% of our student body. We are deeply committed to advancing our mission and supporting the success of our students, faculty, and staff, while preserving the long-term financial stability of the university.

We've been working collaboratively across the university to carefully review our diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility related activities based on federal directives. We're mandated to discontinue certain activities and

programming that involve preferential treatment. This doesn't change our unwavering commitment to foster a welcoming and supportive environment for all students, faculty, and staff. The Vice Provost and I have engaged with various university leaders and stakeholders, including student, faculty, and staff representatives, to account for a wide range of perspectives. Together, we have developed recommendations and begun implementing changes. We are updating university website and materials to align language with federal guidance. We are also evaluating committees, programming, scholarship events, and awards to ensure they are open to the entire campus without restriction based on identity. We continue to explore how to best approach support resources and community engagement opportunities to benefit all of our students.

Most importantly, as we navigate these changes together, we continue to uphold our values of compassionate care for every member of our university community. Let's stay united and strong as a community supporting one another with empathy and showing kindness wherever possible. We are and will continue to actively listen to your concerns and provide clarity when we can. I will be sending an announcement to the campus community soon, that expresses this sentiment. I hope that you share it with your friends, colleagues, and students on your campus.

#### **Questions and Comments [01:14:02]**

- Senator Ziurys stated there are federal mandates and there are laws, she asked what the University is doing to ensure the mandates are legal because in many causes of DEI, this violated the First Amendment rights. First and foremost, it is important for the University community to support the U.S. Constitution, and she asked what the University is doing to support it.
  - Provost Marx stated they are reviewing all of the legal ramifications for every one of these. As Vice Chair Hymel stated, there is the tracking page, they are looking very closely at each one of these and doing an analysis of each. Some of the issues are legal, and he is not a legal scholar but like most legal issues, they are always indeterminate and there is always ambiguity associated with them. He is aiming to reduce the ambiguity as best as possible.
  - Provost Marx stated some of these are not legal in the sense of law but there are still compelling reasons on why there should be thought on how to respond to them. This includes like Pell Grant. If the federal government decided to investigate something about the University of Arizona, what if they decided as part of that investigation, to suspend Pell Grant payments during the investigation. It would devastate the University with 22% of students receiving it.
  - Provost Marx stated decisions on how to respond are going to be conditioned by judgement about how much risk can be taken to stand up on the battlements and since late has arrived.
  - Senator Ziurys stated at some point it will be a losing battle and the University will have to stand up because they will keep pushing and pushing.
  - Provost Marx stated that is why he said he stands up there as Provost, not as Professor Marx, he would behave quite differently, and he urges professors to do so.

#### **9. NEW BUSINESS [00:45:42]**

##### **A. Writing Program workload and salary changes – Senator Jamey Rogers [01:17:27]**

First, I would like to introduce Kristin Little and Danny Clifford, they are two of my close colleagues and this speech about career track faculty is in part about them. Today, I think it is a good time after Kristin and Romi's introduction of the career-track needs committee study white paper, to tell you a little about the history of career track faculty of lectures, lecturers, instructors, and adjuncts of the University of Arizona.

I'll start with my history which dates back more than 30 years. I'll begin by talking about my dear mother and Kristin's mother as well. They both inspired us to become writing teachers. You might be surprised that both of them were instructors in the University of Arizona writing program. Together, they have over 25 years of experience out here at the University of Arizona, dating back to the 1980s.

I brought them up because during the 80s and 90s, even I have been here for 11 years, even before my time, things were quite different for adjunct and career track which are now called lectures. They had no job security at all, they had no path to promotion. Their opportunities in shared governance were minutes, so they were adjunct essentially and we all know the plight of the adjunct. Kristen's mother, for example, had to teach at as many adjuncts do or contingent faculty do even today. She taught at Pima Community College, cobbled together an income between Pima and the University of Arizona to make ends meet.

Perhaps after this news, I may seem rather sunny, I am really happy to say that things for contingent career track faculty have improved dramatically in the last several decades and in particular, in my last 10 years at the university. This has not happened on its own, Faculty like Kristen Little, Danny Clifford, and Joel Smith have brought really incredible change and the University, primarily in the writing program through their considerable efforts and sacrifice. They are proof of what Margaret Mead said, "never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world, indeed it is the only thing that ever had."

So I'd like to tell you a little story about these people, such thoughtful people, I humbly include myself. Four thoughtful, committed citizens of the university. I'm referring to Danny, Kristen, myself and Lydia Parr who could not be here today. A little bit of context is useful. Faculty in the writing program had not had a meaningful raise since 2018. Our base salary is currently \$46,000 a year which is not a livable wage in Tucson, AZ in 2025.

So seeing this injustice, the four of us, Lydia, Danny, Kristen, and I, thought we could do something about it. On our own, we lobbied administrators, in particular our Dean, the director of the writing program, and ultimately the Provost for better compensation. We faced daunting odds and surely we thought only the ship of fools would sail these waters in these financial times, but we did. We were steadfast and we pushed forward with optimism keeping in mind our track record of breakthroughs we made in the last 10 years. Though we ran aground a few times, we managed to craft a persuasive proposal to the dean and the provost. I'm pleased, proud, and frankly a bit surprised still to report to you that because of our efforts, all writing program faculty were awarded, or should I say, they earned a \$12,000 annual increase in their salary. This affects maybe 50 people including me. To put into perspective this is a 25% raise for people at the base level.

We realized this was not only our, the four people I mentioned, effort, it was collaborative. We thank our director. We thank Dr. Lori Poloni-Staudinger, and Provost Marx. Though I see recent changes in a positive light, I do want to take the voices of faculty into account who express dissatisfaction. They have two major concerns. First, they said the increase was commensurate only with the dramatic rise in inflation and cost of living in recent years. Second, our teaching load was increased to a four-five rather than a four-four load. It's no secret that writing is teaching writing is extraordinarily labor intensive. Our faculty are already overstressed. More classes will mean reduced one-on-one instruction, such as feedback on drafts. Crucial student teacher conferences, less attention to students will negatively impact retention rates, given our vital role in early detection and intervention with at-risk students. While writing program instructors can continue teaching a four-four load, some of our best instructors will in fact stay with the four-four load rather than five-four because they believe it will inhibit the quality of their teaching. They have a point. Their truth reflects the fact that we need to reverse the trend of placing more demands on our faculty.

So, you might ask at this juncture whether I'm encouraged or not about our future career track faculty future. I am. We already have momentum. Recently, the UA was awarded the prestigious NSSE Delphi Award in recognition of advancement and retention of career track faculty and promoting our role in shared governance. This spawned speaker series which provided a forum to raise awareness about CT faculty excellence and dedication. We see further opportunity in recent developments in the provision of multi-year contracts that Provost Marx and Vice Provost Andrea Romero spoke about in the Senate. By committing to faculty job security, not only does this support faculty well-being, but it ensures the continuity of our care for students over their whole careers.

The future of our CT faculty must reflect our increasing importance and impact on students. We accomplish this with a few small practical steps. First, we should act on the recommendations made by Kristen and Romi. In the last Senate meeting that evolved from a needs committee. Further, Kristen and I feel this committee should be established as a standing committee concerned with the health and vitality of CT faculty, so they're well positioned. A healthy faculty is a unified faculty. I suggest a yearly CT faculty retreat to bring us together. A vital faculty is also one with a voice in the university to amplify our individual and selective voices, I suggest we have a university-wide Forum, the retreat and the forum. Forging ahead will require a great deal of administrators and faculty, but we've seen that collaboration works. We need to work toward a unified long-term vision that is grounded and mutual respect and recognition of our contributions.

**B. Constitution and Bylaws revisions – Chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Kate Zeiders [01:27:14]**

Jamie for reporting on that. And I look forward to raising the base salary for all faculty. We currently still have 57 career track faculty who are making less than \$50,000 a year. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is bringing the following changes to the Faculty Senate. The first change is a housekeeping change and only requires faculty senate approval. The other two changes are more substantive and would require full general faculty vote upon Senate approval. I'm bringing these today so that we're aware of them. We probably won't be voting today given the time constraint, but we will be discussing this moving forward in another either special session or the next faculty senate meeting.

The first change is noted in green in the bylaws attached to the agenda. This is because a few years ago, the staff council consolidated different Staff councils into one. The current name is University of Arizona Staff Council, (UASC). At that time, some changes in the bylaws were made, but then others were missed. So, these changes in green in the bylaws reflect that us updating that information.

Second change in blue, this is not a housekeeping change and because of this, this will require general faculty approval through a vote. This change eliminates the role of the nominating committee in reducing the list of CAFT

candidates for the General Faculty Election. Additionally, it limits the number of members serving on CAFT to three per college. The Constitution and Bylaws Committee is proposing this change based on a recommendation from C11 from a report in 2022, Matthew Abraham brought up this report in his opening remarks. The full report is attached to the agenda because it's relevant to this item. Briefly, in 2022, concerns came to light regarding the nominating committee's role and process in selecting CAFT candidates for the ballot. The process in the current bylaws requires that the nominating committee select a number of people from the general faculty to vote for CAFT. As documented in the report, there were concerns that faculty were being prevented from participating in the CAFT election. The proposed change eliminates the role the Nominating Committee in selecting these candidates and instead allows the general faculty to vote on any interested faculty who meet the CAFT committee membership requirements and have submitted necessary materials to the Nominating Committee. This change makes the process more democratic. Note that we have added we're proposing an additional inclusion of the limits of the number of faculty per college that can serve uncapped. We added this because this would ensure that there is adequate college representation across within CAFT.

The third change adds one postdoc representative from the University of Arizona Postdoctoral Association, UAPA to the Faculty Senate. The representative would be selected by the UAPA chair. This change is being proposed at the request of UAPA and multiple requests during faculty senate and open session that you all heard for the need for more shared governance from representation by postdocs.

### Questions and Comments [01:31:07]

- An Senator Rafelski why there would be one postdoctoral representative instead of two.
  - Secretary Zeiders stated this is just something that the committee decided but this can be looked at more closely, she asked if the Senator recommends two.
  - Senator Rafelski stated it would be good representation of scholars, and graduate students are an important element of contributing to the research base, especially post-doctoral scholars. He asked how the number of one individual was come up with.
  - Secretary Zeiders stated she can look into this and discuss two post-doctoral students instead if this is the recommendation.
  - Senator Simmons asked if Secretary Zeiders can remind everyone of the population of postdoctoral students.
  - Secretary Zeiders stated there are about 500 postdocs that are represented.
  - Senator Russell asked why just postdocs and not research scholars.
  - Secretary Zeiders asked if research scholars are considered as faculty already or if they are in the same umbrellas as postdocs.
  - Senator Russell stated they are under the same umbrellas as postdoctoral students, but they are not temporary the way that many postdocs are on contracts, specifically she means research scientists. They have PhDs, do extraordinary work, and work with students often. They are very important but would not identify as postdocs.
  - Secretary Zeiders asked if their designation is staff. .
  - Senator Russell stated, yes but they have PhDs.
  - Secretary Zeiders stated she has noted Senator Russell's recommendation that research scholars be taken into consideration alongside postdoctoral students.
  - Chair Hudson stated she recommends getting the big step to pass which would be to include postdoc representation in the first round, then there is another meeting about the number and type of postdoc and research representatives when there is next year's study done of apportionment within the Senate.
  - Secretary Zeiders stated this is something that the Faculty Membership Committee is looking at.
  - Senator Barefoot stated there is Staff Council at the University which is the shared governance body for staff and she would encourage research scientists who are staff to participate in UASC. For awareness, many staff members have advanced degrees including PhDs and have participated in academia in various aspects. Individuals can be lecturers, adjuncts, faculty members, before becoming staff at the University. These individuals have the opportunity to participate in shared governance via Staff Council.
  - Senator Russell asked for confirmation that there are 13,000 staff, most of who don't have PhDs.
  - Senator Barefoot stated she thinks that's on a case-by-case. The question was, do most staff do not have PhDs.
  - Senator Russell stated there are 13,000 staff, not faculty, 15,000 total employees, 2,000 faculty and the people she is talking about are the equivalent of postdocs who stayed longer.
  - Secretary Zeiders stated she will go back with numbers on research scholars and she will bring this back to the postdoc association and something will be brought to the next meeting that rectifies this.
- **[Motion 2024/25-41]** to approve the current proposed version of the bylaws passed with forty-one in favor, none opposed, and no abstentions.

### C. [Report on COACHE SURVEY AND INTERNAL CLIMATE SURVEY – Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero](#)

Hi, everybody. I'm here to talk with you. I have five minutes to share with you just a little bit about two big climate surveys that are now available to you on our website. There are two surveys that we've done. The climate survey objectives are to gather comprehensive information and insights about current experiences, perceptions in areas critical to faculty success. The whole point of doing this is to develop well-informed strategies that highlight strengths and identify areas for improvement that will foster a positive supporting working environment for faculty at the University of Arizona. There's a long history of doing climate surveys at Arizona. It goes way before 2005, but I just want to give you a little bit of background here. You have all these slides on the Senate website already and again, you should be able to access all the reports and everything already. The OHI that was from the external consulting company ] led to us actually developing our own internal climate survey that was created by our own U of A experts and shared governance process with lots of people involved. You can click on more links there to get all the background on who was involved and what they did in the process and everything. That was created and piloted in 2020, but through a variety of different circumstances was not implemented until November 2023, right during the financial action plan. Then COACHE, we took a little break during COVID because of funding, but came back around in spring of 2024.

On the next slide is the U of A COACHE working group, all the different faculty that were nominated by Faculty Senate and by all the different colleges who helped us take a deeper dive with the COACHE report. So, what you'll see is there's actually two surveys, the internal U of A survey and the COACHE survey, but there's actually three reports that you can look at. There's one report from our internal survey, and then the COACHE survey has a report that COACHE developed and you can look at their results and disaggregation of their results. The Coache working group actually took a really deep dive, looked at the data much more in depth, looked at the survey, and they created their own report with their summary of findings and action items for the U of A.

This is a brief overview of the two surveys. U of A had 542, COACHE had 530. You'll see the response rates are a little bit different, mainly because as part of the COACHE regular guidelines, they do not include adjuncts, but we did in ours. This is the list of the key topics that are included in both of those surveys.

With the U of A internal survey key findings, we highlight for you here just a few strengths and areas for improvement. But again, if you go to the PDF reports for all of these, everything is a lot more in depth. We provide a lot of graphs. In five minutes, I can't show you all the things I would love to show you. Some things are on the slides. On the slides, I pulled out a few graphs that you might want to particularly look at. But again, take a look at the reports. In our internal survey, we found some of the strains that faculty told us were professional development, work relationships, workplace environment, mentoring, and academic freedom. Some of the areas for improvement are recognition, workload, work-life balance, leadership effectiveness, particularly in the areas of communication and hiring.

We did look at differences between career track and tenure track. By and large, most of the results were very similar for both tracks, but I highlight for you here some of the areas that were different. Career track faculty felt their jobs were not secure or financially stable compared to tenure track. They're less positive about workplace relationships and collaboration compared to tenure track. They were less likely to have peer mentors and 32% were recruited by other institutions compared to tenure track. 52% were recruited by other institutions, but tenure track individuals were less likely to feel they could share concerns with the administration without fear of retaliation compared to career track.

I give you a really brief kind of view here of what the results in the COACHE survey are going to look like. What is great about COACHE is we have the comparison to peers and to other institutions. We are that little diamond and the black bar is compared to our own results from 2018. The little bars all throughout are the 85 institutions that participated in 2024, and the circles are our peers. According to COACHE, our strains that stood out were we are at the top 30% of the cohort of our 85 other institutions. We stood out for collaboration, interdisciplinary, and promotion of full. We had a lot of areas of concern where we were at the bottom 30% compared to those 85 other institutions- appreciation, recognition, governance, leadership, and nature of work.

There are a lot of highlights for action items. Look at the report from the U of A COACHE Working Group, and they give a lot of action items. We're going to be following up on that and sharing that with you periodically over the next year. I'd like to ask the career track faculty who worked on the career track faculty ad hoc group to join me up here. They're going to share with you the next part about career track faculty proposal policy change.

**Susan Holland, Department of Communication [01:43:56]**

Hi, thank you very much. I'm Susan Holland and we want to talk about the career track faculty proposal for change. I've been fortunate to work with Dr. Romero and our team here, and we want to extend our group gratitude I want to list everyone out right now. All of these people, we're very grateful.

We spent a greater part of a year working together. It's been a wonderful opportunity for us to work together and we were looking at a need for change in this career track faculty proposal. There are two points that we addressed as a need for change. There is currently no appeal process for career track faculty promotion decisions. Secondly, there is no university level advisory committee.

**Cindy Rischel, Professor, College of Nursing [01:45:35]**

Hi, I'm Cindy Rischel, I'm a Clinical Professor in the College of Nursing and also our faculty senate representative from our college. There are some draft changes that we are proposing from our work group, they fall into two categories. The first category is really about the promotion and tenure process. The second category is around appeals.

The first category, we are recommending that the decision for lecturers going after promotion rest at the department or director level right now rests with the Dean. The decision would be at the dean level in the college for professorial title series everyone except for full rank. So, associates and assistant professors, clinical professors or career track would be decided at the dean level. If the person of faculty is growing up for promotion to full rank, that will be reviewed and approved at the provost level. Clinical professors, research professors, and professors of practice would be decided at the provost level, that is a promotion.

The second part is related to the appeals process which we currently have no appeal process for career track faculty. We would like to propose a process where if you are in a lecture series or lecture title series, if you wish to appeal your promotion decision, it will go to the dean of your college. If you're in the professorial series, you would appeal to the provost unless you are going up for promotion to full rank, then the appeal would go to the President of the university. Those are the proposed changes.

**Dr. Andrea Romero, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs [01:47:26]**

The bottom line is we're trying to add an appeal process for career track faculty for promotion and tenure decisions because there has not been an appeal process in UHAP in the past. Any of the changes which you can see the Word doc or in your faculty senate page goes through the edits. The only edits we're doing are in relation to adding the appeal process.

**Questions and Comments [01:47:52]**

- Senator Smith asked what the timeline is for this and the approval process.
  - VP for Faculty Affairs, Romero stated she would like to get this in front of everyone and gather feedback right away so it can then go through the policy submission for the university where the President will look through it. This will sit as an interim policy where anyone can comment, and those comments will be taken to see if it can be finalized. They would like to move quickly on this. If anyone is in agreement or has concerns, they should reach out to her right away to discuss whether there are things that haven't been discussed.
- Senator Miller-Cochran asked if Dr. Romero can discuss why the recommendation is for the decision about promotion for lectures to be made at the department level.
  - VP for Faculty Affairs, Romero stated because currently the decision ends at the dean level, and it does not go to the Provost, everything is being pushed back one level so there can be appeal the next level up.

**D. Initial presentation of [General Education Attributes and Foundations policy proposal](#) – UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter [01:49:38]**

I'm Jeremy Vetter. I'm a faculty member in the history department, currently chairing the university-wide General Education Committee. We have a very important set of policy changes that's starting to work its way through the UGEC as well as the Undergraduate Council. I wanted to bring it to all your attention for an initial viewing. It concerns mostly the foundations and attributes areas of GE. You can find a link to it on the agenda for today, and I'd encourage you to look at this very carefully and if you have any questions or comments, I'm happy to address them.

We also have a faculty senate committee that's been looking at these changes that represents many people on the faculty senate. I guess at this time we don't have time to take questions about it. I would like to I encourage you to look at that because at least parts of it will be coming through Senate eminently. There will be some parts of it that may be delayed. You can see common boxes on the side that I made about which parts have already been approved by UGEC, which parts have already been approved by the UGC Curriculum Policy Subcommittee and others that we're still discussing.

There's a lot of really worthy changes in there coming from undergraduate education and we're hoping to deliberate over them Very soon, even the parts that we haven't approved yet, we're looking at in our next meeting this week.

**10. [Adjournment](#) [01:51:06]**

Vice Chair Hymel adjourned the January 27, 2025, meeting at 4:45 PM.

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

### **Motions of April 7, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2024/25-38]** to approve the agenda of the April 7, 2025 Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2024/25-39]** to approve the minutes for the February 3, 2025 and March 3, 2025, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2024/25-40]** to approve the 2025-2026 Faculty Senate Schedule. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2024/25-41]** to approve the current proposed version of the bylaws passed with forty-one in favor, none opposed, and no 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 [February 3, 2025](#) and [March 3, 2025](#)
3. Page 3, Action Item 5: Approval of [2025-2026 Faculty Senate Schedule](#)
4. Page 11, Action Item 9B: [Constitution and Bylaws revisions](#)
  - a. [SC11 Final Report](#)
  - b. [Proposed Changes](#)
5. Page 12, New Business Item B: [Report](#) on COACHE Survey and Internal Climate Survey
6. Page 14, New Business Item E: Initial presentation of [General Education Attributes and Foundations policy proposal](#)
7. Page 15, New Business Item E: Reports from:
  - a. [President](#)
  - b. [Provost](#)
  - c. [SAPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456