

# MINUTES FACULTY SENATE DECEMBER 1, 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=15ae9d58-dc88-4ba5-9a6a-b3a70008670d>

**Present:** Senators Adler, Apanovich, Barefoot, Brochin, Cerny, Cochran, Coletta, Cooper, Cornelison, Craig, Diaz, Downing, Eaton, Eckert, Engineer, Figler, Friesen, Giacobazzi, Gregory, Guzman, S. Harris, W. Harris, Hingle, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jens, Kennedy, Knox, Leafgren, Little, Lin, Lowell, Maggert, Mars, McCallum, Meyer, Miller-Cochran (Parliamentarian), Neumann, Nolan, O'Leary, Paschke-Wood, Pau, Pollard, Prelock (Provost), Rafelski, Rishel, Rocha, Slepian, J. Smith, M. Smith, Spece, Stegeman, Van Haren, Waddell, Witte, Wittman, Zeiders (Secretary), Zhupanska, Ziurys

**Absent:** Senators Abdennebi, Baker, Braitberg, Buxner, Chandrasekar, Díaz de la Rubia, Garcia, Garimella (President), Goetz, Grijalva, Heileman, Huffman, Levy, Lucas, Perez, Roman-Palacios, Russell, Slepian, Stephan, Su, Williams

## 1. **CALL TO ORDER [00:00:06]**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the December 1, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

## 2. **ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:00:25]**

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-12]** to approve the December 1, 2025, agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

## 3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2025, AND NOVEMBER 3, 2025 [00:01:03]**

- Senator Stegeman stated in the October 6, 2025, meeting, the Motion on Gen Ed was ill-defined and it is impossible to tell from the record what happened. The minutes were not a correct rendering of the meeting, and he believes an external review would confirm that. He is opposed on the motion to approve the October 6, 2025, minutes.
- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-13]** to approve the October 6, 2025, and November 3, 2025, minutes. Motion was seconded.
  - Senator Stegeman requested a secret ballot motion on the Motion to approve the November 3, 2025, minutes.
  - Chair Hudson stated the motion made to approve the Gen Ed package in the October 6, 2025, meeting was vaguer than people would like, but in her opinion, and those of other experts, it was a properly made motion. This was to pass the entire package presented by UWGEC and UGC to the Senate and she objects any more votes on this matter.
  - Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran recommended there be a full vote on the October 6, 2025, and November 3, 2025, minutes as opposed to passing the motion by unanimous consent.
  - Vice Chair Hymel stated in the email received by Senator Stegeman, the second, third, and fourth item he proposed are not connected to the minutes and would be items of new business.
  - **[Motion 2025/26-13]** passed with thirty-eight in favor, three opposed, and six abstentions.

## 4. **OPEN SESSION [00:10:08]**

Senator Ziurys stated she is giving her time to Senator Downing.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated typically an individual is not allotted double time but there was no one else waiting for an open session slot.

### **Miranda Pasquarella, Global Professor, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences [00:11:03]**

Hello, my name is Miranda. I taught at the campus in Tianjin, China last year, and I had my contract shortened following the closures. I would first like to emphasize that regardless of the reason for the closures, the University of

Arizona should be responsible for supporting and protecting those affected. However, so far, I have seen no such adequate support.

The students were left with no clear path to degree completion, and only unfeasible options for pursuing their UA degree. After years of hard work, these students were sent an apathetic email that began "Dear Insert Micro Campus Name here, student," and continued with the sentiment of "your plans for the future have been derailed, and the thousands of dollars you have invested in this degree are now gone."

Furthermore, the approximately forty faculty and staff affected by this decision were in lieu of legally binding contracts, asked to work the entire semester under essentially email notifications that stated only a termination date. There is no mention of pay, or how employment during this time could be impacted by UA's rapidly deteriorating relationship with the China campuses. These faculty and staff have uprooted their lives in service to this university multiple times. They built homes under UA's promises, and now they've been stranded under unstable conditions and at the mercy of an institution whose written commitments have already proven unreliable.

For many, the harm is irreversible. However, based on conversations with students and faculty, I submit the following request for the university:

- First, for the faculty and staff affected by the closures, UA provides adequate compensation for each individual case.
- Second, for all UA faculty and staff, UA creates a clear and ethical policy that offers legally binding, timely contracts, and a publicly stated, humane process for non-renewables.
- Third, for micro-campus students still pursuing their UA degree, UA provides a feasible detailed and public plan for degree completion.
- Fourth, for the students who, through no fault of their own, were forced to abandon their UA degree, UA provides a full tuition refund for the degree they paid for but will now not receive.
- Finally, for the faculty, staff, and especially the young students, who, at one point, proudly chose to dedicate their talents to the University of Arizona, UA provides a public and sincere apology.

Thank you.

**Clarisa Robles Parra, Chief of Staff, Office of the Provost [00:13:40]**

Hi, my name is Clarissa Robles Parra. I work in the Office of the Provost. It's my pleasure to speak briefly with you today about the Employee Emergency Fund.

I serve on a university committee that reviews applications for employees who are going through temporary financial hardship, such as struggling to pay bills, dealing with health crises, and handling all manner of emergencies. The fund that we use for this assistance is the UA Emergency Employee Emergency Fund which is supported by donations from fellow employees through the UA Cares Workplace Giving Campaign.

This year, the emergency fund is about to be depleted because more people are utilizing it than are contributing to it. The UA Care's Workplace Giving Campaign is currently underway. All employees received an email about the campaign on November 11<sup>th</sup>, and the campaign ends this Friday, December 5<sup>th</sup>. The campaign enables all employees to enroll in payroll deductions for the charities of their choice, which includes any 501 nonprofit or any UA Foundation account, including the Employee Emergency Fund.

To contribute, simply log into UAccess and click on the UACares tile to get started, or visit [uacares.arizona.edu](http://uacares.arizona.edu) for a short tutorial on how to enroll. Please help us continue to help those in need during these difficult times by enrolling in a payroll deduction for the employee emergency fund or any other charity, and please encourage your colleagues to do so as well, because at the U of A, we Bear Down and step up for each other.

Thank you.

**Senator Ted Downing [00:15:33]**

Thank you everybody. I'm speaking directly to the elected faculty representatives. The University of Arizona's legally binding system of faculty governance is being intentionally ignored by the Garimella administration. A dangerous attempt is underway to extend this bypassing into the area of the CAFT hearings taking place on a dismissal of for cause of a tenured faculty member.

In 1992, elected legislators and a Republican governor, enacted ARS 15-1601(B). This law binds "elected faculty representatives, to participate in the governance of each university and actively participate in the development of university policy."

In contrast to this university-wide mandate, it also mandates that elected faculty representatives and the administration, "share responsibilities in academic, educational matters and faculty personnel decisions." All three of those areas are subject to the responsibilities and power of the Board and the University President. The law protects academic freedom by establishing a governance structure grounded in democratic elections, within a university culture long dominated by appointed authorities and advisory bodies.

As one of the statues original promoters, I was state president at the time. I acknowledge that its structure is imperfect, but you fix things through established processes, not executive orders. Unlike President Robbins and his predecessors, President Garmella's administration has arrogantly chosen to ignore the law.

He refuses to sign a memorandum of understanding or offer any compliant operation alternative. He has challenged the Faculty Chair's traditional appointments, reduced elected faculty participation in budgeting to passive quarterly briefings, and is seeking our Senate's authority to Honorary Degrees. His brief appearances in this body limit substantive engagement with the faculty with their representatives, as the law requires.

Last week, under his direction, the Office of General Counsel attempted to shift the legal and procedural boundaries governing our Committee of Academic Freedom and Tenure. They challenge the right of elected faculty representatives to conduct one of the most serious things that this body can do, which is dealing with the dismissal of a tenured colleague for costs.

The university attorneys objected to the participation of an elected CAFT member fulfilling their statutory rules, asking critical questions, seeking clarity, and performing duties assigned by their peers and by statute by ABOR. They are suggesting that the CAFT members now sign affidavits about any communications with the dismissed faculty, which could be anyone coming in CAFT, and cease all contacts with them (that's difficult, since the Chair of the CAFT has to talk to the person), and even be removed from the hearing itself. A silly brouhaha surfaced to deny CAFT members from attending even the hearing itself, if they were on Zoom.

These attempts violate civil rights. free speech, academic freedom, and the governing the laws of this state. I urge you to witness yourself. Join me tomorrow at the Student Union Sabino Room at 11 o'clock, that's on December 2. I think that at that point, we will get a chance to see the importance of the Committee on Academic Freedom, to our freedom.

Let's thank the CAFT members for their voluntary and awful stressful duties in protecting our collecting freedoms under law. Thank you.

## **5. Q&A WITH THE UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY LEADERSHIP [00:20:35]**

### **A. Chair Hudson – ABOR 6-201(K) Committee Findings**

Welcome, everybody, and just like that, another semester or so is almost behind us. I want to leave any time for any questions you all might have. I just want to make a couple of very brief announcements.

A team led by Cindy Rankin, well-known to all of us, and Kian Alavy of the Provost's Office is soliciting your input on UNIV 101 and UNIV 301. It is my understanding that a Zoom session will be held this Thursday at noon, specifically for the input of faculty senators and others involved in shared governance. So, I urge you to attend that so that they have the best and most complete feedback available.

Similarly, the budget model team, led by Richard Cate has been working hard, and I believe we'll be scheduling one or two information sessions in the month of December for Senators and for other people involved in shared governance. I confess that I do not remember when those sessions are scheduled for, but keep an eye out on the Senator's listserv for information about the budget model, so that you can be among the first to know how the money that comes in, whether it be, how it will be distributed. I can say that I, along with Melanie Hingle, have represented the faculty on this committee, and I think it is a solid model. I urge you to come and ask the questions that we might not have remembered to ask.

I will be assisting the Presiding officer of the Senate, Mona Hymel in assembling a committee to review the dismissals from the Ocean University micro campus based on the findings of the ad hoc General Faculty Committee assembled last month. This is to examine the implications of ABOR 6-201(K), the responsibilities not only of the administration, but specifically of the Faculty and the Faculty Senate in providing review for faculty members dismissed due to program reorganization. I may well be contacting some of you, or Mona Hymel may well be contacting some of you for participation on that committee later this month, or hopefully not early next semester.

Finally, I wanted to apprise you of a matter that will soon be coming to your attention, if it hasn't already, and that is the matter of Honorary Degrees. The President and the Provost's office have proposed to cut the Faculty Senate out of its traditional final approval of the Honorary Degrees granted usually each Spring, based on the nominations of different Deans and different units in the university. I have let them know privately, and I will let them know publicly, and will probably bring a motion to the Senate should this initiative persist that cutting the Faculty Senate out of the Honorary Degree awarding process is radical, short-sighted, and not in the best interests of the institution, and I'll be happy to elaborate if that is desirable. The justification for cutting the Faculty Senate out of this process is that that's the way they do it at ASU and NAU, to which I countered that. In fact, ASU and NAU should follow the proper model endorsed here at the University of Arizona compliant with ARS 15-1601(B), anything having to do with the awarding of any degrees, real or merely symbolic, cannot bypass the faculty. Expect more discussion of this matter publicly.

I'm going to leave it at that, and I'll take any questions that anyone might have, so it's less about me talking and

more about you all having a chance to ask questions.

**Questions and Comments [00:25:44]**

- Senator Witte stated these matters have been discussed in the Committee of Eleven and it is important to review established policy in the Faculty Senate. She remembers the item regarding honorary degrees to be very clear, it was established in the Senate, and unanimously agreed on, which included the President at the time. This was changed from an indiscriminate giving of honorary degrees.
- Senator Witte stated regarding the issue of financial exigency, there has been an established policy in the late 80s or 90s that was never reversed. There was financial exit exigency before a department was closed, which at that time was the Journalism department. There would be no journalism, at the time, an administrator was upset about the journalism department and decided to close it. There was then a policy developed, which is why it is important that policies that are established are reversed by Faculty Senate rather than inventing new ones. This is violating one's own policies and those should be asserted, cited, and made clear.

**B. Provost Prelock - [Presentation](#) [00:27:42]**

Thank you. You've got my report, so I'm not going to go over that. Hopefully, you can look at the link for the ABOR meeting, which it was another productive meeting. There were several Provost Initiatives that I identified where we're investing in our faculty staff. Thank you for all of those who were nominated and put their names in for Provost Fellows. We had over 60 applications of highly qualified faculty and staff, which was really exciting.

I do have something I do want to share with you that I mentioned to our group. It has come up a number of times that there's no administrator review process, and I wanted to let you know that I actually implemented a significant one this year.

There's an annual review for all administrators that report to me. I have thirty-six and in the annual review, they all review an evaluation form that we've made some adjustments to, and they respond to the progress on the goals set by the Provost. I sent a pretty significant list of goals to all of my direct reports and so they have to report on those. We also do an anonymous 360-survey that has been adjusted so that it can have qualitative comments and not just quantitative comments. I've made changes in some of the redundant questions, so that there's ten questions in each of the categories that are, I think, more direct and meaningful. The Provost meets with the administrator to discuss all the materials that I've collected and provide feedback, and then we establish the goals for next year and any need for change.

I've instituted a new process called a Three-Year Review Process for all administrators, so this is for all deans, vice provosts, executive directors who report to me. What will happen, and I am in the middle of a three-year review right now, is that the provost meets one-on-one with the administrator under review to get the process started. I then meet with their leadership team, and then other faculty stakeholders, program directors in certain areas. I do a 360 to collect both the quantitative and qualitative feedback anonymously. Then, I meet with the administrator to discuss feedback and action items. I will send a brief letter to the college or unit summarizing what I heard as strengths and opportunities for change, or if there's something more dramatic that needs to be done, and then the requirement that the administrator must discuss the results with the college or unit and how they are going to respond to the opportunities for change.

The Five-Year Review Process for Administrators is the one that's in place that faculty have a significant role beyond the college. In the previous one, faculty are always part of the review. In this, we establish a review committee that has a chair that's usually at a similar rank or position from another area and they initiate the review. I speak with the administrator who has to do their own self-evaluation and that is provided to the review committee, and the Provost. Then again, there's the 360.

The review committee that's made up of faculty, staff, students, and administrators, what you have typically done, draft a report after conducting interviews, focus groups, evaluating the survey, and assessing the administrator's self-evaluation, and they send that to me. I will meet with the review committee if I have any questions, but then typically I'll meet with the administrator and I'll send a letter to the community and summarize the strengths, opportunities for change, or if any changes are being made. The administrators also expected to provide some feedback about what they're going to change.

On the slide are the Three-Year Review plan and the Five-Year Review plans that I have for all my individuals, so you can see we have them on a schedule and we're trying to keep track. It is an intensive process, but it's an important one, and I felt like this is the one way that we can demonstrate our commitment to having high-quality administrators.

The last slide lists all the departments, their roles, and when their Three-Year Review is, when their Five-year review is. As you know, we have to be determined. We have sixteen searches going on right now. We have some other interim faculty. Our efforts there will be to make sure that once those permanent individuals have been named, then they are on a list for Three-Year and Five-Year reviews.

**Questions and Comments [00:34:10]**

- Secretary Zeiders stated her thanks for the presentation and stated many colleagues appreciated an additional review after the Three-Year mark because if things aren't going well in a college, it provides an extra step. One of the concerns she has often heard faculty talk about is that the feedback given from a survey or input, is screened or in some ways kind of readjusted and then presented to deans in a particular way. She asked if the Provost would have access to the comments from both the Three-Year and Five-Year review.
  - Provost Prelock stated yes, that is correct.
- Secretary Zeiders stated this is helpful for faculty to know that Provost Prelock sees the comments. She also asked how individuals on the Five-Year committee are selected as there are faculty who are picked because of favor oftentimes.
  - Provost Prelock stated in terms of the comments, she feels like the administrators are grownups and should be able to manage the comments, and she does not have any intention of screening things unless there is a place where someone can be identified. That piece would then be taken out but she does read every comment.
  - Chief of Staff, Office of the Provost, Clarisa Robles Parra, stated typically there is a survey sent out to the College or Division which solicits nominations for faculty, staff, and students. From there, they look at the committee to ensure there is a good mix of rank among faculty, departments, and staff. For students, they will gather undergraduate and graduate students.
  - Provost Prelock stated the nominations come from the college and she does not appoint anyone.
- Senator Witte stated the Committee of Eleven developed policy which came through the Senate and was passed by Faculty, which is very detailed, and was also agreed to by the Previous Provost. This seems to be a return to the administrators being in charge, and it is fine if they want to do their own review, but this is not considered a faculty review. A faculty elected committee is necessary, and they also insisted on an annual review.
- Senator Witte stated it may sound cumbersome but if there were a ten-question or Likert scale, this would be easy enough to do. She has been at the University for a long time and has had volatile department heads where one year would be a disaster, and one needs to know that is no longer happening which can be accomplished with a Likert scale, or ten-questions which faculty can interpret and would be a true 360-degree. Anything else, in her view, is inadequate and can be added to what the faculty does but is not a substitute for it.
- Senator Ziurys asked what would happen if the review were bad and how that is handled by Provost Prelock. She stated her applause for Provost Prelock.
  - Provost Prelock stated she can't discuss specific things since they are personnel issues, but she can tell everyone in her previous experience, she always goes with a Three-Year review. The reason she instituted this is because she found that through coaching and specific expectations, behavior can change. If that is not seen, it makes the Five-Year review easier, and the individual knows it is unlikely they will be reappointed. Sometimes, in a Three-Year review, that can also happen.
  - Provost Prelock stated she likes to give every individual the benefit to demonstrate the change, and a lot depends on their interaction with her and when she reads the review. Sometimes they're not kind and identify patterns of behavior that are concerning. She is very specific in her interviews, and she writes a particular report out. She gives her administrators actions and dates by when those must be met, and if they don't comply, this gives her additional information.
- Chair Hudson asked if there cannot be dismissals after Third-Year reviews.
  - Provost Prelock stated there can be dismissals at any time.
- Chair Hudson stated there was recently a case of an administrator at the college level that was driven through and through with perceived or perhaps real Conflicts of Interest. It became apparent that deans are using their own methodology for the review of their Associate Deans and other staff. The recent example that was seen did not rise to the level of the Provost's methodology. She asked what the Provost will do to address different methodologies in colleges which have left a lot of people with a lot of questions.
  - Provost Prelock stated she has heard concerns at the levels of the colleges such as "how are chairs and department heads being reviewed?" One of her goals will be to talk with the Deans, since they now know that this is their expectation of her, that she is gathering their current framework and will be giving feedback on this, and trying to create a template. She is encouraging them to do Three-Year reviews for their chairs or department heads and to be more thoughtful in their annual reviews, how they make determinations, and gather information.
  - Provost Prelock stated these individuals know her process and she will be gathering more information on this. If she sees inconsistencies, she will give them a template to use.

**6. ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, JOOST VAN HAREN AND CHAIR OF GRADUATE COUNCIL, PHILLIP WADDELL – [BS in UG Minor in Genetics and Genomics](#), [BS in Agricultural and Applied Economics](#), [UG Minor in Computational Social Science](#), [GRAD Minor in Indigenous Health](#) [00:42:02]**

**Chair of the Undergraduate Council, Joost Van Haren [00:42:40]**

Thank you, Mona. So, consent agenda are three programs for undergraduates. A BS and a Minor in Genetics and Genomics, which would mean the first such program in the western United States. BS in Agricultural and Applied

Economics, which follows from a reorganization within that department, and dealing with staff changes. Then an Undergraduate Minor in Computational Social Sciences which would be preparing students to work through data that is gathered by Meta and all these other global companies that collect your data day in, day out, and what do we actually do with that data? And how do we process it? All these programs were unanimously, after thorough review, voted on in the Undergraduate Council and approved.

**Chair of the Graduate Council, Phillip Waddell [00:43:27]**

From the Graduate Council, there is the Graduate Minor in Indigenous Health. This is going to be under the School of Public Health. This passed in the Undergraduate Council and we're a bit behind our other institutions, so I strongly urge you to pass this.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-14]**, **[Motion 2025/26-15]**, **[Motion 2025/26-16]**, and **[Motion 2025/26-17]** to pass the Consent Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**7. OLD BUSINESS [00:45:25]**

**A. Information Item: Creation of *ad-hoc* Committee on Surveillance, Privacy, and Civil Liberties – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [00:45:43]**

I'll take thirty seconds to let you know that the plans to assemble an ad hoc general faculty committee on surveillance, privacy, and civil liberties is proceeding a little slower than anticipated because of the Thanksgiving week holidays. I have a list of colleagues that I have spoken to from a variety of different disciplines on a committee to be chaired by Dr. Linda Green of the School of Anthropology.

The aim is mapping the surveillance landscape, both virtual and physical, so that the Faculty Senate and the entire university community can be informed about what data is being collected, in what modality, how it's stored, who owns it, who has access to it, and how it might impact people's privacy and civil liberties.

That work will proceed probably starting in January, and I'll let you all know the full charge and the full committee membership. As always, if you have colleagues who are particularly knowledgeable or expert, or might be interested in participating, we have a pretty full roster, but I'm very open to suggestions. It behooves us in this time to understand the surveillance landscape and to hear recommendations from a dedicated committee to prevent the abuse of data collected and all other related matters.

**B. Action Item: Constitution and Bylaws changes – Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders (5 minutes presentation) [00:47:58]**

Last senate, we discussed these changes, these constitutional changes that are being brought by the Constitution and Bylaws Committee but I'm going to remind you all these changes.

So, the first change is removal of Article II, Section 2. This article states "No candidate for a degree at University of Arizona shall be a member of the General Faculty." We the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, as well as APPC, recommends removing this.

The second change is linked in your agenda and was sent to all Senators last Monday. This is a change to Article II, Section 1, and Section 5. It is revising the General Faculty definition to include career track faculty with .5 FTE or greater. So, as it stands, currently at the UA to be General Faculty, you have to hold at least a half-time tenured or tenured-track faculty appointment, at least half-time continuing or continuing status appointment, have emeritus status, or be a career track faculty with a multi-year appointment, or have a year-to-year appointment of three of the past four years.

This constitutional change removes that multi-year appointment and the three of the past four years requirement for career track faculty, and it allows career track faculty appointments with at least half time to be General Faculty.

I spoke last month about this, but we believe this is critical for shared governance to include active career track faculty who are teaching with many students across our university. They're involved in the classroom, they're involved in our academic community, so they should have the ability to be active in our shared governance structure.

One minor concern came up last Senate, and that was from Senator Rafelski. It was that this change could allow graduate students to be part of General Faculty. That is not the case. The language in the Constitution clearly states that you must have a faculty appointment. Graduate students are not faculty, and we have ABOR Policy 6-201, and UHAP that have clear definitions around faculty.

Secretary Zeiders moved **[Motion 2025/26-18]** to approve the presented changes to the Constitution and Bylaws. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with fifty-three in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

- Secretary Zeiders stated the change to the Constitution must go to the General Faculty and there must be a General Faculty meeting where all faculty are informed of the change. There is a plan to do this in January or February, and will be strictly an information meeting, not for voting. After that, this goes to the General Faculty



election in Spring.

## **8. NEW BUSINESS [00:53:14]**

### **A. UAGC Faculty Hirings – Dr. Gary Packard [00:53:38]**

Thank you very much for this opportunity to talk about an important transition that's happening at the University of Arizona campus. I appreciate the time very much. I've been asked to talk about the transition and the alignment of UAGC faculty to the University of Arizona. We have previously shared details on this process with the Senate Leadership, as well as the Career Track Advisory Committee in August and September.

I want to thank Andrea Romero, who's sitting back here from Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, who's been very helpful in this process, as well as Caleb Simmons, Vice Provost for Online, who has volunteered to be the Chair of the Hiring Committee, who will be here as well as we have this conversation.

As this information been shared before in other venues, I'm going to keep this brief so we can have lots of time for questions and answers. UAGC, as per background, is operating under a one-year extension of a 2023 ABOR waiver for personnel policy. One of those open things that was approved as an extension of, by ABOR earlier this year, was the alignment to faculty positions.

UAGC full-time faculty under this process will be given a separate designated title series of Assistant Global Campus Professor, Associate Global Campus Professor, or Global Campus Professor to eliminate any confusion with titles currently being used by main campus faculty. UAGC-ranked appointments for full-time faculty and academic administrators will align to recently developed UAGC faculty appointment criteria, which were developed by UAGC Shared Governance Faculty Council and model after the college procedures for career track faculty here that are published on our website at the University of Arizona.

This alignment will take place in two phases. Phase one is the ongoing phase right now, and it is for 23 academic administrators and their underlying faculty appointments. Those include one Vice Provost position, two Dean positions, seven Associate Dean positions, and thirteen department head positions. It will then be qualified to serve as reviewers to Phase two for the remaining faculty.

The hiring advisory committee is being chaired by Professor Caleb Simmons, Vice Provost for Arizona Online. It includes Professor and Faculty Senate Secretary, Katie Zeiders, Dr. And Dean John Pollard of the W.A. Franke Honors College, Dr. Lisa Elfring, Vice Provost for Assessment, Teaching, and Technology, and Professor of Practice, Bill Neumann of Eller College of Management.

As the Senior Vice Provost over at UAGC, I serve as the hiring authority in the final approvals will be cleared with the Provost upon that process completing. The original search was coordinated with HR Faculty Affairs, General Counsel, and the Provost, and originally designed to be an internal search for UAGC only. At the request of Senate leadership to the University President, applications were open an additional week to include all U of A faculty and staff as well.

The Provost and I charged the committee at the completion of that process, and the committee has completed their initial review of the applicants. We'll meet tomorrow to review candidates and schedule interviews as needed. I will also do one interview, and that is for the candidates for the Vice Provost for Global Campus Academic Affairs, which is the only position that reports to me. This is what I did when I hired the sitting person in that job.

The committee will provide their recommendations to me. I'll review their recommendations just as I would with a hiring committee as a dean, and then I'll present my selections to the Provost for final approval. The goal is to complete this process before winter break. Just as I would as a dean, I have not interacted with the committee since the charge, so the committee is independent to provide me an independent review on the applications that we have received by the deadline.

As I said, Committee Chair Simmons is with us. If you have any questions for the committee, he is here and can answer those. However, I do remind us, in all searches, questions about candidates or committee deliberations would remain confidential and not be open for public conversation in this room.

Phase two will begin after the winter break and the goal is to being in the other ninety-one faculty through what is, in essence, a, normal promotion process that we would do for career-track faculty here at the University of Arizona. Those individuals have already submitted and completed dossier that include a summary of their experiences as faculty members, a candidate statement, a CV, and a full teaching portfolio to include artifacts you would expect from a teaching faculty, also including syllabi, student results from their surveys, and so on.

The timing of this is important because if someone is not offered an appointment after this process, we want to finish it by Spring break so we can give them ninety-days' notice of that non-renewal of their appointment per guidance. That is what's driving the timeline more than anything, it is to make sure we do right by a faculty who may not meet the criteria through that review process.

The faculty peer review committee that will review this process will consist of seven UAGC faculty and a greater

number of UA faculty that we recommended to the Provost for appointment by campus deans across the university. This mirrors the process of appointing institutional review committees, in general, for campus promotion processes. Vice Provost Romero has already coordinated with those colleges to receive those names to identify U of A faculty for this process Committee recommendations that we reviewed by Senior Vice Provost Rickus and myself at the end of it. Vice Provost Romero will be very involved in the normal review process. Senior Vice Provost Rickus has decided to do that with me, and we will present those results to the Provost for our approval at the end of the process.

UAGC faculty will remain at the end of the process, a distinct body of faculty and not a part of the General Faculty of the University of Arizona. That concludes my report. I'll be happy to take any questions you might have.

#### **Questions and Comments [01:00:00]**

- Senator Downing stated he appreciates all of the work Dr. Packard is doing and wonders how UAGC can align with the Arizona statutes he mentioned earlier, 1601(B), to be integrated.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated they will be aligned with all of the processes and procedures for career track faculty at the University of Arizona. He is unaware of any statutes that they wouldn't be aligned with when complete with the process. He is happy to look at specific statutes brought to him and will send a response if so.
  - Senator Downing stated he is referring to Arizona Revised Statute 1601(B) which is critical for the role of faculty and elected faculty representatives in the governance of the university, personnel decisions, academics, and educational matters.
  - Senator Downing stated thirty-two years ago, with the support of a Republican governor, there was only one opposing vote from both parties, and it is a dominant statute that passed and governs the University on this area. He would like to ensure Dr. Packard can go through it to ensure the UA is in compliance with the law.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated he complied with this statute when he was the Dean and intends to fully do so in his current role.
- Senator Spece asked for the percentage of administrators and faculty involved in online teaching at the University of Arizona Global campus.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated 100%.
  - Senator Spece asked if Dr. Packard is referring to 114 people.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated this depends on the participant as there are over 120 positions. Not all of the full-time, UAGC faculty positions are filled.
  - Senator Spece asked if he expects that body to elect Faculty Senate representatives.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated they are not a part of the General Faculty therefore they would not be on the Faculty Senate. They have their own faculty governance which is called Faculty Counsel who is elected by faculty at UAGC.
- Chair Hudson stated there is a chronic concern over the last few months about non-competitive hiring. The length of the applications being open, and communications to applicants were concerning for individuals. Chair Hudson directed her question to the Chair of the Review Committee which is how many applicants' holders of these jobs are not currently or how many University of Arizona faculty or staff applied to these jobs. She asked if there will be competition for these jobs.
  - Chair of the Hiring Advisory Committee – UAGC, Dr. Simmons stated he doesn't have the specific number currently but there is competition. Every position receives multiple applicants.
- Chair Hudson stated by Dr. Packard referred to the standard used for career track faculty at the University of Arizona. At a certain point, her and others were discussing this with the Provost's office and it was suggested that only career track faculty be involved in some of the steps downstream, specifically step two: hiring the faculty, or any other process. She stated there was alarm expression at the exclusion of tenured faculty from any process and asked if Dr. Packard envisions a process from which the tenured faculty of UA proper are to be excluded.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated no, this has never been a part of the process. They have tenured faculty on the current committee, and there is no restriction from deans offering tenured or career track faculties to their nominations to be on the next version. That will go to the Provost for the selection of that committee. There's no restriction.
  - Chair Hudson stated, she will note for the record, that the elected representatives of the faculty were not involved in the selection or nomination of the actual search committee. She is concerned about the two-step process in which it is very probable that current UAGC holders of these positions would be reappointed. Then, at the second step, they would simply reappoint their current faculty in a non-competitive manner. She asked for reassurance that this would not happen.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated he will not reassure Chair Hudson if any results but he can reassure her that he would never run a process, as a leader of the institution, that is not in the best interest of the process.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated the reason he is staying out of the committee is so there is no undue influence to the committee and he will take all of their suggestions, who is made up of 100% University of Arizona faculty. He will then make the best recommendation he



- can to the Provost for her approval.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated he will take a serious look at every applicant and has already taken his own time, as he would as a Dean, to do his own independent review of all of the candidates to form his own opinion before he hears from the committee. He will then rectify this if there are differences between his thinking and the committee's. There is no influence to ensure anyone gets the job, which he promises.
- Secretary Zeiders stated her thanks for Dr. Packard for attending the Senate meeting and providing a very detailed description of the process, she believes this is appreciated by all Senators as she has been requesting this. She is on the committee, has done her due diligence and will continue to do so.
- Secretary Zeiders stated there was a push from many of the Faculty on the committee to open the search up to all UA faculty. The Provost and Dr. Packard were responsive to this in thinking about how to have a merit-based and competitive search. She believes Chair Hudson has points to make about the next steps and how Senate can be involved since that is not finalized.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated he is always open for further conversation. He stated the faculty at UAGC, just like the faculty at UA, are wonderful human beings, doing a great job teaching students. He asked that everyone give them a fair shake in this process and not pre-judge them or anyone at the University.
  - Interim Senior Vice Provost for Online Initiatives, Dr. Packard stated his faculty are hurting from this as others can imagine the feeling of having to reapply for their own job. This is not an easy process for anyone to go through, they are shouldering the burden well and committed to their students. He promised a fair process and decision to them as well.

## **B. Micro-campus closure faculty concerns – Senator Roy Spece and Chair Hudson [01:10:25]**

### **Chair Hudson [01:10:26]**

I have Senator Spece up here, who is the Chair of the Ad Hoc General Faculty Committee on ABOR Policy 6-201, which we quickly convened, and has quickly completed its work. I just want to give you all a chance to ask any questions of the Chair of that committee. Just to remind you that when the Ocean University Legal Program was abruptly closed days before the start of this semester, four faculty members at that program petitioned the President of the university under ABOR Policy 6-201(K) for review under the ABOR Policy Manual, which I should add is a lot more detailed and procedural than UHAP, our own local interpretation of ABOR policy.

Under that policy, these faculty members who were abruptly terminated prior to the end of their contract, interpreted that they had the right for review. That in cases of their petition, the President of the University should convene a committee of the Faculty Senate to review their termination for program reorganization purposes. That did not happen. There was a concern that was articulated by members of the Law School Faculty, that, in fact, not only was the administration subject to legal action, but perhaps the faculty and the Faculty Senate as well would be subject to legal action.

I asked Professor Spece to chair this committee. He has recommended that in the absence of the President's action by last week that the Faculty Senate, itself, appoint a review committee to hear the petitions and the complaints of the four dismissed faculty and to follow the procedures outlined in ABOR Policy 6-201(K). I will work with the President of the Senate, Mona Hymel, again, to compile a Senate Review Committee so that the petition of these four dismissed Law School faculty members does not go unanswered, at least by the Faculty Senate.

I can answer any questions that you might have but so can Chair Spece from a more legal perspective, having done the work.

### **Senator Spece [01:13:27]**

The committee consists of four named professors, including myself, at the Law School, two other faculty, and one very respected staff member who's active in governance on the campus. We went through the provisions of the Policy Manual invoked by these four dismissed professors. We found that we have a voluminous record. We concluded that every one of the criteria within that provision of the Board of Regents Policy Manual was met by these professors, therefore, there should be a review committee.

We can answer questions. We forwarded recommendations to the Chair, and I think that was forwarded to the President. One last point I want to make is the priority of law, like the Constitution of the United States, is the supreme law of the land. It says right in the Constitution, Article 6. The hierarchy of laws applies, and in this case, the Board of Regents Policy Manual stands in bone to UHAP. The administration has invoked UHAP as if it could write off the Board of Regions Policy Manual. There are numerous cases, and it's a deeply embedded principle in the Anglo-American jurisprudence that the higher level trumps the lower law, not vice versa.

- Chair Hudson stated her or Vice Chair Hymel may call on individuals to join the review committee if the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee are taken up.
- Chair Hudson stated she would like to add that since ABOR Policy 6-201(K) is coming up again in this meeting, and has repeatedly come up, in addition to there being a lot of contract issues, she going to ask the ad hoc committee under Senator Spece's chairmanship to stay on. She also asks that they consider other issues that

might come up under ABOR 6-201(K). The committee will continue if individuals have contract questions or termination questions. In that case, individuals should bring their questions to her, and they may be referred to this specialist committee with a lot of legal knowledge.

C. **General Education Second Language issues** – Associate Professor, Joost van Haren and UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter [01:16:56]

**Associate Professor, Joost Van Haren [01:16:57]**

Thank you very much. It will be me in conjunction with Jeremy Vetter, the Chair of UWGEC who is online. Since I am here, I will present. This is really about the changes in the Undergraduate General Education curriculum that have been happening here at the University over the past couple of years. There is one sticky widget we're still dealing with, and that is the second language requirement.

I want to back up first to remind everybody of the new goals of the general education. There are threefold general education uniform requirements. Students cannot complete general education by changing majors. This simplified whole general education curriculum for both students and advisors to make the process easier to follow for them. All these should help towards the ultimate goal of helping students graduate at the University of Arizona and hopefully graduate on time.

Faculty governance has worked through all these components of the general education curriculum. The second language one has proven to be more of a sticky point, in part due to the pre-existing exemption of the College of Engineering, that they can choose their methods for gauging whether students have reached second semester skill level in language. In practice this has meant considering the admission requirement of two years in high school to automatically meet the requirement.

Currently, for all other students, the foundation's second language requirement can mean anywhere from 0 to 8 units at the university level, depending on the level of previous second language preparation and one of the many existing pathways, proficiency test, credited by exams such as advanced placement, can be used to successfully demonstrate second semester competency.

To adhere to the goal of making the general education curriculum the same across campus, the second language task force, which was convened in 2023, if I'm correct, they went through, and it had broad representation from all colleges and several shared governance committees. In their most narrowly decided vote, recommended to allow for all students to have two years of high school second language to count to satisfy the General Education Foundation's second language.

There was also broad supported agreement that we should separate off the two additional semesters of competencies currently required for the general education for all BA degrees and make this a BA degree requirement instead so that the general education requirement can be the same for all students. They also suggested to afford flexibility to BA students on how they continue the second language study, identifying additional methods of satisfying second language requirement, including study abroad, seal of biliteracy and multilingual learning experiences.

When the second language policy proposal came up in both UWGEC and UGC Curriculum and Policy subcommittee, the members were concerned about allowing the Engineering exception for all students. This, again, implies that two years of high school coursework achieves the same learning as two semesters at the university language course.

Many members of the UWGEC objected to this arrangement on principle, out of the concern that this factor undermines the task force commitment to the importance of a second language requirement at the university. Others were concerned that this would set a precedent, eventually allowing high school coursework without demonstration of proficiency or learning to undermine foundation's requirements in math and writing as well.

Experts in teaching of language and culture have pointed out that this method is unlikely to be a reliable measure of assessing the learning or experiences of students giving the diversity of high school experience and the shortage of qualified teachers in many high school language programs and object to its current use in the current College of Engineering.

Furthermore, both committees strongly felt that second language acquisition makes students better communicators and more sensitive to other cultures and that the University of Arizona should not follow suit of some other universities, by eliminating this requirement. Furthermore, the committees reject the sentiment that high school students choose which university to attend based on second language requirements.

UWGEC suggested to modify the proposed General Education Second Language Policy to either remove the two years of high school second language, to satisfy one-year university second language coursework, effectively removing the Engineering exemption, or to let three years of high school second language coursework satisfy one year of university level coursework. A compromise that passed the UGC Curriculum and Policy Subcommittee.

This compromise was not favored by the policy sponsor, who then retracted the policy for moving forward through

the faculty governance process. Afterwards, Eller has put in a request to UWGEC and UGC to be granted to the Engineering exemption for their Bachelor's in Science in Business Administration degrees which was denied in both faculty governance committees, for the reasons explained above, and that language training serves alongside courses with the world cultures and society's attributes to help students understand and value differences.

Second language learning promotes critical thinking and information literacy. With that, the Faculty Governance Committee's UWGEC and UGC are hoping to ensure that students in all colleges have a consistent general education program and the rationale for this program. And that the second language part of the general education policy can hopefully move forward after further discussion.

#### **UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter [01:23:34]**

I think I would just add that I worked with Joost this morning to put together some documents if you want to explore further between now and the next Faculty Senate. There may be matters related to second language coming forward to Faculty Senate in the spring, either if they push the Eller request forward, or a more broad-based second language policy, so I wanted to make sure that you all have the chance to familiarize yourself with some of the issues that are at the root of this logjam.

In that document that we posted just before the meeting, you can read at your leisure before the next meeting. It has the position statements of UGC and UWGEC, about why they rejected the ELA request. Also, another position statement from UWGEC about the general policy and the two different options that Joost laid out that we favor at the committee, and the request from Eller is there. You can look and see what they're requesting, as well as the original second language policy proposal change that was presented. It was part of a much bigger packet of general education changes earlier this semester, but it's just extracted just the second language part, so you can see that. Finally, the second language task force's recommendations from the committee that met from Fall 24 to early Spring 25 are also there at the end.

We thought these would be the best documents to help all of you familiarize yourself with what's at stake, but we're happy to answer any questions or to hear any concerns. There's nothing to vote on at this meeting, but this is familiarizing all the senators with what's being discussed and what's moving and not moving forward.

#### **Questions and Comments [01:25:20]**

- Senator Zhupanska stated she is a representative of the College of Engineering and is a Professor in Aerospace Mechanical Engineering. She speaks three languages, can teach in them, and can debate in them. Their students have different experiences than students in other colleges because they have a high percentage of faculty from foreign work which students can interact with firsthand.
- Senator Zhupanska stated she believes understanding and cross-cultural communicating is important. Her and others understand the importance of second languages as well as professional opportunities, as she is one who benefited from studying these foreign languages.
- Senator Zhupanska stated she finds it sensible for the general education committee to address this important issue but there are concerns her college has, and why she would not recommend adopting policies to remove the expectations of the College of Engineering students. The students must complete 128 total units minimum, which means they must take more courses to complete their degree in four years or stay longer. By adding a second language requirement, this would potentially extend the unit requirement to 134 units, which is one semester, as opposed to the normal 120-unit requirement.
- Senator Zhupanska stated her college also must meet the requirements of the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) which require professional competencies for all graduates and that the college is accredited every six years to remain in compliance. Adding a second language requirement will increase the number of units a student must complete to graduate which is a major concern of the College of Engineering.
- Senator Zhupanska stated she values the opportunity that students have to study foreign languages, and students are still able to explore this within her college, but in practice, decisions need to be grounded and there is a need to be pragmatic. She urges Senators to seriously consider this.
  - Associate Professor, Joost van Haren stated this is not currently a proposal that is being put forward. What has been so far in UWGEC and UGC is to not allow other colleges to have the same exemption as the College of Engineering.
  - Associate Professor, Joost van Haren stated the only proposal that has been discussed is changing admission requirements from requiring two years of high school language to three years of high school language. This would potentially change the admissions process but not necessarily degree completion requirements at UA. This proposal is not yet at the Faculty Senate; there would have to be an entirely new proposal put forward and it would have to go through the committee.
  - Associate Professor, Joost van Haren stated Senator Zhupanska's comments are noted as the College of Engineering requires more units than any other program and has the element of accreditation. This is why the college was granted an exception earlier on in the practice.
- Senator Lin stated the engineering exemption is also in practice in peer programs in other nations and states such as the neighboring state system, the UC system and Arizona State University. In addition to the higher number of

units because of ABET, there is a technical writing component and other science requirements. There is very little room for additional courses.

- Chair Hudson asked how many students are taking advantage of the College of Engineering exception as she imagines most students are already pursuing a standard second language learning. She asked if there are many students not able to prove their competence in a language.
  - UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter stated they haven't yet received any evidence on this, but it would be useful evidence to generate. This is a tricky question because the process for verifying this has been within the College of Engineering, and he would have to ask for more information on this. He hopes for good dialogue with the College of Engineering about the situation for their students.
- Chair Hudson stated there is now a slippery slope where there has already been a request from Eller to have the Engineering exception, where she imagines that more students will be trying to take advantage of the laxer standard, just because of the less international profile or other reasons. She has also heard of rumblings from the College of Nursing, which has accreditation as well.
- Chair Hudson asked what is to prevent this and who is to decide if not the Faculty Senate, about these specific exceptions. She asked if the Senate should expect UGC to put forward proposals on the exceptions to the Faculty Senate.
  - Associate Professor, Joost van Haren stated so far, as it has gone through faculty governance, Eller has put forward their exception, and they have moved through the process. With that, both you UWGEC and the UGC Curriculum and Policy Subcommittee who asked more detailed questions. Both decided not to approve the other exception.
- Senator Mars stated he echoes what Chair Hudson stated and added an exception is an exception, but when there is multiple, this is a policy change. This starts to beg the question for colleges to consider what types of classes they considered "not needed" as they may consider spending more time on other classes more important.
- Senator Mars stated he is apathetic to the College of Engineering because of the time and money spent, but at the same time, the UA prides themselves on being a global and world class university. He asked if there can be a cap on exceptions.
- Chair of SPBAC, Heileman [01:35:43] stated many colleges were asking for this exception but to the point where this had to be holistically reviewed. The College of Engineering has a "call-out" which is not an exception, but a method of their choosing. To answer the question of Chair Hudson, most students consider colleges based on whether they have two-years of high school credit in second languages. The requirement is consistent across many institutions, and the University of Arizona was alone in the way they did it. There were then requests from Eller College of Management, the College of Nursing, and College of Pharmacy, and College of Education. Provost Marx recommended there be a task force put together to attempt to solve the issue more holistically.
- Chair of SPBAC, Heileman stated there is still the situation where is a student is a B.S. student and switches to a B.A., they have an incomplete gen ed and this shouldn't be allowed and should be fixed. This was taken care of with Math policy changes, but this problem still exists in second languages. The solution the task force came up with is that those additional two courses should become a part of the B.A. degree which distinguishes it.
- Chair of SPBAC, Heileman stated there are also situations where transfer students satisfy the Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC), and this requirement is moot. If it becomes part of a B.A. degree, they will have to do it.
- Chair of SPBAC, Heileman stated the concern is how much is lost in second language instruction, and a lot would be made back because transfer students would not be subject to that if it was moved to B.A. There is the opportunity to ask questions, just like in Humanities where students don't need a certain level of math, and it raises the question of who is to say what level of second language is needed in technical programs. There should be a conversation on what distinguishes a B.A. from a B.S.
- Senator Cerny stated as a representative from the College of Engineering, he is a computer scientist and software engineer. He would like to make a motion to recognize Java and C++ as a foreign language. He was on a committee at Baylor University making the same motion, which went through.
- Senator Cerny stated based, "the second language is a very difficult thing, but as an international, I might tell you. and I don't mean to offend you, how is called someone who speaks 3 languages, trilingual, how is called someone who speaks two languages, bilingual, who is speaking one language, American? Ouch. And you might be offended, but this is true." This is his experience with students speaking in the Czech Republic and speaking in the US. He asked why there is a requirement for students to speak two languages when the result is that they will speak language because English is a language for all the technology.
- Senator Cerny said his college has the best engineers, with Meta, Amazon, Facebook, and more companies. Asking students in the College of Engineering to take a second foreign language, when not all of them are capable, is difficult when the first foreign language is already very hard to learn. If there is space carved out for them to be more proficient in a technology, the college will contribute to the national technological advancements.
- Staff Council Representative, Barefoot stated she saw a comment that the policy from 1997 to 1998 says, "in the College of Engineering by a method determined by the college, however, all students in the college must also take a second language placement examination on entrance to the university." She asked if that is still in effect and is that an exception. She agrees with Senator Cerny and agrees there should be expansion on the distinction of language, however, if that is still in place, she wonders if this is still being followed by the college.
  - Associate Professor, Joost van Haren stated yes, this is still in place and how far this determines what

- students must take is unclear because the College of Engineering has their own method.
  - Associate Professor, Joost van Haren stated referring to the computer languages, it misses the cultural aspect of second language learning which you do not get with computer languages.
- Senator Brochin stated she is from the College of Education, and they have an Indigenous Teacher Preparation Program and they would like the broader committee to consider exceptions also for Indigenous students who want to get the language requirement complete, but the university's requirements are not in their indigenous language. This conversation in her opinion, is worthwhile for many reasons and appreciates the space to have the conversation.
- Senator Brochin stated she hopes that complexities and barriers to getting a degree at the University of Arizona are considered, as well as things that get in the way, with the assumption that students aren't bilingual or multi-lingual, when the assumption should be that many students are. She would like to know more ways to support these students in getting their degree and a path forward.

**D. Non-competitive Hiring and Program Reorganization – Vice Chair of the Faculty, Mona Hymel and College of Science Representative, Dr. Keith Maggart [01:44:30]**

Recently, I was approached by a career-track faculty whose contract is being grossly altered midway through its period as this person is being reduced from 0.75 FTE to 0.05 FTE. This apparently is because unit funds have been withheld by the central administration, and the unit leadership is being forced to alter its career track contracts. This faculty member asked that APPC be involved because there's a policy difference between funds being, "no longer available," which the administration claims is the situation, and funds being, "a strategic realignment or reallocation." That is the language used by the administration to describe the situation.

This faculty member's concern and mine is how the university honors its obligations. This occurs on two grounds.

- First, ABOR 6.201E8 states that any appointed person whose appointment is dependent for continuation upon funding from a specific source other than state appropriations, shall have no expectation of continued employment, if such funding is, "no longer available." But it seems that sufficient funds do exist within the university but are being used to pay for new priorities to the detriment of past priorities and present obligations. So, saying that funds are no longer available is a budgetary decision rather than a statement of fact.
- Second, ABOR6201 requires that certain procedures be followed upon reorganization including modification or redirection of funds. This includes the release of tenured faculty and non-tenured faculty prior to the end of their appointment period, which this is, in effect. In this ABOR policy, reorganizations require review by the Faculty Senate, as we already heard, approval by ABOR and prioritization for alternate employment for affected faculty.

So, the question is whether dropping multiple faculties from 0.75 to 0.05 is being enacted with the effect of avoiding the Faculty Senate's mandated review, ABOR approval, and accommodations to the faculty. I ask if the provost can bring some clarity to these concerns.

- First, how is the term "unavailable" being used when altering contracts, when those funds seem to exist, they just seem to be shifted from one priority to another.
- Second, what criteria are being used for ascertaining reorganization under 6201-K?

This is timely, as these career track faculty are being reduced from 0.75 to 0.05 within the week. I know that the Provost is there, and so I would like to ask if she would clarify how those two terms are being used.

- Provost Prelock stated her takes to College of Science Representative, Dr. Maggart and stated this is new information for her and she will have to do some investigation. She asked if there a particular department or unit that this is happening in.
- College of Science Representative, Dr. Maggart this was discussed in the Senate Executive Committee two weeks ago and this seems to be affecting the Office of Research & Partnerships (ORP).
- Provost Prelock stated she knows they're doing a lot of reorganization and focusing on the five strategic research areas. She hasn't had a chance to talk to SVP for Research and Partnerships, Díaz de la Rubia, about this yet, but it is on her agenda, and she plans to follow up.
- College of Science Representative, Dr. Maggart stated he would like to underscore the urgency as these faculty members, and in fact, the units are being underfunded currently. The career track faculty look to be effectively losing their jobs within the week.
- Provost Prelock stated she thinks one of the challenges here is that in the research arm, as there is a focus in a particular area, resources will be allocated to those areas that are meeting a strategic need and not necessarily the funds that is no longer meeting the strategic research need. In the meantime, policy must be followed and faculty must be supported.
- College of Science Representative, Dr. Maggart asked if Provost Prelock believes these funds are unavailable if they're being diverted to different priorities. The term "unavailable" triggers the provision within the contracts that allows the reduction in their FTE status.
- Provost Prelock stated this is a great question and she does not know how the term is being used, and she will

check on “unavailable” versus “reallocated.”

- Chair Hudson stated even as voting rights of career track faculty are elevated to full-fledged members of the General Faculty, techniques like reducing someone's FTE to practically zero, is unacceptable bypass of the 90-day notification period, or the full out pay and outplay of a person's contract.
- Chair Hudson stated she is going to refer this case to the ad hoc general faculty committee on 6-201(K), which is not satisfying to the individuals whose livelihood is being stripped away currently but at least there can be recommendations. She stated the committee may be able to come up with recommendations with the general recognition provisions under UHAP are not sufficient to guarantee people's contract rights.
- Chair Hudson stated the University has come from an administration that exercised wanton strategy and she is not referring to this administration, but the wanton and promiscuous strategy of the previous administration is something that this administration should absolutely avoid at all costs. Rules, regulations, contracts, competition, and all these things must be upheld for the Garimella administration to be successful. T
- Chair Hudson stated this will be brought up in the spring if needed which is small comfort to yet another cohort of people whose contracts have been abruptly terminated.
- Senator Witte stated not only referring to contract issues, but the financial exigency reorganization policy that the Senate established as a provision, as her understanding, when RII/ORP got a Senator when they became an academic unit. Therefore, they fall under the policies of the Faculty Senate regarding reorganization, and financial exigency.

**9. Written reports from the APPC, ASUA, C11, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Faculty Officers, Gen Ed Office with UWGEC, GPSC, Graduate Council, President, Provost, RPC, SAPC, SGRC, SPBAC, UA Staff Council, Undergraduate Council, University Community Relations [01:49:37]**

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-19]** to adjourn the December 1, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- a. Vice Chair Hymel adjourned the December 1, 2025, meeting at 4:53 PM.

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

**Motions of December 1, 2025, Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2025/26-12]** to approve the December 1, 2025, agenda. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2025/26-13]** to approve the October 6, 2025, and November 3, 2025, minutes. Motion passed with passed with thirty-eight in favor, three opposed, and six abstentions.

**[Motion 2025/26-14]** to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council, BS and UG Minor in Genetics and Genomics (Science). Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2025/26-15]** to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council, BS in Agricultural and Applied Economics (CALES). Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2025/26-16]** to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council, UG Minor in Computational Social Science. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2025/26-17]** to approve seconded motion from the Graduate Council, Grad Minor in Indigenous Health. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**[Motion 2025/26-18]** to approve the presented changes to the Constitution and Bylaws. Motion passed with fifty-three in favor, none opposed, and one abstention.

- *Details of the approved amendments may be found under attachments.*

**[Motion 2025/26-19]** to adjourn the December 1, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

**Attachments Within the Minutes**

1. Page 1, Action Item 1: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the minutes of [October 6, 2025](#) and [November 3, 2025](#)
3. Page 4, Item 5B: Q&A with University and Faculty Leadership
  - a. Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson – [ABOR 6-201\(K\) Committee Findings](#)
  - b. Provost Prelock ([report](#))



4. Page 5, Action Item 6: Consent Agenda
  - a. [\*BS and UG Minor in Genetics and Genomics \(Science\)\*](#)
  - b. [\*BS in Agricultural and Applied Economics \(CALES\)\*](#)
  - c. [\*UG Minor in Computational Social Science\*](#)
  - d. [\*GRAD Minor in Indigenous Health\*](#)
5. Page 6, Old Business Item 7B: Action Item: [Constitutional and Bylaws changes](#) & [presentation](#)
6. Page 10, New Business Item 8C: [General Education Second Language Issues](#)
7. Page 14, Written reports from
  - a. [UWGEC](#)
  - b. [President](#)
  - c. [Provost](#)

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456