

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 2, 2026**

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=7c4d4b88-1410-4b4a-9863-b402000fda7a>

Present: Senators Abdennebi, Adler, Apanovich, Barefoot, Braitberg, Brochin, Cerny, Cochran, Coletta, Cooper, Cornelison, Craig, Diaz,, Eaton, Eckert, Engineer, Figler, Friesen, Garimella (President), Giacobazzi, Goetz, Gregory, Guzman, W. Harris, Heileman,, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jens, Kennedy, Knox, Leafgren, Leite, Lin, Little, Mars, Meyer, Miller-Cochran (Parliamentarian), Neumann, Nolan, , O’Leary, Paschke-Wood, Pollard, Prelock (Provost), Rafelski, Rishel, Rocha, Roman-Palacios, Slepian, J. Smith, M. Smith, Spece, Stegeman, Stephan, Su, Van Haren, Waddell, Witte , Wittman, Zeiders (Secretary), Zhupanska, Ziurys

Absent: Senators Baker, Buxner, Chandrasekar, Díaz de la Rubia, Downing, Garcia, Grijalva, S. Harris, Hingle, Huffman, Levy, Lowell, Lucas, Maggert, McCallum, Pau, Perez, Russell

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

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the March 2, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

Vice Chair Hymel stated the next meeting is April 6, 2026. The Runoff election cycle is occurring, and nominations will be accepted until the end of the week. Voting begins on March 23, 2026.

There are two General Faculty Meetings which will occur on March 4, 2026, and address different issues. The first will address changes to the Constitution & Bylaws from 2:00-3:00 PM, ran by Secretary Zeiders. The second will be an open forum to the public to provide an opportunity for all members of the community to present their views on the impact of the impact of the proposed reorganization. There will be no questions taken at this meeting.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL](#) [00:03:11]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025/26-27**] to approve the agenda of the March 2, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting with the friendly amendment to remove Items 8C and 8D. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- Items 8C and 8D which were originally passed by the Senate Executive Committee will be moved to the April meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE [JANUARY 26, 2026](#) and [FEBRUARY 2, 2026](#), FACULTY SENATE MEETING [00:04:40]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025/25-28**] to approve the January 26, 2026, and February 2, 2026, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION [00:05:37]

Keiron Bailey, Associate Professor, Educational Policy Studies and Practice & Public Health [00:06:05]

42 U.S.C. Section 1983 is a federal statute allowing individuals to sue state or local government officials for violating their constitutional or federal rights while acting “under color of law.” Section 1983 does not contain a right of action per se but it serves to hold accountable state officers for violations of constitutional or statutory rights, typically free speech (First Amendment), due process rights, Titles VII and IX, and Section 504.

Responsible parties include those who possess color-of-state authority, for instance, police officers, university administrators, public ones, and Board members. Damages include nominal, attorney fee recovery, compensatory and punitive. In marital community states, including Arizona, Section 1983 liability attaches to the assets of the marital community of the Defendants.

A couple of examples or three rather, Jack Lipton, former Faculty Chair at our peer institution, Michigan State. who sued

members of the Board in 2024 for violation of First Amendment rights. Dr. Lipton has just won a settlement of \$300,000.

Number two, former UA staff member Clarissa Siebern sued former UA Dean of Education Robert Berry and his marital community member, Miss Michelle Berr, under Section 1983. Dean Berry refused to provide the process server his wife's name, but her identity is a matter of public record, and she is now a defendant. This case is ongoing. Last week, I discovered perjury in Dean Berry's small testimony concerning me, and I've reported this to the DOJ and FBI.

Last, in December 2023, an eminent professor of Mechanical Engineering at Georgia Tech sued the Board of Regents as well as President Angel Cabrera, Miss Danette Jocelyn Gaul, and General Counsel under Section 1983. The plaintiff alleged, among other things, "Defendants notified him in September 2023 that he was being put on administrative leave for allegations regarding his conduct and potential violations of Georgia Tech and USG policy without disclosing to him the allegations or potential charges against him or the identity of the complainant, and, thus, not affording him due process." The plaintiff's name was Dr. Srinivas Garimella. The answers to your question are yes and yes, everything I've just said is protected under the First Amendment public interest at a public forum

Senator Danielle Barefoot [00:08:57]

I'm joining you today as your colleague, not as a senator. I am an Associate for International Research Development, and I also am the University's Fulbright scholar liaison. I am so delighted to join you today and announce that we have been selected as a Fulbright top producing institution for 2025-2026.

Seven of your peers on the faculty here were selected. This includes folks from seven different colleges across campus. Melody Buckner, Brian Silverstein, Stefano Guerra, Peter Ecke, Shelley Hawthorne Smith, Solange Duhamel and Priscilla Magrath. They're around the globe in various locations, in Europe, in the Western Pacific, in the Eastern Pacific and other locations.

I would like to invite you to join me and some of your other colleagues across campus to celebrate Fulbright Week this year. That will be March 30th through April 3rd. We are hosting some events for the scholar and specialist program, including some information sessions, and I'll have some special office hours if you're interested in the Fulbright program. We're also going to have a special panel and reception at the Honors Village Amphitheater on Thursday, April 2nd from 4:00-6:00 PM.

We'll have some opening remarks from Provost Prelock. Thank you so much for that. I hope you'll be willing to join us for that, and there's a QR code if you'd like to register for the reception. If you're interested in attending any of the information sessions or have colleagues who might be interested in the Fulbright Scholar or Specialist programs, you can have them reach out to me. I would love to chat with them, and you.

Lisa Kiser, Associate Clinical Professor, Nurse Midwife Program

I am Dr. Lisa Kiser. I am an Associate Professor here in the School of Health Professions. I am here because I would like to share with you a serious concern that's been coming to our attention. I am part of the committee that's working on our sexual assault awareness, which will happen next month, and I appreciate your time because I'm really here to thank the administration and also to encourage the faculty.

What we need to know is that this has been an ongoing issue on campus for years, that the University of Arizona has higher rates of sexual assault compared to any U and ASU. That our rate of 1 in 4 students has been historically higher than the national average of 1 in 5, and that the University of Arizona offers but does not mandate sexual assault awareness and prevention training for students, faculty and staff. This is the core issue, and this is something that is fixable, but it is something that all of us must come together and really take as a priority. That's something we can work on.

When I say this, I say this carefully. There are many people on campus that are working on this issue, but it is how you define the Cleary Act and the US Campus Assault Violence Elimination (SAVE) Act, where we are required to provide this training. The full intent of the law is that the students, faculty, and staff are required to take the training. But at this point we are just offering it. So, the students on this campus faculty and staff are not consistently receiving this education and training.

I'm here personally because as part of my HRSA grant, we had wanted to apply for more additional funding through the VAWA Act, and we're told that we could not do so because we were not in full compliance with the Cleary Act. I also know that there have been donors that have withdrawn their funding to the University of Arizona because we are not in full compliance.

I was very impressed with the model that ASU has done. We have been doing research about what other colleges and universities are doing, and it's just a way of saying that this is very fixable and something I hope that the faculty specifically, will take a leadership role on.

So, what I would advocate for is that there is mandatory in-person training for all incoming students, faculty, and staff based on the latest research and evidence. There really is stronger evidence of how we can make this work. how it

does reduce assault on campuses, and that we really could look at this and have the faculty be the ones that are really leading and advocating for this. We then should include mandatory online training on a yearly or rotating basis, and that the faculty needs to be the one to provide the leadership in really bringing forward these initiatives. In the red was that the faculty had the lowest response rate to the safety faculty. There were forms that were put out. The faculty had the lowest response rate. There were 80 slots and only 20 faculty responded.

I'm also seeing on campus that there are faculty that are not complying with when students are assaulted. They are supposed to be given reasonable accommodations, and that our faculty are really making some of our students fight for that, including two students I personally had that we were giving them accommodations for, but that the campus advocates were saying that other faculty were not helping with this.

So, I'm here thanking you for your time. The last and most surprising thing is we've done this work, I was really asking who it is that makes the decision on this campus of what is mandatory education. For example, when we had, unfortunately, the events where we had a shooting on campus, it was the president who made the decision that it would be mandatory for all of us.

So, I really think, again, the faculty is here to partner with the staff and our students and our administration to say there needs to be a clear process for when something is essential as this, such as sexual assault awareness and safety training. When there isn't a clear process that together we say that this is something that's essential, and we should be providing it. I think that's one of the best outcomes of my time here to say we just need a process. So thank you for your time.

5. Q and A with University and Faculty Leadership [00:16:45]

A. Chair Hudson [00:16:53]

Thank you, everyone. Good afternoon. Welcome back. I just want to remind you that the runoff election period is upon us, and so please, we have several college representative seats, some Nominating Committee seats, please tap some of your colleagues that you think might be good for those, and have them submit their candidacy by the end of the day on Friday of this week. Then, as noted, the election will take place after that. Again, let me tell you one more time, that we will be having two General Faculty Public meetings on Wednesday, March 4th, one at 2:00 PM, which will feature our Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders, discussing proposed changes to Constitution and Bylaws. and a chance for General Faculty members to ask questions and make comments. The second one at 4:30 to 5:30 PM, on the same day, again, allowing for public comment on the closure of the Chinese micro campuses as our interpretation of ABOR policy requires. Two chances, we'll put out more notifications.

Just a few little updates. I wanted to let you know some of the things that we're working on. I am working with a Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero, hopefully in the very near future, to introduce some more information about shared and faculty governance to our heads and directors training modules. That's one of the projects we're undertaking. Another one is working with the jack of all trades, Richard Cate and Jenna Rickus to look at ways for refining our grievance process so that we prevent the large number of grievances that are coming forward for formal hearings. That would take the form of perhaps some conflict resolution initiatives that we haven't previously tried and trying to stem the production of conflict at the level of colleges and departments.

I also wanted to report one win, I think, for shared governance. When we recently met with Celina Ramirez, who's in charge of our policy portfolio, with a new robust policy change group, including representatives of the faculty, the staff, and the administration, we were able to provide useful feedback that was instantly taken up by senior leadership in the form of allowing on top of our 12 weeks of parental leave, an additional 12 weeks of unpaid leave for parents who might need it. It was in this discussion that we had and the outcome, which allows people who need it, to take an additional 12 weeks of unpaid parental leave. It was very directly the product of a robust conversation between faculty, staff, and administration. When we talk together, we do solve problems, I think, for the benefit of the community, and I wanted to thank Patty for being receptive and listening to the feedback that was received in that little meeting.

Other things on the agenda. I will tell you what we discussed this morning with President Garimella and Provost Prelock, and I think we'll have a chance to probe a little further into each of these questions on today's agenda. I let them know that faculty, along with deans and department heads, are quite concerned about the current state of admissions. You can actually feel this in the air that the shifting process for admitting students is causing great anxiety, especially when coupled with the difficult financial times and the still unfolding all-funds process. So, we're going to ask Patty about that a little bit today to give us some oversight of how we're going to get the class size and the net tuition revenue that we like, with the control of the colleges and the deans and the participation and active recruitment.

We talked, of course, about the honorary degree process and plans. I have once again written, along with C11, writing to President Garimella to express how important it is for our traditional and statutory role on honorary degrees to be implemented. I think at this point, we have agreed to disagree. I have made my case, and I think we'll talk about this a little bit more today.

We asked questions as well about the new deal for a dorm construction on the corner of Speedway and Campbell, and I asked the President to talk about it a little bit today, for those of you who would like to better understand the complexities

of this unique deal and what the impact on our community is going to be.

Finally, I remain interested in seeing the Dooley report on UAGC and making sure that we open discussions about the future of Arizona Online and UAGC, and all the degrees that we offer that participate in Arizona Online, to robust community discussion. I think our senior leadership team are very confident and interested in information control on all these matters. I will continue to advocate for more transparency, more open discussion as they continue to make decisions. I will emphasize that. Faculty governance is not about managing the university per se. It is about advice and consent. It is about checks and balances, and ultimately it is about risk mitigation, as unfortunately, we see in these turbulent times with all the power is concentrated in very few hands, sometimes bad decisions are made. I want to keep advocating, and I hope all of you will too, for a robust interface. When we work together, we make better decisions. Thank you.

B. President Garimella [00:24:41]

Thank you, Mona, and hello, everyone. Good. A number of things to go over this. You all see the tents on the mall. This is that time of the year. So, I'm looking forward to the Festival of Books. Really proud that we host that. No credit to me, but I enjoy that very much. In fact, in those same tents, we will have our staff social on the Mall. It'll be our second annual staff social in the Mall. It's an opportunity for us to thank our hardworking staff. I think Patty mentioned this in her faculty digest, Provost Prelock did. I think we should all find ways whenever we can to thank our hardworking staff. So please, do so when you can. Provost Prelock and I also host the breakfast, as you know, and we've been enjoying those a lot. It's a first come, first serve thing, and they've been well attended, so we'll certainly continue that. I see several people in this room that have attended those, and they've been very informative for me.

I've also been visiting every college. I spent several hours with each college. I'm almost done. I think about two or so left, and they're coming up, too. We also have new leaders. I'm sure you know by now we have Regina Deil-Amen who is now the full time, regular permanent dean for College of Education, and Brian Anderson for Optical Sciences. We have ongoing searches for Law, Pharmacy, and CALES. In terms of our office, Rachel Reinhardt has moved over from the Office of Research and Partnerships to our office as Chief of Staff.

It's been lots of success for our faculty, staff and our students. Like you just heard, we are the fourth highest in the nation for Fulbright scholars. This is something to be very, very proud of. We have seven faculty this year that were selected. Our S&P debt rating outlook has improved, and the organization cited our improved operations, more transparent reporting and monitoring of financial performance on our part. So, it was a nice thing to have an improved outlook from S&P. Our latest NSF HERD ranking, as you probably know, based on 24 numbers, placed us among the top 20 publics for the seventh year in a row. We've brought in the HERD expenditures for a billion dollars plus. Arizona Online, which some of you work with, was ranked by US News and World Report amongst the nation's best online programs. It was in the top 15 for a sixth year in a row. Eller's MBA, for example, ranked 6th overall, so we're doing well there. Finally, in terms of those, there's many others I could list, but the Air Force ROTC unit we have was named the best in the nation. There are a lot of ROTC units, we're the best, which I think is a source of much pride.

We had three excellent ABOR meetings over the last few months since I've spoken to you. In November, we presented a State of the University kind of a presentation. We focused on student success and strategic research initiatives. In December, we had a special meeting in Yuma, where ABOR talked about a particular Regents grant for agriculture, that's going well already. Most importantly, we announced our first and new medical branch in Yuma, where we'll be training 45 MDs in Yuma, that'll be doing their clinical rotations there, and residencies there. Most importantly, the hospital there is paying full ride for those 45 MD students. These students will graduate with no debt and hopefully work in Yuma or other rural areas. So that was a very uplifting board meeting for us in Yuma.

In February, we had a meeting in Phoenix and we the residence hall was approved that was just mentioned, and we also talked about leasing 600-plus acres that we have of land that we couldn't put to other use for 120-megawatt Solar array and a battery storage system. That's another positive thing. So, we're doing well with our strategic imperatives, our focus on student success is going really well. Patty Prelock and her and the team of deans and others are making great progress on the academic success goals. I do want to thank all our faculty for their contributions towards that.

So, on the housing, we will build a new residence hall that'll have about 1,200 beds. There's a lot of evidence that it's very good for retention to have students live on campus, at least for the first year. It also supports our expectation that first-year students should live on campus, which we're putting in place from this fall onwards with the appropriate exceptions. Our study abroad is going well.

As you know, we talked last year about a transformative gift from the Garcia Family Foundation. That gift has sort of encouraged other gifts that are coming in. There was a study abroad fair in January. The study abroad summit in April, and we're also growing our faculty-led study abroad programs, improving advising, etc. I'm very optimistic about where this is going.

On the other kind of advising sort of for our students. We have this milestone advising initiative examining compensation for our advisors, because there's been some significant turnover there, so I'm very optimistic also about our advising work. For tuition and fees. We're holding in-state tuition flat for a third year in a row. We're also working hard on community college and transfer partnerships. Some of you have probably heard that Greg Heileman and his

team have come up with a very easy to use interface that integrates the curricula from these community colleges as well as ours. Students can plan their pathway from the community college to the U of A and not waste a lot of credits. I believe the number is like 30 credits are wasted in these kinds of transfer processes, typically, and we want to avoid that.

In terms of early action, and you'll probably get more details from Provost Prelock, we had about 25,000 applications by the early action deadline. I'm showing a lot of interest from us from students who want to come here. About 6,000 of them marked honors college as an interest to them, and decisions were made by January 15th. We now have about 37,000 total applications, and that number changes all the time. It's probably gone up. The regular decisions have been released every Friday. I want to share, some of you know this because you probably participated, we had our admitted student day. The first one was this past Friday. We had over a thousand attendees. I think that's going well. It shows a lot of interest. The average GPA of students coming in is 3.6, so it's higher than in the past. I just want to remind you that we're focused on recruiting graduates and not just numbers. We're quite pleased with where that's going so far.

I've been engaged across Arizona and on campus. I spoke to the Tucson Rotary Club, some of you there, and the Heads-Up Group, for example. I went and watched the talented student musicians at the annual President's concert. That was a lot of fun. I helped welcome Daphne Barak-Erez, the Supreme Court Justice from Israel as our annual Jeffrey B. Blevin lecture speaker. We had the launch of the Galaxy Slam. I hope some of you participated in that. It basically brings the prominence of our athletics and our prominence in space sciences together. We recognize Marcia Rieke at this event. We had a very nice event for our cleanroom opening. The cleanroom was supported with a \$35 million grant by the ACA and Governor Hobbs. So that room is open now. Most recently I gave the keynote remarks at the Ambassador's Ball in Phoenix. About 500 people, it was very well attended.

I want to share some good news on fundraising with you. We've raised about \$280 million in philanthropic giving so far this year. That compares to about \$180 million at the same time last year. So, our goal for this year, which I very much hope we meet, is about \$400 million, which is a lot higher. Our averages have been on the outer \$250 or so. I think we need to diversify our sources. I think people are responding to our strategic approach, and fundraising is going well. Among examples, we have an endowed College of Science deanship now that we announced at the Galileo Lecture Series. We had a \$20 million anonymous donor that contributed during Giving Day and encouraged with a match other giving. So, we raised more than \$25 million on that day. Our previous record was \$7 million. We're doing well, as I said, in that space.

I also want to say that we have also gone National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University (NYCU). We met with TSMC, obviously, the very large semiconductor Behemoth that is engaged very much in Arizona as well. Other companies, the space agency there, National Taiwan University as well, the Education Ministry, etc. We worked with a Brookings-like Institute there called CAPRI at a nice alumni gathering. So that was a short, but very eventful trip. I've also been in India recently, as have some of our colleagues. We've had meetings with universities and government agencies. We're advancing semiconductor partnerships there as well with Intel Applied Materials and Synopsys and others.

Finally, I'll be reminiscent noting our athletics prowess. Things are going really well. We've had one of the best years in athletics. I was at the women's triathlon second national championship. It was a really nice event. Of course, men's basketball is off to a hot start. Tonight, we have a game, and if we win that, we'll clinch the Big 12 championship seat there. The Casino del Sol Stadium that we've got a naming rights for came in at \$60 million over 20 years. In the McKale Center, we kept the name McKale and added at ALKEME Arena to it. We get just about just over \$27 million over a 15-year period. It's the largest deal in the Big 12. The exciting thing in both these cases, but especially McKale, is that the company is led by U of A alums, and they're very excited about partnering with Eller and others in terms of entrepreneurship and leadership, etc. So those are some just good things happening. Happy to take a couple of questions.

Questions and Comments [00:36:43]

- Chair Hudson asked if President Garimella can explain the financing of the Mortenson CHF deal so faculty can better understand what is going on.
- President Garimella stated there are a lot of documents on the ABOR website which he also encouraged Chair Hudson to share with the Faculty Senate. This includes a lot of detail including the resolutions that were passed and data provided, there have also been articles written about this
- President Garimella stated the UA is not incurring debt and Moody's and S&P were notified about this. The S&P outlook is improved even after these discussions. This is a real estate transaction where the UA provides a ground lease. Mortenson will purchase the property from its current owner, Collegiate Housing Foundation (CHF) will issue bonds in May, and purchase the property from Mortenson. The property will then be conveyed to the UA, where there will then be a ground lease to them and student support will be offered. Essentially, they'll be managed like a resident hall and part of those listings.
- President Garimella stated if all goes well, by Fall 2028, there should be about 1,200 new beds that align with the desire to have first-year students on campus and allows improvements to the housing stock and allows other stock to be taken offline. There will be more details provided in the future.
- Senator Ziurys stated her thanks for President Garimella attending the meeting. She is concerned about the new resident hall as it is supposed to be a very tall building which can be an eyesore in the Old Pueblo area. She asked if this is necessary.

- President Garimella stated this kind of development, a parallel one, was approved by the City Council who has been working on this for some time. The UA took because the project wasn't moving forward. There can be more information provided. He believes there needs to be UA-ran student housing. He doesn't think that location is doing anyone favors in terms of how it looks and how it is being used, therefore, he believes it to be an improvement for what currently exists.
- Senator Rafelski stated the height of buildings limits the ability of a fire brigade to provide rescue in case of a fire. He is unsure of whether Tucson has this capacity or the height of the building. He knows this has been approved, but if something happens, the UA is responsible which is a concern to be looked at.
- President Garimella stated he is sure his people will be looking at this.

C. Provost Prelock [00:41:09]

Hello, everyone. Danielle, it was so fun to hear about all the Fulbrights. Congratulations to all our faculty who represent us around the country and world. I have my report. I'm not going to read it to you. The President talked about all the searches we have. Just as a reminder, most of the searches, when they have the forums, it's both online. and in person. I encourage you, if you're interested, to participate. I've been trying to go to as many forums as possible. Last week we had two Law candidates. This week we have two more, and the College of Pharmacy will be end of March and beginning of April, and then CALES (Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences) will be the end of April, and the very first week in May. I really appreciate the search committees who are doing hard work but bringing in excellent candidates.

In terms of admitted student visit day, the President already talked to you a little bit about this, but the next 2two days are March 20th and April 11th. Just to give you some sense of the decision making and missions, I know people are very anxious, we are as well, because admission of students means financial pieces and planning for our curriculum. What we're hearing across the nation is that most publics are seeing fewer large numbers of applicants, particularly in the Rocky Mountain area, which is us. More students are choosing not to go to college, and many more are choosing to go to community colleges first. That's why our community college effort is so important.

We do have a strong pool of applicants, as the President said, we get applications every single day. I just want to make sure that you understand early action is very different than regular action. Early action where you saw the numbers of students and those who are interested in, the Honors College were the ones who came first. Those are usually eager students who really want U of A. What I did learn from Friday is that we had a 91% turnout rate, which is huge for students who register ahead of time and then actually show up, and we're looking to see how many put down their admissions fee. That's always a good sign. The research says about 50% will come. My goal is we should have 75% or more. Once they see us, see the university and see the amazing faculty, I think that is important.

Financial aid packages are being prepared for this week for students. Once we start financial aid packages, that will also, we'll see an increase in admissions. Typically, our yield has been about 19.3% or 19.4%. Our goal is to average about 23 to 25%. So that means a lot of work. Our faculty, staff, and deans are doing a really good job, and our peer ambassadors are doing a really good job, and we're hoping they will continue to do that in supporting the students who have been admitted to encouraging them to apply.

The President talked about many of our strategies. Our Yuma strategy is going well. We have 4 working groups who are meeting regularly and are developing plans to really focus on our areas. We are working with Arizona Western Community College (AWC) in several areas. We're building up our UA Yuma presence. We're working closely with Cooperative Extension, and the experiment stations, and YCEDA, which is a public private partnership in Yuma, and we're working with the Yuma proving grounds and the Marine Air Force Base who are looking for training and support for their communities.

We also have a task force on alcohol and drug education prevention and policy, and there are three subcommittees there, Prevention and education, research and data, sales and sponsorship. I just did a charge with them a couple of weeks ago. It's a great group, a lot of faculty researchers who are leading the research and data subcommittee, and we have students on those committees as well.

Academic success goals. On the 28th of January, I met with our leads, and they engaged in an implementation surge. For our community of practice, individuals are meeting, and their first session was held in February, so it's great to have ongoing faculty and staff engagement. Just a note, part of our academic success goals requires that we have some data to support the movement that we're seeing, and most of you are probably aware of the NSE, which is the National Student Survey of Student Engagement. That is for first-year students and seniors. That is going to go out March 16th through May 11th. It's important that we encourage our students to participate in that. Please encourage them to participate. The more data we get, the better we can see how we are meeting our benchmarks and beyond, and if we're achieving what we want.

The thing that's going to be new, for the first time the university is going to administer the FSE, which is the faculty survey of student engagement to get faculty input. It measures instructional staff expectations for student engagement and effective educational practices. This is linked to high levels of learning and development. That will be administered between March 17th through May 11th to all faculty who are teaching undergraduate courses. I really ask that you participate in that.

Lisa, I really appreciated your focus on the sexual assault area, very important to me as well. We developed a whole new program at my previous institution, and there are good models out there. I know Mary Beth Tucker has been working with a group and trying to reintegrate some training and Student Affairs and Campus Health. They are willing and able to do that. I think the training is something that we absolutely can make happen, and they're soliciting feedback on how the training working is, and what needs to be changed. I've also talked with our ASUA group and our GPSC group about the need for this. The one thing I do want to clarify, I think there was some misunderstanding about compliance. We are fully compliant with Cleary and VAWA. I just wanted to make sure that that was corrected.

Questions and Comments [00:48:53]

- Senator Cerny stated his thanks for the Provost's report and said it is an honor to ask questions. Some of his peers reached out to him concerning a program from the provost office on opportunities for recruitment of new faculty members. This means about 20 new faculty members related to the AI field. Some of his peers were concerned with respect to competitive recruitment of faculty members, because most of the departments will likely have zero recruiting this year or next year. His peers would better appreciate it if people could be recruited in a competitive because most of the departments know their needs, and weaknesses. This can be done to better serve students.
- Senator Cerny stated oftentimes the opportune recruit may not be the best person that suits the needs, because there was not a full search completed. He asked if Provost Prelock can elaborate on why the opportunity to recruit is seen as a better direction rather than traditional competitive recruitment as his department did in the past.
- Provost Prelock stated she may have not heard the entire question but clarified whether Senator Cerny is referring to cluster hires.
- Senator Cerny confirmed he is referring to cluster hires.
- Provost Prelock stated she is unsure of where he received this information as the cluster hires are competitive hires and not opportunity hires. There are opportunity hires at some level, and every college has requested these of her, especially if there are multiple candidates who are outstanding and the college thought they could only manage one. Cluster hires are in the five research areas, AI, health, mining, air, land, and agriculture, cybersecurity, national security, and space and fusion energy.
- Provost Prelock stated the cluster hires are designed to encourage faculty to group together with colleges, and across colleges. There must be at least two colleges that work together. It is desired to bring in five individuals in each of those areas over the next five years. Whether that will happen or not, they are given the opportunity. She will be paying half of those salaries for the first two years and VPR Diaz de la Rubia will be providing half of the startup for those hires to incentivize the college to engage in them.
- Provost Prelock stated this does not mean that colleges that have other needs will not have faculty support. It is part of their allocation of funds. They've identified what they need to meet as far as their teaching, instructional, and research needs. Most of the significant faculty hires can occur in those areas and the opportunity for more support is being looked at. She is aware that some deans feel they may not be able to do half of the salary or startup, so they are looking at creative ways of supporting them. Those will be competitive searches.
- Senator Brochin stated she is a part of the College of Education who has been following admissions very closely. One of the issues they have found, due to the rollout and timing of the early action model is that the timing inhibited them from getting in front of students' needs with partner districts to continue to meet the land grant mission and the workforce needs of Southern Arizona in particular.
- Senator Brochin asked for more information why students were not admitted so they can work with partner districts so they can know the criteria. An example of this is knowing why students were denied. There are huge student-to-counselor ratios and many districts in Southern Arizona don't have the curriculum where they could easily add or roll out changes if their curriculum is informing these decisions.
- Senator Brochin stated in the College of Education, there were 555 admitted students but only 39 accepted which feels particularly low. It seems some colleges are even 7% and others are considerably higher. Her college is finding that there is a length of time, as long as 10 business days, to get information out to students who have been admitted, as these messages are delivered through Slate. Some of these processes are impeding the ability to yield more students, at least in her college, which they are feeling the stress of. She imagines that the Provost, as she shared in her speech, that admissions will come later, but she wonders how there can be to get more students to commit by May 1st to achieve a comparable goal like last year.
- Senator Brochin stated she wonders about the number or percentage of students who have accepted across the university, because they keep hearing about the ones who have been admitted. The percentages that have been accepted within each college may be useful to understand if there are proportional differences across colleges. This is where the conversations are happening.
- Senator Brochin stated she is also curious about plans for next year as Spring is approaching, where high school juniors are thinking about their decisions next year. She asked if there are ways which district partnerships can be strengthened to prevent or anticipate the challenges seen with this rollout.
- Provost Prelock stated the acceptance rate has been at 82%. Partnership is always something important. Education is a high touch framework that is committed to the land grant mission. She believes there are future opportunities to work with the schools. They have a holistic approach to admissions and rubrics are not shared as this is a confidential blind process to ensure everyone undergoes a fair process.
- Provost Prelock stated she will allow Kristina Wong Davis to share strategies to support colleges as every Friday, more applications go out, and it is a process. She knows there have been delays, and they are working on these

delays as this is a collaboration between slate enrollment management, reviewing applications, and UITS.

- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated their current turnaround is two to three days at most, if not less. This depends on whether data has updated which is complicated when one is moving data back and forth between systems. Sometimes there is a 24-hour delay, but otherwise, there is a two to three turnaround at most.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated regarding the question related to who gets admitted and who doesn't this is a holistic process where she always reminds people that there is a reason to find a student admissible. They are looking for ways in which they can pull a student in and ensure they will be successful while being thoughtful about not setting students up for success.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated what they have found with some students they haven't been able to offer admission to refers to not having an academic background in preparation, as spelled out by ABOR admissions requirements. This is what has been really followed, and they are trying to ensure every student who is ABOR eligible is admitted. Not every student has been ABOR eligible and that threshold is stated for all three state institutions which should be used to ensure students will be successful on every campus.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated there have been few students denied relative to the size of the application pool and those who have been admitted. They are very excited as they know they can be successful, and they believe there are still many more students yet to come within this process. Students are being admitted each week, and it is a moving process.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated she is excited about the financial aid packages going out as they are sitting at a 37% Pell eligibility rate in the Arizona resident admitted poll. This is even higher than last year. Hopefully now, with their financial aid packages going out, there will be a good uptake.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated there are two months from May 1, at this point, there is still time for students to sit and consider what their acceptance is going to be in the Fall. Most students decide on the last day of April at 11:59 PM, which is true student behavior, even when it comes to submitting essays, portfolios, or anything in their academic coursework. The same holds true for the admission process.
- Secretary Zeiders stated her thanks for both individuals attending the meeting and sharing their process. She believes there is a lot of worry and stress coming from faculty regarding numbers, rightly so. Net tuition revenue is one of the things that drives universities and colleges. Deans are coming into all funds meetings, not quite sure about what their numbers will be.
- Secretary Zeiders stated there is a \$480 enrollment fee that is non-refundable which is a change from last year. There is also a slight change in how students can change from majors. Regarding numbers, President Garimella stated about 25,000 students were accepted, if 80% of those students were admitted, that would be about 20,000 individuals. If the yield is 20%, this is less than 4,000 students. She is aware there are more applications coming in, but she asked if there is an anticipated class of 5,000 to 6,000 or if the University is aiming for 7,000 or even 9,500 students which was had previously and in 2024.
- Provost Prelock stated the acceptance rate is about 82%, they're looking for a 23 to 25% yield. It was at about 18% in the past. The goal is to increase in yields. They're looking for the 7,000 to 8,000 range and will never be back at the 9,500 range.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated the 25,000 figure was just the early action applications but there have been 37,000 applicants and more coming in since. The enrollment fee is non-refundable, but this has always existed. If a student has need, the fee can be deferred until the Fall term so that the financial aid package covers the enrollment fee. Needy students are not being penalized or harmed in any way. This is an enrollment fee to track how many students intend to enroll.
- Chair Hudson stated she has a question from an anonymous advisor, "Given the volume and pace of changes being implemented for summer orientation, including the removal of mandatory placement testing and the shift to student self-scheduled appointments, what is the specific measurable plan to prevent advisor burnout and attrition this summer? And what accountability structure exists if advising capacity is overwhelmed?"
- Provost Prelock stated there are two advising task forces working right now. One is looking at how to provide all advisors with the education and training and support that they need, so they can be successful. The second is a compensation committee to recognize that the compensation for our advisors is not where it should be, and the Provost is making an investment in that. Each college is being looked at and compared to the national standard which is about one advisor to 250 students or so. This is being examined within all funds process, which she forgot to mention. There have been two, and she has had five this week, she will have several more over the next month. One thing are they making sure of is there will not be cuts to advisors to ensure the advising initiatives that exist are being supported.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated placements are still required and that has not changed. Colleges can choose how they would like to use the pre-schedule. Some colleges have chosen not to it. She cannot speak to that advisor's experience and their college's decision. Some have chosen not to use it, some are using it for some courses, and others are using it for all courses. This is a varied landscape in that regard.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis stated her team is working

very closely with the advising community in preparation for summer orientation as it is an extension of yield. They don't want to lose any of those students over the summer, and this will be a very important period.

6. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – Chair of Undergraduate Council, Joost van Haren, and Chair of Graduate Council, Phillip Waddel – [Acceptability of Graduate Transfer Credit and Policy Benchmarking](#), [Substitutions for Approved General Education Courses](#), [Posthumous Degree and Posthumous Certification of Achievement](#), [Course Types and Components](#) [01:06:54]**

Chair of Undergraduate Council, Joost van Haren [01:07:26]

I will talk about the undergraduate proposal. There's are undergraduate proposals policy changes that are moving forward. One is a Substitution for Approved General Education Courses, policy change. This represents a shift of the approval of general education course substitutions from the departments or colleges to the Office of General Education. This centralization ensures that students who change their major will not uncomplete requirements. With that, makes it all simpler, more straightforward. Colleges will still do this for their majors and minors and so forth. This is just for the general education courses that students would want to substitute.

The second one is Posthumous Degree and the Posthumous Certificate Achievement Policy. This allows students who are likely to complete their degree due to either death or debilitating or terminal illness that they can receive a recognition for their time at the University of Arizona. Of course, we hope that this policy will never be needed. But if it is, it's in place.

The third one is the Course Types and Components Type upgrade. This policy includes all course types. Previous policy did not have all course types that we have on the books included in the policy. Secondly, it includes a clinical course type. For the medical and veterinary schools and so forth, it removes contact hours, since they are already addressed in the credit definitions policy. It broadens the language to accommodate class sizes and afford different departments more flexibility with core course types like studio, lab, and workshop. Those are the three current on the consent agenda from the Undergraduate Council.

Chair of Graduate Council, Phillip Waddel [01:10:11]

The policies for the grad counsel are very similar to the ones Joost just went through for Undergraduate. We also have a Posthumous degree and Posthumous Certification of Achievement and fixing the Course Types and Components.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-29]** **[Motion 2025/26-30]**, **[Motion 2025/26-31]**, and **[Motion 2025/26-32]** to approve the Consent Agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

7. **OLD BUSINESS [01:10:48]**

A. [Constitution](#) and [Bylaws](#) Update and [President's Memo](#) – Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders [01:10:59]

Hi everybody. I was asked to come and give an update on the Constitution and Bylaws committee work. A few things that are that you should be informed about.

Last academic year, the Senate approved two changes to the Faculty Bylaws. We added postdoc representation to Faculty Senate, and we had a change in the Nominating Committee procedures for the CAFT ballot selection. The changes were voted on by General Faculty, and then they were approved by General Faculty, and then sent to the office of the President and reviewed. On February 12th, the President's Office issued a memo. I've sent this to all Senators, and it's also going to be linked in the agenda. The President's office approved the first change, the inclusion of the postdoc, which is great. We have a new postdoc representative on the Senate Geovana Leite. Thank you for joining us. It's a great inclusion.

The second change that we put forth forward was disapprove, the change to the process of the Nominating Committee related to CAFT. So again, I sent this to all the senators to review. I can summarize the concerns expressed by the President's office. First, in making that change, there was a lack of either majority support or minimum vote percentage requirements for the candidates to be elected to CAFT. The risk of nullification of votes and results if multiple candidates in college run for CAFT on the same ballot. Then, the change would disrupt the existing CAFT process and the work being done. I expressed a bit of frustration on this change, in part because this change was brought about to alleviate the Nominating Committee's role in selecting CAFT folks for the ballot. There's been some scrutiny of that process, and there was a lot of pressure on those folks to reduce the names to appear on the ballot. We're kind of back at square one here and thinking about a solution. I know my successor here, Susan, will lead the committee in thinking about a resolution to this next year. We'll start on it this year, but likely to be more discussed more next year. I wanted to report on that.

I did want to briefly mention the constitutional changes that we have coming up, and we hope that that is on the runoff election ballot. Just a reminder, these changes were approved by you all, the Faculty Senate in December. They included the removal of Article 2, Section 2, which prohibits faculty from who are seeking degrees from the UA to be members of General Faculty. The second change is related to Article 2, Section 1 and Section 5 is revising the general faculty definition to include ^{career} track faculty with 0.5 FTE or greater.

We are holding a General Faculty meeting on March 4th from 2:00 to 3:00 PM. We will describe these changes. We will answer questions about these changes and describe the rationale of why we're pursuing this.

B. Discussion on Honorary Degrees – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:15:15]

I don't have a lot to add to the process that we've already been through on honorary degrees. We definitely had our vote. We conveyed that vote officially to the President and the Provost. We corresponded about that. We've discussed it. C11 has also written to the senior leadership requesting information about how a degree can be granted without some formal faculty process.

I have also let the President know that I am more than happy to convene an emergency Executive Session meeting of the Senate should he choose to present the people that he is putting forward to the Senate for our approval. Of course, as you know, these are generally not contentious decisions. It's usually simply a chance for the faculty to appreciate the nominations, to vet them, to discuss them, and to put on the formal seal of approval that, I think in most interpretations, is necessary for any kind of degree, whether earned or honorary or symbolic. I'm not sure that there is a lot more that we can do since the President appears to want to own the honorary degree policy and to exclude the elected representative representatives of the faculty from it.

I will communicate one more time, unless you all object, that it is not appropriate to assign a degree without the formal approval of the Faculty Senate, and that the President might want to consider more accurately describing it as a Presidential Award, rather than an honorary degree. Senator Witte has reminded me that for the purposes of the people receiving these degrees, it might be appropriate for us to let them know that it's not actually a degree. It is a Presidential Award and initiative, rather than an honorary degree. If that's splitting hairs, so be it, but I think we need to alleviate any confusion as to whether this is a degree or not. I'm happy to take questions and suggestions, but I'm not ready to litigate this in court yet.

Questions and Comments [01:17:51]

- Senator Rafalski stated he has been thinking about a compromise and wonders if Chair Hudson can suggest that there would be an Honorary Degree committee of the Senate, which would be a smaller group of people. The President and Dean may feel more comfortable about discussing awards.
- Chair Hudson stated her thanks for the suggestion and said she would think about it. There is already a committee convened by the President and the Chief of Staff of the President, but it doesn't include, except for the Secretary of the Faculty, elected representatives of the Faculty.
- Chair Hudson stated Stacey Cochran will point out, as currently configured, that committee exclusive to regents and distinguished professors who have been hand selected.
- Senator Cochran stated regarding the President's behavior, he was taking notes as the President spoke with the Senate and there were concerns raised as it seems there is a lack of emotional attunement between the President and the body of the faculty. It seems the President is dismissive of the Faculty's concerns, and this pattern seems to be emerging. Conflict tends to happen when someone is not attuned with another.
- Senator Cochran stated as many others may have noticed, President Garimella leaves very quickly after meetings and that has the effect of communicating that he is not present with the Faculty Senate which is deeply concerning.
- Chair Hudson stated she will continue to do her best and calls on the rest of the Senate to help her, as perhaps it is her fault as the representative of the faculty that she has offset the vibe. She believes the answer to this would be more participation rather than less.
- Chair Hudson stated the Faculty Senate will continue to struggle as they are, and she will do her best to have a productive line of communication with the President and she will work overtime on this. She will also communicate more.
- Senator Ziurys stated she must echo what Senator Cochran says, the President doesn't seem very engaged with the faculty and most of the administration doesn't seem concerned about what the faculty want and the faculty welfare. This seems to be illustrated in the higher number of CAFT cases and attempts to dismiss faculty and remove their tenure without due course of inquiry and so forth.
- Senator Ziurys stated this is an issue that needs to be taken up in the Senate because faculty are an extremely important part of the University who should not be ignored, treated poorly, or pushed around. Without good faculty, good students won't be recruited. Enrollment will go down as it seems to be doing. She is aware of a lot of faculty looking for new jobs due to the poor morale and atmosphere of the University which is the fault of the administration. Chair Hudson stated she will redouble her efforts and will be more firm and charming and will work with the task force that has been recently set up with Jenna Rickus and Richard Cate to attempt to negotiate some of the persistent issues in a slightly less public setting. She will report back to the Senate.
- Senator Witte stated she agrees with the previous speaker, she believes what is occurring with the dormitory on Campbell and Speedway will involve the community. She is in the neighborhood, but she is not active. She can ensure everyone that is not what they ever expected or were promised. Business on Park Avenue and University Blvd. will be affected.
- Senator Witte stated the dormitory is at the busiest intersection in Tucson. There is already almost no parking in the Medical School, Health Sciences Center, and the hospital. She predicts this may not happen and is very interested.

She believes the community should be involved in all these things that happen when honorary degrees are given, when the university is for sale, or when strategic initiatives are made up out of thin air.

- Senator Witte stated there is no knowledge of the Conflicts of Interest on the Board of Regents. There is some indication that there are very distinct Conflicts of Interest with student housing, particularly in partnerships that are being engaged in. She hopes the community at large, not just university communities, realizes that all this matters and they are going downhill. This concerns her as she has been at the University since Harvill brought the University to the position of a rising and exciting place. Others have maintained it to some degree, but never with the universal kind of curriculum that was aboard at the time of President Harvill.
- Chair Hudson stated she will keep the Senate informed of the state of the negotiations. When the Senate has been excluded, decisions should be owned. Her and others are always asking questions and following up.

C. Discussion of the [Master Space Plan](#) – Chief Facilities and Planning Officer, Josh Wright [01:25:37]

Good afternoon, everybody. Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer. Chair Hudson told me before the meeting that you all enjoyed having me here so much last month, you couldn't wait to have me back for two months in a row. So here I am again.

I do have two of my colleagues. today from my team here in facilities and planning who we're going to go through the presentation with you. We're going to talk about a couple things. We were asked to talk about what we began talking about last time, which was our environmental health and safety group, which is new. This is bringing together of lots of different functions on campus that we think is really important, and then we'll transition over into the campus Master Plan and give you a little bit of an update on that, and of course, we welcome your involvement and your commentary on that, and we'll show you how to do that as we move forward in that process as well.

So let me start by reintroducing Leon Harris, who is our Senior Director of Environmental Health and Safety, and then after him is Trevor Ledbetter, who is part of our core team working on the Master Plan, and he is our Senior Director of the Office of Sustainability.

Leon Harris, Senior Director, Environmental Health and Safety [01:27:00]

I know we covered quite a bit of ground last time in a short amount of time. So, thank you for your patience, and thank you for allowing me to breeze through our discussion last time. I'm going to just kind of rehash what we covered last time, just to give a quick summary and overview. I think we've made it most of the way through, but I just wanted to take the opportunity again just to clear up any confusion, or if you have any questions to be available to you all to answer those.

As of October of 2025, we have established a new Environmental Health and Safety group. We've taken environmental compliance, fire and life safety and occupational safety programs, and combined them with occupational health, and our research lab safety program, and developed the Environmental Health and Safety Unit that we have currently. As part of that EHS program, we have a research safety team, and that team is really focused on facilitating research. We're here to serve as your safety and compliance partner and support any research you have going on in the strategic initiatives of the institution.

We've talked a little bit about program scope during the last time I was here. We have roughly 650 PIs, about 7,000 people registered with some service at EHS. We have about 3,000 lab spaces, and we conduct about 1,200 inspections annually. The takeaway from the slide here is I strongly believe our research safety program is trending in the right direction. Mainly, that the number of critical findings that we have, the ones that would impact human health, significant noncompliance from our regulators, is down about 70% all during the same period where we have experienced some real growth on the research front.

The last time I was here, we briefly talked about the number of services that we offer for our research stakeholders. I could stand up here for a while to talk about all the things that we can partner with you all on, but lab onboarding, offboarding, we do routine safety inspections. We provide training that is customize to the need for the researcher, equipment calibration for a regulatory compliance survey. We provide those calibration services free of charge in-house. as well as several other surveys or assessments. We can provide those for your researcher's activities as well.

The big one here that I want to touch on is regulatory support. So, we're here to liaise with all the regulators. Whether it's OSHA, whether it's the Bureau of Radiation Control, whomever it might be, we are here to partner with you and to answer any questions, report any of the items that may be reportable to those regulators. We're here to provide that service for our research community.

Next is incident response. Any incident, big, small, even near misses, we have a policy or process in place. We'll investigate, we will act, and we will monitor once we've been made aware. We have a plan in place to follow up on any incident that we've been made aware of, and we track that to completion.

We have a brand-new website. It's live finally, we're still building. We're about 4 months into the merge, so we're still building. Ehs.arizona.edu is the place where you can find and learn more about all the services that we offer. We do have this PI registration form. It's one of the ways that we get our researchers in contact with the services that we provide at EHS. It's a great way for us to kind of connect and get them sort of a one-stop shop approach to all the

services that they might need from EHS. We also have a report of safety concern. We like to shop this. If there's ever anything that you see around campus, this is a great place where you can go and you can share your concern, and we're happy to follow up with you all just to make sure that things are being addressed timely and adequately.

Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer [01:31:29]

Transitioning to talk about the campus master plan, just to set the stage a little bit. The campus master plan is an ABOR required initiative. So, on a roughly 10-year horizon, we are required to develop the campus master plan, and the ABOR policies dictates the transition or the interpretation of the strategic imperatives of the university into the built environment. You think about the physical space, everything that we can see and touch on campus every day. In this case, we're talking about the Tucson main campus. That's the focus of this master plan. We do other master plans for other campuses that we have around the state, but we're interpreting the physical growth, the boundaries, the kind of overall experience that we look at. In terms of a lot of different features, so not only kind of just new buildings or renovated buildings, but also things like mobility and how we get around campus, the safety of the campus, things like that. Anything that's in the built environment is what we're talking about with the master plan.

We began working on the master plan some time ago. There were some starts and stops related to COVID, related to the university's financial challenges. We're about 75% of the way done. We picked this back up last fall, and so this is the final 25% push, if you will, to actually get a final plan in place. This would then go to university leadership for their review, and then ultimately does get voted on by the Board of Regents, and we're anticipating that would happen sometime later this year. This is roughly the calendar and the schedule of where we are. You can see kind of approximately where we are here.

We are continuing to make this a deliberately inclusive and welcoming process. We've had lots of discussion with everything from neighborhood groups to specific departments and faculty, researchers. We've invited different stakeholder groups, different teams to come into the process at all different times. We have a project website you can go to as well where you can comment at any time. We've had several faculty that have chimed in and said, what about this or have you thought about that? We do respond to every one of those inquiries personally. So, with that, I'll turn it over to Trevor Ledbetter to let you know a little bit about some of the themes and where we're going next.

Trevor Ledbetter, Senior Director, Office of Sustainability [01:33:49]

On the timeline slide you all can see that that arrow is sometime in January. I think our timeline got stretched a little bit, but we are, of course, just after the start of March. We had a few on-campus, both advisory group and more focused stakeholder meetings last week. As Josh mentioned, since October, November, when we started this up again, we've had several very targeted engagement meetings, and those have spanned the gamut from neighborhood associations and our community relations folks into research and specialized facilities, looking at our utilities, space management, and everything in between.

With that, we've identified a number of both critical and emerging critical spaces that require some deeper investigation, and that could look like demolition, or it could look like a more intentional repurposing of the space that we have. As Josh mentioned, I am the Senior Director for the Office of Sustainability, so we are very much in favor of reusing the space that we have, where and how we can. It's, of course, also the most efficient and effective use of the resources that we have as an institution.

Really importantly and timely, we've also taken a very close look at connectivity and pedestrian and bike safety on and near campus. With that, folks who have been here for, I think, just over 15 years, some of you will remember that second street used to be closed for a good stretch before the streetcar came in and reopened it I think in 2012, give or take. We have sort of reopened the conversations about what it looks like to reprioritize pedestrian and bike. spaces on campus and look to exclude private vehicles in certain areas while maintaining access both for service and accessibility needs.

We've also continued to discuss the evolving space needs post COVID, both for students, but also for employees, and really looking at faculty and staff needs with that. We're really looking at how we continue to grow our collaborative classroom spaces while also emphasizing flexibility in that. We're also looking at trying to do the same when it comes to office and lab space across the board.

For those of you who saw last week's Lo Que Pasa article, we have also sort of identified several emerging trends with the master plan and the direction that we're going since our restart. So first and foremost, as Josh mentioned, this is a plan required by ABOR, and really the master plan is meant to operationalize our strategic plan or our strategic imperatives. We are looking to ensure that the master plan is both aligned with our strategic imperatives but also sets the stage for alignment of college level and departmental level strategic planning or things within that.

We're also looking at strategic infrastructure renewal. We all know that we have a lot of deferred maintenance. There are a lot of needs on this campus in a lot of different buildings. We're really looking at how we integrate that into this plan to ensure that we're renewing academic spaces, research spaces, and student spaces, both within and outside of the sort of housing perspective.

With that, we're also really focused on the student experience and that, of course, goes beyond our dorms on campus and gets into common areas, libraries, study spaces, our unions, where students eat and do everything beyond that.

I already mentioned circulation and safety, so we're also looking at how we expand our open spaces and really improve our dedicated bike and pedestrian routes, both on and off campus. So how we connect from campus into our neighborhoods around campus and how we do that safely, especially in those higher traffic areas like Euclid and like Speedway and 6th.

Finally, we're also looking very closely at infill and redevelopment. So how do we strengthen the campus core? Again, through looking at some of those critical and emerging critical spaces but also looking at how we densify the campus core and how we meet needs like parking and accessibility. Given time, that's my very high-level update. I'm happy to answer questions. But as Josh mentioned, the draft plan we are looking at completing in April should be on our masterplan.arizona.edu website. As Josh mentioned, if anyone has any input, any questions, please feel free to email us at masterplan@arizona.edu. Both I, Josh and several others on campus check that email daily and get back to folks individually. So, thank you very much.

Questions and Comments [01:39:53]

- Senator Ziurys asked what the department is doing about decrepit moldy buildings on campus that faculty and students are forced to be in. She also stated she does not want to hear they don't exist as she has plenty of pictures that people have sent her which include terrible buildings.
- Senator Ziurys stated regarding deferred maintenance, what will this department do while people are currently getting sick in them.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated there are buildings in all different states. There are buildings that are brand new and in fantastic condition, and everything is rated on a fitness facilities condition index. There are also buildings in challenging conditions which he feels everyone realized. He would like to distinguish terminology between a building unsafe to occupy and a building in poor condition.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated they take safety issues very seriously and he wants individuals to report these issues. They will do an analysis and figure out whether there is a real problem which poses a risk to health and human safety. These issues are addressed immediately.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated there are some buildings which need serious attention from a maintenance perspective, and this is part of the campus master plan that has been designed to address and identify these types of issues. There has been a lot of time spent on where those opportunities for long-term solutions will be. In some cases, the building may have passed its useful life and doesn't have value to the institutional mission anymore. It may be time to repurpose the building into something else or take it down. In some cases, this may make the most sense, then relocation of operations must be considered.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated there are several buildings that are being looked at soon because they have reached that stage. They are finding ways to move those individuals to other locations and continue operations to ensure there is quality building stock. At the same time, they are looking at how to invest in buildings, so they don't get to that level of status, with the current financial resources. These things are being taken very seriously in this plan.
- Senator M. Smith stated she has a concern about light pollution on campus which seems to be totally ignored, and she believes this should be a major concern regarding the environment. Light pollution has reached exceeding levels that has never occurred on the campus, within the last year. There seems to be no consideration in this team's planning and thinking about strategic initiatives regarding concern for these types of environmental issues.
- Senator M. Smith stated Tucson is concerned about environmental issues as they are a leading astronomy center. These individuals are creating significant light pollution which has been measured and reported on internationally. This is currently occurring on campus. The creation of such pollution can ruin the University's international reputation and the connection with the entire astronomical world. This is meant to support astronomy and dark skies, and she is unsure why the university is going in this direction with regards to light pollution.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated Senator M. Smith's points are well received and this is one of the reasons Trevor Ledbetter is a leader on the campus and is involved in the Master Plan through the Office of Sustainability. They want to imbue a sustainability element into their campus planning across the entire Campus Master Plan.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated this is why this team is very ingrained in terms of light pollution specifically. Tucson is an internationally recognized dark sky community which has adopted dark sky principles. The University follows those principles.
- Senator M. Smith stated the University is not an approved dark sky community. It was the founding of the international organization that now operates on six continents for protecting dark skies. Tucson is not an approved dark sky site.
- Josh Wright, Chief Facilities and Planning Officer stated they do use dark sky principles and they are in their development codes used for reviewing university projects.

8. NEW BUSINESS [01:46:44]

A. Information Technology Update – CIO Elliot Cheu

Thanks for letting me come talk. Today's agenda, based on what we've been hearing, you know, there's some discussion about restructuring, about support, and about cybersecurity. All those are key. We have several things also that are not on the slide but been very instrumental that's happened over the past year. A ton of changes on email that I'll bring into.

We moved basically all our students, alums and retirees off Gmail onto Outlook. We moved over 200,000 accounts, to best my knowledge, we did not lose any data in that process, and it went relatively smoothly. Some people prefer Gmail, I understand that, but from a security and usability sense, it's actually better for all of us to be on the same system rather than trying to lose things for the transition, that was a big deal.

Two other things that I'm excited that came out worked out really well from the IT side. I know most of you haven't, I know Shufang has used the mobile ID. This is your phone as a Cat card. We rolled that out. Remember, we have 50,000 students, and you put 17,000 or so employees and DCCs. That process went relatively smoothly. A couple hiccups. I like interesting facts. 93% of our incoming first-year students adopted the mobile cat card. The 7% is interesting. Some people really like that physical card. We had to change over 3,000 readers on campus just to make it work, as well as all the POS systems, the point-of-sale systems. You can use your watch. About 94% of students are using iPhones. The ones who are using Android are International Students.

On the centralization part, we consolidated IT support infrastructure into a single unit. The reason that that's important is to provide a much more robust system for campus. It seems like I know people who said they a good relationship with one person. Often that was one person. We now have a team that can back each other up. In fact, I'm trying to go through the whole UITS system and have lunch with them, which is about 700 people now. I had lunch with 110 people. One of them said, you know, I was working by myself in my own unit, but I really liked the camaraderie, having a community to work with and the fact that when I go on vacation, nobody's calling me because there's a team to back it up. While it may seem like we've gone through a massive change, we went from an organization of 350 people to nearly 1,000. It's now smaller than that because people went back and things like that. Generally speaking, it was fairly challenging to finish.

The last one is interesting. We're now moving to a single ticketing system. I know people hate ticketing systems, but we had 13 ticketing systems just for support on campus. So having one is a better system than having 13 that don't talk to each other. Now we have a single way for people to follow the ticket through, get better analytics, understand what's happening. Often those tickets are often handled kind of on the back end. A lot of times you're not submitting a ticket. You're calling up somebody. When you call our 24-7 hotline, that creates a ticket that allows us to track what's happening with that. We can go back and figure out what happened, and we can improve our customer service. I go and read them and see what happened during this day when we had a bunch of tickets coming through. We can measure why we're having a lot of tickets. We can see what's going on, and we can triage after the fact. Having 13 on campus was a little bit challenging. I think there are 70 units that are going to be using ticketing systems, and we're down to handful. I think about 60 or so are now using the central ticketing system. So, a lot of success in that.

On the support side, the way to think about support, at least from a faculty point of view, is there are four buckets of support. Most of the time you don't have to figure out what they are. We'll deal with figuring it out. You call us, we'll get you to the right place. 24/7 is probably the most common one, when people forget their password, they forget their Net ID, sometimes they use their email address as their Net ID, you know, the whole thing. That's not your net ID., those kinds of things. Sometimes using the wrong password too many times puts a lock in your system. Usually that's kind of a time thing, so it doesn't last forever where you can go into the system a bit later. If you really need to get in the system, you can call up, we'll get you back in the system. 24/7 works well.

If it happens that that's not what you need, that kind of upfront quick service is something like you need to upgrade your Windows machine or Apple machine, or whatever it is that you need to, that goes into our enterprise support group. They're the ones who might come out to your office and do what they do behind the scenes to get your laptop up and working. We deal with that, so you don't need to know that we have these systems, but we kind of have a handoff. The 24/7 is just front and center, but they will direct you to the right place.

There are also instructional technologies. This is classroom support. One of the things that people don't realize in the centralization, we went from about 250-ish classrooms that we support to over 850. So, there's been a huge amount of work that we've been doing to understand what all those spaces are. This past summer we had an infusion of money. We're able to upgrade a lot of the technology, and we're doing that again this year. So, you should start to see a lot of the technology inside the classroom. A lot of it ages out. It's surprising how quickly that that technology becomes old and unsupported, or it starts to be dim, or it doesn't work with our systems. We have to upgrade the backend systems a lot and software in classrooms.

Regarding our response rate, people may sometimes have an experience where it didn't work as well as it can. We're trying to locate teams close to where those classrooms are, and most of our classroom response time, we measure it, is under 30 seconds. There are times when it gets longer than that, but we are generally on the spot and trying to get you the help.

One thing that's not clear, though, is that some people don't realize the phone numbers used to be in the classrooms. You'd look, and there were different phone numbers you had to call, or it was your buddy, or whoever it was. There is

one phone number now posted. Call that number. Don't try to go back to your buddy. Sometimes that person may not be the right person. Just call the phone number, we will get you somebody. I said, usually it's relatively quick.

The last one's a little bit confusing, I think, from the researcher side. Some of the people that were working with you have been organized into teams. We have 4 teams that are working on Campus Health Sciences, Business Affairs, Libraries and Research, and academic colleges. So non-health sciences colleges which is how we broke things up. Those groups are looking for needs very specific to a college. For instance, if you're in Health Sciences, generally, there's lots of HIPAA. There's a little bit of HIPAA in some of the other colleges, but a lot of it's in health sciences. There's a lot of more experience within our service teams to deal with those groups.

I want to give you a little bit of data about how we're doing. You can just see from the last 3 years that, for instance our phishing reports have increased by about 40% last in the last 3 years and yet we have a somewhat smaller team now dealing with that. The satisfaction rating is when you go to a 24/7 online ticket and call, that's rated on a scale of 0 to 5. Those numbers have pretty much stayed about the same. People are relatively satisfied. Every time you do one of those calls, you get a survey. Usually, we get about a 15 or 20% response, so it's not 100%. Of the people who do respond they are very satisfied with the service they're getting, although the number of calls that we're getting has been rising quickly. There are lots of reasons for that but what I would say is that that doesn't tell the whole story, and we agree with that. We understand there are cases where there are going to be pockets of things that just are not working well for you. Call us. Let us know that this happening.

We have gone out and triaged with several colleges in the last 4 months. Those have worked out well. I just got an email this morning from a college Dean saying, yeah, they were having some problems, there was some communication, people didn't know their roles, but now we've been able to go back, fix those problems, and they come back extremely happy. It's not that we will be perfect, and we understand that there have been changes that have been somewhat disruptive, but we are very conscientious to try to fix those problems, and we are a service organization. I take it very seriously. If you're having problems with that, just come talk to us. We are we are getting things fixed for people.

Information security improvements. This is a whack-a-mole thing. The amount of stuff that people are dealing with. I should have brought some statistics, but it's amazing. You would be floored how many attacks we're getting daily to this institution. Universities, because of the open nature of how we try to do research, and several people that access our systems, is an enormous place where people want to come and find vulnerabilities. The biggest vulnerability is people, unfortunately. So phishing attacks, we see that all the time. Anytime we announce something that we're going to do a change, like when we told everybody that we're going to change all your Gmail to Outlook, we got a flood of people attacking the university. They were able to use that kind of preconditioning to be able to say here's an opportunity for me to fool somebody. That does happen and we take it very seriously.

You may recall back in 2017, there was an audit. The university was the genesis for a lot of the things that have happened in the past, and one of them that was required was that we had to have a mandatory Security Awareness Training Program. Going back to what Lisa said earlier, I believe we're the first one where we have consequence, if you don't take it, you lose access. We've rolled that out in the past year, now we're 100% compliant. You either have access because you've taken the training, or you don't have access. Just to give you a couple numbers, 99.5% of our full-time employees have taken the training. We're talking about literally a handful of people who have not had training and are locked out. The place where we're seeing the least number of compliances with the DCC population. Many of you may know what that is. That's the volunteers and outside researchers, and that's more about 65%. That has been very successful. It's continuing to roll out. Right now, we don't really get too many complaints. People kind of understand this is just kind of the normal process, and I would say it's the 1st time this university has really dug in and said, yes, you're going to have to do certain things, and there are consequences to doing that.

We started this process about 3 or 4 years ago; it's called the Assets Program. Some of you may remember that nomenclature. This is to get all the hardware into a more secure state. We know when things are patched things like that. Some of you have been going through where you get a lot of you get enrolled in blue cat or cat net 2.0. You've seen that. That's a process where we bring you into what's are called our Active Directory and we manage your endpoint, your laptop, your desktop. We know, it's a first approximation what software's on there. We make sure that you're up to date and you're patching, things like that. That's a key thing, because another vulnerability aside from phishing is when you have systems that are not patched.

Every day you can just look at the list of things where something gets attacked and it's often because it's untouched. We've had that, won't give you numbers, but we've had a number of times when we've had systems on campus that this has happened to.

9. **Adjournment** [02:00:41]

Chair Hymel adjourned the March 2, 2026, meeting at 5:00 PM.

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

Motions of March 2, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2025/26-27] to approve the agenda of the March 2, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting with the friendly amendment to remove Items 8C and 8D. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/25-28] to approve the January 26, 2026, and February 2, 2026, minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-29] to approve seconded motion from Graduate Council, Acceptability of Graduate Transfer Credit and Policy Benchmarking. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-30] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, Substitutions for Approved General Education Courses. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-31] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate and Graduate Council, Posthumous Degree and Posthumous Certification of Achievement. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-32] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate and Graduate Council, Course Types and Components. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the [January 26, 2026](#) and [February 2, 2026](#) minutes
3. Page 8, Action Item: Consent Agenda
 - a. [Acceptability of Graduate Transfer Credit and Policy Benchmarking](#)
 - b. [Substitutions for Approved General Education Courses](#),
 - c. [Posthumous Degree and Posthumous Certification of Achievement](#),
 - d. [Course Types and Components](#)
4. Pages 10 & 11 Item 7: Old Business
 - a. Old Business Item A: [Constitution](#) and [Bylaws](#) Update and [President's Memo](#)
 - b. Old Business Item C: Discussion of the [Master Space Plan](#)
5. Page 13, New Business
 - a. New Business Item B: [Information Technology Update](#)
6. Written reports
 - a. [UWGEC](#)
 - b. [President](#)
 - c. [Provost](#)
 - d. [SAPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456