MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
AUGUST 31, 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=fcde7fb3-8c4e-4455-bb12-b4b8000c39a3

Present: Senators Adler, Amodeo, Apanovich, Azaz, Braitberg, Cochran, Coletta, Diaz, Downing, Engineer, Friesen, Goyal, Gregory, Guzman, Hansen, Hasankhani, Hills, Hingle, Hudson (Chair of the Faculty), Hymel (Vice Chair of the Faculty), Jens, Kennedy, Knox, Larry, Leafgren, Little, Lyski, Macamo, Maggert, Mars, McCallum, Meyer, Miller-Cochran (Secretary), Neumann, Nolan, O'Leary, Pau, Rafelski, Rocha, Roman-Palacios, Russell, Sanderson, Schlacks, Slepian, Smith, Spece, Jr., Stothert-Maurer, Su, Verhougstraete, Waddell, M. Witte, R. Witte, Zhupanska, Ziurys

Absent: Senators Buxner, Cerny, Cooper, Cornelison, Diaz de la Rubia, Kelliher, Lee, Lin, Linares-Gaffer, Lucas, Rishel, Roof, Sadayappan, E. Stephan, R. Stephan, Wittman

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

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the August 31, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Miller-Cochran was also present.

Vice Chair Hymel introduced herself, the Arthur W. Andrews Professor of Law at the James E. Rogers College of Law. She teaches business tax courses, and her research is in environmental taxation. She is honored to serve her colleagues as the Vice Chair of the Faculty and Chair of the Senate. Leila Hudson is the Chair of the Faculty.

Vice Chair Hymel welcomed all new Senators and asked that in the future, Senators attend in-person for connection purposes, although she understands not everyone can do so.

Vice Chair Hymel stated that Senate used a voting software called TopHat in Spring meetings. The consensus over the summer was that it did not add efficiency to the meetings, so the use of this platform for voting will be discontinued. The next Faculty Senate Meeting will occur on October 5, 2026.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:04:52]

Vice Chair Hymel explained the process of following the agenda during Faculty Senate Meetings. Most of the New Business Items A-D have been moved to the October 5, 2026, meeting. If there is additional time remaining, she will make a call to Senators to ask whether they have New Business Items to add to the agenda which requires a seconded motion and vote. New Business Items can be requested until the end of the meeting.

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2026/27-1]** to approve the agenda of the August 31, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 42 in favor, 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

- Senator Downing asked if any of the guest speakers will be present in today's meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she believes the guest speakers whose names are now struck through on the agenda cannot attend.
- Senator M. Witte asked because the President never attends if the Provost will be present in today's meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel confirmed Provost Prelock is present online.
- Provost Prelock stated she plans to attend every meeting while in town and apologized for not being able to attend today's meeting in-person.
- Senator Ziurys asked if all New Business Items have been struck from the agenda.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated this is correct, and Chair Hudson will discuss this.
- Senator M. Witte asked whether an item removed from the agenda could still be raised through another process.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated the reason the items are on the Faculty Senate Agenda is because they were approved by the Senate Executive Committee, and the items have been visibly struck through to represent changes. When she calls for New Business, Senators are free to bring up topics.
- Senator M. Witte stated the Senate Executive Committee is an entity that was added into shared governance. Prior to that, the faculty set its agenda.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she appreciates Senator M. Witte's comments.
- Senator Ziurys expressed concern that ongoing research-related issues remain unresolved, including delays affecting grants and student payments and asked how the Senate should interpret the absence of scheduled presenters, particularly when the issues are time-sensitive.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she does not have a direct answer to this question, and senators can draw their own conclusions.
- Senator Ziurys stated that recurring issues remain unresolved when invited presenters do not attend meetings to discuss them.
- Provost Prelock stated the point is well taken. She followed up with some of invited presenters and found they were planning to attend the originally scheduled September date but were unable to attend now due to rescheduling of the meeting. The presenters are expected to attend the October's meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated if the agenda is approved, there may be time to request New Business Items.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MAY 4, 2026 FACULTY SENATE MEETING [00:13:00]

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2026/27-2]** to approve the May 4, 2026, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION [00:13:41]

Dr. Jose Soto, Former Assistant Professor, School of Natural Resources and the Environment [00:13:50]

Madam Chair of the Senate. I am Jose Soto. Until recently, I was a tenured Associate Professor at the School of Natural Resources and the Environment. I'm here to place in the public record an August 18, 2026 letter from the Faculty Chair Leila Hudson, sent to President Garmiella and Provost Prelock, and to request that the Senate initiate a formal inquiry into the university's actions and establish safeguards protecting every member of our university community.

The letter documents that on March 25th and 26th of 2025, the Pima County Mobile Crisis Unit came to my home twice to assess whether I should be involuntarily committed for a mental health evaluation under Title 36. These highly visible and traumatic visits occurred, according to agency records, at the request of my employer, apparently, SNRE Director, Kathryn Stoner. After both evaluations, the government clinicians found no basis for action.

Please note that from the university's point of view, I was a former employee, a private citizen, when these government agents shamed me on my front porch in front of my neighbors. The day before the university had "voluntarily resigned me from my tenure position." The University refused to participate in my CAFT hearing, and the President reversed the CAFT finding.

I did not resign. I asked the Senate to determine how ABOR policies could be ignored when administrative authority is misused on a private citizen. I request a formal Senate inquiry and concrete safeguards protecting every member of our university community.

Madam Senate Chair, here is the letter. Thank you so much.

Dr. James Hunt, Barton Cardon Associate Dean, Career and Academic Services, College of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences, Professor of Practice, Human Development and Family Science [00:16:20]

Good afternoon, members of the Senate. I am simply here to speak as the co-chair for the mandatory Milestone Advising Program that is being rolled out this fall on Main Campus. Call it a beta test, if you will.

All main campus students this year have now received a mandatory advising syllabus. They will also be required to have at least one one-on-one appointment with an advisor during the first year here, one group advising appointment in their first year, and one-on-one appointment in their second year.

We will be rolling this out for online and distance students next fall and proceeding from there forward. I really wanted you all to be aware of this because we know that a mandatory advising program helps us get connections to students. So, I just want to make you all aware of that.

It's a program we're proud of. We're very excited for it. Hopefully, you all will see the payoff in our retention and graduation rates moving forward. This is something that Senior Vice Provost Rickus helped us initiate a long time ago.

Last Fall, we had a committee to review advising policy, and in the Spring, we developed the mandatory milestone advising program with the participation of several faculty and advising professionals across campus. So I just want to throw that out there for you. Hope you all are really excited about this because we are excited about it. It's a great way for us to make sure that our students are connecting. Thank you

Senator Ted Downing [00:18:05]

Beginning my fifty-fifth year on this faculty, spanning ten administrations, I am deeply disappointed to watch this administration mismanage the university into a looming crisis.
Rather than engage faculty, their elected representatives, local businesses, and the wider community, the Garimella administration offers institutional theater—branding, flashy websites, ceremonies, slogans, and overnight initiatives..
Symbols—not communication.
Ceremonies display power, not legitimacy. Branding alters appearances, not substance. Silencing critics does not produce consent. And handsome, highly paid actors cannot rescue a bad script.
At the heart of this theater is a dangerous proposition: that merit may be declared by edict and bestowed by anointment rather than demonstrated through open competition.
Without real and open competition, titles and awards may or may not demonstrate merit; they merely certify the preferences of those who bestow them. That is not meritocracy. It is patronage dressed for the stage. A “sole finalist” clutches the best actor award. Or a distinguished professor is installed endowed weeks after being hired. Or the title of research one university is flaunted for spending buckets on research expenditures, sans its significance.
Dazzled by the footlights, the performers can no longer see the people they claim to serve. Non-competitive hires pop up, like rabbits. Initiatives are announced without consultation. Enrollment falls without a public accounting of the consequences for southern Arizona.
A $250 million dollar dorm, a tower to excellence, is announced. With a dining hall. The University boasts no debt—but students will repay the financing through housing charges for decades.
Cost-free? Only to those who transferred the cost.
The performers in the administration fear stepping off the stage to engage elected faculty and the people whose livelihoods their decisions affect…or you, their elected representatives.
Faux winners fear people who win through open competition and competitive elections by their peers. Their standing is confirmed by peers outside their little theater. .
But we are not their audience, their scenery, their subjects— unless we consent to be.
The reviews are in: five rotten tomatoes.

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:21:33]

Faculty play a central role at any university, especially an R1 institution. It's the faculty that do the teaching, the scholarly research, bring in large sums of money through grants. You would think that the faculty would be particularly valued. Yet, at the University of Arizona, this is apparently not the case. Our leadership, in fact, seems to be quite anti-faculty, as evidenced, for example, by the unprecedented number of grievance cases by the faculty against the university administration. The recent disruption of the conciliation CAFT process. The nonsensical travel policy recently instituted. The endless number of trainings for faculty only. The bureaucracy of forms, and even the removal of tenure based on what appear to be personality conflicts, rather than real performance issues.

All of this is carried out under the veneer of, using the words of strategist and author Priya Parker, “toxic politeness.” Isn't it time for university leadership to rethink its priorities at the University of Arizona? Thank you.

5. CONSENT AGENDA – VOTING MEMBER OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, CHRISTOPHER A. SANDERSON – *UG Minor in Applied Design for Health* [00:23:05]

- Seconded **[Motion 2026/27-3]** from the Undergraduate Council, UG Minor in Applied Design for Health was approved by unanimous consent.

6. Q&A WITH UNIVERSITY FACULTY LEADERSHIP [00:24:03]

A. CHAIR HUDSON [00:21:20]

Welcome back, everybody. Welcome to 2026-2027. It's great to see you all here on this wonderful rainy day, and I think I have walked through every puddle on campus to be here with you. So please enjoy the rain while it lasts.

This summer saw President Garimella's administration double down with ABOR's apparent approval on the kind of corporate-style leadership that bypasses faculty governance and indeed violates the shared governance law. It, more importantly, affects our reputation, our morale, and our finances. I just came from the KPI Leadership Forum where we got a very nice overview of the things that are going right, as we try and set metrics by which to evaluate ourselves.

Here on this side, we're a little grittier and human. We're the place where the policy meets the road, and we have a slightly different perspective than the shiny KPIs, metrics, and plans that are rolled out for the selected university leadership.

We've become familiar with several different techniques for bypassing faculty governance to make policy without community consultation, especially the faculty participation mandated by law and tradition. It doesn't serve the institution well. Selecting a handful of faculty to communicate with the leadership does not supplant the role of all of you who are elected by your peers.

After the most successful administration and faculty governance collaboration of President Garimella's tenure, we fought the Department of Education Compact in the Fall together, and President Garimella consulted with many of us in the way that faculty governance is supposed to work. But we've since gone back to a course correction in which the administration arrogated the power of the Senate to vet and recommend honorary degrees to replace well-established policymaking with community consultation, with top-down dictated so-called procedures. The Senate did not get a chance to vet or intervene or recommend contributions to the honorary degrees, which caused an awkward fiasco at commencement. Consulting with the elected representatives of the faculty would have prevented that awkward episode.

Also during the summer, the unilateral restructuring of the Health Sciences, which ironically, many faculty would have supported, had we been consulted and included in the process, was done in a way that cost the jobs of a couple of dozen professional support staff in Biocommunications and Events, whose professional services in bringing our research to the public, whether through events or through media presentations, were a template that the rest of the University should have had access to. Their two disestablished departments could have easily been expanded on a limited fee-for-service model created by those professionals. The elected representatives of the faculty would have insisted on retaining those jobs and expanding those services on a reasonable fee-for-service basis designed by the very people who've been carrying them out for decades.

The unannounced change in the transfer of University of Arizona Foundation-held endowments into the central administration's coffers introduces bureaucracy and the opportunity for redirection of funds without transparency. Worse, it introduces mistrust among donors, especially smaller donors, the kind that don't get the headline treatment into the funding of many of our legacy projects. The elected representatives of the faculty would have pointed out how important it is to maintain the legacy trust of donors and families in our philanthropic giving.

A travel policy was rolled out in July and August without consultation or any kind of the policy process that is prescribed, including community feedback, a 30-day review period, revisions, et cetera, et cetera. This policy is confusing, differently implemented across colleges, and has resulted in disruption of travel and a serious increase in faculty workload on administrative work previously carried out by our excellent staff. I'll be putting out a survey to find out how this new travel policy is affecting people in different parts of the university.

Admissions policy has left our colleges in the dark and very likely looking at tens of millions of dollars of budgetary shortfall mid-year. Deans and department heads are having a difficult time effectively predicting and scheduling courses, and we have had and expect to continue to have, waves of layoffs of our most important instructors and teaching faculty ranks. Those of us who have been here for longer than a minute would have prioritized our instructional staff, our community relations, and our links in recruiting, and engaged in the specialized and targeted recruiting that we've done historically in the past.

The office of the Vice President of Research, now renamed as ORP, seems to have divided loyalties between the rank-and-file research faculty of the university, and our somewhat secretive research affiliate, formerly known as UA-ARC, now rechristened as the Kyle Institute. A non-university affiliate structure serving the military industrial complex, beyond the scrutiny of faculty, and with faculty and their research projects recruited or purveying to the military industrial complex in Southern Arizona. We need the Office of Research, the ORP, to manage and support our researchers with fair and even application of policy for all research, not just the targeted high profile research areas. We need basic and consistent service for PIs, grant support, and lab safety, a part of ORP's portfolio that has been neglected.

In terms of administrative reform, the President, who initially earned my respect by being able to fire many of the Robbins era vice presidents, has now delegated so much oversight of the university function that we have a new problem. Building is much harder than firing people. Non-competitive summer hiring, excluding the elected representatives of the faculty, results in an interesting new phenomenon at the university, twinning of administrative positions and confusion of roles. Going beyond ABOR's policy of keeping former presidents, provosts, and coaches on payroll. The new administration has proved somewhat inefficient as not only do we pay a current president's salary, we pay nearly a million dollars in salary for two provosts: one hailing from Vermont, another hailing from Purdue. Another $900,000 goes to keep two top finance chiefs. One from the heart of ABOR and another from Vermont. Addressing the UAGC quagmire required at this point two online provosts. One from Purdue, and now hopefully replaced by one from Vermont. Other non-competitively hired positions in admissions, our internal audit, also come from the President's former institutions. A back of the napkin calculation suggests that almost $3 million in salary is going to non-competitively hired colleagues from President Garimella's previous institutions, often hired in uncompetitive searches, always excluding the elected representatives of the faculty. Many of our locally hired administrators have met the glass

ceiling and have little hope for future in this administration. It feels not only corporate, but sometimes colonial as well. I often sit in rooms where I'm the only non-Vermont or Purdue alumnus.

Over the summer, we hired an online provost in a process that bypassed, as usual, any meaningful shared governance participation. And of course, that new provost comes from the University of Vermont, which should not be confused with online powerhouse, University of Southern New Hampshire. The new position is going to be focused on continuing and professional education, as the University of Vermont does not have, I'm told, a single online degree program. The position here, which oversees a $250 million portfolio, has been filled by someone with experience with a budget of $2 million. Participation of the elected faculty representatives would not have allowed these kinds of hires to take place.

One of the most troubling new developments over the last year was hinted at by Dr. Soto's open session statement. The administration is actively endeavoring to undermine legally mandated conflict resolution and grievance procedures that is the last bastion of faculty and workers' rights. A new informal policy uses the so-called confidentiality of personnel processes--designed to prevent all our addresses and social security numbers from being revealed to the public--to protect institutional secrets. I was even sent a letter this summer in which the provost somewhat surprisingly attacked my right as your elected faculty representative to advocate for individual faculty going through challenging situations. I will submit that letter for the record. I did not reply to it. I did not think at the time that it merited a response in the ongoing fight to eradicate workplace democracy, which is also required by law.

Erosion of due process prescribed in the law and the rules seems to be an administration goal. I see our multiple provosts unable to address toxicity and mismanagement in problem departments that compromise the performance of whole swaths of our faculty. I see respected senior researchers bullied into early retirement. I see the provost covering for deans and guided by a very explicit legal strategy, refusing to participate in the legally mandated CAFT hearings that tenured public employees are guaranteed. I also see a tactic of hiring outside counsel, expensive outside lawyers, when the faculty in these grievances are unrepresented by counsel. A violation of the Faculty Constitution and the principle of due process. These outside lawyers who I have not received my public records request to find out how much is being spent on these outside lawyers, but they are definitely expensive. They are in a position to intimidate and harass faculty going through grievances or facing dismissal. I see the neglect to train department heads adequately in the most basic processes of governance and care for the faculty, all of which undermines our research and academic freedom.

The recent Arizona Auditor General's report identifies a couple of key deficiency in ABOR's oversight. There are many more; in intelligence, they would call this limited hangout. It reminds us so much of our administrative flailing and inefficiency comes from ABOR's failure in its oversight and governance. And I'm going to submit that auditor general's report of ABOR for the formal record. The non-competitive hiring of a president and the blessing of that corporate model needs to be addressed. We need regents who know and care about Southern Arizona, not just the corporate interests of mining and the military industrial complex in Southern Arizona. We need regents who come from Tucson, who love Tucson, who love the borderland, and who know the U of A. Again, not just corporate or Phoenix-based, partisan-adjacent. ABOR is about to relax its own conflict of interest policies very poorly enforced to date and its procurement policies. We are heading in the wrong direction.

There is always a way out of the culture of fear, control, extraction, and corporate bureaucracy. It is traditional faculty governance. It is a feature, not a bug. In spite of my blunt words today, my hand remains outstretched to the administration. Since it looks like you're going to be here a little longer than you anticipated, President Garimella, let's turn the page and work together. Thank you.

B. PRESIDENT GARIMELLA [00:42:00]

Thank you, Mona. Welcome. I understand a number of you are new senators, so welcome to you and also welcome back to the semester. It's really nice to see the union full and the mall full of students. So, just a great time, and of course the weather has turned for the better now.

I just want to share a few thoughts, that hopefully, you saw much of it represented in the annual letter I shared. It's almost the only long memo I write, because there's a lot to celebrate that our faculty, staff, and students have accomplished. Once a year, I will share that, as sort of the state of the University with you, and it's public, it's on my website as well. So, it would be helpful if some of you actually looked at it carefully before making some of the claims you made, but anyway.

So, we've we entered this year in a more focused and financially sound way as an institution. You all are faculty, have helped get our four-year and six-year graduation rates to the highest on record. It is not an empty KPI, it's not an empty number. Sorry, Leila. This is extremely important. Universities in Arizona have had a shameful number for retention and graduation. It is something that I will focus on, and I'm so glad that our faculty help with that. We are nicely moving up in in those 2 numbers, and we should continue to move up in that, in addition to our career outcomes and job placement for our students, etc.

We've had a fundamental shift in how we recruit students. It's not just based on a GPA. It's based on a holistic review, and we have frozen tuition and fees now for three years in a row. There are no shenanigans there in terms of costing our students more for in-state Arizona residents. I would like to continue to do that for as long as we can. We've asked

the legislature to help with that. That's part of our ask that we put in to the through ABOR. So, I hope that at some point we will get some support with that. We've also restructured our financial aid to address the unmet need of more Pell-eligible and Arizona residents.

More students who want to be here are choosing to be here. We have higher yield rates this year for in-state students, for out-of-state students, and for international students. Arizona Online is up 7% and UAGC, as you all know, is fully integrated now to the university. Their first-year retention has climbed 15 percentage points since AY23 to 53%, which is higher than the creditors benchmarks. I'm very proud of what the UAGC is trying to do.

In addition, I'm really pleased that multiple folks in the Provost's office have helped, Greg Heileman before his departure, and now Jenna Rickus and Amy Kimme Hea are working on this. We are deeply strengthening our partnerships with community colleges. I just spoke with the academic leadership forum, which is all of our heads and vice provosts and deans and directors and such. It was a good conversation, and what we want to do is to avoid students losing credits when they transfer from a community college to the university. I understand that students can lose up to 30 credits in that in that move, and 30 credits is one year of tuition. It's one year of time, and we want to make that zero. We're doing that by this optimization tool we've come up with, which has the curricula of all these community colleges uploaded there, Pima, AWC, Eastern, Cochise Maricopa, etc. So, students can choose what courses they want to take at Pima for their first year and move over here in the second year. I think that's a great thing for them to do. It's part of our engagement mission, it's part of our student success mission, and many sort of data results have shown that community college students who transfer to a four-year college graduate and retain at higher rates, and I hope that would be true here as well.

While we'll only release the final enrollment numbers after census, which is the right thing to do, and that'll be available a little later before your next Faculty Senate meeting. I want to clarify something which perhaps eludes the superficial look at these numbers. There has not been a substantive change in the number of fully academically qualified first year undergraduate students enrolling at the university over a number of years. We've looked at the numbers. We've had this odd thing for admission calls scheduled for success, which was not a great pathway. We've stopped doing that. That resulted in mixed outcomes for students and very little additional net tuition revenue. So, if you take those numbers out, we've been pretty much within the noise at the same place, and that continues this fall. So, I want to clarify that, and we'll provide more numbers around it once census is done. You know, we've gone through big change in enrollment management. It takes a while for counselors, for people here, for colleges to adapt to it. I know we are better prepared this year with the systems in place and the tools in place. We're in a good place for that.

Our support services for students are also much more coordinated. We have the Provost's office reorganized to better help our students. AI literacy, which a lot of students and parents are asking for, is being introduced into UNIV 101. We now are designated an intentionally thriving institution by the Seal of Excelencia. It's something we should be proud of for what our campus does. Our CAPS appointments, the counseling appointments, are free for all students, any number of CAPS appointments. There used to be a limit on how many would be free. Now there is no limit, and students can access CAPS services. We've put in place a requirement that first-year students stay on campus, because obviously the usual exceptions, but there's plenty of evidence that those students who stay on campus graduate at higher rates and have a better experience. That's in place starting this fall, and we're building the Catalina on that corner, replacing what used to be Palm Shadows. It's going up very quickly when you drive by there, you'll see. It's about 1,350 new beds. It's what students have asked for, suite-style living. There's a dining hall, etc., and student support services there. And, yes, it does not cost us a penny. It's a very clever approach to not actually putting up our own money to build the dorm and going with a nonprofit, the Collegiate Housing Foundation lowers the cost of the of rent for the students as well.

Just this morning, I visited the Welcome Center. I believe there'll be an open house next week. I encourage you all to take a walk through. It is right there in the Union. We've missed a place to have our parents, and prospective students walk through and be received here. It's a wonderful, wonderful place. Our young ambassadors, student ambassadors, are enthusiastically welcoming parents and students, and there's a one-stop shop there to support our students. I think we'll see that as a major advance in our student support.

Finally, study abroad under Jenny Lee's leadership, and of course with a lot of campus-wide support is on track to meet our goal of increasing by three times. We want more of our students to go study abroad. We've raised money for it, philanthropic gifts for it, alongside doing research internships that our faculty have always been welcoming of and paid company internships, etc.

Finally, we've also strengthened our international partnerships. We've had a great partnership with CNRS in France, that's growing. Our partnerships in Taiwan are growing, and somebody asked earlier why some of the folks are not here. Some of our senior leaders are in Taiwan signing a cooperation agreement. I think that'll be very helpful, given where the state is going. We're deepening our partnerships with Mexico, with UNAM, etc. In Kazakhstan, we have a micro campus, where I went and conferred the first round of 39 or so degrees, and in Panama and in India. So those are the countries we're focused on.

On the research side, very briefly, our research awards have gone up by 17%. This is at a time that there's such strong federal headwinds for research funding, our awards have gone up 17%. I credit our research faculty, our staff, our students that are working so hard to get there, and of course our Office of Research and Partnerships. We remain

among the top 20 publics in the country for the seventh year in a row for research expenditures. And what we're doing is to diversify our funding sources. Our expenditures that come from nonprofits has gone up 32%, and for-profits has gone up 22%. We're trying to diversify the pie so that even as federal headwinds are challenging, we're able to maintain our research portfolio. One important statistic here that might be of interest to you, if you look across the AAU, there's been a 15% drop in PhD admissions, 15%. For us, we have just a little bit of an increase, it's flat is about 1% higher. We're focusing our bridge funding and things like this on supporting our PhD students. Commercialization is doing really well. Tech Launch Arizona, a brave operation here in Tucson that has a 15% increase year on year, in the number of invention disclosures. We've also been deemed the number three university in the country for the probability of seeding unicorns. Unicorns are billion-dollar startups. Who knew? Number three, we're ahead of Stanford, MIT, and all these other places you like to quote. So, our focused research initiatives are thriving, and Tomas will be here, I believe, at the next meeting. We did discuss this and we should set these schedules and the agendas in consultation, so we know when people are available.

Finally, the third part of our strategic imperatives on engagement remains really strong. I will just give you one example of it. A couple of weeks ago, we were in the heater of an Indian community, and we announced the nation's first medical, sort of MD-granting medical school branch in a tribal nation. I think this will be seen as a major advancement in our engagement with tribal communities, and this follows the model where we did something like this in Yuma last year. It was the first rural medical branch. This is the first, in the nation, tribal medical branch. This, in the Gila River will have 30 MDs at a steady state, and all 30 get a full-ride scholarship from the hospital there. In Yuma, 45 MD students get a full-ride scholarship, which means they graduate debt-free, and they're far more likely to stay there and work there. It's a 3-year MD, so it's faster, and they do 18 months of their work in, in either Yuma or Gila River. It's a residency, so they're much more likely to stay. So, we're very proud of it I give a lot of credit to Fred Wondisford, Dean of the College of Medicine in Phoenix. We're open to doing this in other places so that the rural access issue is addressed.

On the finance side, I'll just say, with balanced budgets last year, with balance budgets this year, with a new budget model that actually incentivizes innovation on the part of the deans and such. The S&P credit rating outlook was changed to stable, which is a good thing for us. We have new leaders. Our Chief Communications and Marketing Officer were hired this past year. Our General Counsel, our Chief of Staff, and the Online Leader, Bettyjo Bouchey, that'll be here September 14th, I believe. We also, at the same time, have several new deans for Fine Arts, as you know, and Ag and Pharmacy just started recently. Law, Optical Sciences, Education, VetMed, and Pharmacy received full accreditations, eight years each. That's a really good thing. VetMed, remember, is an unusual program. It's a three-year program and has been receiving a very large number of applications. I'm very proud of what Julie Funk has done, and Chris Finch, who's a new Dean in Pharmacy, and he's doing a great job.

We've had the best philanthropic fundraising year in university history. It's something we should all be proud of. We exceeded last year's fundraising by about $85 million and brought in $425 million this past year. We will continue to try and raise more money so that we can support other scholarships and the faculty fellowships and things that we would like. We also met our $3 billion goal for The Fuel Wonder campaign. Of course, that means we start a new one, but we'll celebrate that at Homecoming.

On athletics, I think I'd be amiss in not mentioning that we won. For the first time in university history, the Big 12 Commissioners Cup, which not only recognizes competitive excellence, but academic excellence and community service by our athletes. And of course. men's basketball went to Final 4 for the first time in 25 years, but 18 of our 22 programs went to the postseason. So, this is a wide, broad, sort of excellence across athletics, and academics is leading as well. We had a record 92% graduation success rate. That's a really nice number. We'll continue to improve that.

I'll just close by saying I'm grateful to our faculty and staff and our students whose success remains our North Star. Also, our community partners, our alumni, our donors, our sponsors, and ABOR for their support of this university. This institution succeeds because our faculty and staff are dedicated and working hard, and we all need to work together even as higher ed, nationally, is facing major headwinds. There's a lot coming our way. We need to work together, collaborate the headwinds, you know, the demographic cliff, the greater reluctance and ability of families to pay for college tuition. There's a great need to demonstrate the value of a degree, and that's what parents are asking for and we're working on. And there's limitations to revenue growth. How much can we grow. So, given these, we will not agree on every approach, but if we can work together and continue to hold student success as our North Star, I'm optimistic we'll get there. We continue to work with the state and with all our supporters to protect and grow our revenue.

In the good news category, ABOR recently passed in their meeting last week that a greater portion of TRIF funds would be allocated through the base formula, so we'll have a little more assured funding from TRIF funds for supporting our work.

The last thing I'll say is, if you'd like, please look it up. On my website is posted a document called How We Lead. I thought it was important for me to lay out my commitments of accountability and collaboration. I've asked all my senior leaders and the deans and such to consider those and pass them on to their teams so that we move forward functioning as one university. So, I do convene and meet with as many groups as I can. As I said, we just came from the academic leadership forum with a couple hundred people there. I have open-ended and an open invitation faculty

breakfasts several times this semester, and those go really well. We have a staff social of the mall. We have we brought back the service awards for staff. I've visited now every single college and many student groups. So, I have met with SPBAC leadership this semester. We'll be going to their meeting. I'll engage with SPBAC leadership as well as the faculties and executive council to solicit feedback around a possible response to the Department of Education request that has come our way, and we will work that the same way we did last time. So, thank you very much, and I know we're running late, but thank you.

Questions and Comments [01:00:25]

7. Secretary Miller-Cochran stated her thanks for President Garimella's speech and stated she is delighted to hear that working with community college transfers is such a high priority of this administration. She started her career in the Maricopa district, therefore, this is one of her passions. It is a laudable goal but an extraordinarily complicated one. She asked how Faculty autonomy will be respected in terms of the curriculum on both sides, including the University and Community College Faculty. This includes understating the goals of incoming students, some know they want to transfer right away, but many don't. She asked how the UA is working with community college partners on that.

- President Garimella stated this is a great question, and he would recommend that at a future meeting, Jenna Rickus spend some time discussing specifics on this. This was discussed at the Academic Leadership Forum and there were good questions.
- President Garimella stated this is not a vanity project and this is not being imposed on anyone. They have worked most closely with Pima Community College leadership, and they have stated they are thrilled that for the first time, UA is engaging with them, so there is no imposition here. The community colleges want this, and UA is working with them. The tool uploads curricula, and it is not being changed. Theirs is being taken and uploaded so that students can plan carefully to move from one institution to another. They would be able to take Math 101 and Psych 101 at Pima, then expect those courses to transfer to UA. This has been a very collaborative process.
- President Garimella stated that across the nation, but certainly in Arizona, a lot of effort has gone into this without a lot of success. He believes the UA's approach seems to be welcome from especially Pima and Arizona Western Community College as they have shown interest in a close partnership.
- President Garimella stated the other component is the financial differential. Students pay less there and want to transfer to UA. One of his goals in fundraising is to support the students coming from community colleges, and there has been potential interest in supporting this. This has been a very collaborative and collective approach so far.
- President Garimella stated perhaps Jenna Rickus can demonstrate the tool at a future Senate meeting and go into more detail.
- Senator Ziurys stated President Garimella's speech is great and she supports all the work being done for the students. She said it sounds like he has interesting international collaborations and fundraising, but in his speech, he doesn't talk much about what he is doing for the Faculty. Faculty are the backbone of the university, and they are being subject to such harassment from his administration with trainings, forms, and a ridiculous travel policy. She asked what he is doing to help the faculty with decreasing their load so they can spend more time writing grants, doing scholarly work, and bringing the university up in its ranking.
- Senator Maggert stated his thanks for President Garimella's speech, but the picture he paints is very different than Chair Hudson's. He asked President Garimella to respond to some of Chair Hudson's points.
- President Garimella stated in response to Senator Ziurys, the University is the Faculty, and he is a proud faculty member himself, as is Provost Prelock. They are engaging as broadly and widely with faculty as possible, including a lot of fundraising to support faculty members. This includes growth and research funding. The support they are trying to solicit from fundraising is all to support faculty. Over time, they will continue to have faculty salary raises and such. Of course, that is a big part of his initiatives.
- President Garimella stated in response to Dr. Maggert's point, Chair Hudson stated one thing that wasn't worth a response, and there were several inaccuracies in what she said, which he won't pick up one-by-one. Some of these, he is surprised about, and he believes she should know that some remarks were likely not completely factual.
- President Garimella stated he is happy to get questions from the Senate, in writing, and address those with a written response. He has a hard stop, and thanked Senators for listening and their questions.
- Senator M. Witte stated as a point of personal privilege, she would like to ensure that there is time for questions and answers with Chair Hudson which is customary. She would like to be the first to ask a question about a very immediate situation that is occurring this week.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated Chair Hudson used her entire time allotment which was double what it usually is which is the reasoning for no questions. When the agenda returns to new business, there will be an opportunity to bring up topics.
- Senator M. Witte stated this is a parliamentary issue.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated this is not a parliamentary issue, and the meeting will move onto the next item on the agenda at this time. The Provost's report has been extended, the hope is to have more time for questions.

C. PROVOST PRELOCK [01:08:19]

Thank you so much, Mona, and welcome back, everyone. I hope your first week plus with the students and with your research has gone well. It's an exciting time as I have a doc student and a postdoc, and they're heavy into grant writing and writing manuscripts, and it's exciting to keep my head in the game.

So, just wanted to share a few leadership updates. The President mentioned this, but I want to thank many of the faculty in Faculty Senate who helped participate in all of the searches that we have had. Just a point of correction in the Provost's Office, we do follow bringing in Faculty Senate members to help guide the search process for all of our deans, etc.

So, as you may know, Cindy Rischel in Nursing was appointed the Interim Dean of the College of Nursing. She's doing a fantastic job. She was a Faculty Senator here, and on several of your committees, so she has a very nice framing of how to support her faculty and have the faculty voice. Kim Ogden was appointed interim dean of the College of Engineering. Thank you to Kim for stepping in with short notice, and she's also doing a wonderful job. We brought Chris Finch, competitive search across the nation. He comes from Tennessee. He began his appointment at the College of Pharmacy August 1st. Thanks to Julie Funk for chairing that search and the number of faculty and staff who truly participated in the search process. We also have George Smith, who began his appointment as Dean of College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Thank you to Katie Zeiders, who was our former Faculty Senate Secretary who served on the search committee and was very helpful. Amy Kimme Hea began her appointment as Interim Vice Provost for Academic Affairs in August and thank you to Jeremy Vetter for serving on the Interim Selection Advisory Committee. Melissa Colchado was appointed Executive Director of the Health Sciences operation, and she was extremely helpful in providing support through the transition period of health sciences. As you know, Bettyjo Bouchey, was appointed Senior VP for Online Education beginning September 14th and Daniel Barefoot, past Staff Council Chair served on that search committee.

We will have 3 searches coming up, so we will be asking Faculty Senate for their recommendations, as well as faculty in each of the colleges that are impacted. That will be Nursing, Information Science and Engineering. The search for the Yuma Regional Director is underway. There's been campus interviews and forums are taking place now. We had two last week, and I believe the next 2 will be this week. Again, Katie Zeiders was very helpful serving on the search committee, as well as crafting the position description.

In terms of organizational announcements, I just want to clarify something that Chair Hudson said. Actually, this organization started reorganization started over a year ago, right before I came. When individuals and layers of administrators adjusted, and dollars were saved to really look at how might we better infuse health around the college, around the university campus. So, this has been going on for like 15 months. Faculty, staff, and designated campus colleagues were part of this discussion and how instead of having separate health sciences activity, fold them in, knowing that Nutrition, Food Sciences and CALES has a contribution to health. Knowing that Speech Pathology, Audiology, Psychology, and the College of Science has contributions to health, etc. So, our goal is to raise up the health portfolio and support those through the transition process, which Melissa Colchado did.

Several of the groups, centers that are run by grants, they are in ORP, but the others actually requested to be under the Provost. It gives them greater visibility, so I have AHEC, ASTEC, which is the simulation, etc., and some of the K-12 programming. We will be able to support them at a greater extent than has been in the past, and then all colleges can truly be a part of the Health Sciences framework, which we are doubling down on.

The beginning of the school year is always fun because we welcome in a new class. We also welcomed in new faculty. So, faculty orientation took place mid-August. Thank you, Chair Hudson for your participation and addressing the new faculty. The HeadsUp Forum and the new Heads forum also took place in August, and several leaders participated in that. We had a graduate student orientation and Destination Arizona. Lots of activities to get our young people and our young faculty engaged.

In terms of initiatives, you heard a lot about our campus efforts for the community colleges. That has been something that was one of the first things I wanted to have happen. I meet with Ian Roark, who's their Provost at Pima Community College. We're very excited about his leader, Jeff, and Jenna, our leader to really make things happen. Susan, to your question about autonomy. I don't know if that was answered, but there's full autonomy for faculty in both places. The goal is really just mapping their curriculum to our curriculum to make it easier for students. We have a really nice relationship with their Arts program. Our Fine Arts program went out to Pima with a whole group and are working on a pathway that their students in the Arts can have a clear pathway to the arts here at U of A. So, we're excited about that.

As you know, I do have an investment fund in which I can invest in faculty instruction and research. So Lucy, to your question, over 90% of the investment fund I have went back to faculty or the instruction that they do, or the research they're doing, whether it is spousal hires, startup funds, bridge funding, for those who had grants that were stopped or slowed down, as well as new programs that they've started. There's only 10% left, but 90% went back to the faculty and to the instruction and research that we do.

As you know, last year when I first came, and I was part of a competitive search. I just want to remind you of that. I was the fourth of 4 candidates, Leila. What I did last year, was I had multiple campus conversations to see what was important for the community around faculty or students' success. That really helped drive our initiative that Jim Hunt talked about. Our advising milestone, our community colleges, our UNIV, our one-stop shop. So, everything that we did

this year came out of those conversations. So, I'm starting a new conversation this Fall, and that is with postdoctoral scholars and the faculty who work with them, with the goal of learning more about how we can best support our faculty mentors and our postdocs who may soon be faculty, in their careers or move to industry. We also, as you know, for FY27, as we've done in the past, the Provost's office does fund the Faculty Center and Faculty Senate with an allocated budget of $268,000. This is for staff support Faculty Senate leadership, stipends, and operating expenses.

As you heard about the academic leadership forum this morning, we have made some significant progress on our academic success goals. The leads have been wonderful. The Faculty and Staff Provost fellows, UAIR, Jenna, Nina, many campus partners have really helped us achieve a huge success in how we're moving, and hopefully we'll have our dashboards ready for everyone to see. So that's all I have and thank you for all that you do.

Questions and Comments [01:18:15]

- Vice Chair Hymel stated her thanks for Provost Prelock's discussion and stated there is time for questions.
- Senator M. Witte stated she was looking forward to hearing from the Senators about how they have contributed, each having two minutes, but this won't be plausible. She has two immediate items that she believes the Provost oversees. The first is regarding the notices of appointment. She wonders how several people got a notice of appointment that was delayed. It was hard to get and incorrect in terms of funding sources. Other faculty have stated they haven't been able to access their notice of appointment, and many accepted it and didn't realize it had been revised in April. There is a big section on intellectual property that she believes is patently illegal. For those who receive a contract, she urges them to read it and consider whether it's the same version as two years ago when there were reviews. She believes the current version is patently illegal, improper, and incorrect.
- Senator M. Witte stated regarding parking, faculty coming from other parts of campus are going into designated parking lots to teach classes, and when they go to park, the lots are full, and they have nowhere to park. They travel from lot-to-lot, then resort to illegally parking at the College of Medicine to run to class and get there on time. Students have said they can't do an in-person class due to parking.
- Senator M. Witte stated because Provost Prelock's signature is on it, she hopes she can investigate the incorrect versions. She has been unable to access her document and must go through another individual who is on vacation. She was never alerted that the document was viewable, although she has had the same funding source for 20 years.
- Senator M. Witte stated she has been at the University for half a century and was the first woman faculty. Her college has now gotten the first ARPA-H grant awarded to the University. She does not want to hear the President give his newsletter, promises, and accomplishments. She wants to hear what each of the faculty do.
- Provost Prelock stated she has taken notes, she is unsure of the specific details, but she believes regarding notice of appointments, there has been discussion in HR if one is a tenure track faculty, and they get their letter of offer, there is questioning on what the point of another notice of appointment is because the individual has position here. She is unsure of the circumstances.
- Provost Prelock stated she has little control over parking but understands Senator M. Witte's frustrations. She will speak with the department of Parking and Transportation to see if they have heard of particular situations for faculty who are coming and going, so they can get to their classes. She will need specific details.
- Senator Ziurys stated reflecting the malaise that faculty are in, faculty can't park, they don't get their notice of appointment, and they are constantly harassed with umpteen trainings. There is no longer support, assistance writing grant proposals or computer support. Faculty pay overhead support, and they are only returned with harassment for it. She would like to see changes that improve faculty lives and create ease instead of boutique solutions.
- Senator Ziurys stated she urges Provost Prelock to reconsider the mandatory trainings and current faculty morale, which is currently very low. There is a faculty member who receives a few million dollars from the administration, which they are happy about. She can name a few faculty in similar situations. Overall, the general faculty are upset with the current happenings at the University.
- Provost Prelock stated her thanks for Senator Ziurys' remarks, and she has made it one of her priorities to think about things that would support the morale of the faculty. She has also completed the same training, spending hours on weekends doing so. Some are required by law and will be audited if they don't ensure people understand the content. It did seem to come all at once, which she understands, because she too experienced it. The best she can do is give feedback to the policy personnel about how to be more thoughtful about trainings and their timing. There has been a lot of change in policies that have required adjustments, but that has come with an unexpected pace.
- Provost Prelock stated policies continue to go through a 30-day review.
- Senator Ziurys asked who reviews them as she does not believe the faculty takes part in this.
- Provost Prelock stated the policies get posted on the community website for thirty days. It is possible that Senator Ziurys missed this, or there are many emails that come forward.
- Chair Hudson stated regarding the specific policy that did not undergo any process, the travel policy, which came from the financial branch of the administration and did not get reviewed by the faculty. She confirmed this with Celina Ramirez and her staff, that these financial policies that play such a large role in the life of researchers and instructor. They emanate from the part of the university that doesn't do academics, like the P cards, the travel, all

those things. This was the most egregious bypassing of the faculty and all other public input, and it's going to start playing a very dramatic role in people's ability to perform their research.

- Chair Hudson stated the other thing that she was referring to was the deliberate blurring of the line between policy and procedure that has been immobilized to allow bypassing of legally mandated faculty governance. This did not include everything, as a lot of policies still go through the policy process. The travel policy was egregiously absent from that.
- Provost Prelock thanked Chair Hudson for the clarification. She believes there should be more care in saying that no policy goes through a review process, she will discuss this with Celina Ramirez.
- Senator Downing stated regarding policy, there's a deeper issue for the Senate. The Faculty Governance Law 15-1601(B) states that the elected faculty representative, are required to actively participate in the development of university policy. That's the law for the State of Arizona, signed by a Republican Governor. When policies are coming out in the university that are only put out by the administration without the active participation of the elected faculty representatives, they are technically illegal and it's going to be challenged.
- Senator Downing stated that someone is going to get into court in a case and throw that out, the entire policy structure will collapse like a deck of cheap cards. There is an obligation as elected faculty representative. It's not a Board of Regents policy. It's above that. That is a law which ranks ABOVE UHAP and he is certain individuals present in today's meeting aware of what he is talking about. These issues must be dealt with from the Senate.
- Vice Chair Hymel asked if there is a question for the Provost.
- Senator Downing asked Provost Prelock if she will follow the law.
- Provost Prelock stated her thanks for Senator Maggert's Zoom chat. She will follow up on their obligation to ARS 15-1601(B).
- Chair Hudson stated what she believes will go a long way to addressing some of the policy questions and the faculty morale, is what she said after her harsh and blunt speech in the President's presence. This is to allow the Senate to go back and establish a document, which is not an MOU, but a statement of principles that clarifies for everyone, what the role of the faculty is. Once this is done, there won't be disagreement about it in public, in front of the press.
- Chair Hudson stated everyone will benefit from a structured, collaborative process that respects the faculty and its traditional role and the law of the State of Arizona. It will boost all the successes that the President and Provost have cited, if this is done together, and not in an adversarial format.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she appreciates Provost Prelock for attending Senate meetings and always being willing to engage.

8. OLD BUSINESS [01:31:37]

A. Update on the status of Revised Email Policy – CIO Elliot Cheu [01:32:09]

Thank you, everybody. Thank you for letting me come talk about the email policy. So, this is just an update of where we were. The first point is that the policy that was presented, it's currently in the process. It is a combination of two existing policies that basically were written in 1988. So, in 1988, we created an electronic use policy and also an email policy. The effect of this process, which actually started before I even was in this role was to combine those two policies. The vast majority of the policies that were presented to Faculty Senate have been in place since 1988. We've been operating under those rules and policy for almost 30 years. It was revised in 2022, and I don't remember the details of that.

The biggest change for the new policy was to remove automatic forwarding of university email to a non-university of University of Arizona email site. It's actually not that many. I believe it's 150 faculty and about 2,000 staff members are currently automatically forwarding their email off the university site or off what we call the tenant, so Microsoft. The reason for that is twofold. One is we want email to stay within the University of Arizona. There are a lot of cybersecurity reasons we do that. We can tell if you click the malicious link, and we can trace that back so we can figure out which emails are causing that. It gives us a tool to understand on the security side.

On the second slide, it's also for a compliance reason, it's important that we don't have FERPA and HIPAA data or PHI data leaving the university. That's another reason we have this policy in place. So that was the big change. Most of the comments we got back were addressing the original policy, which, as I said, has been in place for about 30 years

Just to give you more of a timeline, the policy was released back in April for the 30-day comment period. We extended that for a few more days because the 30-day ended right about during Faculty Senate. We extended a little bit further to so that it could be addressed. I believe it's one of the highest policy responses we've ever had, according to Celina Ramirez, who oversees the policy process. That has been closed, and we received, I don't remember, but there was quite a bit of feedback. It was reviewed, and we incorporated that through the Policy Office. The policy office is not my office, it's a separate office and the Office of General Counsel to address the changes.

The first thing that was changed was that there was a comment which suggested that email contents were at the proper university. We clarified that. That was a great catch. It was surprising everybody looked at it, and we didn't see that. So now the policy basically says that the university owns the account and the name of the account, but not

necessarily the contents within that. So that was the first change. The second change was there was a lot of people thinking that the email policy was setting forth disciplinary actions. What we did was said that the restriction of access to email could be the result of disciplinary action, but not in itself a disciplinary action. So, if somebody said that there was some reason to not be able to access your email, the email policy allows us to do that, but it's not because of the disciplinary action. The third one was that this doesn't apply to students. There's a separate student email policy. Because of the complexity of that, we have decided not to. That's a future discussion.

This is my last slide, which is a process. The policy has been reviewed and approved by senior leadership. The next step is to go to presidential review for approval. Once it's approved, the policy will be posted on the usual website, and any comments that come in after the fact will be addressed going forward. There will be advance notice and guidance. We're not going to turn off automatic forwarding right away. We will get people who are using it right now some advance notice. That would probably take place about a month after it has been announced. So that's it, I'm happy to take questions.

Questions and Comments [01:23:26]

- Senator Downing stated there was no active participation of the elected faculty representatives in the development of this new policy.
- CIO Cheu stated he does not believe this is true, he believes this is currently the active group.
- Senator Downing asked how the Senate participated.
- CIO Cheu stated he did not run the policy process itself.
- Senator Downing stated he is asking whether this is legal or not.
- CIO Cheu stated he is the sponsor, the person who can answer this is Celina Ramirez who oversees policy. He looks at the policy itself, not the process of approval
- Senator Downing stated if CIO Cheu returns to the first slide, the policy prohibits automatic forwarding of university email to non-university email accounts. If he is talking to a colleague at another university, which can pose an issue when he attempts to send him a copy of an email that he has received from the CIO.
- CIO Cheu stated there is a setting that can be turned on, where many request that their emails get forwarded to their personal email account, which is an automatic setting. One can still send an email to their colleague at another university, as this is not an automatic process. The key word is "automatic."
- Senator Downing stated security, and confidentiality is a major issue at all universities. Standford passed a very strict policy about what is and what is not considered confidential, and what can be seen and scrutinized by the administration from faculty communications. Senator Downing asked if CIO Cheu is willing and interesting in creating such a policy at this University.
- CIO Cheu stated the Information Security Office has a classification of data information. There is public information, restricted information, and provide information. There is a well-defined process for understanding how data is classified which also includes email. They are currently setting up a data governance process which will have a lot of what Senator Downing is discussing, but they are not quite there yet.
- Chair Hudson stated she is someone who regularly has her communications public record requested. She approaches her email and has for many years, with the understanding that everything she writes in email is public and searchable and she believes this is the best practice for everyone at the university.
- Chair Hudson said a question she has been asking for many years, is when a public request comes in to search her email, as has happened more than once, she has always been given the courtesy of a heads-up from the public records office. She asked if there were circumstances under which someone would not know their email is being surveilled.
- CIO Cheu said in the policy, it has been long-existing that as a courtesy, they will often try to do that. If there is a disciplinary action for which they would not want one to change their email prior to that, this is an example of where a courtesy would not be given. Generally speaking, it is mentioned in the policy, that they will give the authority, especially for something like she mentioned, which is an F01A request.
- Chair Hudson said there should be consideration of tightening the language in case it is part of a legal proceeding.
- CIO Cheu stated there is existing descriptive language. It doesn't cover every case, which as many know, in policy it is hard to. It gives examples of what is and what is not covered.
- Senator Rafelski asked if this policy change is a consequence of something that happened. He has only noticed failure of university mail in many ways which includes non-functionality. For a while, he has used other systems because he is incapacitated by the University email. Having to manually forward emails will be more work for him.
- CIO Cheu said there should be some consideration in what is currently being automatically forwarded to an off-site address. This is a risk that the university must decide on
- Senator Rafelski asked for one example regarding how this will add to security and reduce legal risk. He senses inconvenience in this policy.
- CIO Cheu said an example would be a student emailing him with a FERPA-related issue, which may regard their grade in their class. This would get sent to the faculty on their University email, then forwarded to their personal email address. Because this is no longer contained within the system, there is uncertainly on what Gmail will do with this information. There may be similar cases where someone may send personal medical information that goes into the UA email system, then gets forwarded to a personal email like Gmail or Yahoo which become out of the University's control. They would like to avoid potential issues such as this, on the cybersecurity side.

- CIO Cheu said another example would be if one accidentally clicked on something or sent it off, they wouldn't be able to tell.
- CIO Cheu stated this is where most universities are now, there are very few universities allowing automatic forwarding at this point.
- Senator Ziurys asked how one can separate ownership of the email address and its content.
- CIO Cheu said because they own the account, therefore they can restrict access to the amil, or go in if there is a F01A request, where all the emails pertinent to the request would be downloaded. This also happens to him, and most of the senior leaders in the room.
- CIO Cheu said an example of them not owning the contents would be if someone personally made a picture, or there is content one made that they plan on sending to a colleague because they are proud of it, and they share it. The University doesn't own the content, it is still the sender's priority, but if there was an investigation, they can go in and examine the email.
- Senator Ziurys said it seems like there was a period where comments were accepted, and now that the policy has been written, she asked why the Senate hasn't seen it. It seems like the Faculty are being bypassed once again, as it's going directly to leadership now.
- CIO Cheu stated he has previously mentioned he does not own the process, but this is how it has been described to him, and this is how it is being moved forward.
- Senator Ziurys said she means faculty have been left out.
- CIO Cheu said no, faculty have had every opportunity, and they received a lot of faculty comments in the process which were all read. The policy was also reviewed and edited based on those comments.
- Chair Hudson said when the new revised policy is made public it will be circulated to the Senate and Faculty. All of the comments that come in, whether or not it is a formal 30-day review period, will be provided to him.
- Senator Ziurys said at that point it will be too late, and comments will be ignored.
- Chair Hudson said she is hopeful there will be collaboration on this due to how instrumental faculty feedback has been in the first round of revisions.

9. <u>NEW BUSINESS</u> [01:48:17]

- Senator Slepian said regarding the issue of library, publications, and open access, everyone is striving to do their best. He worked on a three-year project with students, that was just accepted into a nature publication, but now he must come up with $3,500 because it was not funded with anything. He doesn't want to deny the students of a paper in nature. He realizes this is political and not everyone will agree that it's egregious in Elsevier and other big companies, but that is the name in the game. If this money is to be raised, for the short tun, faculty and students should be elevated to get grants, they have a nature paper that shouldn't go into an unknown journal with no impact.
    - Senator Slepian moved **[Motion 2026-27/4]** that the Senate undertake a discussion about the library, resources connected to the library, and publication fees. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 38 in favor.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated there will be further investigation done on this topic and the Senate will return for a discussion on this topic.
- Senator Kennedy stated in 2024-2025, the CALES Faculty Council looked at the revisions and streamlining of the APR process and its connection to raises and promotions. They came up with 4 recommended changes to the 2022 streamlining process that would better protect faculty from what is referred to as the evil director. The mythical evil director that would ensure that peer review is meaningful and that would provide a more sensible recourse path In the case of an unfair evaluation. She would like to bring this forward as a topic to focus on this year, it was previously tabled due to the budget crises on campus, but she believes there is now time to focus on this issue.
    - Senator Kennedy moved **[Motion 2026/27-5]** to review the 2022 Annual Performance Reviews (APR) streamlining process and its subsequent integration into selective raises and linkage to P&T. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 35 in favor.
    - Vice Chair Hymel stated she looks forward to further discussion on this topic once there is more information.
- Senator M. Witte stated there never used to be an adjournment time. She believes during every Senate meeting there should be at least 5 new senators, or more, to take two minutes to discuss who they are, their title, what they do, and what they contribute to the University. She has done this at other workshops. There have recently been a lot of newsletters from the administration during Senate meetings, and this is the Faculty's forum.
    - Senator M. Witte moved **[Motion 2026/27-7]** to have a set number of Senators introduce themselves and describe their work at the beginning of each Senate meeting, for a two-minute time period per Senator. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 33 in favor.
- Senator Downing asked to make a motion to add five more minutes to the meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated this cannot be done as this is the way the agenda operates.

10. <u>Adjournment</u> [01:59:39]

The August 31, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Susan Miller-Cochran, Secretary of the Faculty
Jasmin Espino, Recording Secretary

Motions of August 31, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2026/27-1] to approve the agenda of the August 31, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed with 42 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.

[Motion 2026/27-2] to approve the April 6, 2026, minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2026/27-3] to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council, *UG Minor in Applied Design for Health* was passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2026-27/4] that the Senate undertake a discussion about the library, resources connected to the library, and publication fees. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 38 in favor.

[Motion 2026/27-5] to review the 2022 APR streamlining process and its subsequent integration into selective raises and linkage to P&T. Motion passed with 35 in favor.

[Motion 2026/27-7] to have a set number of Senators introduce themselves and describe their work at the beginning of each Senate meeting, for a two-minute time period per Senator. Motion passed with 33 in favor.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the **Agenda**
2. Page 1, Action Item 4: Approval of the **minutes of May 4, 2026**
3. Page 3, Action Item 5: Consent Agenda: ***Proposal UG Minor in Applied Design for Health***
4. Page 12, Old Business Item A: **Update on the status of the Revised Email Policy**
5. Written reports
    a. **UWGEC**
    b. **President**
    c. **Provost**
    d. **SAPC**

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456