

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 1, 2024**

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=0c761b1e-b8dc-4396-813c-b1460008421f>

1. CALL TO ORDER [00:00:18]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel, called the April 1, 2024, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Dysart was also present.

Present: Senators Braitberg, Bernick, Braithwaite, Brochin, Cai, Casey, Cheu, Coletta, Cui, Domin, Downing, Dysart (Secretary), Eckert, Fellous, Fink, Gerald, Gregory, Guzman, Harris, Heileman, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jones, Knox, Leafgren, Little, Marx, Nelson, Neumann, O' Leary, Ottusch, Pace, Rafelski, Rocha, Rogers, Russell, Schulz, Schwartz, Senseney, Slepian, M. Smith, J. Smith, Spece, Stegeman (Parliamentarian), Stephan, Su, Torres, Tropman, Waddell, Werchan, Willis, M. Witte, R. Witte, Wittman, Zeiders, Ziurys.

Absent: Senators Anderson (GPSC Rep), Barron (ASUA Rep), Buxner, Cochran, Cooley, Dial, Gordon, Grijalva (ASUA Rep), Kandel, Medevoi, Meyer, Pau, Rankin, Robbins (President), Sanchez, Simmons, Stone, M. Williams, T. Williams, Yoon (GPSC Rep).

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:00:30]

Vice Chair Hymel stated there have been changes to the April 1, 2024, Faculty Senate Agenda including replacing the TRIF item and moving it up to the May 2024 meeting with a resolution opposing House Bill HB 2735, and adding Executive Session to award an honorary degree, below the written reports item. Another change is removing the minutes of February 19 and March 11, 2024.

- Senator Fink moved **[Motion 2023-24/49]** to approve the amended agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

Vice Chair Hymel stated before moving into Open Session, she would like to remind everyone to be polite and courteous to one another as everyone is on the same side as all are a part of Faculty Senate, regardless of disagreements. This is especially regarding the chat as she is unable to see it during meetings. If an individual has an issue that needs to be addressed, one of the senators should be contacted.

3. OPEN SESSION [00:04:14]

Annamarie Tellez [00:04:53]

Thank you for the introduction. My name is Annemarie Tellez, I serve as the Director for Parent & Family Programs here on campus, just downstairs of Enrollment Management. The reason I am here is to share with you a little about Family Weekend. This year, Family Weekend will be hosted October 25-October 27. I recognize some names and faces on the Zoom screen and in the room.

The reason I wanted to share Family Weekend with you is because we have some designated outcomes that we share with our families during this weekend. I'm going to read to you for a second, "Family Weekend provides families with the opportunity to learn more about what it means to be a Wildcat through learning about the students' academics, Arizona spirits and traditions, our campus resources, activities, and experiences within the Tucson community."

The outcomes that we laid out are that families have the opportunity to see our students' home-away-from-home and experience everyday life. That families can get a sense of academic excellence of our Arizona faculty, which is why I am here today. Families can gain a better understanding of campus resources that support their student's success, learn about what it means to be a Wildcat through spirit and traditions, participate in activities on campus and in our community, and the opportunity to meet and get to know other Wildcat families and Arizona faculty and staff.

The reason I am here today is to communicate with our faculty and staff here on campus to showcase excellence, the work that you all are doing with our families in October and throughout the year. We have met with several of you and

have some really creative ideas. I know we are working closely with the Frandrau Science Center & Planetarium. They are opening up the dome, showcasing a couple of science classes for families and we're just always available. I will leave my contact information with Kian, and we just appreciate the opportunity to continue to engage and showcase all of the incredible work that you are all doing. Thank you for your time.

Senator Alex Braithwaite [00:07:30]

Hi Folks. I think Family Weekend is an excellent time to engage folks. It is depressing that parents are now sometimes younger than I am, and I wish it weren't true.

My name is Alex, and I am a Professor in the School of Government and Public Policy which is in our excellent College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. I am a Senator at-large. I am here with a relatively quick statement and a request for us as a Faculty Senate. Like most of you, I hope all of you, and many in our community, I am upset by the cuts that I am already starting to see around campus that cost saving is impacting real people's lives. However, as a tenured faculty member, I also can't help but feel like being upset is sort of the equivalent of offering thoughts and prayers after a tragedy.

What I want to recommend is that the Senate move towards offering some support for our colleagues, whether they are faculty, staff, or leadership that have been appointed to the University Advisory Council. I think it's really important that we see that as one avenue through which we as faculty can potentially be involved in conversations and if not always, decision making.

We have a number of colleagues that are on the University Advisory Council who are known to be super upstanding individuals who care about this community. I cannot help but feel like the only way in which we get to the point where their participation through appointment is genuinely counter-productive, is if we make that a self-fulfilling prophecy. I think that the only threat to democracy from appointment comes as us questioning the validity of those individuals standing on that council.

So, I come here, not through conversation with anyone, this was not planned as part of some agenda, just as a regular member of the Faculty Senate to ask that we please empower rather than undermine the faculty, staff, and students that are participating in that council. Whatever we might believe to be the intention behind their appointment, I trust them as individuals and I hope you will support them, so thank you.

Senator Marlys Witte [00:10:24]

In my fifty-five years as a faculty member, forty-five of which have been in shared governance, I have never seen this campus at such a low point. In morale with academic freedom violations, retaliation, and self-censorship in the air, humble finances, and obtuse central decision making which is not only dangerous but violates the public trust.

I come to you with two cautionary tales. One is from 1974 exposé "Our Invaded Universities" by journalist Ronnie Dugger exposing at the time, what was happening at the University of Texas in Austin. Here, he describes the politicization of that campus, industrialization, centralization of authority with the President becoming a CEO, and silencing of faculty and student voices.

The second scenario is from Johns Hopkins Professor Benjamin Ginsberg's "The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why it Matters," I brought this book at the time it was published, in 2011, to the Faculty Senate because he described the centralization of administrative authority, administrative bloat, sidelining of full-time faculty, expropriation of intellectual property and successful summer programs which were taken over and actually failed when they were taken over. He cautioned that it does matter when this happens.

All of these things that they predicted, they tried to offer solutions to at the time. I think things march forward exactly how they are predicted, and we see it here and now on this campus. What I would like to suggest is that we ask ourselves, are we going to rise up and protect our invaded universities from invasion?

Senator Mark Stegeman [00:13:14]

I am not speaking here as a parliamentarian. At the previous meeting, I spoke very briefly about the report, the first required report of the ad-hoc faculty committee on general education. We did not have the report completed at that time, we received it by email later. I wanted to encourage you to look at that report, comments are of course welcome. We worked quite a while on it. The committee will be delivering another report, according to their charge, at the end of the semester.

The committee now has fifteen members representing eleven colleges and similar units, and it is looking at adding another which is not yet final. The general viewpoint of the committee is forward looking. This particular report was about civics, although the charge of the committee goes beyond that. We are looking forward to successful and collaborative implementation of that entire charge and working on these difficult projects together in reporting to the Senate and working with the Administration.

In that report, I want to call attention to what we view as thirteen issues concerning civics implementation which makes

it complex, somewhat challenging, very doable, but not trivial. Three of those issues are somewhat different from what the refresh before. In addition to an existing program which adds some degree of complexity, we are now designing something in the absence of a known budget model given the importance of SCH and planning that adds a complication. NAU discovered that Civics can attract external attention and we would like to avoid that. We believe that starting a constructive conversation with the Office of General Education about the timeline and sequence for working through these things will keep us optimistic that things will move very well. I do believe as I have proselytized endlessly, for the past couple of years, that Civics cannot be a burden but a homerun for the institution.

4. STATEMENT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, LEILA HUDSON [00:16:17]

I want to use my time here today to share some of the qualitative data from the survey that I put out to the faculty a week ago. On the one hand it gives us an anecdotal broad confirmation of the experiences that we have all been having with some very rough data and illuminates where some trouble spots are. On the other hand, it reminds me again and again of what an amazing, extraordinary community of professionals, educators of knowledge producers and people who care for each other that we have here. What we've learned in the survey is that the University of Arizona, an amazing professional committed and caring community, which has everything it needs for an amazing comeback.

But the survey suggests to me that the damage inflicted by mismanagement requires nothing less than a change of leadership as soon as that can happen. What we don't need is more chaos, volatility and short-sighted actions and that's part of the reason why I've been holding back on formalizing the lack of confidence with a vote.

My primary concern as chair of the faculty as we approach the end of this academic and fiscal year is to oversee an orderly unwinding of Pres Robbin's presidency. Many of you are impatient for a formal vote of no confidence and I hear you. But many of you are uncomfortable with the kind of vote that we could do here in 10 minutes. Many of you want to make sure that the president has a chance to defend himself against the rising momentum of frustration. I have numerous requests including a resolution in hand and a plan for a general assembly of the faculty all Brewing as we speak.

Over the past few weeks, I was waiting to see whether, humbled, by all the enormous mistakes and chastened by the governor whether President Robbins wouldn't reach out to finally collaborate with the elected representative of the University, specifically the faculty through their elected representatives in their properly constituted deliberative bodies.

I've been disappointed in patterns that I have been exerting show that the President may have lost confidence in himself. After winning re-election to the post of chair of the faculty I extended offers to talk one-on-one with the President, determined not to leave any opportunity for productive collaboration on the table, he didn't answer. The new University Council and the faculty that were chosen for this were those with clear track records of loyalty and support for the Administration. An answer to what Senator Braithwaite said, I think the President should talk to anyone he wants to, anyone who can get the message across. But to the extent that the University Advisory Council, which includes excellent representatives of staff and students, to the extent that it's used to bypass the properly constituted bodies, properly elected representatives of the faculty, and dilute our voices. It's a problem.

The Committee of Eleven asked the President to do something that shouldn't have been that hard, to come out and boldly oppose legislative efforts to concentrate executive power in his own hands. He declined to do that. He dodged our questions here in the Senate, but also in the written form that we sent to him afterwards, and we have reason to think that he is not neutral in talks with legislators about HB-2735.

As said, I have a resolution in hand for a vote on whether he has breached the public trust, but I think we need a full discussion and debate including a chance for the President or a proxy or delegate to answer the charges that he has breached the public trust. We are not a court of law, not prosecutors, we do not need to prove anything, but also, we don't want to rush a resolution of this importance.

I'll do a very quick rundown of the anecdotal evidence in the survey I put out last week. It corroborates what most of us here already are witnessing firsthand. We received 138 entries, many of them containing more than one issue. I coded them roughly into 233 anecdotes or comments and will probably do a follow-up survey to distinguish between colleges so that we can make sure we're not double counting the same events and issues. I now have a vague understanding of the hot spots: the places where staff layoffs are already happening, the prospect of faculty non-renewals and opportunistic structural changes are being made.

I broke the data down into three broad categories – first, the effects on faculty and staff and the workplace which can be summed up by the ugly phrase brain drain and workplace toxicity. Second -- largest category focuses on programs and effects on the students' academic experience which can be summed up as deleterious. The largest subset of comments focused on the negative effects on the student learning experience both the accumulated, chronic mismanagement and of the ways that it is being addressed right now. Third -- structural changes to units and Facilities. I'll focus on the first two categories.

Because of who answered the survey, namely faculty, the largest number of comments pertained to the degradation of the faculty, staff, and workplace morale. Mid-semester it looks like the biggest and most prevalent dynamic from the

point of view of faculty is the flight of talent for both faculty and staff. So many of us are retiring earlier than we would have, looking for other work, and are watching their valued colleagues depart. This creates the first kick in the gut to morale, in just about every college. I'm sure the Provost office will provide us with statistics soon enough. Those who remain both faculty and staff are overburdened or anticipate being overburdened in the upcoming academic year. Multiple faculty lines that have left, being replaced with a single visiting professor or going from a staff support of three, to 0.3 staff, paying taxes to other colleges and units in order to process grant requests are some of the incidents that have been cited or anticipated. The hiring freeze is the realest part of all of this, and it accentuates this dynamic of flight and exacerbates it. Labor, money, and hopes were invested in many searches that have been cut short, and the effect of pulling back offers that have been made, or rescinding open positions that people have applied for, is terrible for our reputation. Other replacements in units that are financially healthy have been called off or held off. There are two or three locations throughout the University where staff layoffs have already occurred, and it'll take until the summertime to understand the scope of non-renewals of career track faculty. In short, morale is terrible and the personal stories of staff who have been terminated or anticipate termination are painful to read. I should note as well that many who reported on this situation are speaking out for the first time because of fear of retaliation and even expressing gratitude because no one had asked before what this looks like from the perspective of our precarious faculty and staff.

As I mentioned before, the largest number of comments mentioned the degradation of the student experience. programs are being cut that is coming from shrinkage of our operations across the board. Programs are being cut, especially interdisciplinary programs which are foreshadowing the future of the academy. Small classes and studios returning into large lecture classes. At the same time graduate programs and majors, even ones that cost little and especially interdisciplinary programs are being imperiled. There are fewer and fewer TAs to assist with the teaching of those large lecture classes. Summer teaching that would help students complete faster and provide much needed income for instructors are being eliminated or disincentivized. The ratio of advisors to Undergraduate students is moving in the wrong direction. Contact hours will be cut. Post doc programs are being decimated.

In short, professionals who keep the university operating, scholars who embody and execute our mission are paying the price for missteps in management. Meanwhile we still have not heard of a plan to counter administrative bloat, to address the problem of leadership in the handful of budget units responsible for the majority of the deficit. We haven't heard of a payback plan for athletics which we subsidized perhaps even more than \$87 million, or a plan to make UAGC something that we can use as an asset or be proud of rather than an incubus on our reputation and our conscience.

The community is out of patience, sick and tired of blunders, excuses and what appear to be lies, and President Robbins is almost out of runway. All candidates to be our future Provost and President need to know however, that in the Senate and other elected representatives and properly constituted bodies of the faculty, they have collaborative partners who value above all else, the academic mission and can bring it back to excellence stronger than ever. We value stability, diversity, deliberation, consensus, and fairness.

5. Report from the President – President Robert Robbins [00:28:10]

Vice Chair Hymel stated President Robbins is out of town and asked Senior Vice President and Secretary of the University, Jon Dudas if there is anything else he would like to share.

- SVP and Secretary Dudas stated there is nothing else to share beyond the report.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there used to be an individual who would regularly attend the Senate meetings to give a legislative report, and asked SVP and Secretary Dudas if he would be that individual.
- SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he sometimes gave the report out if the President were not in attendance and can make that possible.
- Vice Chair Hymel asked if that can be made a regular occurrence.
- SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he can go over anything by request, secondly, there is a newsletter which can be made available to all which will include updates and the ABOR position. A third item can be to bring a report to the Faculty Senate or send it directly to Faculty Senate Executive Committee.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated she and SVP and Secretary Dudas can coordinate this offline.
- Senator Harris stated President Robbins has missed many meetings recently and asked if it is appropriate to have a spokesperson in his place to give reports and interact with the Faculty Senate, given the environment.
- SVP and Secretary Dudas stated that would be him and he is able to give the report if Senators would like.

Senior Vice President and Secretary Jon Dudas [00:30:50]

In the report, the first thing was the direction that ABOR Committee Meetings are this week up in Phoenix, AZ. The full ABOR meeting will be held in Tucson, AZ in the next two weeks. At that time, the Strategic Planning Committee will address demographic shifts in Arizona. This is where the State Demographer will discuss what it means for shifts in populations for all three universities, as there is still a growing population in Arizona, and the effects of other states.

- Health Consultants Judy Burness and Jackie Chadwick, who used to work at the University of Arizona, will report on the strong focus on health initiatives at all three Universities.
- The Governance and Operations Committee will address ASU's gen-ed crosswalk. They will also focus on FAFSA

as there have been many issues with the Department of Education getting FAFSA data out, there are questions such as: What does that mean for our enrollment? What does that mean for our students? How do we provide support, particularly for some of the most vulnerable students financially?

- There will be a financial update from the University of Arizona Interim Chief Financial Officer, John Arnold.
- ABOR will clarify the consolidation of Graduate Student Tuition & Fees which is something UA's GPSC is interested in. This will be just a cleanup, but it is important to ensure they are doing a good job at supporting what students at UA are advocating for.

Questions [00:33:01]

- Senator Downing stated his thanks for SVP and Secretary Dudas. Senator Downing stated SVP and Secretary Dudas mentioned he is at the apex of an infrastructure that is supposed to be protecting the academic freedom of the campus, while also providing a warning about legislation that would attack academic freedom. Senator Downing stated knowing what happens when the session is almost closed does no one any good and asked if there will be a change in the technique.
- Senator Downing asked if SVP and Secretary Dudas will direct his staff to not stop individual faculty who wish to go into the legislature to testify, as he tried doing so, which can discourage them from exercising their academic freedom, to testify to the legislature of Arizona.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he can work with anyone to ensure the Faculty Senate or Faculty in general has a more updated process. There are a lot of faculty who are a part of the newsletter who have also made that point.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he is happy to instruct the team and government community relations to not stop anyone from testifying as it is 100% the opposite of what they do. They work very hard to ensure every staff and faculty member who goes up there has the opportunity to testify and promotes them to ensure they understand the laws while they're there because there have been times where people have been asked "well are you here because you're taking time off, etc.?" He believes he knows what Senator Downing is referencing.
 - Interim SVP of RII, Elliot Cheu stated there are requirements to communicate with government officials which is that faculty members submit a Conflict of Commitment form and obtain approval from their supervisor. This is built into either policy or law, and as employees of the state, one cannot just show up and start advocating as that is considered lobbyists. There are rules necessary to follow as UA employees.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated there is a state statute and fine for individuals who violate it which is a reason the Government Community Relations office is careful to talk to anyone who comes up to testify to ensure the individual is made aware and that they understand the law.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated they have discussed the idea that one can mention they work for the University of Arizona and their position, but the individual is not there to represent the University. No one can, outside of ABOR.
 - Senator Downing stated he was walking into the Senator door and was asked why he was not in his office; he was there as a former member of the legislature and had every right to enter. He was asked multiple interrogations; he was not in violation of the State law and can guarantee many individuals have signed in including the Parliamentarian who was there and not stopped. They both signed in to speak against the bill.
- Senator Downing asked if the President is also responsible for following the law since he attended and discussed the bill as he had, which he thinks occurred during the President's official time.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas asked Senator Downing for clarification on whether he referred to President Robbins.
 - Senator Downing stated in the testimony, the sponsor of the bill stated President Robbins was there discussing the bill with him which would give the President absolute power over all departments, deans, and everything else. The sponsor stated he met with the President. Senator Downing asked if the President must also follow the same law or if he is like some individuals within the country who are above the law.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated the President must follow the same laws, but the particular law does not apply to him as he is the representative of the University.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated as background, the University of Arizona follows Kalven Principles of Freedom of Speech from the University of Chicago of 1968. Kalven Principles essentially state that universities should not be speaking on behalf of all faculty, universities should not be speaking on behalf of all students or individuals. They speak on behalf of diversity and should limit speaking on behalf of the university to things that directly affect the university which this would.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated the idea is that faculty members and students have the right to bring up whatever they choose at the Capitol, they can lobby anything whether the University likes it or not. His team is supposed to ensure they are in power, and all students, staff, and faculty are protected from the current laws, ensure they know what they can be accused of, etc. This has been done consistently year-after-year, there have been many students brought up to the Capitol for lobbying days. Students have been brought up to both the State and DC to argue against positions about the University.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he is confident there is robust support for views that the administration may not like or something about administrative policy.
- Senator Zeiders stated it sounds like the President was well within his bounds in terms of lobbying for HB-2735, and

- she is curious if Dudas can state the President's position, his position, and the position of lobbyists on HB-2735.
- SVP and Secretary Dudas stated the President has not lobbied for the bill. The way the positions are designed is that the Universities get together with ABOR who takes a common position for all three universities. They either come in as support, neutral, opposed, or do not say anything about a particular bill. In this case, ABOR came in neutral, and all three Universities did as well.
 - Senator Zeiders asked if Dudas is confirming that the position of the President is also neutral.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he is confirming the position of the University of Arizona. The President is allowed to believe, think, vote, and do as he wants as an individual just as everyone else is. He is sharing the position of ABOR, ASU, NAU, and UA that are all neutral on HB-2735.
 - Senator Russell asked if there is an update for a timeline on a plan for how the UA will get out of the budget mess. A timeline is requested because the next Faculty Senate meeting is in May, which is the end of the year for most, until Fall. There is a lot of unrest, and individuals are beginning to get nervous who are doing activities on the ground. Many individuals would like to help but without knowing what that looks like, it is difficult.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated to the best he knows, Interim CFO Arnold, President Robbins, and Provost Marx are going through the all-funds process department-by-department, division-by-division. He imagines some individuals in the room have had their divisions or colleges discussed.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he is not certain on the timeline and will allow Provost Marx to elaborate, but he knows the goal is to wrap everything up in April. Most decisions will be made locally, each college will have the opportunity to understand what their budget is and what to adjust. Until all divisions are done, it is hard to say where the balance will be.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he has gone through the budget and there seems to be significant savings.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he understands Senator Russell's point that people run out of patience and they're frustrated by it, if you don't have information, the human mind doesn't go to positive things.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated the time has passed for this item of business and there will be one more Senator allowed to speak.
 - Senator Bernick stated he is curious about the university's position and status as he's getting a lot of inquiries from Graduate and Undergraduate students about Senate Bill 1005. He has read the fact sheet from the State Senate that, "It prohibits a public entity from requiring or spending public monies on a DEI program and allows employees who is required to participate in the program to bring an action against the public entity. It also prohibits public entities from entering into a contract with a company that participates in a DEI program." Senator Bernick asked if the UA will be way out of compliance with this.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he does not have that on his report but believes that is to go to a State vote. He will try to find out an answer, the same process applies where ABOR and the Universities can come in and he believes it will bypass the traditional process.
 - Senator Bernick stated that for context, the statewide undergraduate and graduate leadership are writing a memo to ABOR that will be circulated to SVP and Secretary Dudas.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated him, and his team can help with support or ensuring the letter gets to the right people as that is the job of the Government Community Relations area and he apologizes to Senator Downing or anyone else who has had a negative experience.
 - Senator Spece stated regarding lobbying and gathering paperwork, he would like to point out to his colleagues that everyone has constitutional rights as a private citizen. If it is made clear that one is not speaking for the university, they can mention the job they have, and are only speaking from their own opinion as a matter of concern, there is no threat. He's astounded by what happened to Professor Downing as it was described to him.
 - Senator Spece stated he has never seen an administration take this position against academic freedom. He remembers a former Presidency where the University had one of the most liberal positions on academic freedom and the President voted in favor of changing the rules. This is the first time he has seen the University not protect academic freedom and rights as citizens to speak on matters of public concern.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated what Senator Spece stated as a matter of law is 100% correct but does not agree with the conclusion he had. For ten years, the same process has been followed with scores and scores of faculty members, staff members, and others who have gone out there, and it has worked out brilliantly. It sounds like this happened in a way where a Faculty Senator did not feel good about it, but this is the odd time out. There are about ten sides to the story and about nine of them recorded it and shared concerns they had about the way an employee acted at the Capitol, and it wasn't Government Community Relations.
 - Senator Ziurys stated there has been a lot of discussion about IT centralization and she is now hearing rumors that all business administration communications and facilities management are in the process of being centralized. Senator Ziurys asked if this is correct.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated it is correct that around December 13, 2023, which he believes happened at ABOR, the President announced that as part of the financial plan, he would look at centralizing IT, HR, Finance, Marketing & Communications, and Development. All of these are looked at as a way to see if there are efficiencies in scale, ways to save dollars, and most importantly security.
 - SVP and Secretary Dudas stated he recently came across a report from 2009 which can still be found on the web. It discussed centralizing IT because of security concerns, which are the very same security

concerns that are arising now which seems to be a perennial thing. The focus of the State Auditor was on security, they audited a number of things and centralized IT did not result in any negative findings. All negative findings were in other areas. In the last two years there have been eight significant breaches. It is about when organizations like NSC, CIA, and FBI go to the UA and notify them of significant breaches.

- Senator Ziurys stated no it is not because, the Auditor General gave Barry Brummund twenty items to fix, and he only fixed half of them. Then, all of a sudden, centralization was introduced, and the institution was told it was because of the Auditor General although it wasn't. Another explanation given is that it would result in saving money.

6. **Report from the Provost [00:50:02]**

Good afternoon, everyone. I have two brief items to discuss today, I think the second one will include more discussion. The first one is that my office is in the middle of a tenure promotion cycle for the year, we have 157 cases, a very heavy load. 102 of them are tenure-track and continuing status and 55 are career-track. I want to thank the members of the faculty who are participating in these committees, they're very important to me, perhaps the most important committees of the University and it's a tremendous amount of work, and I want to thank them for doing that work on behalf of all of us.

The second item regards money, and the meetings that we have been having. CFO Arnold and I have met with thirty-three different groups to date, and we have six more that will be coming up in the next couple. These meetings run for about an hour to about two and a half hours, in some cases, they are iterations. We met this morning with a college that we had met with a couple of weeks ago to gather further information. This process is in fact, iterative. The deans and division heads have been making presentations for us with financial needs they have in their units and ways in which they can save money given the financial situation we have. SVP and Secretary Dudas comments that the budget allocations will be done sometime by the end of the month are fairly accurate. One of the uncertainties is that the state budget is not likely to be resolved before the end of the month which might impact the kind of money we have coming into the University under one potential scenario of the state cutting the higher education allocation.

We have asked the deans and division heads to project scenarios of cuts of 5%, 10%, and 15%. We didn't ask them to make those cuts, we asked for scenarios of what that might look like or what the impact would be. Obviously, the more cuts, the more grievous the impact would be, which goes without saying. The range of budget cuts at the end of the day will most likely range from a number greater than five, to a number positive. Some units will end up with more money at the end of the day than in FY24 based on an entire host of factors that you might imagine having to do with things like growth of programs and related kinds of issues. As we talk with the deans and division heads, we have been making suggestions about what that might look like, toward the end of the process. Before we complete this, we will go back to the unit heads and discuss their allocations with them. The model is starting with expenditures in FY24 which is pretty much certain by this time. Not the least of which is because we asked for the hiring freeze and procurement limitations starting in January. We have a reasonably good handle on what the expenditures for each unit are going to be and the allocations for FY25 will be plus or minus, based on the expenditures from FY24. It is an uncertain process at this time, but we are iterating through to get resolution. It is a process that sounds a little goofy, but it is actually a process I think is going to resolve into some considerable savings across campus, and as little damage as possible to our academic enterprise as you've heard from the Chair of the Faculty, there's likely to be some damage. I think the Chair painted the most dire picture. I am hopeful the picture will not be as dire as she painted, but there will be some pain without question.

Questions [00:55:25]

- Senator Harris stated her question is related to Senator Ziurys' question regarding the demand for centralization in business, operating, marketing and development. Senator Harris asked if anyone will ever see projections for how much money this will save and a comparison for how things are done now versus what is intended, this should also be extended to IT.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he believes the value propositions associated with the centralization efforts have to be presented to the community.
- Senator Ziurys stated regarding Senator Harris's comment, she has been receiving conflicting stories because she met with the Dean of the College of Science about a week prior and she stated that John Arnold told her the IT centralization had nothing to do with money and had to do with streamlining processes for the future. Senator Ziurys asked what is going on and if there can be numbers shared.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated yes, he will have to get Barry Brummund to share those numbers. From what he understands, there are no savings in the first year, but the savings will improve by the third year as more of the centralized processes iron themselves out. There were a little over 500 people who were changed supervision from units to IT which is a lot of money. There will be savings from that in the out years. He also understands there were savings from purchasing systems.
- Senator Ottusch stated he heard decisions should be made around April regarding budgets and asked if academic colleges and divisions will be able to take that information and use it at that time. He asked what the working budget model is that units will be using based on the upcoming 2024 year.

- Interim Provost Marx stated planning should begin once the allocations are announced. He was at a deans meeting prior to Faculty Senate and one of the deans asked him how certain he was, his response was to move forward with a little bit of caution, until the state allocation is known which is the caveat.
 - Interim Provost Marx asked for clarification on Senator Ottusch's second question.
 - Senator Ottusch stated there have been different budget models including AIB, RCM, etc. and asked what the central guideline will be used for the next year. This can include how colleges work with student credit hours, majors, etc.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he was a great advocate for activity-based budgets that had a lot of advantages and some disadvantages. The straight activity-based budgeting systems will be abandoned. FY25 allocations will be based entirely on FY24 expenditures, not allocations, minus any cost and payment associated with cuts. What is done in FY26 is an open matter, which he will not be the Provost at the time. As speculation, it is most likely that there will be a blend of an incremental budget which is, "you get what you got last year," plus a veneer, some kind of layer of activity where money can be allocated to units that are growing and have ambitious plans.
- Senator Bernick stated Graduate student pay is at a \$21,750 baseline which varies by department or college. Yesterday, he found that the MIT living wage in Tucson, AZ which is far lower in proxies such as Tempe, AZ and Flagstaff, AZ is \$41,000 for a single adult with no kids. Senator Bernick stated he knows it is not the time to be asking for more but wanted to preface this as where Graduate students are coming from.
- Senator Bernick asked what the Provost is hearing during the all-funds process regarding their plans on non-renewals or contracting the graduate workforce, especially GAs into the next year and further horizon.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated as SVP and Secretary Dudas said earlier, at the end of the day, the deciding authority on who gets hired within units is up to the unit head and department head in terms of their budget. He is very sympathetic as Senator Bernick knows very well, as everyone was a graduate student at one point in their lives. He understands the vital role that graduate students play in the research enterprise, and that students must be invested in when they come to work and study with the UA, they can get out the door with a degree and not be totally impoverished.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated from his point of view, he thinks inevitability, the UA will end up with fewer graduate students. He had a long conversation with Provosts of the UC Davis and UC Irvine, and this seems to happen nationally.
 - Senator Bernick asked for clarification whether that means fewer graduate assistantships or fewer graduate students overall.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated there would be fewer graduate students. If pay is increased of existing students, then the pot will not expand at the same rate as pay.
- Senator Schwartz stated Interim Provost Marx mentioned there would be value propositions to explain why the various centralizations might be of positive impact. He suggests they would give great impact themselves if the value propositions proceeded the centralization.
- Senator Schwartz stated individuals have been told they must wait to hear about contractions until the all-funds process is completed. He believes everyone understands that for the colleges and departments people have been waiting to hear how the central administration will be contracted for months now, and nothing has been heard.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he believes he spoke briefly about this at the last senate meeting regarding the Provost office.
 - Senator Schwartz stated the Provost office is one part of the central administration.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated the cuts to the Provost office will be a minimum of 7.9% and might be higher, There are cuts to the President's office and Interim SVP of RII Cheu can speak on cuts relevant to RII. There will be cuts across the board. There are some units where those will be minimized like the registrar's office because there are more students, and the demand on the registrar's office is profound. Adjustments will be done to the best of their ability.
- Senator Brochin stated she appreciates Interim Provost Marx's comment as the cuts won't be as oblique as Chair Hudson said, but he did mention there would be pain. Many are hearing about the layoffs and program cuts and the words of less graduate students, understanding this is a national trend.
- Senator Brochin stated she is concerned about programs such as SPFI (Strategic Priorities Faculty Initiative) that are critical to recruiting top talent faculty across the country. She is concerned about the provost investment funds, the post-doc program, and all programs that impact the quality of the student experience and what it means to choose the University of Arizona.
- Senator Brochin stated given what is known from every Senate meeting including the athletic bailout and the UA Global Campus acquisition, there is an article that came out today, that the Governor is pressing President Robbins to answer questions about UA Global.
- Senator Brochin stated it is hard for her as a faculty member in the College of Education who works in very specialized bilingual teacher education programs that serve Southern Arizona on this campus and in K-12 schools. It is hard to understand why even 5% cuts are necessary given the huge mistake.
- Senator Brochin stated she wonders if the President or his team will respond to the Governor's questions directly concerning the deficit and connection to the UA Global Campus. She asked when it is imagined programs such as SPFI and the Provost Investment Funds might be reinstated.

- Interim Provost Marx stated he is unable to speak for the President but can't imagine he would ignore the Governor. He is sure the President and people who work directly with him are preparing responses.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated he feels the same way she does about programs such as SPFI and the Provost Investment Fund. He took between eight and nine million dollars out of the Provost office budget. The Provost Investment Fund is still in there, and the reason why he suspended investments for the Spring is to be aligned with the fiscal disposition that the rest of the campus was doing.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated they are in the middle of the interview with the second potential provost and hopes everyone would ask the new Provost if they would support that program. Many have been asking him what he would do if he were to stay, and he believes the SPFI and Provost Investment Fund are important and should be maintained.
- Senator Rocha stated she has been in many meetings, and they've stated the hiring freeze will end as of June 30, 2024, and it would be nice to see what that looks like. The UA will still be in the place of deficit, and it would be nice to know specifics such as who can hire. Senator Rocha stated she is aware Interim SVP of RII Cheu is present at the meeting and will not ask him directly as he will get direction from the leadership. She is concerned that everyone is saying it, but asked if it is true.
 - Interim Provost Marx stated the hiring freeze and recruitment freeze are over on June 30, 2024, and the new fiscal year starts without them. The hiring plans are part of the all-funds budget discussion, even during the hiring freeze, most units hired up to 25% they were allocated. He approved a number of tenure-stream and career-track faculty searches during that period of time that are underway now and would fill a leader in the upcoming Fall semesters. There is still recruiting, just likely not as much as before. There will be hiring of faculty and staff as part of the new fiscal year.
- Vice Chair Hymel thanked Interim Provost Marx for taking the time to answer questions and attend the meeting. She looks forward to more stability.

7. **Action Item: Approval of the [2028-2029 Academic Calendar](#) – Vice Chair of the Faculty, Mona Hymel [01:11:03]**

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2023/24-50]** to approve the 2028-2029 Academic Calendar. Motion was seconded.

- Senator Tropman stated he realizes this is trivial to what is being considered and asked if there is a reason the spring semester always starts on that Wednesday. It may work well for others, but instructionally it is opportune for himself and many of his colleagues as there is a false start. The next week is a four-day week with observance of the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. holiday. It is at the end of January, by the time there is a five-day week. He sees it is specified in the Faculty Senator recommendations on scheduling, but not in the ABOR policy.
 - Secretary Dysart stated Alex Underwood from the Registrar's office may be able to answer questions if someone can promote him on Zoom.
 - Senator Tropman stated it can be addressed at a different meeting and is not prepared to oppose it but would like to hear an explanation.
 - University Registrar, Alex Underwood stated traditionally the Spring term follows the standard to ensure there are enough instructional days to hit finals by or on commencement on May 11th. If the calendar were to be switched, he would also like it to start on a Monday, but this may be a lot of work and it is important to look at what the schema could be. He is willing to do that work led with the faculty, and to consider other break periods.
 - University Registrar Underwood stated the UA should give themselves enough time in advance in the future years and there would need to be ABOR confirmation, as calendar dates are sent within five years, but changes can be made with a one-year notice. The 2025-2026 calendar is the soonest calendar that can be changed at this time.
- Senator Russell stated there needs to be enough days to teach a Winter Session.
- Secretary Dysart stated there are many faculty and staff members who have children in the TUSD school system. She and University Registrar Underwood exchanged emails regarding better coordination with TUSD on Spring break and he will try to reach out to them. TUSD sets their calendars after the UA and University Registrar Underwood is going to make an effort to work with them in the future which can benefit a lot of members of the local community.
- **[Motion 2023/24-50]** passed by unanimous consent.

8. **Action Item: Consent Agenda (no discussion) – Chair of the Undergraduate Council, Holly Nelson, and Co-Chairs of the Graduate Council, Hong Cui and Sanlyn Buxner – [Undergraduate Dean's List, Honors & Awards Policy Amendment](#) [01:16:29]**

- Vice Chair Hymel stated no one has requested to remove the item and is a seconded motion which will be voted up or down.
- **[Motion 2023/24-51]** passed with forty-five in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

9. **Old Business [01:18:08]**

A. **[Ad Hoc IT Committee report](#) discussion – IT Committee Chair, Tyson Swetnam [01:18:50]**

I am an Associate Research Professor, the Director of Open Science in the Institute for Computation and Data-

enabled insight, and I am the Chair of this ad-hoc Faculty Senate Committee. I presented our results at the last meeting and the document was available online. I just want to state what the ad-hoc was tasked with doing: assess the IT landscape in line of research and teaching infrastructure needs, the crisis and staffing, the finding of the recent state audit around security, and the ABOR mandate towards centralization and recommendations about centralization storage and the meaning of these for premier research institute.

The report produced is limited to those areas. We specifically didn't talk about other large things in IT like global campus. The recommendations made to the Faculty Senate regarding the next steps, are emphasized with the information that these come from an Ad-hoc committee with no authority to speak to central IT or to make recommendations on the University's behalf as it is up to the Senate to discuss and move forward with the information. Recommendations:

- Encouraging the Office of the CIO to engage with faculty and researchers to develop new committees around IT decision making could strengthen UITS leadership and improve morale across campus IT units. Other R1 universities which have Information Technology Advisory Councils (ITAC) responsible for guiding IT decisions through their offices of IT with shared governance could be used as templates (see §6.3.3).
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated his personal favorite is the University of Utah who has a good set of IT committees.
- We encourage a hybrid approach to the centralization of IT security. A hybrid approach includes high level security policies and protocols which are governed from Central IT, while allowing individual departments and research units the autonomy to implement additional specific security measures tailored to their needs.
- UITS now has the potential to significantly enhance services and opportunities for the University of Arizona community through strategic centralization, cloud migration, and dedicated support for research computing and data storage. We also reemphasize that the adoption of cloud computing and commercial cloud providers is not a zero-sum or all-or-nothing decision. Hybrid cloud, on-premises, and HPC solutions for research computing are the recommended framework.
- IT centralization and cloud services have been stated as being aimed at improving security compliance, operational efficiency, and financial management. Recent annual reports from UITS (see §3.1) have emphasized UArizona IT's already impressive financial efficiency and cost-saving in operations relative to other peer institutions, this undermines the justifications for centralization as a means of improving operational and financial efficiency.

There are a few items included in the report that the committee wants to clarify. We mentioned endangerment to human life and property, the central IT and administration takes safety as a top priority and in our report, we were speaking towards off-site facilities like observatories, and places like cooperative extension stations where bringing an individual across the state to work on something like an autonomous tractor can be dangerous. We want to ensure mitigations are in place, and I am assured those are ongoing.

Questions [01:22:40]

- Senator Ottusch stated his thanks to Chair and Director Swetnam for joining the meeting. Today he had a class, and it was beneficial to have an IT individual in the building because they were able to fix a single button. A hybrid approach was mentioned, and he asked if Chair and Director Swetnam had heard anything about the University pursuing this approach or what this may look like.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated the UA is one of the most forward-thinking universities in the use of clouds. There are already many cloud services such as Box and OneDrive. There are managed cloud services to run things like virtual machines or APIs. Relative to classroom activities and IT for those, that has been managed at the department level for many years. There are things such as UID sign-on where individuals sign in when they enter their classroom environment now.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated he was up at the Biosphere last week and they have a centralized machine where there is wired network registration where your computer has to be registered to connect to the network. Those types of hybrid approaches are all that is needed, so everyone will continue to have laptops.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated he would encourage everyone to move their research computing into a centralized space like the co-location space of UITS, or onto a commercial cloud where large national and international data sets are already housed.
- Senator Ziurys stated everything the committee is doing sounds great, and she asked if Chair and Director Swetnam is sure anyone in the upper administration will listen to the committee's recommendations.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated the ad-hoc committee serves the Faculty Senate and does not speak directly to IT. If the Faculty Senate chose to work with central IT to create a new advisory committee, hopefully they would have the ear and could work in co-production with central IT.
- Chair Hudson thanked the committee for their work and stated she will work with them to come up with a resolution that will be put before the Senate for some of the governance bodies to come into place.
- Chair Hudson asked to what extent does the high-performance computing governance is already in place provide a template or service that can be built on for the recommended IT framework.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated he would say the RCGC framework is inadequate for what is needed.

It was set up for the vHPC users. RCGC should be one of the potential committees, but others are needed to focus on academic use cases, and other researcher's cases.

- Senator Zeiders stated her thanks and said it is an incredible and thorough report, his expertise alongside those of the fellow committee members are valued.
- Senator Zeiders stated separate from this independent report, she would like to say that she is hearing growing concerns from UITS workers about retaliation for speaking out within the public. There have been real threats to workers who are speaking out in public and private meetings, which she finds troubling. Senators should watch this closely. She hopes that Chair and Director Swetnam, his committee members, and all IT employees will continue with this work and under no circumstances should they feel silenced or intimidated.
- Senator Zeiders stated regarding the impact on research, she has heard a lot about the impact of this move, and centralization of research, and her college has specific examples. In CALES, when UITS moved the reporting lines of all IT workers, they moved workers who were fully funded by restricted funds on grants from under PIs of the grant, to UITS. This was really hard and difficult for research teams. Senator Zeiders asked if an update can be given on this as there is a widely known concern. Senator Zeiders asked if the CIO's office has discussed this matter with Chair and Director Swetnam and if this concern has been resolved.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated he has not spoken with the CIO's office about this matter, others may report on this more succinctly than he is able to. The committee's understanding is that all IT has been centralized into one department and they are reporting to one of three supervisors. Individual members of IT will continue to report to their direct supervisor. There is a higher level where the departmental report will now be going to central IT.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated as of now, no one will be moving from their offices, and they will continue to function as they have. Relative to job descriptions, there is now a process where it can be moved to a non-IT position or a more direct IT position which Interim SVP of RII Elliot Cheu can touch more on.
 - Interim SVP of RII Cheu stated it is true that initially individuals funded by grants were identified but not moved, a few days later the decision was changed. Anyone with greater than 50% funding from external sources does not have a reporting line change.
- Senator Russell stated she agrees with the Research Computing Governance Committee (RCGC) who were set up for the supercomputing facilities on campus to grow together and share. This does include some co-location as there is big water, and big transformers. IT on campus is way bigger than that and it was seen in the committee's report. It is not just the research part, it includes teaching, IT for one's office, finances, and all other parts of administration.
- Senator Russell stated one thing that worries her when she gets pushed towards the cloud is she moved too much data and has to buy her own T100 or T10 lines for her office or lab. Those are not provided by the University unless one is in a newer and fancier building which most aren't and moving data to the cloud or wireless can be challenging.
- Senator Russell stated she is glad the RCGC is kept in consideration but there should be a broader conversation about IT that does not only include research. She appreciates all of the work of Chair and Director Swetnam and his committee.
- Senator Ziurys stated individuals were moved and their supervisors became central IT. It was only after massive protection by the faculty that people who were on grants will return to those grants. For the people who hadn't complained, this would have continued on its course. For people paying IT, with a lot of grants, those people would be taken out of their control.
- Senator Ziurys stated she is still worried this is only a temporary fix and as the months pass by, things will change. Senator Ziurys asked if Interim SVP of RII Cheu could comment on whether this situation will change in the future.
 - Interim SVP for RII Cheu stated the lines were not moved. There was an email that was distributed stating that on March 4, 2024, lines would be changed. This never occurred, by the time March 4, 2024, came, the lines were changed for people who had less than 50% of grant funding. Individuals were given email communications that stated they were going to move but didn't.
 - Interim SVP for RII Cheu stated his department is working with UITS through contracting and sponsored services so no rules are broken in terms of who reports to whom. UITS is looking at how they can assist with managing research computing at large. His department is looking at the needs for research computing across campus to develop a more holistic plan.
- Senator Fink asked if Chair and Director Swetnam is aware of any coding violations of federal contracts or serious cuts to research funding resulting from continuous evolving from the IT centralization. It was brought to his attention by his constituents and admits he has not read the entire report.
 - Chair and Director Swetnam stated that sounds like almost verbatim from the Arizona Daily Star report. The committee is not aware of any cuts to funding. They are suggesting that centralization can disrupt research at the University which can lead to cuts. Regarding the violations of federal contracts, he doesn't believe he has the authority to discuss that matter. If anyone would like to discuss this with him privately, he can forward them to the proper people.
 - Senator Fink stated he apologizes for putting Chair and Director Swetnam on the spot and is just the messenger.
- Senator Zeiders asked if there is a cost savings analysis for centralization that Chair and Director Swetnam is

aware of as it has been said this is one of the reasons for shifts over time. Senator Zeiders asked if the President and ABOR can release the ABOR IT Security Audit and whether Chair and Director Swetnam has seen or If it has been released.

- Chair and Director Swetnam stated relative to cost savings, he is unaware of an official report from IT. There was no FY23 report from UITs, so it is unknown what spending looked like in the last year.
- Chair and Director Swetnam stated his guess would be that centralization, typically associated with a reduction in force would lead to cost savings.
- Chair and Director Swetnam stated there were two security audits, one in 2020 and a forty-eight month follow up which are both public information referenced in the report. He does not believe there has been an additional follow-up. With his experience working with campus security individuals, they are fantastic and information security at the UA is great. There have been a lot of steps made forward since the forty-eight-month report.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the report is public, she has a copy, and will try to get one distributed to the senate listserv.

B. Ad Hoc Financial Recalibration Committee update – GFFRC Chair, Gary Rhoades [01:37:37]

First, I will simply say what I hope you know, but it bears reemphasizing given what's going on at the state level and at the state legislature. Now ABOR is taking a neutral position on shared governance. This committee is a general faculty committee appointed by the Chair of the faculty. It is an example of shared governance and if I were in the Senate I would have something to communicate to the board about not defending the idea that shared governance is not an important parcel of a public research university.

The update is that it is an iterative process and part of it is that two of the members of the GFFRC, Shyam Sunder and me, who were involved in early December 2023 in putting together remarks with two individuals of the administration for President Robbins to present to ABOR. We will be meeting tomorrow with Interim Provost Marx, Interim Chief Financial Officer Arnold, and President Robbins to walkthrough a range of issues. To the heart of all of the comments that have been raised about timing, process, and making things clear like taking some wins along the way like cuts being made in central administration. Let's talk about them. Particularly about what Provost Marx mentioned, the least damage possible to the academic missions of the institution, which means to the units and to the people in those units. On one hand it is a good thing this is an iterative process because this has been educating for someone on the ground like for someone like Interim CFO Arnold from ABOR. It provides an opportunity for us at various levels to negotiate that process and not just accept that it's a done deal comment at the same time one of the things we're going to be arguing tomorrow is to be as clear as possible in our communications internally and externally so that people are not simply waiting in wondering. We don't just wait and wonder, we speculate about what is going on, and units are making decisions about what might happen, in order to make cuts.

I am looking forward to a good meeting tomorrow. We will follow up afterwards and we appreciate the chance to have a conversation with those individuals and we will be advancing those findings and recommendations that were in our preliminary report.

Questions [01:41:26]

- Senator Harris stated she appreciates the work of the committee and appreciates Chair Rhodes for pointing out its value to shared governance. She also appreciates the stress that this is an iterative process and that it does require back and forth communication.
- Senator Harris stated her question is for Interim Provost Marx and President Robbins as her and others have experienced disproportionate growth in administration. They have been told there is already a 7.9% cut. She asked what is being cut such as whether senior vice presidents are being cut versus staff which are two quite different things. For perspective, bringing in students with a stipend salary at \$21,000 can result in numerous graduate students for one SVP.
 - Chair Rhoades stated this is what happens in a university when we wait several months, and we iterate and negotiate. It has been heard there will be some reductions in senior vice presidents. Shyam and he will be urging that if that is the case, to ensure it is not just title changes, and it is money-related because there has been experience before where people step down yet maintain their salaries.
 - Chair Rhoades stated he and the committee are highly sensitive to what is being raised like Senator Harris and the Staff Advisory Council regarding what gets reduced. This will be raised in the discussion tomorrow.
 - Chair Rhoades stated the UC system is making noise about reducing graduate assistantships because the union there did well. He has yet to see any reduction in graduate student numbers. The increases that their GAs have received have not been received by ours.
 - Chair Rhoades stated part of the commitment which is difficult in a tight fiscal situation is not to lose sight of the future which is that if a University doesn't have tenure-stream faculty, post-docs, good working conditions for career-track faculty, and graduate assistants or students, there is no research university. This is a priority and should not be put off for three years when the economic benefits of centralization

are seen.

- Chair Rhoades stated as Senator Russell previously stated, metrics for success before a process would make more sense.
- Chair Hudson stated regarding the survey, she saw fifteen different accounts of cuts to graduate programs. She hasn't been able to confirm yet whether they are all mentioning different graduate programs because of her methodology, but it is happening in one department. Other contributors to the survey also noted that while there are cuts to graduate programs, cuts to instructional budgets, sweeping of internal and other kinds of operational funds, that deans and dean suites are not in the various colleges showing any signs of reductions. That is just the middle level, let alone the upper level.
- Chair Hudson stated we tend to cut from future students because they are not there to protest, while it looks like anecdotally, salaries and positions are being preserved at higher levels disproportionately.
 - Chair Rhoades stated the challenges with centralized process is that you don't want people at the center making every single decision, it is not physically possible. He asked, how are there other parameters that are identified? An example would be, "You will realize X% cut, but you will commit to not significantly reduce and map out categories." This is done with salaries where money is allocated to colleges for salary increases with certain stipulations surrounding how many people can get them, the terms and conditions. The same thing can be done with these cuts.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the meeting will move into Executive Session to discuss honorary degrees and if there is more time, the meeting can reconvene to discuss the next item of business.
 - Chair Hudson stated she will roll over the next item of business to the next meeting.
- Secretary Dysart moved **[Motion 2023/24-52]** to move into Executive Session. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

10. Reports from [President](#), [Provost](#), Faculty Officers, APPC, RPC, [SAPC](#), DEI, Constitution and Bylaws Committee, SGRC, [Graduate Council](#), Undergraduate Council, SPBAC, ASUA, GPSC, UArizona Staff Council, Gen Ed Office with UWGEC, C11

11. **Adjournment [01:47:46]**

Unknown Senator moved **[Motion 2023/24-53]** to adjourn the meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent. With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 PM.

Tessa Dysart, Secretary of the Faculty
Jasmin Espino, Recording Secretary

Motions of April 1, 2024, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2023-24/49] to approve the amended agenda. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-50] to approve the 2028-2029 Academic Calendar.

[Motion 2023/24-51] to approve seconded motion. Motion passed with forty-five in favor, none opposed, and three abstentions.

[Motion 2023/24-52] to move into Executive Session. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2023/24-53] to adjourn the meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Item 2: Action Item Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 9, Action Item 8: Approval of the [2028-2029 Academic Calendar](#)
3. Page 9, Action Item 9: Consent Agenda
 - a. [Undergraduate Dean's List, Honors & Awards Policy Amendment](#)
4. Page 9, Action Item 9: Old Business Item A: [Ad Hoc It Committee report](#) discussion

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456