

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 6, 2025**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/107>

812 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=f5b51b5e-c82c-468a-930d-b36f002600bc>

Present: Senators Apanovich, Barefoot, Braitberg, Brochin, Cerny, Cochran, Cooper, Cornelison, Craig, Diaz, Díaz de la Rubia, Downing, Eaton, Eckert, Figler, Friesen, Giacobazzi, Goetz, Gregory, Grijalva, Guzman, S. Harris, W. Harris, Heileman, Hingle, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jens, Knox, Leafgren, Levy, Little, Lowell, Lucas, Maggert, Mars, McCallum, Meyer, Miller-Cochran (Parliamentarian), Neumann, O'Leary, Pau, Perez, Pollard, Prelock (Provost), Rafelski, Rishel, Rocha, Roman-Palacios, Russell, Slepian, M. Smith, Spece, Stegeman, Stephan, Van Haren, Waddell, Williams, Witte, Wittman, Zeiders (Secretary), Ziurys

Absent: Senators Abdennebi, Baker, Buxner, Chandrasekar, Coletta, Domin, Garcia, Garimella (President), Huffman, Paschke-Wood, Smith, Su

CALL TO ORDER [00:00:01]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the October 6, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

1. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:03:56]

2. Vice Chair Hymel stated the Senate Executive Committee approves the agenda and since that meeting, there have been proposed changes. The updated agenda can be found on the Faculty Governance website and includes deleting Old Business Items 9B and 9D, and New Business Item 10A. The removals include the topic of the Salary Increase Program, the update on Language Resource Centers, and the follow up regarding SNAP-Ed. This is to allow for more discussion on New Business Item 10A: Resolution on the Compact for Academic Excellence with Volokh Conspiracy. There was also time reallocated for discussions that may require more time. Under New Business Item 10C the attachments were removed as they were not a part of Dr. Jenny Lee's presentation and were originally uploaded in error.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-3]** to pass the agenda amendments for October 6, 2025. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.
- Senator Rafelski moved **[Motion 2025/26-4]** to amend the October 6, 2025, agenda by postponing Old Business Action Item 9B: Gen Ed Proposal Vote to the November 3, 2025, meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion failed with 6 in favor, 34 opposed.
 - Senator Witte stated several years ago, there was a rule that there would be very few PowerPoints to allow for adequate discussion. She feels that the Senate is going back to old ways in the sense that Agenda Items are now primarily PowerPoint based and only allow for limited discussion. She requests that for future meetings, she requests there is time for discussion and reports are put up on the Faculty Governance website beforehand.
 - Chair Hudson stated she would like to respectfully reject Senator Rafelski's amendment. In response to Senator Witte, the amended agenda has curtailed the allotted time to Provost Prelock and the SVP Díaz de la Rubia so they share only important points to the Senate.
 - Chair Hudson stated she would like to spend fifteen minutes on the Gen Ed topic because time is of the essence for reasons that can be explained later in the meeting. She plans to make a motion later in the meeting to pass the Gen Ed reforms and urges Senators to not vote in favor of Senator Rafelski's motion.
- Senator Barefoot moved **[Motion 2025/26-5]** to pass the agenda as amended. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 38 in favor, 2 opposed.

3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MAY 5, 2025 AND SEPTEMBER 8, 2025 FACULTY SENATE MEETING

[00:09:05]

Secretary Zeiders confirmed she has received changes since the previous meeting. She would like to remind Senators that minutes are posted one week prior to the meeting, and all Senate recordings are public. Anyone can review the Senate recording to review . Changes to the minutes were discussed thirty minutes before approval and she was alerted five minutes prior. Secretary Zeiders urges Senators to review the minutes a week before by simply searching for their names and if they find any corrections, to send her a direct email so she can proceed with making changes. She would like to follow this process to prevent future delays in voting for minutes.

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-6]** to pass the May 5, 2025, and September 8, 2025, Faculty Senate Minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. **OPEN SESSION [00:11:05]**

Keiron Bailey, Associate Professor, Education Policy Studies and Practice, Associate Professor, Public Health [00:11:07]

Can you imagine...a citizen working at a university receives this:

"It was brought to my attention that you sent the below message to Dr. X, a candidate for the position provost at the university. The below communication was inappropriate and not in accordance with the university's statement on professional conduct. Specifically, you're expected to avoid real and perceived conflicts of interest, and to recognize your obligation to represent the university well. Furthermore, attempts to disrupt university business and operations, by dissuading a candidate from accepting a crucial position, is misconduct under Policy Z: Prohibited Conduct.

There are additional candidates visiting the university in the coming weeks. It is my expectation that you will adhere to the statement on professional conduct and limit your interactions with the candidates raising only those topics relevant to their candidacy for the provost's position. If you send additional communication similar to the below, I will consider that a failure to follow and express directive.

Can you imagine? One: Retaliation under the collar of state aegis, unauthorized evaluation of protected speech from state appointment. Two, false assertion of intent, that is, dissuasion, despite widespread knowledge of this citizen's steadfast commitment to compliance and desire to recruit officers who respect the law. Three, false assertion of disruption, recruitment outcomes are consistent with each individual's views, a fact known to administrators. Four, false assertion of speech representing an employer that is sent from a private email, no imprimatur or claim of office, no employer touchpoints, not intended for employer consumption. Five, unconstitutional prior restraint. You could look that one up in the Cornell Law Directory.

Can you imagine a directive so unlawful, that when immediately contacted by external counsel requesting modification or rescission the authors avoid putting anything in writing while eventually acknowledging protected rights to counsel over the phone.

Thank you.

Senator Russell [00:13:18]

Dear colleagues. I'm normally up here begging for help to support our centralized supercomputing, but I'm going to go in a little different direction today, and I want to talk to you about our Gen Ed. I want to speak to you about my sort of worms-eye view of the proposed changes to our current gen ed program to accommodate an additional requirement in civics.

I'm not on UWGEC, and I will point out that there currently is no representation from the College of Science on UWGEC, even though we teach more student credit hours than any other unit on campus.

I have taught over 11,000 students from the University of Arizona in Gen Ed. I am like you, I do a lot of this. It is really important to me and I'm committed to the opportunity for inspiration, for discover, for the magic that happens when a great professor talks to their incredibly talented students. It is amazing, and I'd like to see more of it.

I want to argue to my Faculty Senate colleagues that advocating our responsibility to review and approve new programs, given that Gen Ed changes affect all our students, is short-sighted and likely to lead to core long-term outcomes.

I will note that there is no current available data on the outcomes of the Gen Ed Reform that was voted down by this body. Did the change in course review lead to changes in retention? Hopefully for the better, changes in graduation rates? Did the change in course requirements lead to better recruitment? Better job attainment? Better student

satisfaction?

All other academic programs have periodic program evaluation with a report with specific metrics made publicly available, and an outside review panel. It may be that our Gen Ed Reform has become a beacon of excellence, but given the feedback from our students, you can check everybody out on RateMyProfessor.com if you don't want to try to go through the university on these things. I worry that we have a lot of work to do.

I hope we vote them down the civics blank check or at least postpone it until we have both a detailed proposal, similar to those for new programs in other areas, as well as an evaluation process for any implementation. Thank you.

Senator Cochran [00:11:40]

How's everybody doing today? Who is ready for a new academic year? Those are inspiring words, Senator Downing. I like to say to my students in class, fortune favors the bold. We need to be bold in our vision here at the University of Arizona.

In that effort, I have passed around some flyers for a call for proposals for the 2026 Conference on Writing and Well-being. I am the founder and co-chair of this conference. We want to see your proposals. This conference will be in January. Proposals are due in October. I want to see your proposals, so send them in.

Pass this around if you know some colleagues who would be interested in this. Let's build some well-being support for our university and for our culture. Thank you so much.

Senator Mae Smith [00:16:03]

I want to call attention to a massive U of A environmental change resultant of administrative decisions within the last year that are discordant with our U of A and Tucson heritage and values. Satellite data regarding the degree of light at night in the environment is available for the entire U of A campus for the last twelve years. Those data indicate some very gradual increases over the years, with a huge 15% increase in nightlight specific to the U of A campus during only the last 12 months.

There are thousands of studies regarding the negative effects of increases of night lighting, not only on astronomy, but on virtually all living creatures and including humans, birds, insects, mammals, plants, fish, and bees of which someone recently discovered there were over 2,000 species in Tucson. Tucson was the first city in the world to develop an outdoor lighting code controlling excessive light at night.

Tucson and U of A were recently heralded multiple times nationally in multiple national publications for their respect for dark skies and serving as a hub for protection of astronomy and dark skies. Yet, at the same time, the U of A is functioning to undermine that heritage, that reputation, and the economic opportunities in Tucson, revolving around astronomy and dark skies.

Our function of the U of A campus needs to support, not impede, our Tucson heritage, values, research and appreciation of the environment, the astronomy industry, financial contributions of dark skies, the health of ourselves and all the creatures who share the environment with us. Let's all look at our areas of campus to determine where there is wasted light at night that is not essential and can be eliminated or significantly reduced and take steps to reduce them and talk to our administrative personnel about these problems.

Steve Brian Davis, Representative of De-Flock Tucson [00:18:52]

My name is Steven Davis. I am retired from the University of Arizona, an alum and a current student. I'm also representing today an organization called De-Flock Tucson.

How many of you drove to campus today? I'm guessing that most of you did. As you approached campus, you almost certainly passed by one of Flock Safety's automated license plate readers, known as ALPRs, like the one pictured on the screen. As you passed the ALPR, captured your license plate, entering information about your vehicle and its movements into a database. The data is now, or soon will be, accessible to over 5,000 end users nationwide. Most of those law enforcement.

Flock Safety has installed 54 of these ALPRs. We've mapped them. While UA, the Office of the President, touts the system as a public safety measure, the system doesn't make us safe. It doesn't detect crime. It doesn't respond to crime. It doesn't deter crime. There is a growing body of evidence that the system makes us less safe.

The greatest danger is, however, to our civil liberties. Let me give you the ACLU's take on the matter, "There is no reason that technology should be used to create comprehensive records of everyone's coming and goings -- and that is precisely what ALPR databases like Floc are doing. In our country, the government should not be tracking us unless it has individualized suspicion that we're engaged in wrongdoing."

The Office of the President's response to our efforts to learn more has been to stonewall and obfuscate. So, I'm calling on the Faculty Senate to demand that the University of Arizona end its mass surveillance contract with Flock Safety. Thank you.

Tim Horley, Global Professor of Practice, UA-OUC Program [00:21:43]

My name is Tim Horley and I'm one of the four Law Faculty at UA's Cooperative Law Program with Ocean University of China until it was shut down last month. Our program taught 125 students per grade, or 500 students total each year, about the American Legal System. Concepts like due process of law, Equal Protection, Separation of Powers, and Freedom of Speech.

I have not heard one person articulate any reason why a program teaching such concepts to Chinese students hurts American interests. Common sense suggests just the opposite. Teaching the next generation of Chinese leaders to understand and appreciate the rule of law advances American interests. This much was made clear on the two separate occasions that the U.S. State Department, including Ambassador to China, Nicholas Burns, visited our Chinese micro-campus. Both times, officials praised our program and emphasized the strategic value of these kinds of person-to-person exchanges.

Of course, we all understand that certain high-risk programs must be carefully evaluated, but what risk is it to teach about the rule of law? To those who take a narrower view of self-interest, understand this. Our program was making money for the university, not losing it. UA's China micro-campus has generated nearly \$13 million per year in revenue. Our program alone generated \$2.5 million every year.

The university's callous decision to abandon our students and partners is going to cost money, not save it. This decision exposes the university to millions of dollars of liability. So instead of making millions of dollars, the university has decided it's willing to potentially pay millions of dollars in fees and legal judgments so that it could abruptly shut us down. And abruptly is the right word. Less than a week passed between the release of the Select Committee report and the complete termination of a 10-year-old program. Our micro-campus was not even mentioned in the report. So, our program that the Select Committee did not even mention as a risk and which is not a risk, was completely shut down only 4 days before the first day of the fall semester.

I think we deserve a better explanation of why this happened. Thank you very much.

5. STATEMENT FROM THE FACULTY CHAIR [00:24:37]

Welcome, colleagues, friends, community members, it's great to see so many people here for our October meeting. October is this month where things get crazy, and they only get crazier from here on in. So welcome and thank you for your engagement.

We have two important, informational updates today on the abridged and amended agenda. One is about our new enrollment policy, and you can also see our Provost, Patty Prelock's related op-ed in the press today. The other information item speaks to our last speaker's concerns about the Chinese micro-campus closures. But I want to talk to you about the two action items that I want to put before you, for the Senate's vote today.

At first blush, they are completely different in scale, function, and history, but on closer inspection, they are indeed closely linked. One is the long-standing approval to move forward with the civic learning component of Gen Ed, which you've heard about already today. It's a procedural duty, and one of the main functions of faculty governance, to move forward programs, especially programs that we've been working on for years with good, shared governance contributions. I do want to put that to a vote today.

The other, of course, is the emergency of making our voices heard on the matter of the Compact for Academic Excellence presented to us by the federal government. Our academic colleagues around the country and our local community are looking to the University of Arizona with trepidation to see if we will stand up today. Not for a political position that many of us might share, but for the fundamental commitment to academic and constitutional freedom, academic excellence, and integrity.

I've made my position clear in what feels like dozens of media interviews. There are ideas in the compact that actually unite people across the political spectrum, inside and outside the academy. There are recommendations that are in actual complete alignment with our values, practices, and aspirations. There are other ideas in there that are still, to put it mildly, being actively debated and discussed in the free marketplace of ideas and research.

The problem is, when a program is implemented by the federal government to condition funds, to vaguely threaten unspecified targets and behaviors, to suggest that some are more equal than others, and to offer research and other

funding on the basis of anything other than peer-reviewed expertise and scientific merit and integrity, that's a problem. Others wiser than I have called it recently a trap. A poisoned apple. Federal funds are not a drug that we need a quick fix of to be forever extorted. We need to keep working in the way that we have worked for decades to advance knowledge with integrity, sovereignty, independence, and care for our students and our community.

For that reason, I will propose in the resolution under new business that we join the Faculty Senate of the University of Virginia and the President of Dartmouth College to reject the Department of Education Compact in the form that we have seen it, or any related form. Many have asked me why we were chosen among the nine institutions nationwide. I won't speculate here, but we do have, because of that selection, the privilege of educating, debating, dialoguing, and yes, resisting. I hope that President Garamella will take that opportunity to educate, not the one offered, and make us all proud.

Before we discuss, debate, and vote by secret ballot on that resolution, I want to ask you to approve the suite of changes to the Gen Ed policy that appear under Old Business today. The period of transition that we have been through, and yes, the internal political upheaval and chaos of the last five years, have put us behind schedule, on our Gen Ed program. You've heard the passion of Senators Stegman, Russell, and others, and I welcome it. It was, in fact, Senator Stegman who introduced me to the importance of Civic Education. The package put before us today will allow us to remove obstacles from student paths on all of Gen Ed with the corollary of bringing our graduation rates closer to where they need to be, reflective of our excellence.

Passing the package today will allow our advisors and the registrar's office staff to do their work in a timely fashion and be with less bureaucracy. Most importantly, we will build on the solid foundation demonstrated in the assessment in the documents recently completed on the pilot courses. We will have room to grow, room to scale, room to amend. We will work in faculty governance with the trust that we have established over the last five years with our colleagues. Please pass the Gen Ed package under old business today. Thank you very much.

6. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN – TED DOWNING [00:31:05]

The Committee of Eleven was formed seventy-eight years ago, and it was formed by faculty that had just returned from fighting the war in Asia and in Europe. They took their positions of being members and faculty on this committee very seriously, so did the President. It's had a long, long tradition.

I didn't expect to be Chair of this committee. I want it clear for this committee that we will not take any intimidation from anyone, anywhere, and that has stopped, as far as we're concerned. So, let's stop this intimidating the faculty, and I want that real clear. You're not going to intimidate me, nor any other member of my committee.

With that said, let me explain what the committee has decided to do. The committee has changed; it's transformed. Before we met somewhat in secret, we talked about things, we kept the door closed. Like most committees on this campus. We decided to open the committee, OGC said this is proper, we are mirroring The Arizona Open Meeting Laws. What does that mean? You're going to hear us. You voted us in. This is a fully constituted, only elected-by-faculty committee. The Senate has people that are appointed. The Committee of 11 entirely represents you at large. It doesn't represent any committees. We are going to mirror the committee by having live, open chats, and we're going online.

On Friday you will see the invitation show up. You're invited. It's wide open. There's a chat area where you could talk, and that means people in the community can also talk. A lot of people are talking this week, and a lot of people have a lot to say, and you'll be able to see what the community feels, including some of our retirees and some of our previous people that were leaders of this community. So that will be the format.

Now, what is the community actually doing? The first thing we did was to look at what we call probative questions. We're so honored to have Dr. Witte with us. Dr. Witte has a t-shirt that has a big question mark on it. If you haven't heard her lectures, she thinks the essence of the university consists of asking questions. Not answers, and she's absolutely right.

Each of the committee members went through on the first round, we do one a bucket round, and each of us came up with what we thought were the most important questions, for us, for the overarching issues of higher education. I won't go into those, although each of the committee explain them, but there were things like, "How do we survive?" One might matter, especially with the provost on and to a certain degree. "How do we restructure? How do we live through a decapitalization phase of the University?" We've capitalized and built all this stuff and had to hire people. Now we're decapitalizing. How do we survive that? There are other questions. "How do we stop some of these prolonged conflicts that keep going on with individuals forever and ever?"

Now, to get to this point, unexpectedly. We suddenly discovered, like you, about the compact. So, Friday, you're all invited to listen online, and to add your chat on the side as we discuss with the committee, each of them from their own perspective, as you have elected them, they're going to discuss how they see this.

Now, I'm going to give you just a hint of what that's going to look like. The University of Arizona already has a social contract. We've had one for 140 years with the people of Arizona, and I used to represent people in this room. That compact is an agreement to do many things, to educate, to explore the skies, to find out what's out there. Are there trees? It includes the most important thing of all; our compact agrees to educate the children of our people in this state. That's a serious compact. Now, somebody is proposing that we create a new compact. So we can find some more money, right? We're going to look for a little bit more money.

What are we going to do, and what you're going to listen to on Friday, is you're going to hear a lesson to the members that you elected to compare the two compacts. The compact and the contract that we have with the people of Arizona, with whatever's being proposed. There are parts of it, as the Chair said, that are very good. They're similar. Parts of them are different, some of them are terrifying, because some parts of that compact involve types of political ideology. Political ideology, which right now doesn't exist, as a test of what happens on this campus.

So, with that, we invite you Friday, to listen, make comments. People will be watching from all over the place, and I can tell you the other campuses that are listening or watching. This is our time for you to speak out, individually, and let's put the Committee of Eleven back where it should be, the way those veterans want it to be. We listen to the people.

7. **REPORT FROM THE PROVOST [00:37:11]**

Thank you so much, Mona, and I think I'm going to forego my PowerPoint. You can see it and read it. I do have a full report for you today, and I will identify just three or four things that are important. I thought I'd start with, I know what's on your mind, and I know you have many questions about the compact. We will be answering those questions, I'm sure. I'm going to do more listening than answering to hear what your perspectives are.

What I can tell you is the University of Arizona received a compact for academic excellence in higher education on the evening of October 1st. We were actually in a late-night meeting, and it came to our email at that time. This is the first notice we had of it. That next morning, I contacted Leila and said, I want to talk with our shared governance groups. The university leadership in coordination with the Arizona Board of Regents is carefully reviewing the compact to truly fully understand What is its content? What is its scope? What are the legal ramifications? What are the potential implications? We're in communication with shared governance, and we have meetings tomorrow and other universities that have received the compact. No decisions have been made. We will communicate further once we have more details and once, we do our consultation with the governance group. Thank you for that opportunity.

Just a couple of things I'm going to forego my PowerPoint. I want to introduce Jenna Rickis, who is our new Senior Vice Provost, who's helping me in the area of academic affairs, faculty affairs, and Campus Community Connections. Many of you know her she was also on campus and participated in a rigorous interview process. She's from Purdue. She's an amazing scholar and researcher and thought partner. She's going to really help us with some of the new advising initiatives we have, and some of our community college connections. Her work in academia, students' issues, academic issues is pretty amazing, so I'm really looking forward to having a partner, Knowing that maybe I'll have a little release from the thirty-six direct reports I have.

We released the official Fall 2025 census, highlighting our new enrollment strategies and our VP for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis, is here, and she'll talk to you more about it. The new enrollment strategy really restored us to the traditional first-year class size which is more right-sized for the university and substantially increases the number of Arizona students that we've taken, which is very exciting.

You also saw that we received a \$20 million gift from the Garcia Family Foundation to expand study abroad, particularly for those students who would not necessarily have access to study abroad. This is a huge step to give students a global experience who may never have been able to have this opportunity, so we're very grateful to the Garcia family. It's a big deal, and it's a really wonderful framework to really look at how are we supporting student success for those who may not have that accessibility.

I was privileged to join Marla Franco in Washington, D.C. as the University of Arizona received the institutionally Thriving Institution designation from the Seal of Excelencia in Excelencia in Education. This was our third seal, meaning that we are doing really important things as a Hispanic-serving institution. So, congratulations to all of those, and there are only eight universities in the country who receive this intentionally thriving institution, and we were one of them.

You can read in my report, the results of the twenty conversations I've had with over 400 individuals. We're working on a website, so you can see all of the conversation points. I'll be writing reports about that, but I'm really excited about the input, and it will influence some of the activities that we're engaged in.

The last thing is, we do have a Campus Wellness and Safety Forum this Thursday and it's at 11 o'clock, October 9th. I encourage you to attend. I will be there. Chrissy Lieberman, our Dean of Students, Adriana, from our ASUA organization, Steve Patterson and I will be there. I hope you will attend. So, thank you very much.

8. **REPORT FROM THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND PARTNERSHIPS - Senior Vice President Tomás Díaz de la Rubia [00:42:56]**

Good afternoon, everybody. Good to be here, good to see you all. Thank you for giving me the time to give you a brief update. You know, in the 9-10 months into my position here, I continue to be amazed by the incredible power of the research that is carried out at this university.

We live in complicated times, there's no question about it. But even through all those times, if you look at what happened at this university in fiscal year 25, we actually went out in research expenditures, even through all the chaos, it is amazing what we have experienced over the last few months. That's a testament to all of you, it's a testament to all of the faculty, and our students, the resilience, and the excellence in research that everybody brings.

Just month alone, the amount of incredible research coming into the University. In the partnership with the University of New Mexico, we just received a \$43.5 million-dollar NIH grant for translational research. That is going to help us bring biomedical research closer to the patients and save more lives. Advancing opioid solutions to the real scourge of opioid wax, on two fronts to reverse fentanyl overdose treats with the National Center for Wellness and Recovery. This also includes launching a \$4.5 million NIH-funded study to reduce staff stress and improve methadone treatment. These are things that truly impact, like we say, research that not only shapes the future, but impacts our communities in very positive ways.

If you look at what's going on already in FY 26, throughout the first quarter, believe it or not, we're up 20% in research awards. Even despite all the chaos and mayhem going on in Washington, D.C. We're in the middle of a government shutdown. We're watching that very closely. We're trying to understand right now. Every research project continues to operate as planned. There is no stop work orders related to the shutdown. Obviously, review of proposals in the federal agencies is going to slow down, so we're going to see the consequences of that. Like all of you, we don't know when the shutdown is going to be lifted, but that's going to impact some of the things that we do over the next few months.

As you know, we talk about this a lot in our forums and in our website, we've experienced grant terminations. Just to give you sort of the data to date, I've seen terminations, and there are stop-work orders coming from the administration and the federal agencies to date. 63 awards in total have been terminated under a stop-work order, for the total amount of \$58.5 million of unspent award. That affects a lot of people.

That's in part why we created the bridge funding program. The bridge funding program has spent already over a million dollars supporting twenty-nine projects that have already been funded. Twenty-three are still under consideration. I'm here to tell you today that this great funding program, I said this at the town hall I hosted this morning, is continued. We're going to continue supporting not only, those that are affected by grant terminations going on today. But, like I said from the very beginning, supporting the faculty, supporting everybody that has a need to be bridged between different grants. You know, the world of working on grants fluctuates all the time, sometimes you get a grant, it ends, the next one doesn't come for a few months. You need money, you need time, to sustain the research effort, to sustain the graduate students. That's what the bridge funding program is about. We find ourselves in the middle of the grant terminations process, but really this program is here to stay. We're going to continue investing in you, investing in your students and making sure that the research you do continues unencumbered.

I have some more statistics here for this that I want to share with you. We had 36 reinstatements of awards that were terminated or stopped, that have come back to us and told that we can continue the work. That's about \$7 million worth of restored awards. There was future funding eligibility that was under threat for many NIH grants across the board. Those have all been restored. So, there are things happening that are giving us some optimism, that going forward, we may find some return to some form of normalcy, in the not-too-distant future.

If you look at the current landscape, obviously we're in a federal shutdown, we don't have a budget. The fact is that when both the House and the Senate came up with their proposals for the budget for FY 26, when it came to all of the things that we care about, all the federal agencies that we care about, those budgets came out close to FY 24 and FY 25. So that's where we're at today, and I remain optimistic. We're about supporting you, supporting the faculty, these programs that we have put in place, and future programs that we've put in place, working with the provost, are here to stay. They're not going away. We're going to continue investigating you. So, thank you.

9. **OLD BUSINESS [01:48:44]**

A. **Kindness Initiative – Assistant Director for Faculty Mentoring Initiatives, Tara Chandler and SBS Associate Dean, Jeannine Relly [00:49:08]**

Jeannine Relly, Associate Dean, Professor, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Jeannine Relly, Journalism Professor and Associate Dean in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and I'm here with Tara Chandler, Assistant Director of Faculty Mentoring Initiatives, in the Provost's Office. We're going to briefly talk with you about the University Kindness Initiative.

The University Kindness Initiative is an effort to cultivate and grow efforts around workplace and learning environments where everyone can thrive as kind actions have been linked in the literature to well-being in the workplace, and student well-being. There's a network of researchers across the university that are working on this in different ways. On October 15th, the university will be sponsoring a workshop around predictors of kind behaviors and the impacts of those behaviors. Dozens the faculty, staff, and students have signed up for the training to be ambassadors who will be engaged in programming and events throughout the year. Tara will talk with you now briefly about the timeline. Thank you.

Tara Chandler, Assistant Director for Faculty Mentoring Initiatives

Thank you. Mid-September, Vice Provost Andrea Romero sent out a communication to supervisors both in academic and non-academic units inviting each unit to nominate a Kindness Ambassador, it can be a faculty, staff, or student, from each of these units. As of today, we have 80 ambassadors who have signed up to be a part of this initiative. However, if your unit has not yet nominated someone, please do contact me, and hopefully nominate someone today, but if not today, then please contact me and we can continue to work with you.

We do have our kickoff event happening on October 15th from 11:30 AM to 1 PM in the Bear Down Gym. This is in collaboration with Ben's Bells and the Science of Kindness Community Collective, who will be providing training on that day. Thank you.

B. **Action Item: [Gen Ed Proposal](#) Vote and [supporting documents](#) and [MOU](#) and [presentation](#) – UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter and Chair Hudson [00:51:44]**

Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [00:51:59]

All right, this is me making a motion that I hope will be seconded later to pass what Jeremy's going to talk about, and I just want to preface it with more words from myself.

For any of you who, like me, rolled your eyes in cynical exasperation back in 2020 at the idea of a civics mandate from the regents, I submit to you today, in 2025, that there is no higher priority than developing of a curriculum that ensures that our students understand the principles and mechanics of the American experiment. If you'll indulge a little sentiment on my part, it's a privilege to undertake the work of developing a meaningful curriculum on American institutions and civic engagement.

If you want any proof of that. The letter that we received today, as senators from our students on the Ocean University micro campus, points out the enormity of our responsibility in this moment, to do civics right. And the enormity of our students' potential. It's summed up in that letter we all got. The students, in reference to the abrupt closure of their program overnight, wrote the following. I paraphrase a little bit here, that the opinions of a partisan subset of research staff, the idea that that is a binding government expectation upon a public university like ours, suggests a fundamental misunderstanding of American governing structures. When I read that from the Chinese students at Ocean University that I didn't even know we had, I was humbled, and I was moved.

Let us move onward with our civic learning, controlled by us, and let us move onward with our civic engagement, controlled by us. The package that I'm asking you to pass today is centered on that forward movement on that civics project along with the details that will allow us to work effectively and efficiently with the staff to put this into implementation without chaos by next fall. I'm going to turn it over to the expert, our shared governance chair, Jeremy Vetter, to answer any questions you might have before we ask for a second and a vote on this matter.

UWGEC Chair & Associate Professor of History, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences Jeremy Vetter

All right, thank you very much, Leila. My name is Jeremy Vetter. I've spoken to you several times from the Zoom screen, but I haven't been here in the room before for a long time, so it's good to see all of you. I'm an Associate Professor of History and I'm in the third year of a three-year term as the Faculty Chair of the University-Wide Gen Ed Committee. We've been working on Civic Learning as the final piece of the Gen Ed refresh for several years now and it's been a long, arduous process involving many different faculty committees, including faculty, staff, advisors. Many

different group.

We're now pleased to present to you with the blessing of the Vice Provost's Office, a proposal to implement civics at long last. This was a mandate, as you can see from the supporting materials that I posted online, that was voted in by ABOR in February of 2021, which, for timing for us, inconveniently was near the end of our Gen Ed Refresh Development. It was too late to add it immediately very easily. We undertook the task starting in Spring 2022, starting with the Civic Education Faculty Task Force and proceeding through several different other groups to decide collectively, how we wanted to implement this mandate from ABOR, which you can read about in policy. It is a complicated mandate with seven different specifically defined areas of wrong numeral. The other two universities in the state have implemented it, and all the community colleges are implementing it by next fall. So, we're kind of on a timeline that we need to get implemented very soon to be in compliance.

The more that we've studied this, we've come to realize that the biggest obstacles for getting this implemented effectively and smoothly lie ahead of us. So, the first step is getting the basic policy that you see before you approved, so that we can then set in motion the series of steps that will follow, which includes agreeing on a learning outcome at the University-wide Gen Ed Committee, other specifications for faculty to submit proposals, as faculty developing their proposals, submitting their proposals to the Gen Ed Committee, and having them approved, and then put in the catalog and scheduled. This is a lot of steps, and the more we study it, the more we realize we need to get started yesterday. We can take questions about that.

I would just point out that you may have seen a larger Gen Ed policy on the agenda at the September meeting. It was a much larger set of policies, and that larger set of policies included some second language elements, also a course substitutions item. That stuff is not in the current proposal because it hasn't moved forward yet. The Vice Provost's Office, in recognition of the urgency of the civics and attributes interlinked pieces separated out those pieces so that we could move them forward now, and then we'll deal with the other ones later. If you want to read more about the machinations of all the back and forth, especially on second language, it's in my UWGEC report at the bottom of the agenda,

For now, what we're looking at is the additions of a Civic Institutions course, to the curriculum, which would replace one of the three Building Connections courses in the curriculum. There is a slide that shows more information on this. It is a replacement of one of those BC courses with Civic Institutions course, and the implementation of a depth attribute as well, as a fifth attribute in the GE system. Now, you may recall, those of you who were on Senate last Spring, that we voted to pull the attributes out of student requirements for graduation. They are now faculty-facing requirements only, so they're moving over to the convention side as opposed to the policy side. The depth attribute doesn't have to be in the policy anymore; it will be implemented later by UWGEC after this proposal is passed. It is every intention that that will be implemented as well as a way for more faculty across campus to teach and deepen knowledge in one or more of the seven ABOR areas.

Questions and Comments [00:58:53]

- Senator Spece stated he shares the same concern as Senator Russell previously shared which is the lack of the College of Science representation.
 - UWGEC Chair Jeremy Vetter stated this is a very separate issue as both College of Science members on UWGEC rotated off last year. Despite many requests to the Dean's office, the committee has not been able to find replacements. He did recently hear in a message that there may be one individual named as a replacement. If anyone else would like to volunteer to their Dean's office, like Senator Russell, they committee may be able to get full representation from the College of Science on UWGEC which would be fantastic. There have been very active College of Science representatives in the past.
 - UWGEC Chair Jeremy Vetter stated given there will be future issues related to studying the place of Natural Science within the Gen Ed curriculum, it would be great to have Natural Science representatives from the College of Science. There are currently CALES representatives and others in Natural Sciences, but it would be great to have the College of Science represented again.
- Senator Witte stated she speaks in favor of an apolitical civics inclusion. She was privileged to be in the New York City public school system mat it's height and there was a civics requirement in elementary school which she had to take at least a year of, at a school called Simmons. She considers this to be an extension of what went on in the New York City public school system which was not mandated by any political motivation.
- [01:00:34] Chair Hudson stated, "I'm going to move to call the question, do I have a second?" Unknown Senator seconded the motion. Chair Hudson then stated, "With that, I move that we pass the Gen Ed package presented in the agenda."

Chair Hudson moved to call the question [Motion 2025/26-7] motion to pass the Gen Ed proposal package as presented in the agenda by secret vote. Motion was seconded

Senator Stegeman stated he was advised by his allies in the room not to speak on this as his position is well known, but in his former life as an elected official, he did not back down until he was persuaded his position did not have merit,

and he is not there.

- Senator Stegeman stated he, as many know, was one of the foremost advocates to adopt the civics curriculum and take the ABOR mandate seriously. The first proposal came from the Provost's office in mid-August and as UWGEC Chair Vetter said, there are probably many reasons that didn't come for so long, but that is when the bait is thrown. In mid-September, the committee went through its process in quick succession, in mid-September. This was about a twenty-word proposal which doesn't answer most of the relevant questions. After the proposal went through committees, two major changes appeared. First, it was acknowledged by the Office of General Education that the required Civic courses would not be ready, and it was not realistic to have them ready by the mandated date of next Fall. This would also mean that the Senate, by the language of the policy, would be conceding significant control over the Gen Ed curriculum.
- Senator Stegeman stated there has been reassurance that this will be remedied in the MOU, but he has always believed in putting things in writing first. This is curriculum approval, which is a major task of the Faculty Constitution, of the Senate body. The Senate is the last stop as they are the elected representatives, representing thousands of faculties and tens of thousands of students. This is probably the biggest approval that will be casted in the next two or three years because of its vast impact and there has been no time spent questioning and discussing.
- Senator Stegeman stated before the vote is casted, which will be done by secret ballot, he is not opposed to the concept but asks if the Senate has performed their job. He asks if the Senate can credibly say that this almost non-existent discussion executes what is probably the biggest decision in the near term.
- Secretary Zeiders stated the question portion of this topic was rushed and there are more questions.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated this is a non-debatable motion.
- Secretary Zeiders stated then maybe Vice Chair Hymel doesn't want to answer questions and asked whether Vice Chair Hymel is taking statements and not questions.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated whatever one has (questions or statements).
- Secretary Zeiders stated she does not have a question at this moment but wanted to note that individuals had additional questions and the Q&A portion was cut short on a topic that is pretty important.
- Senator Barefoot stated she is frustrated to hear that peer institutions have been able to implement this sort of curriculum, yet Senate is trying to rush a vote. Though this is fairly urgent, because not only is there an ABOR mandate in place, but there is now federal attention with the new recently announced launch of the America 250 Civics Coalition. She thinks Civics Education is very valuable and hopes this program will be helpful. She has questions but is unsure if there is time or an opportunity to ask them.
- Senator Stegeman stated he is confused by Vice Chair Hymel's previously statement and asked whether this is a cloture vote as this was deemed as non-debatable or if this is on the motion.
- Vice Chair Hymel confirmed this is a cloture vote therefore is non-debatable.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated voting members should receive a secret ballot via email and paper ballots will also be accepted.
- Senator Stegeman stated it is unclear, from various comments, whether the motion was a non-debatable cloture vote or a vote on the motion as Vice Chair Hymel stated it was a cloture vote. He doesn't think it would make sense to hold up a meeting on that account, so when the results of that vote are received, then the motion can be brought up.
- Senator Stegeman stated a motion for cloture is not a vote on the motion, it is a vote to end debate.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran stated her understanding is that the vote was on the motion. Chair Hudson called the question on the seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council.
- Senator Ziurys moved **[Motion 2025/26-8]** to table discussion on the Gen Ed proposal. Motion was seconded.
 - Senator Ziurys stated this has gone on too long.

Vice Chair Hymel stated Senators should vote on the motion to approve the Gen Ed proposal via OpaVote. There will be no cloture vote. ten minutes to cast votes via OpaVote.

NEW BUSINESS [01:14:54]

A. Resolution on the Compact for Academic Excellence with Volokh Conspiracy- Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:15:10]

All right, now the event that you all have been waiting for, thank you for your patience with the parliamentary process. You all have a copy of the draft resolution attached to your agenda. I'm going to read it, so we're all clear on what the motion is, and we'll see if I get a second for it.

Resolution Opposing the "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education"

"On October 1, 2025, the US Secretary of Education requested that the University of Arizona enter into a "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education."

This Compact contains provisions which endanger the independence, excellence, and integrity of the University of Arizona and infringe on the constitutional rights of members of the University of Arizona community.

Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-9]** that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona opposes this Compact and calls upon President Garimella and the Arizona Board of Regents to reject this Compact as well as any similar proposal compromising the mission, values and independence of the University.” Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 40 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstention.

Questions and Comments [01:16:35]

- Senator Spece stated he is the College of Law representative to the Faculty Senate. He sends today, an article by Professor Volokh, who is an Eminent constitutional law scholar at UCLA. He outlines several constitutional and other possible infirmities of the contract.
- Senator Spece stated he has also have been teaching constitutional law for 50 years and in practice, constitutional law. He agrees with this analysis. He would like to add that the contract several provisions that report to have the federal government having power, it doesn't even possess.
- Senator Spece stated secondly, if it did possess this power, the power would be checked by states' rights. For example, they're basically the University to Trump the state faculty co-government law which is part of the state's rights. This violates the 10th Amendment and other provisions of the Constitution. It violates several tenets of the First Amendment and academic freedom. It's over broad, vague, and is a misuse of government spending power.
- Senator Spece stated he would like to note there is another article he would like to reference, from another UCLA prominent Commonwealth Professor Joseph Fishkin. On October 4th. 2025, he, in the Balkanization blog post titled, “The Art of Replacing the Law with the Deal,” which opines basically what the contract does. The quid pro quo is that they will give benefits the University already has the rights to, which cannot be taken away, and the question is, what will the University get in return.
- Senator Spece stated this is basically, a receivership by the Department of Justice which has its own unilateral whims, find that the University has breached the compact will cause it to face the death penalty, in terms of financing.
- Senator Ziurys stated Senator Spece’s comments were very well said. She would like to point out that for many years it seems that the faculty and the staff at the University of Arizona have really been mistreated by the administration and ABOR. For example, the furloughs. In the end, the University of Arizona. Faculty and staff were the only institution in as Arizona that had to pay furloughs. The other ones didn't have to pay, or the money was returned. Then there's the centralization UITS administrative staff support, which has only made things worse and harder for the faculty and staff to get things done. Then, the supposed salary increase program, which, as far as she can see, has been totally dysfunctional. She knows of professors that received decreases in their salary, not increases which she has documented.
- Senator Ziurys stated this now, this has to be the worst. In this compact, faculty and the staff are requested to give up their constitutional rights, such that the administration can possibly receive funding for their pet projects. As John Schaefer wrote in his article in the Arizona Daily Star yesterday, this is extortion.
- Senator Ziurys stated this compact effectively centralizes research everyone will be working on. Projects that they give money for, now for one's own research. It also kills excellence, not supports it. The minute free competition is taken away for grant money and the peer review process, and money is just given away randomly, the motivation to work and do excellent research goes away. This seems to her to be another attack on the administration and ABOR, on the faculty and staff.
- Senator Ziurys stated if one looks at Columbia University, which has a small amount of monitoring, newspapers report that faculty and staff have been reduced to private emails. Their emails aren't monitored by the administration's monitoring team. People have had their IDs checked three to four times before going into work. This is all a glimpse of what will happen if this compact is supported. She asks President Garimella to say no to this compact.
- Senator Brochin stated she represents the College of Education and wants to speak to the faculty and students on campus who are trans, non-binary, and represent multiple genders. She feels this is one of the pieces in the compact that people are afraid to speak towards. For those in the room, on Zoom, and on campus, she is determined to provide protection, stand with them, in front of them, behind, them, or besides them.
- Senator Brochin stated she worries that while there is debate on whether to sign the compact, it is already being leveraged by the administration, and she is curious on what will be done moving forward and what if this compact turns into legislation. It is known that pieces of this compact will be introduced in the January legislative session. She asks what if Warren Petersen returns to the University with a letter, like how he did in Spring 2025. She believes there is preparation needed for this as Faculty Senate, and moving forward.
- Senator Brochin stated she believes unequivocally that the institution needs to make a stance as there are several examples that have emerged over the weekend. She knows the university is waiting for that. She is more concerned with what is happening behind the scenes.
- Senator Brochin stated she would love for Faculty Senate to have an opportunity during the next Senate meeting, to bring in the government relations team and media team to devote real time so there is no rushing, to have an opportunity to ask questions. She came here today prepared for her college to ask questions of the SVP and Provost but there was no time to do that. Her sense in the room is that people feel rushed around particular

issues. Given the November deadline for this, she requests that in the next Senate meeting, there is real time spent on a conversation on this after the resolution passes, which she is sure it will.

- Secretary Zeiders stated like many fellow Senators, she is concerned about the proposed compact and what it means for UA as a land-grant university. She wonders solutions can be created for real issues in higher education without having federal government impose. On the surface, the compact outlines goals that many support, and that she has personally advocated for, like making college more affordable, helping students who leave college with debt and curbing administrative growth. She also sees the growing value of different perspectives, that a university is created which protects all faculty's academic freedom and students' free speech. There are things in the compact that are irrelevant. The student body is overwhelmingly American. Only about 5% of UA admissions are international students, and ABOR policy already prohibits admission decisions based on personal characteristics like race.
- Secretary Zeiders stated the compact, in her view, is the wrong avenue and wrong mechanism for meaningful change, and it's disappointing that higher education has come to a point where genuine reform, something that faculty, students, communities have long called for, and it's being replaced by top-down federal directives. Maybe this is because, for years, changes from boards and presidents have been seen that were introductory, rather than transformative. Patterns of this can be seen in this state. She asks why presidential bonuses have one up by about 160% in the last 5 years while tuition has also increased? Why have vice president titles at the UA been reshuffled but the salaries have stayed the same, or gone up? Why does the University claim to value rural communities and Cooperative Extension, yet those missions have suffered the most during the most recent financial crisis? Why is it said that underrepresented students are supported, including rural youth, where an advanced admission strategies that could disadvantage them.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she urges the administration and everyone to pause and reflect on how the University got here. To listen to staff, students, and communities who have been asking for authentic reform for years. She encourages faculty and the community partners to stay engaged in shaping the future of higher education and seek solutions, ones that reflect collaborative transparency and our public mission. Not ones driven by directives from above.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she is particularly concerned, along with Senator Ziurys, about the compact ties, research funding, research incentives and rewards to institutional participation. The nation's research enterprise at the University of Arizona and across the country is built on merit, funding agencies support the best and most promising ideas. The compact undermines these principles. It shifts the focus from quality of scholarship to compliance with political directives, and that is not the way forward for research excellence.
- Senator Downing stated years ago, he used to teach Economics 409. There's a problem, something missing in this compact, which surprises him, because it talks about the free market of ideas. He used to have a great lecture by Dr. Milton Friedman's, who is no longer here. What he said was critical. He said, the great virtue of the free market is that it does not care what color people are, it does not care what their religion is. It only one that cares whether they produce something one wants to buy. The cornerstone of the Chicago School of Economics was the idea that the marketplace, an open marketplace that allows competition.
- Senator Downing stated if one reads this carefully, there's no reference to competition for one thing, and it's the most important thing in this whole document, jobs. What this is, is it earworms jobs for certain the ideological positions, it says that if one has the right thought, they can get a job. What bothers him, is this looks familiar. The University has gone through non-competitive hiring, starting with the President who was the only candidate, all the way down, where people keep popping up out of nowhere are suddenly hired. The lack of a market competition is enshrined in the document, Dr. Milton Friedman, would say, is urinating on conservative economics, and that's exactly what this document does.
- Senator Slepian stated when reading this document, is apparent that is one-sided. When reviewing the details, it is obvious that it steps into a deep conservative agenda. For those of you who know him well, they know they can debate all the details of this and talk about the constitutionality, which is abhorrent. The reality is this document is in front everyone, and the university must deal with it. practical points are. He would like to echo what his fellow Senator said which is that there needs to be a transparent mechanism within the university by how this is considered because there has been enough strife within the University.
- Senator Slepian stated two minutes ago, the Senate heard about a happiness, wellness, kindness initiative. This is not going to drive that unless there is the opportunity where people can really get their voice out and be understood. When looking back, the University has had a tough time, therefore why they were picked.
- Senator Slepian stated to be blunter, he compares this to the USS Cole sitting in the oven with a hole blown in its side. UA is an easy target, which naturally one would go after. Sure, one can its geographic diversity, in a Republican state, and such, but the University of Arizona is an easy prey which is why it is important to ensure that everyone understands this may be signed. If that happens, there must be transparent mechanisms. This is comparable to telling a patient they have cancer but not saying it right away or only giving them some of the information.
- Senator Slepian stated this seems to be right out of the playbook of Rufo which relates back to the current issue of the chronicle, going back to the Manhattan Institute. He follows these issues although now a big politico, but going back to March of 2025, Project 2025 is right out of the playbook which creates the need to be very careful and requires more thinking with a transparent mechanism, otherwise it may not result in the desired outcomes. It is important for everyone to be engaged, otherwise there will be boiling over.

- Senator Slepian stated the Dean Massaro should be given gratitude for her painstaking, point-by-point, detailed review which many have signed. He would like to mention in the current Saturday, Professor Spece highlighted points about constitutional law. No one is higher than Professor Chemerinsky and the topic of Massaro in constitutional law. The headline is simple, Trump's compact with universities is extortion. He urges for there to be an open process, otherwise there will be more angst and no happiness.
- Senator Russell stated it is known the University is in a tough spot, and she utterly concurs with her fellow Senator from the College of Education that the University's people are protected. This is incredibly important that targets are not put on children and colleagues at the university. However, the University is also at a very strategic moment where whether UA signs, and Harvard does the opposite, it undermines everyone else and makes it more difficult for UA to have a choice.
- Senator Russell stated it seems that the UA is targeted in the wind with no strike chest, as it is not like the other universities. There are buckets for endowments, and the University can't last a week without current federal commitments which is not a joke. When people say they protect their people, there is more than one aspect to this including layoffs, the lack of being able to serve. The budget situation is still precarious, even if the hole was closed.
- Senator Russell stated she would shuffle her feet and discuss while waiting to see what shakes out. She knows to some, that sounds cowardice, and other people may ask why not seize the moment. She feels that if UA goes against much better endowed colleagues, they will be left out of the herd, which in this case would be awful. She would like to see President Garimella have personal conversations with current President of Harvard University, Alan Garber, and in deep negotiation and a lawsuit currently with the resources of a \$48 billion endowment.
- Senate Spece stated he is afraid time won't allow for the more discussion on the cessation of the program with the Chinese University, under the College of School. Four of his colleagues which has been voted and sent to President Garimella, which invoked ABOR Policy Manual 6-201(K) which has been sent to his fellow Senators. When there was a reorganization proposed by the administration, it calls for release of any tenured faculty member before the end of the appointment. He stated the President shall ask the Faculty Senate to designate a review committee composed of faculty and students to review and evaluate the plan. He stated the dismissed professors have a reasonable argument that 6-201(K) applies.
- Senator Barefoot stated she looks forward to continuing robust discussion on this topic in the meeting the following day with President Garimella and Provost Prelock. From what she has heard from staff so far is that there is a mixed. Some individuals are saying no, others are saying they should live to fight another day. She has a lot of questions and would like to know more about the guarantees and amounts of funding that the University can see if they end up in the compact as ABOR and the President are the deciders. There still holds a lot of questions.
- Senator Ziurys stated as Americans, it is the duty to defend constitutional rights and that is what it comes down to which is worth far more than funding.

B. [Enrollment Report](#) – Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions, Kristina Wong Davis [01:39:53]

So really, what I wanted to give everybody is an update on the enrollment strategy, not necessarily an enrollment report because there's been a lot of questions about what we are doing, what is this, and so I want to underscore that there have been no policy changes, whatsoever. We have not changed any enrollment policy. This is simply a process change and a strategy change. So, we are re-strategizing how we recruit for campus and the processes around that.

The most important pieces of this are really a very different cadence to the recruitment process for undergraduate first-time, full-time freshmen. This only applies to main campus, first-time, full-time freshman. Instead of a rolling admission process in the past, we have moved to a deadline guided process this year, so November 1st will be our early action deadline. January 15th, we will release those decisions. I'll talk about what that means. After November 1st, we'll move applications into what are considered regular decision, and we'll batch those. During the spring in February and March. May 1st will be a firm deadline following the national commitment deadline. Therefore, we want students to commit to being a University of Arizona student as of May 1st, therefore we can manage the class and understand who's coming in.

When we think about this, there are many different student advantages and institutional advantages. For students, it does allow them in early action to be considered for merit scholarships and Honors College, initially as a priority. In addition to admission. They will also be comprehensively reviewed, meaning we have expanded the application to include essays, activities, and to look more closely at the type of coursework the student has attempted. Then, allowing the students a longer runway for decision making.

As an institution, we have some advantages in this as well, we are managing towards enrollment targets for the first-time class, rather than just what we happen to get in the door. This allows us to manage not just for how many students we're bringing in, but what resources that requires, how many courses, how many instructors, what we need to do to serve these students, and how we can support them to graduation. We've heard a lot about how that cost of discounting hurt us financially as an institution. We are managing the merit budget to a budget, and so we

are managing that within this process.

So, what is comprehensive review? We look at a student's background in the context in which they grew up, and the educational opportunities they had. So, we assess the student based on what they had an opportunity to take advantage of and understand them each as an individual, then in doing so, we can better understand what it would take to support that student to success.

So, some important notes, if those of you have had an 18-year-old go through the process, there are a lot of different terms. This is an early action only. It is not an early decision process. Early decision means its binding. Early action is non-binding. Therefore, students do not have to take all their admission decisions off the table when we admit them.

Guaranteed admission for residents remains. Again, no policy changes, so all Arizona students who apply will be granted admission to somewhere in the Arizona portfolio. It may not be initially to main campus. It may be to Arizona Online, or it may be to UAGC. We will work with each one of those students to find a pathway to graduation and to main campus if they so choose. If those are not the right option for them, we will work with them on a pathway through the community college to this campus. What about need-based aid? Nothing changes for need-based aid packaging. None of these impacts need-based aid processing whatsoever.

So, we have also changed the entire model for spring. We have had one event in the past. We're moving to multiple spring yield events that give students more opportunities to visit campus and to engage with campus, to make the decision to come here. We will be having regional events around the country for students who can't make it to campus but are very interested in learning more about the U of A. We'll be having virtual events throughout the spring, sometimes highlighting specific programs for students who want to know more about a particular academic program as they're making a decision, and then we will have separate campus tours specifically for admitted students so that we can genuinely engage students and families as they're making the decision to commit to the University of Arizona.

I wanted to kind of give you all an encapsulated version of everything that is a challenge. None of these challenges are specific to U of A. All these challenges are specific to all higher education. So, when we think about and we worry about the things that we're going through, everybody is going through this right now, so it is a very competitive and very challenging landscape. Therefore, we need more tools and more mechanisms to ensure that we're meeting our enrollment goals.

At the same time, many of our other institutions in the country have challenges that we're sometimes fortunate not to face. There are many institutions who were heavily leveraged on international graduate master's students, their budgets were predicated on those students. They are now really re-engaging the domestic undergraduate market because they fear the revenue losses. We don't have that problem. We weren't over-leveraged in that market. Higher education budgets across the country are being contracted for institutions who've never had a budget contraction before. So, we're in a more fortunate position than many other institutions in the country.

I end with the fact that every challenge is an opportunity, so I want to make sure we think about how all of this does frame an opportunity for the institution as we think about looking at students as an individual, when we provide them an individual admission decision, we think about them uniquely and what they bring to campus.

We have new strategic imperatives which guide the work and how we review and think about students coming to our campus. We are in a geographic location that is not part of the demographic cliff right now, that is to our advantage, everybody else in the world wants our students right now, but we're already here, and they already know us. There's a new brand campaign unfolding that we will leverage to ensure that we are positioning the institution in all our constituencies, High school counselors, high school teachers, K-12, as well as our prospective families.

Finally, I reiterate to the staff all the time, every challenge presents an opportunity. Keep reframing our thinking so that we ensure we meet our enrollment goals, because this is a phenomenal institution for students, and we want them to see that for themselves as well.

Questions and Comments [01:48:06]

- Senator Brochin stated she is representing the College of Education and her, and constituents have concerns regarding the new enrollment strategy due to the November 1st deadline. There are talented, marginalized students in schools that are under-resourced when it comes to college counseling and they will miss that November 1 deadline for priority merit aid, which will further reduce their chances for retention and degree completion.
- Senator Brochin asked if the students' aid is restricted only to need-based aid if they miss the November 1st deadline as her and her constituents believe there should be a backup plan for students beyond Arizona Online and UAGC. They have heard the enrollment team is communicating the message to everyone, but she has been in multiple meetings and large spaces with college counselors, principals and teachers and they haven't heard about the November 1st deadline. This is to the point where her college is organizing an online early enrollment access Zoom session with one recruiter to ensure that students attend UA.

- Senator Brochin asked what the admission model is for students who don't apply to November 1st.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions, Kristina Wong Davis stated this information is not accurate as her staff has been heavily involved in high schools, specifically many underserved high schools hosting workshops. There are underserved school districts who have made the essay on the application their high school writing project for the Fall. Her team knows that underserved students are getting this message, and they aggressively working with some of the most underserved schools in the state to ensure that their students have exposure and support to meet the November 1 deadline.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions, Kristina Wong Davis stated she would add that most of the applications last year were submitted by November 1st without there being a deadline. The application peak still follows this pattern, even without the deadline in the past, and this would be formalization of this.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions, Kristina Wong Davis stated even if a student doesn't make November 1, they'll still be considered for admission, there will be the opportunity to provide other scholarships to those students outside of the November 1st deadline.
- Senator Downing stated in relation to the earlier discussion on the compact, he would like to ask whether there would be ongoing risk assessment if the compact is either signed or not signed as this relates to directly affecting enrollment.

C. Closure of the Micro campuses – Dean, Arizona International, Jenny Lee [01:51:44]

I have a prepared statement, and hopefully we'll have some time at the end for questions. Some of you may remember that I was a member of Faculty Senate, so thank you for the invitation to participate in this meeting.

I am specifically addressing how the University of Arizona is supporting our students affected by the closure of the micro campuses in China. Many of you may remember that I've been a Professor of Education for the past two decades, long studying and advocating for the internationalization of higher education, including at this institution. Please, believe me when I say, under my leadership, as well as the university, will continue to care for our students and the university community.

Many of you may have not even heard of the micro campus model. So quickly, what it does is it offers dual degrees with international partners throughout the world. At the University of Arizona, we offer dual degrees in eleven universities across ten countries. International students can pursue a U of A degree while staying within their home country and without having to incur the cost of living in Tucson, as well as the tuition here. This has been a successful model, thanks to our eleven colleges throughout main campus who are actively participating now.

On September 12th, the Congressional Select Committee on the Strategic Competition between the U.S. And Chinese Communist Party and the Committee on Education, they released a report Called Joint Institutes and Divided Loyalties. This names a number of our peer institutions that have closed their China institutes. This includes the University of Michigan, UC Berkeley, University of Illinois, and a number of others. However, the University of Arizona is named as one of the institutions that continued what is labeled as high-risk partnerships in China, and the report stated that these partnerships must end.

Considering the report and the broader implications suggested by the federal government, the university chose to terminate its five active micro-campuses in China. This involved senior leadership meetings with affected deans, and then immediate notifications to the former university partners in China, affected department heads, employees whose appointments would be coming to an end, and affected students. Shared governance leaders were immediately informed, and we also sought to ensure and provide reassurance to members of our Chinese community here in Tucson. Provost Prelock and I hosted a meeting with the Chinese Heritage Faculty Group to hear their concerns and suggestions from our members. We also partnered with ASUA and GPSC, an outreach to Chinese students here on main campus, with plans for follow-up engagement with both groups.

It is important to underscore the fact that the University of Arizona has terminated these institutional relationships in China, we did not terminate the students. Moving forward, the university is treating these dual-degree students as single-degree students as we identify pathways for them to continue here on campus as well as online.

Later this week, Arizona International will hold in-person sessions in China for our students to further explain their degree completion options and answer questions. We're also offering online continuation options to the extent to which departments are able. The costs for these programs to complete their degrees online is not expected to exceed the cost of the micro-campus tuition that their families and parents have prepared for. For adjunct faculty and staff relocating as a result of the closures, we are providing some relocation funds. Please know that these decisions does not diminish our commitment to a robust international mission or providing our U of A students with an enriching global experience.

Our partnerships in our other countries continue to remain strong, and we are actively pursuing new ones. As an example of our global engagement, the provost had already spoken about the generous \$20 million gift that will transform student opportunities for a more global education.

In closing, I want to emphasize that this decision in no way lessens our dedication to Chinese students and our international community, or our international students more broadly. Chinese students, staff, and faculty, and alumni remain an integral part of the U of A, and their contributions continue to enrich our campus. Thank you for your attention. I especially want to thank the deans, department heads, academic advisors, so many who have been doing the work unseen to really identify pathways to support our Chinese students in this situation. They have been working diligently, day, night, weekends, non-stop for the past few weeks, and has not been an easy decision, nor a simple decision, but I do believe this is the right one as we maintain our support for our UA students, while aligning with federal expectations.

Questions and Comments [01:57:18]

- Senator Spece stated he also distributed to the Faculty Center, a Compilation of Information by one of his colleagues which includes a statement from students who say they are not being treated well and are threatening to sue the University for millions. To the professors who he mentioned before, who invoked the ABOR Policy Manual, speaks to the Faculty Senate having a review committee.
- Senator Spece moved **[Motion 2025/26-10]** to form an ad-hoc committee to examine the powers and provisions under ABOR Policy 6-201(K). The Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 19 in favor, 9 opposed, 5 abstentions.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the discussion will continue into the next meeting and she will not be taking a motion.
- Senator Downing stated there has to be a vote for the motion on the floor.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the meeting follows a timed agenda with a hard stop at 5:00 PM.

10. Adjournment [02:00:45]

Vice Chair Hymel adjourned the October 6, 2025, meeting at 5:01 PM.

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

Motions of October 7, 2024 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2025/26-3] to pass the agenda amendments for October 6, 2025. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-4] to amend the agenda by postponing Old Business Action Item 9B: Gen Ed Proposal Vote to the November 3, 2025, meeting. Motion failed with 6 in favor, 34 opposed.

[Motion 2025/26-5] to pass the October 6, 2025, agenda as amended. Motion passed with 38 in favor, 2 opposed.

[Motion 2025/26-6] to pass the May 5, 2025, and September 8, 2025, Faculty Senate Minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-7] motion to pass the Gen Ed proposal package as presented in the agenda by secret vote. Motion passed with 36 in favor, 13 opposed, 5 abstentions.

[Motion 2025/26-8] to table discussion on the Gen Ed proposal. No votes were tallied for this motion.

[Motion 2025/26-9] that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arizona opposes this Compact and calls upon President Garimella and the Arizona Board of Regents to reject this Compact as well as any similar proposal compromising the mission, values and independence of the University." Motion passed with 40 in favor, 8 opposed, 1 abstention.

Resolution Opposing the "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education"

"On October 1, 2025, the US Secretary of Education requested that the University of Arizona enter into a "Compact for Academic Excellence in Higher Education."

This Compact contains provisions which endanger the independence, excellence, and integrity of the University of Arizona and infringe on the constitutional rights of members of the University of Arizona community.

[Motion 2025/26-10] to form an ad-hoc committee to examine the powers and provisions under ABOR Policy 6-201(K), Motion passed with 19 in favor, 9 opposed, 5 abstentions.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 1: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the minutes of [May 5, 2025](#) and [September 8, 2025](#)
3. Page 6, Item 7: [Report](#) from the Provost Patricia Prelock
4. Page 8 Old Business
 - a. Item A: [Kindness Initiative](#) – Assistant Director for Faculty Mentoring Initiatives, Tara Chandler and SBS Associate Dean, Jeannine Relly
 - b. Action Item B: [Gen Ed Proposal](#) and [supporting documents](#) and [MOU](#) and [presentation](#) – UWGEC Chair, Jeremy Vetter
5. Page 10 & 14: New Business
 - a. Item A: [Resolution](#) on the Compact for Academic Excellence with [Volokh Conspiracy](#) – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson
 - b. Item B: [Enrollment Report](#) – Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admissions, Kristina Wong Davis
6. Written reports from
 - a. [UWGEC](#)
 - b. [President](#)
 - c. [Provost](#)
 - d. [SAPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456