

MINUTES FACULTY SENATE NOVEMBER 3, 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=de2438fe-1d8b-4dd8-9b27-b38b000513a0>

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

Absent: Senators Abdennebi, Baker, Buxner, Chandrasekar, Cooper, Díaz de la Rubia, Friesen, Goetz, Grijalva, Heileman, Lin, Lucas, McCallum, Pau, Perez, Roman-Palacios, Russell, Waddell, Williams

CALL TO ORDER [00:00:19]

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

- Vice Chair Hymel called for a moment of silence to remember the three students who were tragically killed on October 30, 2025, Josiah Santos, Sophia Troetel, and Katya Castillo-Mendoza, and their families who are suffering.
- Vice Chair Hymel welcomed new Senators.

1. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL [00:02:00]

2. Vice Chair Hymel stated there are a few updates to the agenda.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated Item 3: Approval of the Minutes for October 6, 2025, will be moved to the December 3, 2025, meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there was a procedural complaint by Senator Stegeman regarding the vote to approve General Education policy changes. A downfall of the recording is that it does not catch everything, but the Senate leadership believes the proposal passed. To eliminate any confusion or doubt of the legitimate passing of the motion, ratifying the vote will be moved to the December 5, 2025, meeting. This will allow individuals to review the proposal ahead of time.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there was a second procedural complaint regarding the vote on the creation of a committee regarding micro campuses. This will be in the agenda as Item 6A, and the Chair of the Faculty will be forming an ad hoc General Faculty committee and presenting on these concerns. The proposed change is that Item 6A will be changed from an action item to a discussion item.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated speakers have been added to Item 7A and Item 7D.
 - Senator Downing raised a point of order per Robert's Rule of Order, Edition 12, which doesn't allow a body, apart from the assembly of the Senate itself, to raise questions of whether a vote was legitimate. He has objections as a member of the Senate Executive Committee that any subcommittee or anyone else can raise issues as to whether a vote took place in Senate. The basic idea of Robert's Rules of Order is the fidelity of a vote and whether there was a quorum or such cannot be questioned later, especially on parliamentary grounds.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated this statement is duly noted and if a quorum is lost, then it is lost and no other action can be taken.
- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-10]** to approve agenda for November 3, 2025 as amended. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with forty in favor..

3. OPEN SESSION [00:08:54]

Senator Rocha [00:08:57]

Hello, I'm Christina Rocha, I am a Faculty Senator. representing the University of Arizona Staff Council. Staff Council's goal is to enhance the quality of career life for staff by providing advocacy, information and resources. In recent months, Staff Council has been able to advocate for staff, and we would like to thank the following.

Thank you to

Faculty Senate for including a staff representative in each of their newest ad hoc committees addressing community concerns. Thank you to President Garimella and Provost Prelock for consulting Staff Council leadership during their conversations with shared governance leaders on the matter of the Federal Higher Ed Compact. Thank you to the University of Arizona Foundation SVP and Chief of Staff and General Counsel, Brad Terry. for helping us revive the Staff Professional Development Awards in memory of Emily Kraus.

The Staff Council Courier, our newsletter, and monthly Zoom meetings continue to be effective avenues for sharing information and resources with a wide cross-section of our staff community. To submit a newsletter announcement or meeting agenda item. or to join our November 18th meeting with guest speaker Richard Cate, please visit our website at staffcouncil.arizona.edu. Thank you!

Senator Stegeman [00:10:40]

Good afternoon. I had prepared remarks here, they have been rendered partially obsolete. entirely obsolete. I may amend as I go, and that does not ensure a coherent result. But I will do my best. So, excuse those portions which may still be out of date.

At our last meeting, several Gen Ed policy changes came forward. The actual text was not shown, and there was minimal review of what those changes actually say. Moreover, this overall process violated our procedural rules in many ways. These were not obscure parliamentary details, but had the consistent effect of blocking or inhibiting discussion. I sent a four-page memo to the executive committee more than two weeks ago explaining these concerns. But I have received, until now, no response or acknowledgement, and I appreciate that. what I just received.

This matters because others and I have both said in this forum that this may be the most momentous Senate vote over the next two years. It is momentous partly because this proposal has the unadvertised effect. of permanently reducing the Senate's authority over changes in general education. Last Wednesday's UWGEC meeting included cheerful discussion of the fact that substantial curriculum changes could now circumvent the policy process, meaning in substantial part, circumvent the Senate. There are numerous other unacknowledged issues with this proposal.

One justification for accelerating the current proposals is that the Regents or someone else may soon burden us with a less palatable mandate. But ABOR is currently focused on enrollment and budgets. The America 250 Project mentioned as a possible threat, is a bipartisan K-12 initiative. The proposed federal compact has hit substantial resistance, including here.

In short, no pressing threat requires rushing these major policy changes through the Senate with minimal review. The argument that we are suddenly in a hurry, that we must quickly jump out of the plane and figure out the details on the way down. represents the Ashford model. By now, we should know better. Thank you.

Senator Ziurys [00:13:36]

In the past few weeks, various Nobel Prizes have been awarded to faculty members at universities across our country. But unfortunately, the University of Arizona is not on the list of recipients. But perhaps this outcome is not surprising. There is a growing perception among the faculty that they are being attacked, harassed, whatever you want to call it, by administrators. deans, department heads, and so forth. A testament to this perception is the, from what I hear, a large number of grievance cases being brought by faculty against administrators.

There's also a growing view among the faculty that many administrators are not subject to regular and legitimate reviews. I can bring up several instances of that. Then there's the weaponization of so-called letters in your file sent to individual faculty members without review, accusing them of inappropriate behavior of whatever, or whatever, with very little recourse for the faculty member. At the same time, administrators are seemingly allowed to practice retaliation, obstruction, whatever, with very little accountability.

It seems as if the overriding concern of department head these days is for the faculty to complete their online trainings. In something as silly as training to fill out timecards, which we don't use. This is hardly a road to a Nobel Prize.

I call on the Senate to set up a committee to investigate administrative reviews. And the legitimacy and even the legality of these letters that get placed in people's files. I also call on President Garimella and the university leadership to carefully look at their administrators, and to emphasize to them. that their purpose is to help the faculty and make them successful, not to police them.

Senator Cochran [00:15:54]

I'd like to dedicate my open session today to the topic of community, and the importance of community in times of tragedy. As many of you know, late Thursday night, University of Arizona students Katya Castillo-Mendoza, Sophia Troetel, and Josiah Santos lost their lives in a tragic accident crossing Euclid Avenue at 2nd Street. On my way into campus this morning, I passed through that crosswalk and saw a small memorial with flowers and gifts. Susan and I live in West University neighborhood, and my kids and I use that same crosswalk almost every day.

This past year has reminded me, personally and profoundly, of how much we depend on one another. Over the winter, my 13-year-old daughter spent more than three months in a hospital in Utah. Our families spent Thanksgiving and Christmas with her. nursing her back to health. Then, while I was on FMLA, my brother, a high school teacher with two young daughters, died suddenly. A month later, I lost a beloved aunt. During this same difficult season as many of you know, Susan stepped down from her role as Director of General Education, a position she has poured her heart into. for years.

My family and I are struggling, who are university professors shouldn't have to hold down multiple additional jobs just to feed our kids and make ends meet. Yet, this is the reality for many in our academic community, and it underscores how vital it is that we advocate for a university that truly sustains the people who give it life.

In the wake of last week's tragedy, I hope we as a university remember that our strength. lies not just in our scholarship or teaching, but in our willingness to stand together. To care for one another, and to extend compassion when we are hurting, for that is what it truly means to Bear Down.

4. STATEMENT FROM THE FACULTY CHAIR [00:19:01]

I think we're going to talk about the compact with the President, and we're very glad to welcome him here today but let me just say, very briefly, since the compact proposal came out on October 1st, our campus, our university, our community has been prominent in the national discussion around higher ed reform and freedom of speech. I, for one, am here for it.

I am also very pleased. with our president's stance, which echoes my own and that of many of you, I think. It also resonates with all our peer institutions and the networks that we're in across the country, as charter members of the Compact proposal. We've been in communications with our peers in the other universities, as well as many other networks of Faculty Senates. The position that we're in right now is one that I think reflects the general sentiments of our profession. I think we will continue to play a role in the nationwide conversation about affordability, access, campus climate, never at the expense of our integrity, never in the form of a legally binding document or a vague set of political threats or favors. We have some time on the agenda today to address that.

I want to notify the Senate that I have invited experienced former CAFT members to join our elected CAFT members to help process the large number of grievances that are coming towards CAFT. Also that I have extended the term and expanded the membership of the ad hoc General Faculty Committee on Career Track Faculty Needs, just to get that on the record.

A couple of other updates. Vice Chair, Mona Hymel and I submitted a letter to the President and the Provost expressing concern about the onboarding of UAGC administrators as faculty in a way that may well violate our policies on non-competitive hiring. I'm glad to say that HR has opened the two dozen jobs to internal candidates. I will make that letter that I sent to the President available, and we will also post those job openings, should anyone internal be interested in applying for them in the spirit of competitive hiring.

I wanted to brief the Senate on a matter of some concern to me, but I also think to us. On Thursday, October 30th, the editorial board of the Wall Street Journal posted an editorial attacking our faculty, and me, as anti-Semitic. and pro-terrorist. I was not contacted for comment or context about this article, so it came as a rather jolting surprise. I understand that others were not contacted as well. The article, which does not seem to have made it into the print version of the Wall Street Journal, was a complete surprise. I have received threatening and abusive emails as a result, which I have submitted to the Threat Assessment Management team.

Coincidentally, at the same afternoon that the Wall Street Journal article began to circulate online, I personally was falsely and anonymously accused of being overheard loudly expressing anti-Semitic view. behind the closed door of my office. I look forward to those spurious, malicious, charges being investigated and dismissed for the outrageous and slanderous lie that they are. I will append the Wall Street Journal editorial to the meeting minutes for next time. I must say, I am not sure what to make of this episode, other than that it strengthens my, and I hope, our, collective commitment to academic integrity, freedom, our basic anti-hate values, and the importance of institutional neutrality in

these times of extreme partisanship. I just wanted to get that on the record and make sure that everyone was aware of this episode.

Questions and Comments [00:23:57]

- Senator Rafelski stated he would like to ensure Chair Hudson verified the authenticity of the online journal because it is not printed. Everyone knows how easy it is to spoof anything these days.
- Chair Hudson stated this is one of the reasons she is going to append it to the official proceedings so that everyone can review it for hallmarks of legitimacy. She will append it for everyone's inspection.
- Senator Ziurys stated these sorts of threats are very scary and similar threats have led to people being killed before. She asked if the University is helping with any protection.
- Chair Hudson stated, yes, she immediately notified the higher administration, including Steve Patterson, the President's office, and the Provost, as well as her immediate chain of command. She has a meeting tomorrow with the Threat Assessment Management team, which has been great in this and in previous lesser episodes.
- Chair Hudson stated she four abusive emails, including one with racist and dehumanizing language. She has submitted all those and wants everyone to be aware of the situation.
- Senator Ziurys asked if Chair Hudson is the only one receiving these types of emails.
- Chair Hudson stated she believes so, the articles mention herself and the former President Robert Robbins. The headline and the conclusion of the article slander the entire faculty as a bastion of anti-Semitism and pro-terrorist sentiments, dormant within the academy. It is personal and collective.
- Senator Witte stated she believes it is important to prepare a letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal.
- Chair Hudson stated she will do so.
- Senator Witte stated she reads the journal often and thinks it is important as she believes the letter will be printed.
- Senator Ziurys asked if the faculty should prepare a letter in addition to Chair Hudson's since everyone is accused of bad behavior.
- Chair Hudson stated she will leave that up to Senator Ziurys once she reads the article as she doesn't want to conflate those two roles of being a prime representative and a personal target

5. COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN UPDATE – Chair of the Committee, 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.

6. **REPORT FROM THE PRESIDENT [00:27:56]**

- Vice Chair Hymel shared her thanks for the President including the faculty in his response to addressing the decision regarding the compact.

Folks, let me also start with acknowledging this devastating tragedy that led to the loss of life of three students and really affected a fourth as well. I just kind of imagine how the families are handling this. It's very hard to put oneself in their shoes. Our prayers are certainly with the families and all those that are affected.

We spoke about using that intersection. Patty was using that intersection just walking here. Most of us have children, it's just hard to process this. All I can say is, let's pay extra attention to each other, and to support each other, and to support our students. You know, any loss of life is painful, and I hear about students' lives lost more often than I wish to hear. I wish we could not have that, but this was just such a concentrated tragedy that it is sort of hard to process, as the details came out. I appreciate Mona having a moment of silence. I know Patty sent a note to the campus and such.

It's hard to sort of go on to the next comments from that, but I gave you a written report, I hope you've seen it. I just returned from a meeting with CNRS, the French National Research Agency. One of the greatest agencies in the world, because unlike most, they have 33,000 of their own researchers. I hope you all know, and are very, very proud, that their first international research center was established at the University of Arizona in addressing global grand challenges, and that's the context in which I was there. Given the of the Joint Center but also the potential CNRS, then established similar international research centers with the University of Sao Paulo, the University of Tokyo, Imperial College, University of Chicago, etc. So, clearly a great group that has come together because of that.

There were 150 people or so, and much appreciation of the work that we've done, pioneered in some ways. What was important in that conversation is how much of an opportunity there is for all the center hosts to work together. Sao Paulo had ideas about working in agriculture with us, Imperial wanted to work on space sciences. I'll be following that up, but it was a great visit. I think whatever we can do to represent the University of Arizona in these very accomplished circles, we should, and I will continue to do that. I think whatever we can do to advance global science, global research. in these ways is something we should all do.

In another recent event, Banner and the University of Arizona celebrated a 10-year anniversary. We've had this affiliation agreement for ten years, so it was a very good event. Some of the leadership on both sides focused on the next ten years as well. I think there's much we can build on, but also grow a lot more, too.

I've been visiting colleges and centers, I just visited the College of Medicine in Tucson, and previously Honors College, the Andrew Weil Center, the Vet School. This is useful for me, exciting, and they've been fun. This week, I have Law, Nursing, and Eller that I'll be visiting. It's pretty much in the order in which I was invited. Not everybody invited me, I'm just kidding.

We also celebrated the fifth Luminaries event, which was wonderful. We obviously conveyed my sincere congratulations to our faculty who are recognized, and we will continue to look for ways of recognizing our faculty, staff, and students anytime we can.

Finally, I know the Compact is on everyone's mind. Thank you for all the feedback we received, all the robust

collaboration we had. Hundreds and hundreds of people weighed in. If you haven't read our response, please do. It was a detailed response. I would say it was more detailed than any others I'd read, and that was on purpose. From all the feedback I've received, it's been received well, clearly, amongst yourselves as well. Leila had the takeaway line, she said, "we finally found our peer group." Well, there are other ways to find peer groups, but whatever. You see that in the principles we enunciated; there's a lot we can agree with, right? There are things that we already do by board policy, by university policy, by state policy, etc. At the same time, we will stay true to our foundational principles including academic freedom and merit-based funding, etc. We could go on about that for a long time, but I wanted to say it in writing. I do appreciate all the feedback we've received from within and beyond campus.

Finally, Homecoming weekend will be a busy weekend. I'm looking forward to that bonfire again. It was one of the nicest things I attended, and it's exhilarating. I'm looking forward to that, and multiple college-hosted alumni events, so I will attend as many of those as I can. I hope I didn't exceed my time by too much, and I'm happy to take a question or two.

Questions and Comments [00:35:28]

- Senator Witte stated last year, there was an unlit crosswalk pointed out at Cherry Avenue between Park Avenue and the Bioscience Research Labs. Within hours, Jon Dudas, who was a former associate of former President Robbins, put a light there. It is important to note unlit crosswalks around the university and be willing to get them lit.
- Senator Witte stated the Committee of Eleven, following the Faculty Senate vote to decline the compact met because they weren't sure the action that was going to be taken. Most of the Committee of Eleven were senators and had already voted to decline the compact but C11 went one step further. This was to try to rewrite something that would express the viewpoints, which is probably what the President has done in the past few months. On PBS, the President of the American Council for Higher Education said the same, that there should not only be a decline, but also a rewrite of principles.
- Senator Witte stated her third point is about Nobel Prizes on campus. More attention should be paid to the Nobel Prizes that were awarded. She knows of one, maybe two faculty that left the institution a year or two before they won the Nobel Prize because of the way they were treated here. The President may want to go back and find out why they left. There was one who was a long-time faculty member in physics who wasn't given the Nobel Prize because he was a physicist, and they were going to give it to three chemists. He was unrecognized, but he would have won a Nobel Prize, too.
- President Garimella said everyone should treat each other better and, in the future, there can be a Nobel Prize.
- Senator Ziurys stated the collaboration with CNRS is impressive and she asked if there is somewhere she can find more information.
- President Garimella stated there is a lot of information online but there can be a link sent to Chair Hudson to share with the Senate in her report. CNRS put out a very detailed press release that was picked up by UK Science. Most countries write about science more and there are a lot of good articles available. His team will also be issuing a release. He is more excited about where the University is going.
- Senator Cooper asked in regard to the Compact, has there been a response or is one expected, and what are the next steps expected in the near future.
- President Garimella stated it would be hard for him to predict this. It has been widely publicized that he has had calls. He clarified in his message to the campus, despite confusion on dates and deadlines, the University was told they were mostly seeking input and feedback, and this was provided. It is unclear of what the next steps are.
- President Garimella thanked everyone for their collaboration on the compact and stated everyone will continue in best efforts. He appreciates everyone and believes extensive communities are important. It is important to take the best care of each other as possible.

REPORT FROM PROVOST PRELOCK [00:40:10]

Thank you so much, Mona. I, too, want to acknowledge our three students, and a fourth student, whose life has now changed, but will cause us to think differently about how we support our students, and look at the use of alcohol and drugs on campus. We will be addressing that. I got some input from some pediatricians right after I sent out my message who said, we want to help. I will be meeting with them to see how we might be able to support and educate our community and work with our Dean of Students.

I will say I was at the vigil last night. There were almost a thousand students, faculty and staff. It was quite amazing and beautiful. The words of our students were just powerful, because Sophia, Katya, and Josiah really made a difference on this campus. It was nice to be able to hear those words, and to understand the impact that each of them had. So, young lives, but they made a difference. Katya's family said that she donated organs to four individuals whose

lives were saved because hers was lost.

So, on that note, I'm not going to go over all of this, but in your report, we have lots of searches going on, so please participate for those in your colleges. Go to the open forums, participate in the meetings with the candidates. These are really important searches. Right now, we have candidates on campus for the Executive Director for UAIR and Optical Sciences, and in the coming weeks, it'll be the Law School and the Pharmacy School, and the Ag School. We have lots coming up, so November, December, January will be very busy.

President Garimella already mentioned the Luminaries event, which was my first time here to have that. It was a wonderful experience. But we also have the Gerald J. Swanson Prize for four of our amazing faculty teachers. When they described what they're doing in the classroom, I wanted to go back to school and sit in their classrooms. We have some incredible teachers on this campus, so I was very impressed. Then we did have our Promoted Faculty Event on October 14th, where we celebrated all those faculty who were promoted, and we invited their families, and it was just really delightful. We had 217 dossiers submitted this year, which was a record. Approval rate was at over 95%. We had wonderful faculty and tenure track, continuing status and career track. I was really pleased about that.

I just announced Provost Fellows for Academic Success. I am trying to recruit the next generation of supporters and leaders for our academic success goals that this community has been involved in, and it will be a faculty member and a staff member. that we will support, and give funding to, to work with us for at least one year, if not two years, in a leadership role assigned to student success, research that shapes the future, or community engagement. I hope you will either self-nominate or nominate your colleagues who you think would be good. They will be working with our office and those who are the leads for each of the academic success goals. This is a true way to get shared governance as part of our implementation of our academic success goals. It is a stipend of \$7,500, and for those who are faculty and need to be released from a class, we will work with your Dean and your chair, but we ask that you get permission from your dean and chair before you put yourself forward. It will be an opportunity for you to connect with my leadership team and then the leads for each of the goals. I'm very excited about the Provost Fellows for both faculty and staff who will work as partners.

Then the last thing I wanted to point out, we are continuing to do our community college connections. We have some great things that are happening. It looks like we have four health programs that we're going to be working with, with Pima Community College. We just met with Cochise again today, and we have a plan to work in particular areas that are of interest for them. So, ultimately, we will be working with all the community colleges, but those two have been front and center, and we're working effectively with them.

The last thing is, I don't know how many of you took advantage of the NCFDD: Rethinking Your Research Funding Workshop. This is something that our office paid for in collaboration with the Office of Research and Partnerships, and we have 46 faculty members that we funded to go through this. There were 60 slots that were available. We took 46 of them. That was 77% filled, 70% were tenure track, 15% were postdocs, researchers, staff, Emeritus faculty, 9% were continuing status and 6% were career-track. We'll continue to work with NCFDD. They were an organization that we worked with at my previous institution, and faculty who took advantage of this, it was a huge lift for their research, their scholarship, and some of the activities they were engaged in. I think that will be it. I'm happy to take a question or two.

We'll be talking more about multi-year contracts when I can do that with Katie and Kirsten. Okay, thank you.

7. OLD BUSINESS [00:47:07]

A. Information Item: Formation of ad-hoc Committee on Micro Campus Concerns – Chair Hudson [00:47:15]

Let me just take a minute for transparency here, we've already noted the procedural issues attending to the hasty vote at the end of last Faculty Senate. I do, of course, believe that that vote was valid, yet, I have superseded it by going ahead to create the ad hoc general faculty committee under my own authority as Chair of the Faculty.

I've asked Senator Roy Spece, who brought the motion last time to Chair that committee. I've since invited about nine or ten members of the faculty to join in. I think we'll have a good working committee of about seven people, and unfortunately, I don't have the list of their names here. This committee is a stab at addressing policy issues that are not well treated in UHAP, and we've got items on the agenda later today that show our new administration taking charge of some of the policy gaps and inconsistencies that you have.

Let me just read you, for the record, the charge of the new committee which is literally to determine the faculty and the Faculty Senate's obligations and duties about program reorganization and terminations happening under program reorganization. Under the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 6-201K, specifically regarding the recent micro-campus closures. This is in response to the petition by faculty members terminated from those micro-campus to have an ABOR-style review not provided for in the University of Arizona's own UHAP procedures. This is a legalistic

matter.

We want to make sure that as the faculty, under our obligations, to do shared governance, that we are not neglecting any ABOR policy that might help make whole or redress terminations of faculty, presumably also of staff, occurring under the excuse of program reorganization, which is not adequately addressed under our own in-house UHAP. So, the committee's also being asked to assess the university's compliance with the Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 6-201K, and to recommend any actions to bring the Senate and the University into compliance with that ABOR Policy 6-201K. The immediate case here is the abrupt terminations resulting from the closure of the micro-campuses, but there are implications for many other faculty whose employment ceases to exist for budgetary or program reasons. We would like to be proactive in defending our colleagues in these situations as required by policy and perhaps by law.

Roy Spece is undertaking that committee as we speak, and I've asked them to make a recommendation or an interim report to the Faculty in December 2025, and a final report in May 2026. I'll take any questions if there are any.

Questions and Comments [00:51:20]

- Senator Su stated currently, the global professors and their contracts will be ending by January 18, 2026. She asked if Chair Hudson is saying the community report will be coming out in March.
- Chair Hudson stated there are different categories of faculty. Faculty whose petitions have triggered this committee were the faculty at the Ocean University Law Program whose contracts ended on October 19th. They've already been terminated, and they have petitioned the President for redress. Part of that redress specified by ABOR is that the Faculty Senate, at the President's bidding, convene a review committee. None of that has happened. Those law faculty have activated the Faculty Senate to address whether that should happen. She believes it should, and she has assembled the committee to address that.
- Chair Hudson stated there are other faculty of other micro-campuses whose contracts will extend through January of 2026. Those are not the faculty who have. Officially requested this review, but she would certainly hope that what is uncovered by Senator Spece's committee can be applied to the case of other micro-campus faculty whose letters of offer that were never congealed into valid work contracts can find some redress.
- Chair Hudson stated she would like for the committee to submit a final report in May, and she may extend their charge as there are so many contract issues that come in up, in so many parts of the University. The Ocean Law Program will be a start and will extend to other micro campus faculty. There are implications for people all throughout the institution.
- Senator Su stated her question had to do with the fact that the committee report is not coming out until 2026 and she asked if is there going to be kind of mutual activity with those faculty whose contracts will already be terminated by that time.
- Chair Hudson stated she hopes that the recommendation will consider the passage of time, and recommend. whatever it takes to comply, and to make the faculty whole. The deadline has already been missed for that first batch of faculty. This is the fastest that this can happen, with all the bureaucracy and parliamentary procedure and recruitment of committee members. She hopes the committee will make recommendations. to the administration and to ABOR that will demonstrate that faculty governance, Faculty Senate, and the faculty are trying to uphold is required by policy and needed for colleagues.
- Senator Su stated she looked this up and there is time as Physics faculty are affected, and they fall into a faculty category which is a global professor and non-tenure track. When the funding source no longer exists, the University is only required to give a one month's advance notice, per UHAP. She asked if Chair Hudson is saying this is not applicable in this case.
- Chair Hudson stated her personal perspective is that what Senator Su has is vaguely written and imprecise, and not very useful in cases like these. The cited passage refers to people who are on grant funding that gets terminated. One of the interesting features of the micro campuses, at least the legal education program at Ocean University, is that it was still producing revenue, and its revenue flow was only cut off by the termination of the program. Because of this, she wants a committee of legally sophisticated faculty to study it and make recommendations. She would like there to be well-rounded recommendations presented to the administration and to ABOR.

B. [Multi-Year Appointments](#):- Provost Patricia Prelock, Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zieders, and Senator Kristin Little [00:57:11]

Provost Prelock [00:57:46]

I like that this is a total engagement of Administration, Faculty Senate, and career track faculty who are committed to the same thing. That is recognizing our career-track faculty provides so much education and support to our students that we need to recognize them, and for those who have taught for many years, how might we do that?

I just wanted to give you some national data on what the trends are, and then Katie's going to talk about our policies and where we're at, and then Kristin is going to talk about what are some recommendations for us. This is data that came from Colby in 2025. It is looking at kind of a data snapshot for tenure-track faculty and contingent faculty across the nation.

What we are seeing is a national shift towards contingent faculty, recognizing that although the power of tenure-track faculty remains solid, it is less than our contingent faculty, or those who are career track or non-tenure track. Nationally, about 48% of faculty in R1 institutions are on the tenure or tenure line. Contingent appointments range anywhere from 51% at R1 institutions to 83% at Associates Colleges. All this work is from Andrea Romero's work and her team. She couldn't be here, so thank her very much for all the work that she's been doing on this. We're a little lower than we would like to be in terms of tenure-track faculty at 43.4%. Our pattern is like what the pattern is nationally, with 31% career track. We do have a lot of the adjunct faculty, especially for some of our specialty programs and clinical programs.

We just thought it was good for us to see what the national trend is, and what does our campus look like. Then, we want to talk about the ABOR cap, and I think Katie's going to be talking about that.

Secretary Katie Zeiders [01:00:33]

It's really great to be here co-presenting with you two and the Provost on this important topic. I think this, as the Provost said, this is a collaborative project between shared governance and central administrations. I'm honored to work on a project, an initiative that has material consequences for our faculty, and that is job security.

So, just a reminder, ABOR policy 6-201 E (11) states at each university, the total number of multi-year appointments, may not exceed 15% of the number of tenure track or tenure-eligible faculty. This cap was increased to 30% in fiscal year 2022. It was that year in Faculty Senate that Senator Little, Senator Romi Wittman, who's online today, and , asked Provost Folks, at the time, to consider increasing multi-year appointments among our Career Track faculty. We've continued that push, and we're finally at a place where we have some progress, and I'll report that in a minute.

We currently have 1,550 tenure-track faculty, so 30% of that number is about 465. We can issue 465 multi-year appointments this year. We currently have 1,225 career track faculty, and the Provost's office has determined that 536 of those faculty are eligible. Ineligible faculty are those who are funded on grants or temporary streams of funding.

We are pleased to report that we currently have 267 career track faculty on multi-year appointments, and we have 31 additional multi-year appointments being processed. At the end of the semester, we would expect 298. So, we still have some room. We can issue more of these, but I wanted to highlight this progress we've made together in this last year. From last year this time, we have increased multi-year appointments by about 40%, and if we add in those 30 additional, that'll be a 55% increase. This could not have been done without the Provost's Office, Provost Prelock, , Vice Provost Romero, and the college deans stepping up and issuing these. We thank them for that. And of course, the career track faculty, many who have advocated across the university for greater job security. This is really their work, and we are helping them advance that work.

Senator Kristin Little [01:03:06]

We have some recommendations that we have worked on. The expectation is that the majority of faculty at full rank will have multi-year appointments. Colleges and units are expected to review full-rank CT faculty and hopefully appoint, a multi-year appointment. Lastly, deans and department heads will have discretion to appoint other multi-year appointments to those who are not at full rank, such as Associate and Assistant Professors of Practice, and hopefully Senior Lecturers, if not just lecturers who aren't at senior or principal.

I just want to take a minute to say how important multi-year appointments are for faculty, because they allow for, as Katie said, job security. Job security lends to stability, people wanting to stay here in Tucson, buy houses in Tucson. There's a continuity of engagement and participation in academic departments, opportunities to participate in shared governance. If people have that multi-year appointment, they feel like they can take time to do that.

Most importantly, is its continuity of care for our students. I teach freshman composition, and I have students contact me after they're out of my classes, junior year, senior year, "Can I have a letter of recommendation? Can you help me with my resume?" or whatever it is. Building that relationship takes time, and so you want to have faculty who want to stay here. One of the ways the university can do that is. give you multi-year appointments. I just want to say, Katie, thank you so much for your continued work on this, and push. Provost Prelock, thank you for your support and taking time to focus on this issue.

- Provost Prelock stated that when she did her ABOR presentation in June 2025, she was here three weeks, and she had multi-year contracts on there as her priority. She said to Andrea Romero that this had to be done for faculty who are full rank and those who are promoted to associate rank. She would like to give thanks to the office of Andrea Romero and the Deans for supporting this. This is something that was important to her and she said this would be done, and now it is done.

Questions and Comments [01:06:04]

- Vice Chair Hymel stated regarding the 30% number, if there is 30% of tenure-track calculated, would 465 multi-year appointments be of tenure-track faculty.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated no, in response to Vice Chair Hymel's question.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated so the ultimate result over time would be an increase in career-track faculty with multi-year appointments because of the way this is calculated.

- Secretary Zeiders stated if tenure-track faculty fall, there would be fewer due to how the policy works.
 - Provost Prelock stated they would like to maintain their tenure-track faculty, and this is all based on a proportion.
- Senator Cochran stated his thanks for the hard work on this, as a faculty member in the writing program, this means a lot to him, as well as many others in his program. He asked about the duration leading to the multi-year contracts as they can be extended up to three years. He asked how individuals might impress upon deans that there is no need to set two-year limits on multi-year contracts which seems to be the standard process, at least in SBS with the writing faculty. He also asked why it is not extended to three years.
 - Provost Prelock stated this is a great question and there are financial implications for everyone, as multi-year contracts are made, individuals are thinking carefully about filling classrooms, having work to do. She believes the deans are being cautious because of the financial elements with regards to the population of students.
 - Senator Cochran asked, once the University becomes more stable, will this ever change.
 - Provost Prelock stated she is unsure but ultimately, the goal is to try to get them to three years, but there must also be fiscal discipline.
- Senator Eaton stated her thanks for everyone's work on this. As a member of a college with a high proportion of career-track faculty with no representative, she asked if there will be a cost-of-living raise associated with this. If faculty are being employed on the low end, with no cost-of-living increase, and they are locked into a three-year contract, they may be three years behind in pay with regards to cost-of-living. She asked what the plan will be for this type of situation moving forward.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated multi-year appointments are not contingent, and salary increases can happen and continue. There was recently a salary increase program.
 - Provost Prelock stated faculty will get salaries based on what the institution has identified they can afford, this goes for all faculty, not just multi-year contracts.

8. **NEW BUSINESS [01:10:16]**

A. **Formation of *ad hoc* committee on surveillance and privacy – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:10:30]**

In the last Senate meeting, we heard from Steven Davis about the automated license plate reader state-of-affairs. It occurred to me, not for the first time, that we don't have a good understanding of the surveillance landscape on campus. I first raised this question in the aftermath of Tom Meixner's murder, wanted to know, and was told at the time that there was no consistent surveillance mechanism on campus. We actually came at it from a public safety concern at that time.

More recently, in the case of the automatic license plate readers and our contract with Flock, it's come at us from privacy concerns. I am in the process of recruiting faculty members for a committee to produce a report, simply an informational report on what the surveillance and privacy landscape on campus is. My understanding right now is that it depends on what building you're in, what college you're in, what part of campus you're on. Despite my best efforts, I do not have a good idea of where the cameras are, what they're collecting, who has the data. what kind of contractual transactions are possible with that data, and its high time that we know that.

I will be passing some names of faculty, staff, and students by the executive committee at our next meeting for this new *ad hoc* Committee of the General Faculty. I would love your recommendations if you knew colleagues who work on these matters, who have expertise on these matters, or concerns. I would love for you to pass me those names.

Questions and Comments [01:12:34]

- Senator Witte stated there is an article that just came out in on cybersecurity and the University of California faculty claiming. that there are violations of academic freedom. She didn't read the article, it's obviously very germane, but it is the current issue of Science.
- Chair Hudson asked Senator Witte to send this along.
- Chair Hudson stated for the transparency, both from the public safety angle and the privacy angle, people need to know where the cameras are, where the data is, who has access to it, in order that we can even begin making recommendations.

B. **Policy Proposal changes for UHAP Chapter 3 for Career-track faculty – Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Carolyn Casertano, Senator Nuemann, and Senator Little [01:13:40]**

Senator Kristin Little [01:14:28]

Bill, Carolyn, and I are going to present a couple of proposed policy changes in UHAP 3.3.03, which is the promotion and appeals process section and UHAP 3.4.031A which is non-renewals for CT faculty. I'll just say, this just an informational presentation. We are here on behalf of Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero, who couldn't be here today. My understanding is this process doesn't require a faculty senate vote, she really wanted this information to. be presented to all of you for transparency and inclusion.

This really stemmed from the Delphi Award Career-Track Faculty Working Group. We had quite a few members working on this in collaboration with Faculty Affairs this last year. I will turn it over to Bill, who will be talking about the appeals process.

Carolyn Casertano, Professor of Practice, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences [01:16:17]

Good afternoon. In alignment with some of the feedback and being a little bit more responsive for the career-track faculty needs, this has necessitated a change that we implement some sort of policy for an appeals process for career-track faculty. Currently, there is not one.

This is a summary of the draft changes, and you'll notice the bottom part with the appeal process, that at the lecture title series, the appeals process would go to the Dean. For professorial title series, it would go to the Provost. For the full rank, for Professor who is career-track, it would go all the way up to the President.

Senator Neumann [01:17:12]

Mine is a relatively short one, but an important one that has been discussed in Senate but also goes all the way back when we did the career track harmonization. Previously, if you look at the policy that is in the 3.4031A, it dealt with when you would get noticed on terms of the policy being renewed.

The change that is going to happen is the end of the contract. This basically moves it back up to an earlier date, this articulates incredibly well with the work that's still being done by the Provost and Enrollment Management, such that we can plan. We can basically anticipate the needs and be able to bring faculty at the appropriate time.

For both, some work has been done in terms of our faculty working groups since. The original career-track harmonization effort, but also now with the support of the Provost in terms of bringing, basically, two key things in terms of appeals and the idea of earlier notice so that our career track faculty, if they do have to make a change will receive earlier and more timely notice.

As we indicated that we are just representing the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs. Adriana is here as well, this is an early informational item, if you have any questions, concerns, comments, or suggestions, please forward those to her office and she will follow up with you in a timely sort of way.

C. Committee on Eleven Update – Chair of Committee of Eleven, Ted Downing [01:30:32]

Thank you, Vice Chair. First, I want to apologize for not being in the room with you. I had another issue, and I had to be away from the building at this moment. I'm going to give a brief report on the Committee of Eleven, as I hope you know that Committee of Eleven is an independent elected by the General Faculty. It's been around for about eighty years, and we are to promote, initiate, and stimulate studying actions dealing and looking forward to solutions of situations and problems that the faculty identifies. I think that's important that we identify those.

The Committee of Eleven this year has been quite active and have taken some new initiatives to change somewhat of our methodology. What we're doing is we've decided to reach out and open the committee to the faculty, to our constituents, all of them the best we can, given a zero budget. We've opened up the meeting using a mimicking or mirroring of the Arizona Open Meeting format which means our agendas are published ahead of time, that our meetings are put on the webinar, we have a chat area, so constituents can write in, we can see those. We've also been looking at other options, which would be community forums that accidentally somewhat appeared on the open compact. Option that was proposed where we had a forum that involved 160 participants, quite to our surprise. We're open to direct comments, and all of the members are ready to receive whatever you say.

We are not a grievance committee, even though it has happened in the past. We're not a substitute for example, for CAFT. If we see patterns among grievances, and I'll talk about those just right now, we will look at those. Our purpose this year has been to focus on what we call probative questions. I won't get into all those, but they involve questions that the members each, through their constituents, have identified as general questions, and we're finding those questions of trust, I'll just mention some. Effectiveness of shared statutory governance, healthy community discourse, faculty roles in budgeting, expanding free speech, outreach to full faculty constituents, that includes the Senate's ability to reach its own constituents, and the senators, and one that hasn't been mentioned in a long time that's very important, the vulnerability of our international faculty and students who are on campus to external pressures. Just to give you one example, each of these questions we have, they begin with a methodology developed by Professor Marlys Witte on questions.

For each of these we unpack, we break open, and we last time, looked very carefully at the probative question raised by one of our members about protracted personnel disputes and disruptions. They just seem to go on and on. Is there any way of moving upstream and trying to limit those and bring them down so they get resolved quicker? That involves looking at everything, structures, policy, everything else. We're taking a question, cracking into pieces, and then bringing solutions, we hope, to the Senate in the future.

The final point is that one of the issues that we have already seen today, was this issue of the alignment of UHAP with the binding policies of ABOR, which is above them. The ABOR policies are procedural and legalistic. What

we're discovering is, and gradually through time, UHAP has evolved into more of a substitute for personal, administrative, behavioral ideals, and ethical aspirations. That difference between aspirations and policies and legalistic one is critical. We're starting to look at that in detail. I explained it by simply looking at both grievances coming in.

I've heard from the Academic Policy Committee, that many of the grievances that were coming in involve, not exclusively, usually claims Bylaws of UHAP 7.01, the Professional Conduct Policy. If you look at that policy, you'll discover it's only half a page long, five paragraphs. It involves the word "we" nineteen times. It has no procedures, and it describes the ideals of what we should be. It reminds me of a football game. The coach should be out there and inspire the kids to get out, win the game. That's aspirational. However, when the coach punches one of the kids, that is using an aspirational policy for a sanction. That's becoming increasingly common.

Recently, the confusion with performance evaluations and the lowering of one tenured faculty members perform evaluation based on the idea that he had somehow violated UHAP 7.01, without a hearing and without any evidence.

D. Constitution and Bylaws changes – Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders & Senator Kathleen Kennedy [01:25:48]

Hi, everybody. I am the chair of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, and I am here to talk about two proposed changes to the Faculty Constitution. I'd like to introduce you to Senator Kathleen Kennedy, a new senator from College of Ag, my college and a member of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. She will be presenting on the second item that we have here.

First, the C&B Committee is recommending that we remove Article 2, Section 2 from the Constitution. This change has also been recommended by APPC and the Faculty Membership Committee. The article states this, "No candidate for a degree at the University of Arizona shall be a member of the General Faculty." We are recommending the removal of this article for a number of reasons. First, it has either not been enforced for a number of years, or when enforced, enforced inconsistently. Second, the interpretation is unclear. As it is written, it could mean that first, no UA student without a completed degree may be faculty, or that a faculty cannot take courses toward a degree without relinquishing their General Faculty status. Related, the phrase "candidate for a degree" is confusing. We usually think of candidates as PhD students who have passed comprehensive exams and not yet defended.

If it is the intent to bar faculty who are pursuing degrees from general faculty status, this conflicts with ABOR 6-902, which encourages faculty independence to take university courses through QTR: Qualified Tuition Reduction. The only rationale that was brought up for keeping this section is concern over Conflicts of Commitment, though those are not governed by shared governance bodies or the faculty constitution. We are recommending removing it. I just wanted to say, we're not voting on either one of these changes today as faculty senators, we are just bringing these up for discussion, and we'll be discussing and voting on them in December.

Senator Kathleen Kennedy [01:28:47]

The second change, which is somewhat unreadable on the slide, is to change the definition of General Faculty in Article II Sections 1 and 5. An extensive review of faculty governance and general faculty definitions from peer institutions and other major universities revealed that the University of Arizona has a uniquely restrictive definition of faculty, General Faculty, and specifically about which career-track faculty are members of the General Faculty.

Our requirement is that you either have a multi-year appointment, or you've had a faculty appointment of 0.5 FTE or more for the past four years. We have full-time faculty who are serving the university, who are career-track faculties are not members of our General Faculty. The recommendation from the committee is to change it so that all Career-Track faculty with a half-time or greater FTE appointment are members of the General Faculty. The effect of this is not dramatic. We have 3,812 General Faculty members. With this, will add 391 faculty. That is our second recommendation.

Question and Comments [01:30:32]

- Senator Rafelski stated if he understands correctly, a teaching assistant who is a candidate for a PhD degree and has a continuing status with a master's degree, for example, is considered General Faculty after these changes.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated no, this does not include a teaching individual who is not a faculty member, they are staff.
 - Senator Rafelski stated this change is unclear to him and he doesn't see how teaching assistants are excluded from becoming General Faculty.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated teaching assistants are not faculty.
 - Senator Rafelski stated they would fall under the classification as they have a degree, are teaching, have a 50% appointment.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated per ABOR requirements and categories of employment, teaching assistants are not considered faculty.
 - Senator Kathleen Kennedy stated the constitution requires that one has a faculty appointment to be a member of the General Faculty, which teaching assistants do not.

- Senator Cochran stated he would like to applaud this as he believes it to be very inclusive and the more inclusivity there is, in terms of faculty engagement, the better the University can be. From a personal level, he was a member of the General Faculty and decided to go back and work on another degree. He believes this is why there is QTR in place and this encourages that.
- Secretary Zeiders stated she has data on the Census of General Faculty that she can share. The first slide first slide includes numbers that were pulled in September which are members of the General Faculty. The number is 3,812. 30% of the General Faculty are Emeritus. That part of this was removed to add more inclusivity, because they make up of 30% of the General Faculty who are voting and deciding how the university is involved in shared governance.
- Secretary Zeiders stated there 391 faculty who are 1 FTE or 0.5 and higher FTE and are not part of the General Faculty. This is adding only about 10% more of our faculty and allowing them to be part of the shared governance process and having a voice. This is one thing that was reviewed when thinking about this change.
- Senator Ziurys asked if there is ambiguity about teaching assistants being Faculty, couldn't there just be something added to this change.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated they will certainly look at the language, but she believes the Faculty Constitution is clear that teaching assistants are not included.
 - Senator Ziurys stated this can possibly be added as a clause to add clarification.
- Senator Ziurys stated per the Faculty Constitution, when changes are made, the Chair of the Faculty is required to convene a meeting to consider the change with all faculty. There will be a faculty meeting hosted where all faculty will be able to weigh in and voice their opinions on this matter, before it officially goes to vote. This will require 75% of the votes to approve the passage of this constitutional change.
- Senator Slepian asked if there is a certain number of faculty that must be present during that forum.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated there would be no vote during that meeting and the vote would go to all General Faculty to vote on. This meeting is solely for the purpose of getting perspective and feedback.
 - Secretary Zeiders stated she believes it is 5% of the faculty that is considered quorum.
- Secretary Zeiders stated this item will return in December for an official vote by the Faculty Senate, it will then go to the General Faculty meeting, then a vote.

E. Discussion of the “Compact for Excellence in Academic Education” – Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:36:35]

We've set aside ten minutes on the agenda for senators to voice any questions or comments that they might have about the compact issue, the President's response to the compact and information items about the compact. I really don't have anything more to say, but I thought we have the unusual opportunity to have Senators opine and question for ten minutes. Senator Rafelski points out that we can always discuss some administrative issues as well, it is part of the compact, the compact is broad, and deep, and wide, and encompassed potentially, every concern that we might have. I open the floor.

Questions and Comments [01:13:06]

- Vice Chair Hymel stated she would just like to ask that when there are updates on the progress the compact changing, or anything that takes place that the Senate is notified about those changes.
 - Chair Hudson stated she would like for it to be noted that in the Senate's shared governance role, be included in any important material updates to the state of the compact discussion
- Senator Rafelski stated there has much discussion on the issue of bloat and waste in the administrative sector in the Senate. The President's response is applauded, and it would be nice to take this opportunity to have a supporting document in which the Senate supports the university and the new President in his effort. The President wrote that he has reduced to administrative parallels in support of further reduction, in response to the request made.
 - Chair Hudson stated she believes this is a good point and there is an opportunity here. As Senator Downing has arranged by means of the Committee of Eleven there has already been a lot of engagement with the idea of faculty producing their own document, forum, and recommendations on the issues raised by the Compact. She is open to this and C11 has called for this.
 - Chair Hudson stated as the Senate gets their bearings, it may be good to look at the President's statement of Principles, which she believes was a very good response to the compact situation. The Senate can think about composing their own Statement of Principles, and institutionally specific recommendations on the questions of affordability, good use of federal and other governmental resource, campus climate, and especially the question of how to fund, finance and distribute resources within the University.
- Senator Ziurys stated she has a similar thought with regards to very high-paid administrators who drive up the cost education. Many of these positions could be filled by faculty with a summer salary increase. Administrators don't need to be paid enormous amounts. Years ago, a faculty member, Michael Cusanovich, was the Vice President for Research, Michael Kazanovich and he did a great job and didn't require extra privileges. The University needs to return to that model, and this could be an opportunity to do so.
- Senator Downing stated C11 is now open and anyone who has an underlying, broad issue and wants to bring it to

the attention of the committee can reach out to a C11 member to be placed on the agenda. He also shares Senator Ziurys' concerns and believes it looks bad that the administration has personalized scooters in front of Old Main that they can use at their leisure. Faculty cannot. Administrators have special parking spots.

- Senator Downing stated he has been with the University for over fifty-four years, when he first arrived, all the President's cabinet and administration were teaching or research faculty, even if it were one small course. They were engaged in activities online. This has completely transformed, and he believes the evolution towards a permanent administrative class is not good and partially the faculty's own fault because they allowed it to happen. Faculty decided that it was better for someone else to deal with the issues rather than themselves which is the issue.
- Senator Downing stated if the profile is to be changed, faculty will have to take on some of the jobs, which should also come with rewards. He believes \$550,000 for people to be paid for duties he is unaware of, can be split into smaller chunks for faculty to take up those loads. There is a way to transform and create changes.
- Senator Downing stated the University has gone through an evolution where money has been decapitalized everywhere from students, partners, etc. C11 is looking at what happens when there is decapitalization such as program closures like micro-campuses, changes in furloughs, and reorganization of departments. This is becoming the new environment, and he believes the Faculty Senate should be on top of this rather than reacting to it.
- Senator Cochran stated earlier he spoke about the importance of community and while he understands his fellow senators' frustrations, everyone is a part of a community. He would appreciate if bashing would stop as part of the community. If faculty were paid a little more, they would not be driven to administrative positions.
- Senator Ziurys stated she appreciates the comments and understands the need for a community but there must be fair play, mutual appreciation, and mutual benefits for all involved. Currently it is like a class system where there are highly paid administrators, no accountability, and are hardly reviewed. Faculty are teaching, writing proposals, writing books, and doing other things and are underpaid and overworked, along with staff members, and teaching faculty. Everyone is pushed to the limit, underpaid, and underappreciate.
- Senator Ziurys stated the current ruse seems to put letters in Faculty files if one disagrees with their department head and individuals cannot take any action. Community requires justice and fairness which currently doesn't exist. The idea of a community is somewhere off in the distance.
- Senator Witte stated individuals who speak out, and others like Professor Fink who gave up his professorship because his endowment of fifteen years was taken from him, speak up and do not get rewarded from it, except that maybe being virtuous is a reward for it although there is retaliation. She has high a recurring nightmare for a while that the University disappearing because of a cloud of fat, the only treatment she knows for this is liposuction and a better diet.
- Senator Barefoot stated she would like to say she hears the plight of the faculty. Most faculty, especially now with the work towards more than one-year appointments for career-track faculty and other contingent faculty, there are protections for faculty. Most staff are "at will," and do not have the same protections. When their reductions in force, staff are affected in ways oftentimes with the same result. It doesn't just mean that when a faculty member is gone, the research stops, crucial staff members are also reduced in force if they are affected by those things as well as students.
- Senator Barefoot stated that she saw Senator Downing's comment that community is aspirational, but she agrees with Senator Cochran that there is community, it just must be sought out including having empathy for one another.

9. **Adjournment [01:49:37]**

Senator Barefoot moved **[Motion 2025/26-11]** to adjourn the November 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- Vice Chair Hymel adjourned the October 6, 2025, meeting at 4:50 PM.

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

Motions of November 3, 2025 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2025/26-10] to approve agenda for November 3, 2025, as amended. Motion passed with forty in favor.

[Motion 2025/26-11] to adjourn the November 3, 2025, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 1: Approval of the [Agenda](#)

2. Page 8 Old Business
 - a. Item B: [Multi-Year Appointments](#)
3. Page 10 & 1: New Business
 - a. Item B: [Policy Proposal changes for UHAP Chapter 3 for Career-track faculty – Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs](#)
 - b. Item D: [Constitution and Bylaws changes](#)
4. Written reports from
 - a. [Gen Ed Office with UWGEC](#)
 - b. [President](#)
 - c. [Provost](#)
 - d. [SAPC](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456