

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 6, 2026**

Once approved, these minutes may be accessed electronically at:

<http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/handle/10150/107812>

Visit the faculty governance webpage at:

<http://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/>

The recording of this meeting may be found at:

<https://arizona.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=3e1e1b8b-ff42-4dd2-a9a6-b425001134d1>

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

Absent: Senators Abdennebi, Baker, Buxner, Chandrasekar, Cornelison, Diaz, Díaz de la Rubia, Garcia, Garimella (President), Goetz, Gregory, Grijalva, S. Harris, Huffman, Levy, Lin,Lowell, Lucas, Maggert, McCallum, Perez

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

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the April 6, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:00 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

Vice Chair Hymel stated during this meeting, the Senate will be trialing TopHat, a University adopted system, to vote on motions that don’t typically require discussion. Senators should use a mobile device such as a laptop or cellphone. Paper ballots will still be accepted for those who need them. There will be no password required for today, as it is a trial, but there will be a password sent prior to the next Senate meeting.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE [AGENDA – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MONA HYMEL](#) [00:01:17]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025/26-33**] to approve the agenda of the April 6, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting with the friendly amendment to remove items 6B: Q&A with President Garimella and Old Business Item C: Information Technology Update which will be moved to the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated the goal for using TopHat is to save time as hands won’t have to be manually counted. Today is a test run.
- Senator Downing asked if anyone reviewed the integrity of this voting software.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated yes, for this particular purpose.
- Alex Ward, UCATT stated he is the lead TopHat support specialist for campus and is here to assist anyone with their needs. Regarding anonymity, individuals must choose a display name, but they don’t necessarily need to use their own name, this is why individuals aren’t required to use their own TopHat account. The display name will be viewable by staff.
- Alex Ward, UCATT stated in the next meeting, where there is a password sent, there will also be a document circulated to Senators with instructions. Today is a trial run and an introduction to the system. He will respond to questions from the Zoom Chat during the meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2, 2026 FACULTY SENATE MEETING](#) [00:10:40]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025/25-34**] to approve the March 2, 2026, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

4. OPEN SESSION [00:12:42]

Clarissa Siebern, Former University of Arizona Employee [00:13:25]

Thank you for inviting me to speak today. My career and education began at U of A in 1997 as a non-traditional first

generation Hispanic indigenous student. I earned degrees in ethics and global media built on a career, as a business manager in the College of Ed, a graduate student with a 4.0 average, and a proud parent of a U of A student with cerebral palsy.

Integrating what my degrees taught me, I began whistleblowing in 2022 about financial mismanagement involving Federal funding, continual labor law violations related to hiring a 9s and staff and faculty not being paid for additional work imposed on them. Prior to the impending pay freeze in December of 2023, multiple administrative units gave themselves substantial raises, while departmental staff raises were delayed or denied.

After returning from vacation in October of 2023, I was fired over Zoom. The reason given was tied to a payment issue initiated by a tenured faculty who violated a labor law, a violation I was reporting. I wasn't given the opportunity to provide facts. I lost my career. QTR for me and my son, my life insurance. my family's health insurance. all on the heels of being diagnosed with Stage 3 Metastatic Breast cancer. jeopardizing full retirement in June of 2026.

The College of Ed lost my decades of institutional knowledge. and skills in academic finance. growing enrollments in sustainable revenue. A skill useful, following the \$5 million deficit, created by the previous Dean. While the compliance failures that I reported have been seen. I've seen institutional change. My State and Federal lawsuits continue. I've spent nearly \$100,000 in legal fees, an amount expected to double by the trial dates. ABOR has endless publicly funded resources. At-will employment should never mean at-when terminations. Crowdfunding for justice should never be anyone's reality. The PowerPoint provided are policy recommendations to prevent unjust dismissals from happening to staff or faculty. Thank you.

Dr. Russel Witte, Professor and Member of the Committee of Eleven [00:16:56]

Hello, everyone. My comment is on behalf of the Committee of Eleven More than half of the members are here. We've established a new series. They're public forums. The Committee of Eleven is going to serve as a catalyst for these. The first one will be May 2nd. That's a Saturday from 4 to 6 p.m. The point of this is to bring the local community back into the conversation with the vision for the university. In fact, that's one of the themes for the inaugural public forum on May 2nd.

We're going to have a panel of speakers. Some of the names you may recognize, some of them you won't, but they're going to all have deep roots in the local community. All faculty, staff, and students are invited. In fact, they've helped frame and create these forms already. We want to have 100 to 200 participants at this event, which will be at the HSIB Health Sciences Innovation Building. I'm pretty confident that if we can get people on Saturday from 4 to 6 p.m. to talk about the university, they're going to actually care about the university and want to not just have a voice, but play a direct role in the decision-making process.

It's actually the people of Arizona and the county that have the most power, and they've been severed from a lot of the conversations the last several years, and our goal is to bring that back. So, I want everyone here to participate, make every attempt to. We will have a flyer that goes out and a place to register, although that will not be required. This will be the first of a series of plan on future topics looking at science, technology, health, social responsibility, and we will have a diverse range of voices. I promise you that, all coming together to have. healthy discourse. Thank you.

Jeremy Vetter, Associate Professor, College of Social & Behavioral Sciences [00:19:13]

I'm speaking as an individual faculty member. My name is Jeremy Vetter. I'm an Associate Professor in the history department, and I'm a historian of science and technology. What I'd like to ask for is more critical faculty and community input into shaping the new directions and initiatives of the university. We are currently being positioned at the forefront of promoting both generative AI and what is called national security. Technologies often associated by the public, rightly so, with the projection of US military power around the world.

While there have been helpful caveats, especially in the case of generative AI, about responsible use and of environmental impacts and social inequities. it seems to me there's been insufficient space for stronger criticisms of how generative AI is threatening higher education and human thought, and for faculty and others on campus who favor a more deeply critical approach.

While many colleagues across campus are using generative AI creatively in research and teaching, we need to resist technological inevitability in campus-wide messaging and recognize the profound threat to human cognition, learning and thinking emerging in the early studies of generative AI. For example, we know that desirable difficulties are important for learning, but generative AI too often serves as a shortcut to hard thinking and developing the capacities needed to critically scrutinize the outputs of generative AI.

The National Security Initiatives also need critical faculty input before we reorient the university's brand as the materials for the Kyl Institute proclaim around national security projects and weapons programs linked implicitly or explicitly to U.S. military intervention oversea or to a new era of nuclear proliferation. Will there be sufficient space for open and robust debate to bring in dissenting and critical voices? to help safeguard against harming innocent civilians in the technologies would develop to safeguard against redirection of our world-class research programs for decades.

Even in the present, a deepening global economic crisis is unfolding, from destabilizing military intervention and the

impending deflation of a massive AI stock bubble. we need to demonstrate we're open to more critical and dissenting voices around high-profile concerns like these. Thank you.

Senator Cindy Rankin [00:21:37]

Hi, everybody. Basically, I'm here to give you some updated report out on the University of Arizona Global Campus Faculty Title Alignment Project, which I'm sure many of you are familiar with. So, Andrea Romero asked us to report out. Our work has been done, so I'm just going to read you what we did.

In January 2026, Vice Provost Romero reached out to numerous University of Arizona faculty to form three teams that would be asked to complete the UAGC faculty title alignment project. The expectation that was presented to us was to review portfolios for 91 UAGC faculty and affirm their appointments and titles. Previously established faculty titles were provided to each of the teams for consideration. Those included Global Campus Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Global Campus Professor. Those were the titles that we were given to work with.

We had a total of 23 faculty who were recruited, and 3 team leads agreed to participate, myself, I'm from the College of Nursing, Dr. Jeff Schatzberg from Eller, who I think is online, and Dr. Leslie Gonzalez from the College of Education. We were asked to lead and facilitate the work of each of these teams. Each team also included, I think, at least 2 representatives from UAGC, which was extremely helpful for us, because their structure and how they offer their curricula is very different than what we're used to here at our university. Each of the teams reviewed approximately 30 dossiers.

On January 27th, Dr. Prelock met with us and provided the charge, gave us our assignment for this project. And basically, this is what we did. Each evaluation team was charged to review the assigned dossiers relative to already established criteria. Rank criteria that were agreed upon and provided by UAGC. So, we did not create the criteria that was given to us, and we were asked to vote to affirm or deny each candidate's professorial title request.

They submitted a dossier very similar to what we do, not exactly the same, but somewhat similar. The chairs of each evaluating team met and checked in throughout this process to ensure that our evaluative processes followed a similar approach, which was as follows. We met weekly, each team led by one of us met. We reviewed between 6 and 10 cases every time we met. We met for five weeks to review, discuss, and vote on the dossiers that were assigned to us. Each dossier had a primary reviewer and a secondary reviewer who was the team lead. The primary reviewers were responsible for presenting the case, making sure that the candidates met the baseline criteria that were given to us, and describing the evidence in the portfolio that the faculty submitted.

Following the presentation of a dossier team co-wrote an evaluation letter and offered an initial recommendation based on the evidence that was presented. Each team then had the opportunity in the evaluation letter to also present various procedural issues that we encountered with the respective dossiers for future consideration. We did have two large review meetings. We all voted on those. I just want to say that we were very impressed with the quality of the faculty submissions and the dossiers and the amount of experience that these faculty had. and the teaching that they're bringing to the global campus.

5. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE 2026-2027 FACULTY SENATE SCHEDULE [00:25:40]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025-26-35**] to approve the 2026-2027 Faculty Senate Schedule. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

6. Q&A WITH UNIVERSITY FACULTY LEADERSHIP [00:28:23]

A. CHAIR HUDSON – CONVOCATION 2026

I want to start out by simply acknowledging our open session speakers. What you saw in our open session is the interface between our community and governance. The community discussion sessions that Russ Witte is undertaking the political commentary that is our right and duty as academics that Jeremy Vetter enunciated. Cindy Rishel's diligence and that of her colleagues in lending academic credibility to the processes around UAGC, and particularly, Clarissa Siebern call about what is most necessary. We need a committee, we need a movement to prevent the at-will violence that is being done to our staff members, and I will work with staff council over the summer and in the coming year to put forward some proposals, to put an end to this practice that hurts our individuals like Clarissa, and hurts all of us because of the precarity and violence that it does to our staff members. So, consider this the start of an attack on at-will staff employment. Let's fix this for the benefit of the institution.

So, to my prepared remarks, I want to say that symbolism is important. At the bottom of today's agenda, which we approved. We see the last item, the disestablishment of the degree program that I have built and taught in and worked at since the beginning of my long career at the University of Arizona. The Bachelor of Arts degree in Middle East and North African Studies. It's bittersweet. It's deeply personal to me. Along with the other disestablished degrees that reflect the beautiful, fragile scope. of our critical pedagogy, our innovative teaching, and the foundational recombination of knowledge that has made U.S. education the dynamic envy of the world up until now. We also see Latin American studies, gender and women's studies, Judaic studies, and human rights practice degrees. disestablished. They

represent the constructive and collaborative work of hundreds of members of our community over the decades.

In addition to training poets, scholars, activists, our graduates from the Middle East and North African Studies programs. formed the largest single contingent of diplomats, policy and security professionals from any single American university in the U.S. government, across the departments of state, defense, the military, and intelligence services now decimated by the excesses of partisan grift, greed, ignorance, cultivated by the Epstein class. How ironic, how tragic, that at the moment where we find ourselves a month into, as a nation engaged in an ignorance based and cruel war of choice. A war of aggression, that our degree in Middle Eastern studies is being disestablished.

We got here through decades of organizational mismanagement and destruction, blithely overseen by the Arizona Board of Regents, a body, in my opinion, so structurally flawed and politically compromised, that it itself, requires serious reforms, aside from those required within our academic programs proper.

The former president of a once great university, Lee Bollinger, argued recently that universities can be thought of as the fifth branch of government. With the courts and Congress co-opted by the same dynamics that have created our catastrophic unitary Epstein-class executive branch, the so-called fourth branch of government, the media also co-opted and degraded and silenced by unacknowledged censorship regimes. We, to whom the education of our people is entrusted are the fifth estate, the fifth branch of government, at least symbolically. We play the long game of education to prevent the very avoidable situations that are making your gasoline and your groceries unaffordable. For more and more of our community every day that are killing civilians on mass and service members of our military for the most senseless of reasons.

In spite of the willful maladministration of the University of Arizona and the elevation of the self-serving over the producers of knowledge, we are still standing. We are still working. We are still fighting the darkest moments for our governance community of 2025, when the Department of Education singled us out to test with the so-called compact produced a spark of light. When our President sought our counsel and genuinely reached out to us for help, we produced a resounding national victory late in the game. We'll take that win as we will take all the wins and all the losses on the basketball court and off. The work continues. The students of today are second to none, and in spite of the chaos that most of our current students grew up through in COVID and the defunding of education, they know that they will need the critical thinking skills and compassion that we can offer them to sort out the mess that they inherited.

As I work in this elected statutory position, in addition to teaching about global supply chains and the Strait of Hormuz for 30 years, the evolution of modern warfare and the effects on ordinary people, the adaptation of cultural models of reciprocity, sustainability and innovation. in the Middle East. I also have learned from my colleagues about the fields that our colleagues, mostly international and from marginalized communities are being who are being bullied and hounded by the culture of maladministration at this institution that extends down from ABOR and the President through the Provost's office, the Dean's office, the Chief officers of this and that, and even to the department heads, most of whom are our dear colleagues, but which includes some real outliers. I have learned about forestry and fermentation, arthritis and midwifery, law, advocacy, theoretical physics. Transportation optimization and patents on inventions. An entire degree worth of emerging knowledge just from the people who have fallen afoul of the cruel austerity and exclusion measures that we suffer. What a privilege for me. But we must retake our institution from those who hoard the scarce resources and impose bureaucratic control for their own purposes. That's my cry from the heart today. We have much to talk about.

I have let President Garimella know that I will not be participating in commencement and convocation this year, and I've suggested that I will discourage any faculty members from carrying the symbolic mace, symbolism is important. I've suggested that he carry the mace himself or have one of his appointed colleagues from one of his previous institutions, or perhaps his financial or political advisors carry the mace in our stead.

I am reassured by Cindy Rishel's comments that the UAGC outcomes that we have sought for 6 years are beginning to materialize in spite of deficient processes that have selected our wonderful colleagues like Cindy, rather than coming to us, the elected representatives of the faculty. But again, we will continue, we will persist. We have questions today about information security, about admissions, about all kinds of things. But we will keep working, we will keep fighting long after some of us have moved on to other gigs. Thank you.

Questions and Comments [00:38:15]

- Senator Downing asked if Chair Hudson can provide further understanding on the establishment of a program and asked whether that requires action on behalf of the Senate. These are longstanding programs that with many students, can have a huge impact. He asked if this can be done in the fiat of the President.
- Chair Hudson stated this issue was first encountered during her tenure a couple of years ago when there was a disestablished musical theatre program, it was premier in the country and premier in the state. There were protests in the Senate that this was a short-sighted discussion and that benefited colleagues at Northern Arizona University who have received the students who wanted to attend the UA to study musical theatre.
- Chair Hudson stated at the time, the explanation was that if the program leads, department chairs, and college deans make the decision at the college, program and department level to disestablish a program, there is nothing that the Faculty Senate can do that can induce them to invest in a program that they don't want to invest in. For that reason, there was not time or resources invested in trying to revive programs that had been abandoned by

deans for financial reasons.

- Chair Hudson stated this goes to the larger issue of deans still not having enough oversight. Deans are making decisions based on financial rewards for cutting costs with no transparency and very little purview for the faculty to protest. Now, all the degrees that were disestablished again without input from the elected representatives of the faculty. In the case of SBS, which was rolled over into a degree in global studies, the work continues. The faculty keep going. The students are better than ever, but it's just a little bit harder to find those programs to justify those programs, and to legitimate those programs. Just at the time when one would think they are needed most.
- Chair Hudson stated she can't figure out how the undergraduate council, the graduate council, and the Senate can intervene in and revive a program that has been abandoned by its deans.

B. PROVOST PRELOCK [00:41:56]

As you know, Jason Kreag was announced as the new Dean of the College of Law. We're very happy that was announced to his college today. We met with the search committee. We met with the Supreme Court justices, the federal judges, the law board to really demonstrate what are the next steps and to keep that community engaged. We have three candidates who are participating currently in the Pharmacy search, and that is going well. April 20th through the 28th, we have three candidates coming for College of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences.

You'll hear from Kris Wong Davis later, but April 11th is our last of three admitted student visit days, and it looks like we've surpassed the number of registrations that we've had for any of the others, so it should be the largest student program in our cycle. Also, thank you to the committee that worked on the UAGC efforts. Cindy was a great leader on that team and really supported a lot of work in a short period of time. So, thank you very much.

There are several summits that are taking place, and some of those are the institutional data summit. That's on April 21st. A fun thing, commencement. We have a faculty reception from 6 to 9 in the Bear Down Kitchen before the actual ceremony on May 15th. There's a study abroad summit on April 9th which is this Thursday from 9:30 AM to 2 PM. Thank you to all the judges, coaches, students who participated in the Regents. I was able to go to the finals, and the storytellers and debaters were great, and our storyteller was awesome. So that's it for me. I think the only other thing I would say is, if you're interested in the AI, as I was listening to people, you might want to consider inviting David Ebert, our Chief AI to talk about the responsible use of AI.

Questions and Comments [00:44:28]

- Chair Hudson asked if any reassurance can be provided regarding the admissions numbers and the net tuition revenue projections. This is a source of anxiety, and the longer this uncertainty persists, the more anxious everyone is, including and especially the deans who are trying to plan for next year.
- Provost Prelock stated the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Dean of Admission, Kristina Wong Davis can provide more information but in the last 2 weeks there have been 60 to 70 applications a day that come in, which is exciting. The last group of admissions just went out, or they may have gone out in March. There will be a better sense of knowing by May 1st, and especially after the April 11th admitted student visit day.
- Provost Prelock stated they are learning that about 50% of the students who come to ASV days are coming to U of A. The other thing, it's a slow process where several thousand students who have completed their next steps have not paid their application fee. It is believed they are holding out until the very end. They don't have to until May 1st.
- Chair Hudson asked if there are any active measures to get those numbers up to a place where there is no longer this widespread anxiety about enrollments next year.
- Provost Prelock stated yes, she believes each college is working closely. One of the things that was learned from the students, is they appreciate short videos from student ambassadors which are 30 seconds to 60 seconds welcoming them. This week there was a special video done related to the experience of the Final Four and recognizing that many basketball players are scholars and do well in the classroom.
- Provost Prelock stated Nursing is knocking it out of the park in enrollment, bravo to them and their faculty. They will support them and the efforts that they're making. Honors College is also beyond what was expected. Others are moving up. They're inching up each day. She is feeling hopeful.
- Senator Ziurys asked what this means for the proposed budget cuts and asked whether there will be clarity about that since May is rapidly approaching. She asked if this means there will not be any budget cuts.
- Provost Prelock stated there will always be something, they have been meeting during the all funds process as she explained a month ago. The colleges have been well-prepared for those. There will be some programs that can handle a budget cut and others that will not be able to. There are some that are requiring investment, and some that have not asked for investment. Leadership will be very strategic, but those final decisions will not be made until after May 1st, when there is a better sense of the enrollment, and as Chair Hudson asked, the net tuition revenue. This regards the balance with residential and non-residential students, and the students who have not paid their fees are the non-residential students.
- Senator Ziurys asked if it seems there will be budget cuts.
- Provost Prelock stated as she has said, yes, the University is still not where it needs to be, but the cuts will be strategic and not across the board.
- Regarding Chair Hudson's report, Senator Ziurys stated Chair Hudson mentioned these programs are just kind of wiped out and it disturbs her because she sees similar cuts in certain departments in the College of Science. Suddenly,

certain classes that were always there, are being abandoned or merged. She does not know who's making these decisions, but this is very alarming. She asked if Chair Hudson knows who makes these decisions.

- Chair Hudson stated these decisions are the natural outgrowth of a decade of financial and organizational maladministration that has put the University in a state of permanent, something like debt, because there is the Damocles sword of a certain number of days of cash on hand hanging over everyone's head. It becomes very difficult to reinvest in academic operations. The decisions are made by and large, the deans at the college level with the manufactured consent, in many cases, of the program directors and participants themselves.
- Chair Hudson stated, her, like in this situation to one of biodiversity, came into this job thinking that there was a beautiful garden of academic programs, the smallest of which, the most diverse of which are the ones that need the protection the most. Nothing would have survived up to this point if it wasn't fulfilling a deep social need. The fact that there is an easier time manufacturing consent for one's own disestablishment and kicking faculty and staff out.
- Chair Hudson stated in these cases, she doesn't think that the existing faculty are being affected. It's mostly about student opportunity and student success. What happens is these are all rolled into single umbrella programs to increase the size to maintain the criteria to prevent faculty and staff loss. These programs need to be in their organic state with academic biodiversity. She hopes everyone can contribute to governance in a way to overcome these crushing, financial and political pressures.
- Provost Prelock stated she thinks it is important that for everyone to really understand how this comes through the process. She has asked Greg Heileman to explain the process. It's a nice budget.
- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Greg Heileman stated regarding affairs, there are 20 or so processes for approvals that are maintained. He will provide the flowchart for this one for disestablishments, but they do emanate from a department approved by the Dean, and they go through internal subcommittees, including the Undergraduate Council, which Joost Van Haren has been leading and as well as UCEC which is a subcommittee of this body. They all approved this.
- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Greg Heileman stated Chair Hudson is correct in stating that many of these degrees had low enrollment, a few students in some cases, so they were in danger. Many of them were below the ABOR specified minimum number of graduates over a 5-year period. They were rolled up in this manner described to create a degree that had enough students to meet those criteria. That's how the process works.
- Chair Hudson stated so many colleagues are involved in these difficult decisions. She is not saying there aren't difficult decisions to make in the financial straits that currently stand, but she hopes that governance can get to the point where there can be investment in necessary small programs rather than rolling them up to meet ABOR criteria based on manufactured financial austerity.
- Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Greg Heileman stated he is not an expert in this field, but to his understanding, all the courses are still here. These things are now concentration. All the faculty are still teaching the same courses they taught, it's just the degree that the student gets.
- Chair Hudson stated the students are excellent and thankfully, no faculty have been lost. It feels like three extra layers of bureaucracy, where there were formerly sovereign self-standing programs. In addition to losing the identity of those special, small degrees which date back in her case, to the 1960s in some form or another, and don't necessarily manifest their utility every day, thankfully, there isn't World War III every day. It feels like there is now a school director, a program director, DUSs and DGSs crossing from non-related fields. It produces more bureaucracy, and that's not good for the faculty. It's certainly not good for the students, and it's not good for the institution and the University's national reputation.
- Senator Russell asked how much of this is a function of the budget model which is a top-down. She understands that a lot of people didn't like RCM (Responsibility Center Management), but at a bare minimum, the University's vigor, excellence, and hustle would be rewarded by increased investment when it was showed that earnings are currently higher, whether it was through grants or new students or flowering of fantasticness. Currently, that now has to be relied upon from above, rather than initiative from below.
- Chair Hudson stated one of the good experiences she had this year was participating in the budget model and design led by Richard Cate. They tried to put guardrails on the inappropriate excesses of both RCM and the non-transparent catastrophe that was AIB, and to balance those out. The problem is, considering whether there will be enough money to put into the nicely designed model that has now been created. With the constant impetus for saving money for days of cash on hand, even when perverse incentives have been created. When there is money created, there is a hard time getting it out of the accounts. That it goes into the budget model she is optimistic about. It's the revenue that's the problem.
- Senator Cooper asked if Chair Hudson can lay out what is supposed to happen when a program is being disestablished according to university statutes including how and when is Senate and ABOR are supposed to be consulted.
- Chair Hudson stated she is unsure of whether she has all the facts, it does go from the colleges to the Undergraduate Council. From the Undergraduate Council, ably and wonderfully headed by Joost, it's not something that is voted on when it's a disestablishment. There is no vote that the Senate can make to get the Dean to reinvest under the current circumstances. That's how this has been explained to her but she can follow-up on this offline.

7. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – Chair of Undergraduate Council, Joost van Haren, and Chair of Graduate Council, Phillip Waddel – [Proposal Undergraduate Minor in Sustainable Business Consumption](#) [00:58:30]**

Chair of Undergraduate Council, Joost van Haren [00:58]

I want to just come back to the previous question, that is that in the subcommittee that deals with academic programs, they ask the people who disestablish the programs to come in and explain why. They at least they must justify to us that they do this disestablishment, and why. We of course, don't get to vote on them.

The program is a minor in sustainable business consumption, and it's coming out of CALES. Out of the Retailing and Consumer Science department. Most classes are already taught within department in the school. Right now they're combining it for students to get a minor. That gives them an emphasis within the work world. When you start up a business to give them the extra oomph so that they can sustainably develop their businesses, make them so that they have the tools to better understand how to sustainably run their businesses with the consumers and from a consumer perspective.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated the QR code will reappear on the screen for everyone to vote on the Consent Agenda.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran stated she wants to clarify questions on TopHat. Today is for testing it on items that typically pass by unanimous consent. She understands some individuals have had difficulty voting. This can be thought of as UX or usability testing. This is a trial to ensure everyone knows how to use it when the stakes are higher. In the future TopHat will only be used for items that are not secret ballot. I wanted to make sure that that's clear.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran stated regarding anonymity, this would only be used for motions where everyone raises their hands typically. OpaVote will continue to be used for secret ballots.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran stated on May 4th, a password will be sent to Senators prior to the meeting, and only those with this password will be able to vote. It is not a free-for-all where everybody who is watching the meeting can vote. the voting link is going to be the same. If individuals have this open now, they can bookmark it and use it in the future. The password will change for every meeting.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran stated a few individuals have noted there is a short timer, this will be extended in the future, so the vote does not time out. This is why the testing period is useful, prior to when the stakes are high. She thanked the UCATT team for their assistance. She believes this will add efficiency to voting in the future.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated TopHat will not be used on votes that are typically passed by unanimous consent, but this is helpful for the purpose of testing during this meeting.
- Seconded **[Motion 2025/26-36]** to approve the *Proposal Undergraduate Minor in Sustainable Business Consumption* passed by unanimous consent.

8. OLD BUSINESS [01:03:58]

A. Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices first reading – Senator Ted Downing [01:04:04]

Thank you very much. I apologize for the motion looking long, but you'll understand. It's quite simple. If you remember back, there was a discussion about the rapid appearance of internal searches without open competition and the lack of elected faculty involvement of those. It was over a particular selection, which happened before we even had the discussion. That has morphed into a larger discussion. which is, how do we recruit and hire?

To make things simple, this motion that I'm putting before you are an affirmation that we're continuing to do what we did in the past. That's all. This is my 10th President, by the way, shows you how long I've been here. We've had a system in the past that's developed. It was represented in the Memorandum of Understanding of May 13th, 2022. What I did to help the senators, I went through that Memorandum of Understanding, and then the annex of the amendment is the precise verbatim language of the Memorandum of Understanding.

This motion. does nothing more than repeat and affirm that Memorandum of Understanding with one addition. It adds the idea of compliance that there is a report. Other than that, you're voting on what has already been decided by previous presidents, including President Roberts, and we're affirming that and asking the President to affirm it. So that's as simple as the motion.

Senator Downing read the text of the Motion: <https://facultygovernance.arizona.edu/sites/default/files/2026-04/Hiring-motion-for-Senate-with-attachment.pdf>

Questions and Comments [01:08:]

- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-37]** to pass the Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices first reading. Motion was seconded.
- Senator Cooper stated from her understanding, the current MOU does not have an end date, she asked if this means it would still be in place.
- Senator Downing stated this is not a renewal of the MOU but a reaffirmation of the principles on hiring and recruitment that are inside that MOU. It makes no statement as to whether there is an MOU or one is being recreated, this is not the issue.
- Chair Hudson stated the question of the MOU is very interesting. The 2022 MOU was laboriously produced by Jessica Summers and Melanie Hingle, working with the Shared Governance Review Committee over the course of a year. It took a lot of work to produce that, and it was, in fact, signed in 2022, although Robert Robbins misdated it as 2020 for

some reason.

- Chair Hudson stated her and Vice Chair Hymel were on that committee and they oversaw its production and signing. The tradition around here, since the 1990s is that every new provost, every new President, and every new Chair of the Faculty triggers a re-signing of a Memorandum of Understanding, because how could Suresh Garimella be held responsible for something that Robert Robbins signed and misdated back in 2022? Ideally, this would be the occasion of a ceremonial signing, when Provost Prelock was hired, when she was elected, or when President Garimella was selected for this job.
- Chair Hudson stated because of the recalcitrance of President Garimella and this inclination to sign anything, or even participate actively in Shared Governance, there is no end date. The parameters of the previous, somewhat flawed MOU, is being used as simply the bare minimum. Chair Hudson and others would like him to uphold what his predecessor committed to a better MOU is crafted.
- Chair Hudson stated since there is no partner in this process, a resolution by the Senate, such as being brought by Senator Downing, might be a way of simply holding the administration accountable to something. If they don't want to put in the work to come up with a new and better MOU. For that reason, she supports Senator Downing's resolution.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated there is a motion on the floor with a second which means voting can now occur.
- Senator Kennedy stated she is not prepared to vote on this motion and moved **[Motion 2025/26-38]** to postpone the vote on Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices first reading until the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting. The language in the very last section seems to be non-specific and she would like to think more about it. Motion was seconded.
- Chair Hudson stated she would support the motion to postpone this motion to ensure every Senator can read the language.
- **[Motion 2025/26-38]** to postpone the vote on Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices first reading until the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with thirty-two in favor, four opposed, and one abstention.

B. Micro-campus *ad hoc* committee update – Senator Roy Spece [01:16:45]

I'm Roy Spece from the College of Law. I'm the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Review Committee regarding the termination of the College of Law's joint program with Ocean University in China. We have voted on our final report. The committee consists of 12 faculty, staff and students. The faculty members are from multiple colleges, including both tenure track and career track faculty with expertise in law, governance, leadership, dispute resolution and academic administration. They include 4 named professors from the College of Law, and another professor outside the College of Law who has a jurist doctorate degree.

The review committee conducted an online forum to gather input from the University of Arizona faculty, staff, and students as well as interested members of the public. We obtained input from the terminated professors in the program. We created a depository of documents and other evidence relevant to the terminations. We conducted multiple meetings to deliberate on these matters. We reached out to the university administration to meet and obtain its view and was told that a meeting was not necessary because ABOR Policy Manual 6-201, that we rely upon, does not apply.

We made factual findings, conclusions, including some conclusions of law and recommendations based on the documents, evidence a meeting. The report one hopes will be disseminated this week pending performance of housekeeping matters relating to formatting organizing appendices and the like. Faculty governance has virtually no clerical support. So, this is what's going to delay when we finally put it on your desk. We have made findings of fact, conclusions of law and recommendation.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations start with the University and its agents acted outrageously, and this foreseeably led to severe emotional distress. Monetary loss and other damages to faculty, staff, students, and others. These actions harm the universities and the College of Law's financial situations and seriously impaired their reputations. The findings, conclusions, and recommendations end with, "the University of Arizona faculty, staff, and students, and others harmed by the University of Arizona's behavior should be amply compensated and the dismissed professor should additionally be afforded all the relief. required by Arizona Board of Regents Policy Manual 6-201." This could have extension to other situations.

Questions and Comments [01:17:51]

- Senator Rafalski stated he has been thinking about a compromise and wonders if Chair Hudson can suggest that there would be an Honorary Degree committee of the Senate, which would be a smaller group of people. The President and Dean may feel more comfortable about discussing awards.
- Chair Hudson stated her thanks for the suggestion and said she would think about it. There is already a committee convened by the President and the Chief of Staff of the President, but it doesn't include, except for the Secretary of the Faculty, elected representatives of the Faculty.
- Chair Hudson stated Stacey Cochran will point out, as currently configured, that committee exclusive to regents and distinguished professors who have been hand selected.
- Senator Cochran stated regarding the President's behavior, he was taking notes as the President spoke with the Senate and there were concerns raised as it seems there is a lack of emotional attunement between the President

and the body of the faculty. It seems the President is dismissive of the Faculty's concerns, and this pattern seems to

C. Information Technology Update – CIO Elliot Cheut [01:25:37]

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

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

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

9. NEW BUSINESS [01:20:42]

A. Kyl Institute for National Security and various projects – Senior Vice President for Research and Partnerships, Tomás Díaz de la Rubia

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

B. Guidance for law enforcement on campus – Deputy Chief and Safety Officer, Eric Kazmerczak and Chief International Affairs Office, Jenny Lee [01:21:09]

I appreciate the opportunity to come and speak to the to the Senate. First, I want to take just a quick second while I have the microphone. There is a university safety survey. It's live right now on our website, safety.arizona.edu. We extended the deadline until Wednesday at 5 o'clock, because I was going to be here today. I wanted to afford the opportunity for a couple of extra days for faculty members to take that survey. We would greatly appreciate your feedback, that truly does help us shape safety initiatives on campus. We're at about 4,000 responses right now, so hopefully we get a few more from today and through Wednesday.

On to the topic at hand, responding to non-university law enforcement on campus. I want to start by saying and acknowledging that this is a sensitive and complex issue. I appreciate that and I recognize that this is something that potentially folks in this room have been impacted by either professionally or personally. I want you to know on behalf of the Office of Public Safety and myself, who's been in this community, a staff member now, and back as a student, and have worked in this community for nearly 30 years, the safety and security of this campus and the people that come here are of my highest priority. It is my North Star, and I do want you to know that I understand the complexities of this particular topic, and how emotional this may be.

What we know is we are a public land grant institution. In terms of access, the University of Arizona operates in a mixed-use environment where parts of our campus are open to the public, while other spaces are limited to specific university functions. In some cases, even like this room, for example, the same space could be both public and private, depending on its use. What I'd like to communicate today is how to respond if there's non-university law enforcement on campus.

That QR code provided on the screen will take you to the reference material for my comments today. I wanted to provide it at the front of this conversation, so you had it in case you wanted to read along, although I'm not going to read the website verbatim. I wanted to give you the source of my comments. But first, as I mentioned, not all campus spaces are the same. Outdoor areas, for instance, the mall and many common spaces like the dining areas in the union are generally open to the public. At the same time, the university identifies, as you know, classrooms, labs, offices, and residence halls as spaces that are limited access. In fact, classrooms are considered non-public spaces during scheduled instruction and are intended only for those who are there for an academic purpose.

The University does not expect faculty or staff to assess warrants to determine the legality of a law enforcement officer's presence, or to physically prevent entry in those restricted spaces. This is where institutional coordination with offices like the Office of Public Safety or the Office of General Counsel becomes so important. The university's guidance is clear and consistent. If a non-university law enforcement officer arrives, employees should not interfere or obstruct. Instead, employees should inform the officer that you are contacting UAPD. They will be the focal point or the primary access point for that and immediately do so. You can do that either by calling 911 from either a phone in the classroom or your cell phone. You can call the non-emergency line, which is 520-621-UAPD, or if you're in a centrally

scheduled classroom, a plug for my centrally scheduled classroom folks, all the technology in those classrooms is the same, and you will have a blue call box. It's the same as the blue light phones on campus. If you hit that button, you will be connected directly with UAPD. Those officers who respond to that call and the Office of General Counsel, collaboratively, will assess the situation and manage the response.

The key takeaway is this -- classrooms are limited access spaces intended for academic purposes, and faculty can manage that classroom environment. But when legal questions arise, particularly involving law enforcement, the presence of a warrant, etc. The responsibility shifts from the individual. You all to the institution to ensure consistent and legally sound responses. I came up with a little catchphrase to help everybody remember this. So, if nothing else, remember this. Pause, pause, call and refer. Pause to ensure that we do not engage or escalate the situation. Call UAPD immediately and refer handling of that situation to the institution for clarity.

Questions and Comments [01:26:47]

- Chair Hudson stated one of the things on people's minds is whether knowledge ahead of time can be counted on including whether ICE or any other federal law enforcement agency is present on campus. There have been a lot of conversations about this, but she'd like this to be said on the record, regarding whether information can be provided regarding coordination between UAPD or the institution and the feds or not.
- Deputy Chief and Safety Officer, Eric Kazmerczak stated two things can be counted on including the fact that they are in contact with local state and federal partners. If his office is called regarding a situation at hand, they will be there immediately. Regarding response to situations like that on campus, the UA is blessed to be a very resource-rich environment here, from mental health to safety and security resources, from classroom spaces, etc. They will be there quickly, and they will ensure that that is handled appropriately.
- Senator Ziurys asked what if the federal agent who enters the classroom tries to prevent a Faculty member from calling or threatens arrest for calling.
- Deputy Chief and Safety Officer, Eric Kazmerczak stated he is unsure of whether he's in the position to give legal advice on that matter. Based on his own experience, they likely won't do so but he is not providing legal advice.
- Senator Ziurys asked what should be done in the case where a phone is being seized or something similar.
- Deputy Chief and Safety Officer, Eric Kazmerczak stated if one gets 911 and hits send on their phone, it will go to his dispatch center, the individual's location will be received, and that will immediately generate a response.

C. Admissions/Enrollment Update – Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis [01:29:44]

Good to see you all. I am heartened to hear about the enthusiasm around enrollment. It means it's because people care. You are here for the students. That is a very important thing, and it's part of what makes the U of A important to me is that it is a campus that is committed to its students which is why we're doing what we're doing. All of this is framed around doing what we can to ensure students are successful.

So, a couple of items, because I think there are a little a few items of confusion. This year we did not change admission criteria. The only change was around process. The process moved to a deadline driven process, but it does not mean that we are not trying to serve the students. Early action was a November 1 deadline. It is not a hard deadline. The application is still open, as Patty said, we continue to get applications every day. We will continue to take applications as long as we need to. Also, we continue to issue admission decisions every week so that we continue to get decisions out in front of students throughout the Spring as they're having decisions come in from other institutions, so they can hear from us and know what is happening. We have offered every student who met ABOR admission criteria, an offer of admission to the institution. So, all students who have met the ABOR criteria have been admitted to the institution.

As of today, I'm really excited to report that we are 12% ahead of enrollment fee paid deposits as we were point in time last year. We are just behind Fall of 2024 point in time deposits. So, the fact that we are 12% ahead of last year, and last year was a slightly smaller class, I'm feeling very heartened by the amount of traffic and enthusiasm we're seeing from students. As Patty mentioned, we split admitted student day into 3 events this year. Families had more opportunities to get to campus. We have now seen more students over those three events than we saw on our one event last year. We saw 1,066 students, over our first two in February and March, and we have 806 registered for this Saturday. That registration is still open. We may still have students show up. We take walk-ins at those events as well. I have no doubt. that it will be a very large event with a lot of enthusiasm. We've seen very, very engaged students on campus for those events the last two times.

We've also pivoted this year. We've always sort of had the same campus tour all year long. We instituted not just our regular campus tour, but we've been hosting admitted student tour events specifically in spring that are really guaranteed to focus on all the things that students need to know to decide about coming to campus. Alongside that, we've offered colleges the opportunity to. kind of back those up with a college-specific event after or before the admitted student tour. So really trying to augment every opportunity for students to engage with campus.

In terms of Arizona, we hosted a Northern Arizona tour at the beginning of March to cover a lot of our more rural territory up in northern Arizona. We had a Phoenix High School Counselor Summit last week, March 25th. We brought 75 high school counselors for Maricopa County down to see campus. Some of them have never been here. Some of them hadn't been here in almost 20 years. It was really a chance to reconvene with the market that really influences

students' decisions, second only to families, students report high school counselors as being the most influential in their decision on where to go to college.

All of this month and some of the end of last month, we are hosting Arizona Family Nights in Southern Arizona. These are focused on walking through financial aid packages with our students in Southern Arizona. It's about 75 to 100 families each night who are coming together with us in various areas of Tucson to really walk through their financial aid packages and understand what it means to afford coming to campus.

Some questions I know that have come up that I know keep resonating. We are really committed to serving the students of Arizona. We are way ahead of our Arizona residents point in time also. We have about 31.3% of our Arizona residents who are Pell eligible at this point, that is almost in line with our enrolled Pell eligibility for Arizona residents last year, and we still have time to go. I'm really heartened by this, keeping in mind that FAFSA submission in the state, not just for us, but for ASU and NAU, is down on the whole. It is something that is a statewide conversation, that there are fewer FAFSAs being submitted this year than in past years. So that population is either not submitting FAFSAs or not considering higher education, post-secondary education, which is another concerning conversation. 31.7% of our Arizona residents are first generation. That is, again, on par with where we ended up for our enrolled student population last year, incoming student population. All the metrics that we use as indicators of who we're surveying in the area are all part of those numbers. We are continuing to work.

I know there's been some conversation around New Start. We are working with a lot of our counterparts on campus to think about how do we take the best of New Start and make sure that we're doing our best by bringing students in with the right place to start and the right foot to start off on? We are condensing it down to a four-week program from a six-week program, with the idea that we're not trying to overwhelm students. In talking with some past New Start students, they feel like six weeks can feel a little overwhelming, especially when they have to make a grade in a class. We're really thinking about how we bring them here in maybe a lower stakes environment, but give them every opportunity to get skills, get ready, prepare, learn how to navigate campus. It will be the 4 weeks leading right up to Destination Arizona, so they move straight into destination, and the high schools that we are focusing on for the New Start population this year are Sunnyside, Desert View, Cholla, and Pueblo, because we want to start in our own backyard with this New Start model. To say we are committed to ensuring that the students in our own backyard have every opportunity to start off on the right foot. With that, I know I didn't have much time to present, so I do want to take questions. Thank you very much.

Questions and Comments [01:36:51]

- Senator Russell stated this may sound anecdotal and she apologizes, but she has to speak at a couple of rotary clubs in the area recently, and a bunch of funerals, and she has been asked by parents, grandparents, etc. if something has changed at the university and why their kid didn't get in. She was shocked by this as the University of Arizona generally welcomes most. She has received generally uniform feedback across all these events that to get better students, access is being cut for others. She has never heard this type of feedback in her 20 years of working at the UA. The community is worried and so is she.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated this is an unfortunate narrative because access has not been cut. She believes when there is a change in process it causes a lot of uncertainty. It makes everything feel very uncomfortable, because it is a new process. It's a new environment. It is not cutting access. Her office did look at students very closely to ensure they had the academic preparation necessary, which is the ABOR eligibility criteria.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated there are lots of nuances in that ABOR eligibility criteria. Her team looked diligently at students on that border to ensure that they were capitalizing on looking at the criteria, looking at the students and what the high school was offering to meet these criteria.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated some students didn't get into their initial major of choice perhaps because of not meeting all of the criteria but they got their second major of choice. If the student was admissible, they were given admission.
- Senator Rocha asked how the construction is going on the new dorm and what is the feedback from parents and students that are coming, regarding the new policy of freshmen incoming to live on campus.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated she can't to the construction and will refer that to Provost Prelock.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated regarding the new housing policy, students and families are largely very excited about it, because living on campus ensures safety of their students far more than having to find their own living arrangements in a community, especially those outside of Tombstone, who may not be as familiar with the community. Exceptions are being given to students of the Tucson area, so they are not required to live on campus. They have the option, they can choose to live on campus, but they're not required to or expected to.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated for other families, it ensures her office is committed to taking care of these students. They have safety and security, and they have the support network provided in the residence halls that they might not get in an apartment or another residential environment off campus.
- Secretary Zeiders asked for clarification on whether the UA is 12% up or 12% down compared to last year this time, and whether UA has been trending down and is now suddenly up.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated the University is up. The shift in the trend is

typically how this cycle works. It is very common that students wait for all of their admission decisions to come out. They get their Net ID, they poke around, they look at things, but they don't submit their final commitment. It really starts to pick up in April and gets even more fast paced at the end of April. This trend is a very common pipeline of increased activity through the month of April. She is not surprised by the trend.

- Secretary Zeiders said regarding what Senator Russell mentioned, concerning anecdotal stories, where a student got into the other Arizona universities, but not UA, would this mean that UA has different ABOR requirements.
- Secretary Zeiders stated there is research to support that the early decision does not benefit students of color, low SES, and kids from rural background. She doesn't believe demographics have been assessed, in terms of the current data, but she asked if there will be a comprehensive review of that to truly understand how early admissions affect these students. This can allow for improvements to rectify issues that disadvantaged students may face.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated for everyone hearing this unfortunate narrative, she invites them to be the University's partners in helping to correct that in the community. The more this can be corrected, the more there can be a positive relationship with them as they may be concerned.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated the University of Arizona is not early that is a very different model, they are early action. This has not been unpacked because demographic indicators can't be assessed until admission is complete. There will be a retroactive analysis on who's in the pipeline, who applied, who didn't get in, who did get in. Very few students at this point of time have been denied.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated regarding the metrics concerning Pell eligibility and first gen status, 84% of current students who have deposited, are from the early action round. That represents a lot of Pell eligible and first gen students. She is not completely sold, and having worked in this field for a long time in this model, at a lot of large flagships, she saw in a lot of cases that if the bar is set, students will meet it. She doesn't want to assume that students can't meet this. They do know if students are supported, they can submit their applications in time and they are still open even if they didn't get early action. These students are not being disadvantaged in any way because her team wants to ensure they are provided with access.
- Senator Downing stated there are a lot of statistics in enrollment management, and he appreciates her for going through and giving some of those. The most important one, from his understanding in the legislature, is yield rate. He asked if she has an estimate on the current yield rate. It was previously 18%, there was a big fall, and in compared to ASU, they are at about 22%, then it took a dive.
- Senator Downing stated there was a change in strategy with Dr. Prelock and President Garimella to go after in-state students which means there is competition in the same pond, against ASU and NAU. Because those institutions consistently outdo the University of Arizona, will there be a correction for this.
- Senator Downing stated there is a new dimension added where students who live farther than 50 miles must live on campus. This changes the economics of enrollment. He asked if Wong Davis was a part of a study to understand the decision by ABOR which can negatively impact enrollment.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated the UA is not only fishing for Arizona residents, but they would love to bring in non-residents as well, including international students. The environment of obtaining a visa is different but this hasn't deterred the admission of international students. Non-residents typically wait until April 30th at 11:59 PM to pay their enrollment fee which is typical when a deadline is hanging over one's head. Non-resident movement happens late in the game as compared to resident students. She doesn't use the other institutions as a comparison because UA is the flagship. She believes UA is doing well.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated she can't speak to the final yield rate as it changes by the minute. The yield rate constantly changes, residents typically have a higher yield rate than non-residents. There is still a lot of time left.
- Vice President for Enrollment Management, Kristina Wong Davis stated non-resident high school counselors are being brought in this week as they will influence decisions of their students, as long as all the admitted students being brought in on Saturday for the admitted student event.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated regarding the cost of attendance and the impact of living on campus, on-campus housing is benchmarked against the average cost of living in the community is. The UA is not any different in that cost. A student coming here and living off campus is going to pay roughly the same cost as they will pay living in a residence hall. The residence hall is an academic-year contract. That apartment or house off campus is a 12-month contract, so it's more expensive because they have to sign for the months they're not here. It benchmarks out as slightly less expensive for students because they're not committed to a full year contract, only to an academic year contract.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated her team has what the unmet need gap is for Pell students, they're working on meeting more of the unmet need for Pell students. Students in the past have been left with huge unmet need who have high need. Her team is aiming to not do that anymore as this puts those students at a disadvantage.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated on May 5th she can provide the yield rate when all the deposits clear.
- Senator Kennedy stated her thanks for the presentation. She said everyone is living in an unusual economic time which is showing in enrollment decisions that students are making in terms of their choice of majors. Students are gravitating towards health sciences, away from things like computer science and engineering. All evidence is this is a temporary shift caused by a variety of external factors. She asked if this is being reflected to the University of Arizona, where there are major colleges light on enrollment and students applying. If so, she asked what is being done to recruit

students to balance out where students are on our campus.

- Senator Kennedy stated everyone lived through COVID where some programs were avoided because of the nature of the work involved being in dangerous situations. Students shifted to some fields that did not involve human-to-human contact. Now the reverse of that is being seen. This seems like a much larger version, the numbers out of California are stunning on the shift.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated this is not unusual. Student demand for academic programs is always changing based on job markets, the economy, what they're hearing from colleagues, teachers, and their families. That constantly shapes how students matriculate between majors, colleges, career interests. This change is being seen and because of some of the cutbacks the tech industry, softening has been seen. This softening has been seen for CS over a five-year period. It's impacting computer engineering a little bit, too.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated In the current application pool, there is of a shift towards the health sciences. This is indicative of some of the movement being heard from students, and families and what is being seen in the market. Recruitment for all majors occurs equally, but it's up to the students where they choose to want to put their time and effort and energy.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated the biggest detriments in enrollment, and one the University's challenges, is there are over 200 majors on campus. Students are not exposed to this much academic land K-12, so they really have a very narrow lens of what is out there for them and what those opportunities are. It's hard for them to choose when they look at a list of 200 and don't have as much of a compass to understand what all those opportunities might mean as they will after they've been exposed to more. This is typically when students blossom and start to understand what they would like to pursue.
- Senator Kennedy asked if there is enrollment management based on student major to provide balance to the population.
- Vice President for Enrollment, Kristina Wong Davis stated they can encourage students and look for prospects in all majors, but students choose where they want to apply.
- Senator Kennedy stated it used to be a common enrollment practice to balance students based on their major.

D. Grievance Reform discussions, Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Roberto Guzman and Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:54:20]

Chair Hudson [01:52:30]

I just want to introduce our chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. The context for his brief remarks today is that we have an unprecedented number of grievances, the work conditions for faculty, the shenanigans of deans and a few department heads are creating an unprecedented level of trauma and. grievance among the faculty.

We, of course, are underfunded and there's a huge blockage. We are working with Richard Cate and Jenna Rickus to review, overall, the grievance process. But it's at unprecedented levels right now, so I would like to introduce Senator Guzman to talk a little bit about some ideas that we have for improving our students' learning conditions by improving our employees' working conditions. You will take your leader.

Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Roberto Guzman [01:55:30]

Well, good afternoon. As Leila mentioned, practically this year we have had more than ever in my 30 something years in CAFT, more grievances or events that conduct to grievances. So, to make brief what we have discussed with some of the CAFT members is to try to help some of the faculty members that really don't have the sources to defend themselves or try to do something before they are dismissed.

Again, I want to take a minute to mention what I would like to develop. So, I just want to take this very moment to acknowledge that sometimes we don't often say out loud when faculty members enter the grievance process. It can feel isolating, overwhelming, and at times unequal. Some have access to legal counsel. Others do not. That difference can shape not just the experience, but the outcome. Not only faculty now, it's also staff members. At the core, this is about fairness. Again, we are in the community at the university built on shared governance and mutual respect, and academic freedom. Those principles are tested most when a colleague is navigating a very difficult dispute without support, which is most of the cases.

For that reason, in CAFT, we have discussed, also with the faculty members to propose to create an ad hoc faculty advisory or advocacy committee that can help these faculty members. This committee might be a group of experimental faculties who can provide guidance, perspective, and collegial support. Those going to this given process, especially when the legal resources are out of reach. One letter to the to the Provost Office is \$5,000. Just the letter.

This is not about basing attorneys or formal procedures. It's about ensuring that no colleagues must navigate this process alone. So, if we believe in supporting one another, as scholars and educators, then we should also support one another in most challenging times. That's what I would like to invite you to think about, forming this committee will help. Most faculty members and staff members that are under critical situations, and they feel very vulnerable and alone.

A very busy proposal about the discussion is to propose establishment of a faculty advocacy committee to support faculty members engaged in the grievance process who may not have access to legal representation. What I want to emphasize is, we don't want grievances. We want to solve the problem before they become grievances. That is the main aspect of CAFT. We want to solve the problem before they become grievances.

The grievance process is an essential component of institutional governance and the protection of faculty rights. However, it can also be very complex and resource intensive. Faculty members without access to legal counsel may face challenges in navigating this process effectively, potentially creating disparities in access to guidance and support.

The proposed committee that I'm considering will serve as a peer support resource offering general procedural guidance, clarification of institutional policies and processes, collegial support during grievance proceedings. This committee would not replace legal counsel, nor alter existing formal procedures. Rather, it will function as a supplemental faculty driven resource consistent with the principles of shared governance and mutual support, and respect.

Establishing such a committee would reinforce the university's commitment to fair and equitable processes, transparency in governance, support for faculty navigating complex institutional procedures. We can complement that to include staff members who are, as we know, suffering very dramatic situations across the university.

10. Adjournment [02:00:28]

Chair Hymel adjourned the April 6, 2026, meeting at 5:00 PM.

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

Motions of April 6, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2025/26-33] to approve the agenda of the April 6, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting with the friendly amendment to remove Items 6B and 8C. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/25-34] to approve the March 2, 2026, minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-35] to approve the 2026-2027 Faculty Senate Schedule. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-36] to approve seconded motion from Undergraduate Council, the *Proposal Undergraduate Minor in Sustainable Business Consumption*. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-37] to pass the Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices first reading.

[Motion 2025/26-38] to postpone the vote on Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices first reading until the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting. Motion passed with thirty-two in favor, four opposed, and one abstention.

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 3: Approval of the [minutes of March 2, 2026](#)
3. Page 3, Action Item 5: Approval of the [2026-2027 Faculty Senate Schedule](#)
4. Page 3, Item 6A: Chair Hudson – [Convocation 2026](#)
5. Page 6, Action Item: Consent agenda – [Proposal Undergraduate Minor in Sustainable Business Consumption](#)
6. Page 7, Old Business Item 8A: [Draft Resolution on Hiring Practices](#)
7. Page 9, New Business Item 9B: [Guidance for law enforcement on campus](#)
8. Written reports
 - a. [UWGEC](#)
 - b. [President](#)
 - c. [Provost](#)

1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456