

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MAY 4, 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=a3262847-d6bf-4e82-af4c-b441000d8a83>

Present: Senators Abdennebi, Adler, Apanovich, Barefoot, Braitberg, Cerny, Cochran, Cornelison, Craig, Diaz, Downing, Eaton, Engineer, Figler, Friesen, Garcia, Giacobazzi, Gregory, Guzman, Hudson (Chair), Hymel (Vice Chair), Jens, Kennedy, Knox, Leafgren, Leite, Little, Lowell, Mars, Meyer, Miller-Cochran (Parliamentarian), Neumann, Nolan, O'Leary, Paschke-Wood, Pau, Pollard, Prelock (Provost), Rafelski, Rishel, Rocha, Russell, Slepian, J. Smith, M. Smith, Spece, Stegeman, Stephan, Su, Van Haren, Waddell, Witte, Zeiders (Secretary), Zhupanska, Ziurys

Absent: Senators Baker, Brochin, Buxner, Chandrasekar, Coletta, Cooper, Díaz de la Rubia, Eckert, Garimella (President), Goetz, Grijalva, S. Harris, Heileman, Hingle, Huffman, Levy, Lin, Lucas, Maggert, McCallum, Perez, Roman-Palacios, Wittman

1. CALL TO ORDER [00:00:09]

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Mona Hymel called the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 PM in Silver and Sage and via Zoom. Secretary Zeiders was also present.

Vice Chair Hymel stated that 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 [00:00:38]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025/26-40**] to approve the agenda of the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

- Vice Chair Hymel thanked all the officers and staff for their work this year.
- Vice Chair Hymel thanked the outgoing Senators for their service and shared her appreciation for their work.

3. ACTION ITEM: SENATE ELECTIONS: University Committee on Ethics and Commitment, Committee on Conciliation, University Hearing Board, Shared Governance Review Committee, Grievance Clearinghouse Committee, Senate Executive Committee [00:04:05]

Vice Chair Hymel stated the Elections will be done via OpaVote with paper ballots for those that need them. Senators should receive an email with a link to vote.

- Senator Witte asked if Senators who were newly voted in would be eligible as candidates.
- Chair Hudson stated she is unaware of incoming Senators who have nominated themselves as candidates to serve the committees being voted on today.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the results of the Elections will be announced as soon as voting closes, and Senators will have 10 minutes to cast their votes.
- Senator Eaton asked if there is a Box folder link to view candidate statements.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the Box folder link has been shared with everyone, and it will be reshared on the Senator listserv. Candidate statements were uploaded to the Box folder last week.
- Senator Rafelski stated he has not seen candidate statements; therefore, he is unable to vote.
- Senator Witte stated new senators were not invited to serve on these committees, and there was not enough time to read the candidate statements before today's vote.

4. APPROVAL OF THE [MINUTES OF THE APRIL 6, 2026 FACULTY SENATE MEETING](#) [00:06:09]

Chair Hudson moved [**Motion 2025/26-41**] to approve the April 6, 2026, minutes. Motion was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

5. OPEN SESSION [00:11:57]

Senator Lucy Ziurys [00:12:15]

The purpose of a university is to create new knowledge, educate students about it, and deliver that knowledge to the public for community benefit. Such work requires a lot of creativity and independent thinking. The faculty and their students carry out most of this work, which is the true mission of the University, and they should be in leadership and decision-making positions.

If the university is being run by a large group of administrators who appear to think that a good part of their mission is to control or even subvert the faculty. The current email plan proposed by our IT leadership is a clear sign of this. There really must be something wrong with the administration and with ABOR in wishing to turn the university into a police state through email monitoring.

I call on all faculty to vigorously resist this undermining and destruction of the University of Arizona, which has implications for the strength of the university system in the United States, the strength of our country, and of the free world. Thank you.

Senator Marily Witte [00:14:29]

Neal Barnett is submitting the flyer of the RII Undergraduate student research grants, which is a program funded with \$15,000 a year, to fund ten students to do original research. Historically, this program was funded in the mid 80s by a collaboration between the Faculty Research Committee on which I serve with Mike Kasanovich and JD Garcia, and the Office of Research headed by Laurel Wilkening. At that time, it was funded for \$35,000 a year, to fund 30 grants, across campus, across all colleges. There were 30 students to receive those grants competitively.

Over the next decade and a half, approximately 1,000 students were funded from Fine Arts to Molecular Medicine. One of the mural artists had an exhibit at the White House because of that program. Abruptly around the middle of the last decade, this program was terminated, as was the honors Dean Pat MacCorquodale, who had assisted us in facilitating the program. I brought this matter to the Faculty Senate on several occasions, but nothing was done until Senior Vice President Betsy Cantwell offered to fund the program for \$15,000 a year for 5 years and asked me and Ken McAllister, Associate Dean of Humanities, to run the program from our offices. We did so, and over the next four years, we were able to fund 40 students for original research that has their own ideas. They find their mentor, or a new line of research done by the mentor. These programs are described in the flyer you see, and they were truly remarkable.

This year, the top two grants of the nine went to the School of Music competitively with the School of Medicine, SBS, and Eller, and one went to the School of Architecture. You can see the projects that were done. One also went to a math student who was going to solve an unsolved math problem.

Finally, I want to ask the administration when they develop their budget plans for the coming year to hire one less superfluous senior administrator at \$400,000 to \$500,000 a year and instead fund several hundred undergraduate students to engage in these meaningful experiences. With the money left over from that one salary, to also consider something for the graduate students. Thank you

Senator Ted Downing [00:17:34]

Alright, it's the end of the year, so I wrote a ballad. It's the Ballad of the Garimella Gang. Now, pardon me, I'm speaking as a citizen now, on a matter of public interest. Now, I may slip into my native tongue. I still speak broken Okie. But I write it much better, so, I'm going to read it a little bit here. Let me tell you about the Garimella game.

The Regents were squinting out on the horizon, praying for President, turned out they hired a mirage. The closer you get, the less you see. The gang road into the old Pueblo, dust on their boots, raincoats on their saddlebacks. Not one of them could tell the difference between a horn toad and a Gila monster. Their boss, he's slick like a rhinestone cowboy. He hired a wagon load of high-paid whippersnappers over a hundred vice critters. That's six times more than ASU. Their past Lord knows it's been struck clean. Can't find it on their resumes, on the Internet, like a saloon floor. At the Wall Street Journal Student Success Rodeo, the boss and his sidekick finished 500 out of 500. That's dead last. Their pendant snake oil, it'll cure all ails. Calling it success for all students. Careful. I've heard that's 90% branding. Success for all students. Well, that's impossible. Mathematically and otherwise. It's just plain paint on a wagon that's about ready to roll off a cliff over by Speedway and Campbell. Word's out. They're scouting for new pastures already staying ahead of the posse. Now, it may be time to hightail, because I'll tell you what, the rumors is in town that they've got to shine out for a local girl called Due Diligence. Now, Ms. Due Diligence, she's a firecracker. I've never seen it. They've never seen anything like her, never been near due diligence. But she told them plain on "boys, if you want to do due diligence, go hug a cholla."

Have a good summer. We have problems in the ballot, so you can learn to sit. I promise not to play my banjo. Everybody has said I would. But you guys know me. So, I just handed out copies of this. It's got a little bit of graphics that but none of this was done with state money computers or anything else. So, before OGC gets on my butt, I want to tell you nothing on here. Okay, thank you.

6. Q&A WITH UNIVERSITY FACULTY LEADERSHIP [00:21:24]

A. CHAIR HUDSON [00:21:40]

Well, that's a hard act to follow, Ted. May the force be with you all. At the last Senate meeting of the year, we reflect on the year behind us, note the transitions in faculty and students and shared governance and look at the projects ahead of us. In addition to bidding farewell to Greg Heileman and Adriana Grijalva, I think our favorite administrator and student body leader this year, respectively. I want to take a special moment to thank Katie Zeiders, who has been the best secretary ever. Jeremy Vetter, who has restored the dignity and productivity of UWGEC, and Joost van Haren, who has done heroic work in leading the Undergraduate Council. Mostly, they did an unbelievable amount of work with strategy, good faith, and common sense, as well as bringing the expertise of their disciplines. Mostly, for about the price of one course release, give or take a couple of stipends, maybe.

We have in-house the greatest talent to restock our administration. We work for peanuts, and we deserve competitive professional salaries, not necessarily half a million-dollar salaries, but we have what it takes inside the university, and I urge each of you to reach out to any of your colleagues who serve on the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, UWGEC, or any other university committees and thank them for doing the work of the university.

We've had several successes this year. We, under the leadership of Katie, have pushed the deans and the provost's office to distribute many more multi-year contracts to career-track faculty than would otherwise have happened. Again, under Katie's leadership, we have changed the Constitution and Bylaws and are simply waiting for the President's signature to include all career-track faculty as full members of the general faculty and an underappreciated group, that is postdocs. So again, thank you for that.

We have pressed the Provost's office to make sure that non-renewals happen in a more orderly way in the future. We still do not like the non-renewal policy. We still prefer to keep all our colleagues, to implement smaller class sizes rather than treating faculty, career-track faculty who are our future, as disposable and dependable. But nevertheless, we did push back on a renewal policy that was being abused. We worked with Richard Cate on the budget model. We hope there's enough money to put into what I think is actually a pretty good budget model. And of course, we participated actively in the Fall, in the negotiation of the Trump compact. We made our voices heard, and we helped the President come to the correct decision in that process. Most recently, by working well with our new policy discussion group, we prevented the loss of several weeks of unpaid parental leave on top of the paid parental and family leave that is already provided. I consider all these things successes.

Our ongoing projects include overseeing and working with, and monitoring Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Andrea Romero's UHAP Revision Task Force. Creating our own ABOR Policy Committee under the leadership of Roy Spece and several colleagues in the Law School to better understand the parameters of Chapter 6 and Chapter 2, those chapters that UAGC was exempted from, but that we need to keep in place so that we have an orderly campus. Most recently, we've established a grievance study group with Richard Cate and Jenna Rickus, where we will talk about how to prevent the proliferation of grievances at the college level, as well as how to more efficiently process them without doing damage to our established policy or faculty rights. That's a joint effort, and I see lots of potential for joint efforts.

Our future projects include hopefully, I say inshallah on all this, working with Staff Council to come up with recommendations on how to protect staff from at-will employment and the abrupt and damaging firings that that policy allows. The Surveillance Committee, which I know you all are waiting for our report from, is hard at work on the interim report on surveillance, both physical and data on campus. We had hoped to have it for you here today, but we've promised to share it with our partners in Steve Patterson's office and the Threat Assessment Management Team for their feedback. We will deliver that to you at some time in the future.

C11, under the great leadership of Laura Hollengreen and Ted Downing convened a community event on Saturday which was so inspiring and so productive, when we heard from our community panelists. I am going to work on creating, y'all are going to love this, a Committee of 50, featuring emeriti, alumni, and community, and the Committee of 11 working as private citizens rather than on behalf of the University. We need to engage and interface better with about two dozen items that we heard about from our community partners in this forum. With thanks to Marlys Witte, Russ Witte and Thomas Cherney for organizing this on Saturday.

I am really concerned about department-level finance and accounting. Call it account hygiene at the department level, particularly in the STEM colleges. I would like to figure out a way to have a faculty committee, an ad hoc general faculty committee, to look into some of the irregularities that keep popping up, especially in colleges where there's a lot of grant funding, a lot of startup money, a lot of freezes on that money, to make sure that we are not distributing a problem over many colleges and therefore not seeing it.

I want to make sure that our emeritus faculty, in addition to playing an active role on the future Committee of 50, are not being inappropriately excluded from listservs and other departmental activities. We have a draft of a Senate resolution on that. Big topic for next year is intellectual property, and Kathleen Kennedy has almost volunteered, I think I need to twist her arm a little more, but after drafting some ideas about intellectual property, I want her, Marvin Slepian, and Mona Hymel to work together on the question of intellectual property, which affects so many of us.

Some of you will have noted the memo that we distributed to all faculty in the last couple of days, which I will call the Witte memo, about changes in the way that foundation money and endowments cross the brain blood barrier into the university. I don't fully understand what it means, but I want everyone to know, typically we've had problems understanding how money works behind the foundation walls. As it flows in a different scale and mass and process into the university, it becomes public. We need to see it. We need to understand how it's being used. I am interested if anyone has a personal take on that, we will be addressing this perhaps with a committee.

Administrative review. We've had a year of our new Provost's regime of three-year serious administrative reviews. We want to see that they have teeth, we want to see that they have meaning, we want to see that they are transparent, and if not, we might have our own Committee for Administrative Reviews. Long overdue, something we hoped that we wouldn't have to do. But we will if we must.

My dear colleague and our Vice Chair and President of the Senate, Mona, chairs the Naming Committee, one of the hottest committees in town right now, as we grapple with the issue of the renaming of the building named formerly after Cesar Chavez. As we heard in a public forum recently, the community has already abandoned that name. We need to make sure that we have a formal and transparent process that is inclusive of all perspectives, to basically follow what the community has already in practice done. I would just remind everyone, especially President Garimella, that the name of Mona's committee that she chairs is the Naming Committee, not the "Unnaming" committee. So, we would like to assert from now that when the building comes to be renamed, it will be through the Naming Committee which has already demonstrated its openness to all the relevant stakeholders and a humbleness and ability to follow the community, not necessarily to follow the money.

Safety continues to be a huge preoccupation, especially for our students in the wake of the horrific pedestrian tragedy that happened on our campus. We cannot ever let the ball drop on these issues of physical safety on campus. Our international students and colleagues need our backup, 200%, should the policies of intolerance and deportation manifest on our campus, and we continue to work on data privacy and security as well, overseeing all the professionals who have that as their portfolio.

A couple of other projects that I have in mind. We're going to work with the Graduate and Professional Student Organization to reanimate our Labor and Human Rights committees, which sit dormant in the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws for far too long. It's impressive that it is the students who have impatiently asked, why are we not using these committees that are already legitimately formed? We care about labor practices. We care about corporate relations and human rights.

I'm happy to announce that I just had a conversation with Marv Slepian that it might be the right time to work with the Regents and Distinguished Professors, especially their action group, on a variety of questions. I look forward to formalizing that potential relationship. [\[](#)

I think there's a lot more here, but I'm running out of time. Well, I just wanted to give a shout out to how wonderful it is to work with Mona. How wonderful it is to work with Jasmin, Sabrina, and Andrew, who make these meetings go, and how excited we are about Susan's transition from Parliamentarian to fill Katie's big shoes as Secretary. I want to give a special shout out to Jane Cherry, whose absence here today keeps me up at night. The prospect of a meeting without her fills me with fear and cortisol. But you know what? When we take someone for granted, as this university has taken Jane Cherry for granted for the last 18 years, without a raise for one of the most difficult, challenging, and unique staff jobs, she deserves to take a vacation whenever the hell she pleases and damn the consequences for Faculty Senate. How about we all treat our staff with the recognition, respect, and salaries that they deserve?

As promised, when we talked about the so-called honorary degrees when President Garimella usurped the role of the Senate, I will not be at this year's convocation, much to my disappointment. I am wearing the gown. This is my gown that I usually only get to wear at convocation and commencement. It's the Palestinian embroidered gown from my late mother's collection. My mother was an NIH program manager in toxicology, but her Palestinian heritage was very dear to her and to me.

I thought, and I'm glad that Ted also wore his hat, I thought that I would wear it here today because this is where the faculty holds power, not in a parade of Deans, however fun that party is, and I do enjoy that party every year except this year. Let me take a moment as a point of personal private privilege to stand up in solidarity with my colleague, the Chair of the Faculty Senate at the University of Michigan, Dr. Derek Peterson, who today is facing threats and threats of termination from his tenured position. He's also a MacArthur Genius Award recipient for his speech at the University of Michigan convocation, in which he dared to praise student activists and protesters, not just student athletes.

I want to give a shout out to all the students and faculty who have been targeted or punished here and across the country for exercising their conscience and their constitutionally protected speech, on the matters of Palestine, ICE, our Dreamers, and all the people who suffer university policy.

I also want to give a shout out to the one recipient of a properly administered honorary degree, and that is, of course, our dear friend and leader, Gabrielle Giffords, who was properly awarded an honorary degree in 2025. Unfortunately, the rest of the awardees at our upcoming commencement are compromised by the administration's failure to follow a simple policy and procedure. I will send the other recipients very polite, brief letters notifying them of that, but also welcoming them to the U of A family. They do deserve recognition. Even our commencement speaker, Eric Schmidt, who was not approved through this body for the so-called honorary degree. There is a lot that we can talk about with him. I would remind you that appearing in the Epstein files many times is not in and of itself a crime, and we might have a lot to learn from someone like him and Michael Crow. You can also find Michael Crow in that same capacity in the Epstein files. As someone who was important enough to be courted by the Epstein class but had enough integrity and or street smarts to stay away from them over the course of decades, rejecting their advances.

We do want to talk to these new members of the Wildcat family selected by our administration. We want to learn from them and engage in critical dialogue with them. We want to welcome them with all their accomplishments and wisdom to our family, not as an honorary degree holder like Gabby Giffords, but welcome to the family. Let their association with us be as it is for the students, a commencement. In this case, the commencement of a relationship of learning.

Finally, congratulations to all our 2026 graduates, but also congratulations to all our students and colleagues who are working as hard as they can to fulfill the dreams of their ancestors and to secure the future of their families in spite of and because of immense challenges. The faculty, and I think I can legitimately speak for all the faculty here as the chief elected representative of the faculty, the faculty salutes all of them. Thank you very much.

Questions and Comments [00:42:10]

- Senator Witte stated many of the successes described are the opposite vector to centralization. They are decentralization, and that should be the Senate's word, returning things to the units, ultimately to the colleges.
- Senator Witte stated the very brilliant meeting that was held on Saturday, was truly thrilling to be there and develop the Committee of 50. This was video streamed, and the recording is now available. There will be a communication going to faculty, and they request everyone on the faculty, particularly the Faculty Senate, answer the two questions that were presented at that meeting: "What do you want to see or see changed in the University of Arizona's future?"
- Senator Witte stated it was thrilling to hear the six panelists from all the political parties answer those questions, including student leaders. The second question for faculty to answer is: "What themes and topics would you like to see in the future conferences in this series?" This is a series and there will be more of these forums which will be communicated via the listserv.
- Chair Hudson stated there will be more of these forums and this will be communicated via the listserv.
- Chair Hudson stated regarding the question on decentralization, she hears Senator Witte. Decentralization is not helpful when there is no effective oversight of deans and department heads. For that to work, there needs to be central oversight.
- Senator Ziurys stated she is wondering about the new committee that will be formed on intellectual property. The Research Policy Committee has also had issues with this where faculty have come to the committee stating that departments heads and others have stolen their projects. RPC would be happy to work with this new committee.
- Chair Hudson stated she has become extremely concerned about PI rights in recent times and she thinks there is room for improvement on this. She plans to have this new committee work with the Research Policy Committee.
- Senator Russell stated she is proud to work at this multicultural research powerhouse in the desert. She is also very concerned about the fact that money comes from enrollments, research, and the state. All three of these are in big trouble.
- Senator Russell stated currently, she is particularly concerned about the research and asked where in the Faculty Senate committee structure is there discussion about how to implement piracy. The University of Maine is handing out \$2,000 into research accounts for every proposal submitted. Her understanding is in most departments they're down by at least a third in number of submissions this year, and in many cases it's half or more. So that billion dollars in research, shows the University is in big, big trouble. She is worried about the excellence, the access. There are tremendous headwinds, but the University is also incredibly nimble, incredibly capable. She asked where the actual discussion about how to foster that research funding and excellence that is so critical, lifeblood.
- Chair Hudson stated they will start with the RPC. It also starts with a bilateral communicative relationship with the Office of Research and Partnerships which has treated Faculty Senate like an optional interlocutor, but the Senate is not optional to that conversation. She wishes that the Vice President for Research had responded to the Senate's invitation to be present today. The work will continue this
- Vice Chair Hymel stated her thanks for Chair Hudson's year-end summary.

B. PROVOST PRELOCK [00:47:24]

Hi, everyone. I know it's been a wild semester and year. We're going to celebrate graduation. I just thought I would start with congratulating many of our faculty, staff, and students who won awards this past spring and last fall, and it was pretty amazing to see the work that our faculty and staff do, and our students do, and I was privileged to be a part of that. So wonderful Awards of Excellence, Teaching and Service, and one of your own faculty senators, Marv Slepian, won the highest award for the Convergence Awards.

The other thing, I know there's lots of things that people see as problems. I always like to start with the positive. I wanted to share a few other positive things, and this isn't in my report because this just came to me. Our University of Arizona Health Sciences colleges have moved up in the national Blue Ridge rankings, which is very exciting. Our College of Pharmacy is number four in the country and continues to rise. We will be announcing, hopefully, the new Dean for the College of Pharmacy this week. We're very excited about the candidate there. Also, you should know that all our colleges in the Health Sciences moved up in the rankings, although we should be higher than 51. We did move up seven spots. Our College of Nursing maintained its top 25 status, with incredible faculty, ranking number 24 nationally. So well done, Rachel and her whole team. Both colleges of Medicine moved up. The largest move was the College of Public Health, which moved up seven spots to being ranked number 30 nationally. So, on the Blue Ridge rankings, this is a great accomplishment based on their research and the quality of the faculty they have. Congratulations to the Health Sciences.

The other piece, I'm not going to go over my whole report, you can see all of that, but a big thank you to Greg Heileman. He's sorry he couldn't be here. He's on vacation. As you know, he took on the Provost role for Lebanese University. We don't know if he's going to be in Beirut or New York, but he might be going back and forth. He's very excited about this. The new President at Lebanese University is a colleague and friend of his, and I know he will do well.

We also just finished our meeting with the Committee for the College of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences, and I'm going to start my negotiation with that candidate as well. We're very excited about the candidates. The search committee did a really good job. Faculty, community members, etc. thank you, Jenna and Jenny Lee for that.

The other thing is a big congratulations to Andrea Romero and her team in completing 186 reviews. Her team also got recognition as a university team award for excellence in the work that they do. We had an overall approval rating of 94%, so congratulations. The portfolios to read are just amazing, and Andrea and I talked about that several times, to see how proud we are of the work that our faculty do, both at the tenure-track level and at the career-track level.

I think the next thing that I would like to share is that this has been my first year. Not quite, it'll be May 19th when I started. I really appreciated my work with Faculty Senate through the first year. We accomplished some great things together. We still have a lot of work to do, and I'm looking forward to working with you to really deliver on our promise for students in the larger UA community. I hope to see many of you at graduation to celebrate our students. That's the reason we're here. It's to celebrate them.

Now, I know the big question you have is admissions. I'm going to give you what I can. We are right in the middle of data analysis. I have Kris here who can back me up on that, but let me just give you some highlights, some of the challenges, some of the events, and our strategies for the next two weeks. Kristen Limesand gave me an update on graduate enrollment.

So right now, UA is enrolling 12 of the 20 Flynn Scholars. So again, we have the most Flynn Scholars who are coming to U of A. Thank you for all of those who helped in that recruitment, and John, in your work in the Honors College. We're very excited about that. The average GPA of our incoming class is 3.65 versus 3.43 of last year. The current yield of Arizona residents is 45.6% compared to 39% last year. A larger number of students are enrolling in every county except Cochise. We have some work on that, and we are working with our community college. Honors enrollment is at an all-time high. John is getting a little nervous, but he'll make it happen. Highest enrollment ever for the Honors College. So well done. You've really done a good job recruiting and yielding your students.

As you know, we had four admitted student events this year as compared to one last year. The uptake in terms of people who registered and showed up, for this year it was 85%; last year it was 79%. Why that's so important, it increases yield when students are on campus. You'll like this number, more than 18,999,493 individual messages were sent via Slate from August through May as of Friday. Of the unique campaigns, we had at least 133 college-specific touch points with admitted students. So, thank you to all the colleges who engaged in that work. Pretty amazing work and much different than what we saw last year.

So here are our challenges. The non-resident yield was only 11.2%. We were hoping for higher, although it was higher than last year, which was only 10.3%. This is a national trend with many universities extending their May deadline. So, while our yield is up, total numbers are still down in the non-resident framework. International yield is also up, 12.7% compared to 10.8% for Fall 2025. However, many international students are still down because they're telling us they don't feel safe coming to the U.S. right now for their degree. Overall yield across all groups is 21.4% versus 18.2% last year. We were hoping for about 23%. We're still hanging on to that number. We don't yet have a headcount for you, but we will soon.

Our strategies for the next two weeks are the following. The deadline to accept admissions has been extended to May 15th. This is typical of what colleges are doing across the country. The application for admission remains open. We are

listed on the NACAC board as still accepting deposits and applications, and the staff is continuing to contact students and families indicating continuing interest. Now, there is some progress also on our transfer admissions. The Arizona Community College visits support students throughout their enrollment journey. Right now we now have staff co-located in four offices, Pima West and Downtown, Glendale and Mesa. We have at least monthly visits with our Arizona community colleges, and in fact, this past year we had 426 visits to the colleges, and 46 plus financial aid visits to help them, and 35 college fairs. We are doing transfer in-person and virtual hours to provide one-on-one support, and we've made over 3,000 appointments available for students.

In terms of prospective and admitted student initiatives, we have a Fast Track My Transfer program that provides transfer students with an expedited review to really incentivize their application completion. We have about 240 students signed up. One hundred thirty-seven are already admitted, and we're going to do one more round next week to support our transfer students. We're really working on an aggressive transfer student strategy for the spring semester and the fall semester for the future. Several transfer information sessions are registered, and we had several transfer visit days. So that gives you a sense of the undergraduate picture.

In terms of the graduate admissions picture, the positives are students are accepting their offers of admission across the board. So as of this morning, our master's enrollments are up 2%. Strong increases in public health and nursing. Our doctoral enrollments are up 3% and strong numbers for engineering and nursing. Arizona Online is up 6.8%. That's generally what's holding us in the game, is domestic enrollment. International enrollment is down in every quarter, as you might expect. That's pretty much a national trend. Our enrollment goals are focused on strategic growth in areas with strong labor market data, and the colleges with strong graduate enrollment data align with those growth areas. That is positive, at least at the master's level.

Here are the challenges. International student interest has decreased for master's programs, less so for doctoral programs. They're still very interested in coming to U of A. We are working closely with International Admissions to focus recruitment efforts on strategic locations that might align, also with our ORP research interests and priority areas and historically strong yield percentages.

I also think the new limits on the Graduate PLUS loans are a problem, and that is a headwind that will impact our yield. Colleges have been really involved in advising to use their tuition waivers very strategically. The Graduate College has provided some digital assets to support the college yield campaigns. The next steps for Graduate College are we're conducting a nationally advertised online graduate webinar series from April 20th through Wednesday, May 6th with 15 out of 18 colleges participating. These sessions have provided more than 2,300 prospective students with personal insights, connections with admissions experts, advisors, engagement with faculty, and breakout sessions.

College efforts this month are connecting to your newly admitted students, so we don't lose them in yield is what's most important for everyone. The other thing is we are seeing a slight increase in retention from last year, as we've been really working on that, and so that will be an important piece. But right now, we want to keep the students we have and continue to engage those who are showing interest.

Questions and Comments [00:44:28]

- An individual in the Q&A section of the Zoom Chat asked: "How will we continue with dean searches without the faculty as they are now leaving soon for the summer?"
- Provost Prelock stated both dean searches are done, and for the new one that is starting, College of Information Science, there will be efforts to assign the committee, and then their work will be done in the fall, unless there must be engagement during the summer, faculty and staff will be supported in this.
- Senator Downing stated his thanks for the Provosts report. He stated, first, there are a lot of statistics which he hopes Senate will be provided with the actual numbers, but he understands the key number as 11.2% as the yield rate for the entire University and asked if this is correct.
- Provost Prelock stated not that number was for non-residents, for residents, it's over 45%.
- Senator asked for the overall yield for the University.
- Provost Prelock stated it is 21%.
- Senator Downing stated if this data and statistics could be shared. He requested what the budget implications will be based on these so the Senate and everybody can see this information.
- Senator Downing stated the University made the mistake of early action which was letting people in with no conditions. Michigan did that and failed. He asked if anyone is going to be held accountable when they make mistakes in administration at that level.
- Provost Prelock stated she appreciates Senator Downing's passion for this, but she doesn't think it can be said that there was a mistake made with the decision to do early action. Those are the kids that we were able to enroll, and there is a higher yield in each of the categories.
- Senator Downing stated UA compares themselves for dipping from the same pond. Everyone is fishing in Arizona now. ASU was there and is running much higher yield rates. He asked if ASU and UA can be compared for this current year as they are the nearest competitor.
- Senator Downing stated if one is running a Circle K, and they don't know about QT, something's wrong. ASU is up the road trying to get students too. There are now dorm requirements which he has heard complaints about. If one wants to come to UA and live with a family member outside of 30 miles, they can no longer do that and must live in

the form, unless they ask for special permission. One of his former constituents asked what right UA has to not her niece from Phoenix to live with her, while attending UA.

- Provost Prelock stated they are looking best practices for all students, and if a student lives within a radius, they can live at home, and if they have financial reasons or health reasons, they can live at home. Most universities have a requirement to live on campus. In terms of the budget question, there will be a meeting in the next two days to see what the plan is and the impact. John Arnold was conservative in net tuition revenue, so she believes the University will be okay.
- Provost Prelock stated in terms of colleagues to the north, there are meetings being held with them through ABOR. They are struggling and not achieving the same level of yield UA.

7. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA – Consent Agenda – Chair of Undergraduate Council, Joost van Haren – [Proposal UG Minor Forensic Anthropology](#), [Undergraduate Transfer Credit policy proposal](#), [Undergraduate course Syllabus Policy & Template proposal](#) [01:05:43]**

The consent agenda consists of three items: A minor in forensic anthropology, which will be a great program for students who are interested in a broader training in ethics, law, human remains, and the social and political dimensions of forensic work. Second, the transfer credit policy. This policy update will put the general education individual transfer credit decisions in the University-Wide Office of General Education, and as a result students cannot uncomplete general education transfer credits by switching majors. It also specifies which complete general education curriculum from outside the University of Arizona will be accepted and that these will satisfy the civic institutions requirements, the new part of the general education component.

Lastly, the syllabus policy and template change are to require that undergraduate course syllabi are shared on the course learning management page. For most faculty, this is Brightspace. For internships, research projects, and preceptorships, faculty will work with students on an individualized learning contract so there's a clear expectation of what the students will complete during that process, which will also be kept on file in the department. Lastly, the template is designed to provide faculty with up-to-date URLs and links to policy information that need less frequent updating. Intentionally, that's available to all faculty and is more consistent over time. With that, that's the consent agenda. Thank you.

- Seconded **[Motion 2025/26-42]** to approve the *Proposal UG Minor Forensic Anthropology* passed by unanimous consent.
- Seconded **[Motion 2025/26-43]** to approve the *Undergraduate Transfer Credit policy proposal* passed by unanimous consent.
- Seconded **[Motion 2025/26-44]** to approve the *Undergraduate course Syllabus Policy and Template proposal* passed by unanimous consent.

8. **ACTION ITEM: NON-CONSENT AGENDA – CHAIR OF GRADUATE COUNCIL, PHILLIP WADDEL – [Graduate Course Syllabus policy proposal](#) and [UGC response to questions](#) [01:08:48]**

This is the Graduate Course syllabus policy proposal. This mirrors the undergraduate course syllabus policy and template that Joost was just talking about. Much of this stuff we already do. This is kind of best practices. The new things this policy does are, one, it spells out that you need to be very clear in syllabi with 400 and 500 level, we have mixed graduate and undergraduate classes, to be very clear about requirements and grades for both levels, not just the undergraduate but also for the graduate. Graduate-level classes have always needed a syllabus, so this stays the same. One new thing, and this mirrors what Joost was just talking about with the undergraduate policy, is any independent study, including theses, doctoral dissertations, anything like this, will need something like a syllabus. This is so that students have an idea what to expect and that this is on record so that you can refer to it.

- Chair Hudson stated because of repeated questions she has heard about the last matter, the learning contract for people doing dissertations, theses, and independent studies, particularly when funded by their advisor and supervisor, she has heard many concerns and would like this referred to the Research Policy Committee for discussion.
- Chair Hudson moved **[Motion 2025/26-45]** to postpone Non-Consent Agenda Item: Graduate Course Syllabus Policy proposal to the September 2026 Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was seconded.
- Senator Ziurys stated scientific research doesn't follow a syllabus. This affects how people do research, and it could affect how agencies view graduate students. This poses the question of who one is responsible to, the government agency or the university. The government agency, of course, wants to be responsible and this is something that needs to be discussed by the Research Policy Committee who is meeting next week and has this on their agenda. This affects how people do research, and the committee should look at this.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the **[Motion 2025/26-45]** to postpone Non-Consent Agenda Item: Graduate Course Syllabus Policy proposal to the September 2026 Faculty Senate Meeting will be voted on via TopHat which is open now.
- **[Motion 2025/26-45]** to postpone Non-Consent Agenda Item: Graduate Course Syllabus Policy proposal to the September 2026 Faculty Senate Meeting passed with 26 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.

9. **OLD BUSINESS [01:13:26]**

A. Vote on the [Resolution on Hiring Practices](#) – Senator Ted Downing [01:14:04]

Senator Kennedy was so nice to be worried about the wording being a little leaky. This is basically a statement, which was in the MOU, but it was recommended that the motion be changed to get rid of any mention of the MOU. The motion has been modified, removing all references to the MOU, putting in references to Arizona state statute or ABOR policy where necessary, and other than that it's all the same. I ask you to consider this vote essentially saying, let's do what we did before and keep doing it better. Thank you

Text of the motion, with modifications:

University of Arizona Faculty Senate Motion

6 April 2026

(amended 24 April 2026)

~~Affirming Compliance with Recruitment and Hiring Provisions of the Shared Governance MOU (May 13, 2022)~~

Affirming Faculty Shared Governance in Recruitment, Hiring, and Review of Academic Personnel and Administrators

The Faculty Senate ~~affirms and~~ requests President Suresh Garimella ~~to~~ affirm that recruitment, selection, and review of academic administrators and academic personnel are subject to ~~the provisions of the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding dated May 13, 2022, and~~ applicable law ~~and the University traditions~~, including [Ariz. Const. Art. 11, § 5](#); Arizona Revised Statutes [§§ 15-1601\(B\) and 15-1626](#); ABOR Policies 6-201 and 6-910; the UA Faculty [Constitution and Bylaws](#); and UHAP 7.09.

Accordingly, the Faculty Senate:

- Affirms that faculty, through their elected representatives, shall share responsibility for matters related to faculty personnel and actively participate in university governance and policy development ~~(MOU, p. 1)~~ [\[A.R.S. § 15-1601\(B\)\]](#).
- Affirms that shared governance requires meaningful faculty participation in selecting, hiring, and reviewing faculty and academic administrators ~~(MOU, p. 3)~~ [\[A.R.S. § 15-1601\(B\); ABOR 6-201\]](#).
- Affirms that academic personnel and related policies fall within the scope of shared governance ~~(MOU, p. 8)~~ [\[ABOR 6-201\]](#).
- Affirms that faculty and administration must play a collaborative role in recruitment, selection, and review of academic administrators ~~(MOU, p. 8)~~ [\[A.R.S. § 15-1601\(B\); ABOR 6-201\]](#).
- Requires that all search and review committees be comprised of half or more faculty, with at least half of those faculty recommended by elected faculty peers ~~(MOU, p. 8)~~.
- Requires that elected faculty have a direct role in search processes, either as committee members or nominators ~~(MOU, p. 8)~~.
- Requires that academic administrative appointments be made through open, competitive searches, preferably national or international in scope and based on merit ~~(MOU, p. 9)~~.
- Requires that shared governance participation be sought and considered in all hiring decisions, regardless of whether a search is competitive ~~(MOU, p. 9)~~.

Further, the Faculty Senate requests that:

- The Office of the President and relevant administrative units provide semi-annual report to the General Faculty documenting compliance with these provisions;
 - Any deviations from these requirements be explicitly identified, justified, and reviewed through shared governance processes.
 - These provisions be treated as binding governance standards, not advisory guidance.
- Chair Hudson stated she appreciates and supports this resolution. She believes that anything that regulates the hiring practices for quality is a step in the right direction.
 - Vice Chair Hymel stated there has been no motion for a secret ballot so the vote will occur by hand. A senator requested to vote on this motion by secret ballot.
 - Senator Downing moved **[Motion 2025/26-46]** to pass the Resolution on Hiring Practices. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 32 in favor, 5 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

B. Information Technology Update – CIO Elliot Cheu [01:17:06]

Vice Chair Hymel stated she does not believe CIO Elliot Cheu is present at the meeting, therefore, this item will be moved to Old Business on the first Faculty Senate Agenda of the 2026-2027 academic year.

- Senator Ziurys stated postponing the item on the email issue will be too late.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated the email issue is not being postponed until September 2026, the item regarding syllabus policy and proposal is postponed until Fall 2026. The issue of the email policy has not yet been addressed.

C. Grievance Reform discussions – Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Roberto Guzmán, and Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:18:51]

Chair of the Faculty, Leila Hudson [01:18:53]

I just want to introduce one of the hardest-working and least-appreciated roles in the university, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, my dear friend, Dr. Roberto Guzmán.

Chair of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, Roberto Guzmán [01:19:06]

Good afternoon. Last session we talked briefly about developing a support committee. This is related to faculty grievances, how to navigate the process properly, and how to make the process constructive and the solution effective and beneficial for both the university and the faculty. We all have something in common. We want excellence and to benefit the faculty and university. The grievance process is an essential component of institutional governance and the protection of faculty rights. However, it can also be a complex and resource-intensive process. Faculty members without access to legal counsel may face challenges in navigating these processes effectively, potentially creating disparities in access to guidance and support.

We already have in our Faculty Bylaws a system to navigate this process, grievance policies and procedures for faculty, Article 5, 6, 7, 8 in our faculty bylaws. This includes the grievance principles, grievance resolution procedures, including formal resolution procedures, the Ombuds program, and grievance review procedures. In the grievance review procedures, we have faculty prepared to solve problems at the lowest level with department heads and deans. That's what we prefer, in general. We prefer to choose an informal process. Go to somebody, discuss the issue, and solve it. However, we often don't say these things out loud, a faculty member entering the grievance process can feel isolated, overwhelmed, and unequal. Some have access to legal counsel. Others do not. That difference can shape not just the experience but also the outcome. This of course, is about fairness: we the University, including staff members, and faculty members.

Our community is built on shared governance, mutual respect, and academic freedom. Those are our principles. Yet, those principles are tested most when a colleague is navigating a difficult dispute without support. We on the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure have seen these unfortunate circumstances more often recently. For that reason, we propose creating an ad hoc Faculty Advocacy Committee, comprising experienced faculty who can provide guidance, perspectives, and collegial support for faculty members engaged in the grievance process who may lack access to legal representation.

This proposed committee would serve as a peer support resource providing general procedural guidance, clarification of institutional policies and processes, and collegial support in grievance proceedings. The committee would not replace legal counsel nor alter existing procedures. Rather, it would function as a supplemental faculty-driven resource consistent with the principles of shared governance and mutual support. It is about ensuring that no colleague must navigate this process alone.

The idea is to establish a committee that will reinforce the university's commitment to fair and equitable processes, transparency in governance, and support for faculty navigating complex institutional processes. If believe in supporting one another as scholars and educators, then we should also support one another in our most challenging moments. I welcome input from everybody. I welcome questions from the Faculty Senate and faculty members of Arizona.

The principle is that we all have the same goal: excellence at all levels for faculty, staff, and the university. That is our principle. We are the University. The University has a difficult position. One administrator likely has a dual or three roles. The most importance one is to advocate for the excellence that starts with faculty, not students. After that, they have to endure the difficult process of being able to administer the budget and so forth. The first and most important role is advocacy for faculty members. The second one is administration. Again, I welcome the input for everybody. Questions are welcome.

Questions and Comments [01:24:21]

- Senator Witte stated she is not usually autobiographical here, but she thinks she will be. She has been here for 57 years and started with President Harvill, who was a true president who built this university into what she thought it would become. Four years after arriving here, she was the first woman faculty member appointed. She was the only faculty member, male or female, who was entirely supported by research grants. There was a clinical research center in surgery. There had never been another one in the country. At that point, her chairman, who had achieved everything, was fired, and her entire department stood up against the administration. Eleven years later, hard complaints and the grievance procedures, all of them were true. Two juries and one in Phoenix finally awarded punitive damages against the president and the vice president, which the university had to pay a million dollars including legal fees. Of course, the University Counsel was constantly calling it a frivolous lawsuit, and she was paying for their salaries. She was paying, as a taxpayer, because the salary of these lawyers who work for the administration, are not for the faculty.

- Senator Witte stated she has seen it all, and finally CAFT was formed which was amazing. By that time an attorney from the NEA, from the DuShane Fund, and another lawyer didn't take a penny until they collected eleven years later from a Yale professor. Until all of that, the CAFT was totally reformed. There were good CAFT hearings for about 10 or 15 years, and now it's slipped back to worse than when it was at its worst.
- Senator Witte stated something must be done and she applauds Roberto and the brave faculty who complain, most of them about things they should be complaining, about, that should never have happened if there were annual reviews by the faculty in the first year that these department heads arrive, not five years later.
- Senator Ziurys stated she applauds this initiative by Chair Guzmán and believes the current CAFT process is horribly unfair. The university has lawyers serving on it. If one is a faculty member and doesn't have the money to pay for a good, they're hosed in CAFT. Not only should there be a committee, but there needs to be thought put into about having funds for faculty members who can't afford it, or any faculty member, to hire a lawyer. It's unfortunate that it's come to this, but when one has two university lawyers against them on CAFT, it's very hard without one's own lawyer.
- Chair Guzmán of CAFT stated he is the oldest member currently sitting on CAFT and started in 1991. The committee worked with the Provost and President in a very different way then. The Provost's Office, the Vice President for Research, and the President was always involved. Now, they are still involved but what is missing is the communication to the faculty or to the people involved. He will say, Deans and Department Heads, must solve problems in the simplest way possible and that has always been the case. Right now, the University and the Provost's Office are involved in trying to develop something, to create groups and so forth, of course, but again, the process is missing because the problems must be solved at the lowest possible level.
- Senator Witte stated she was fired when she stood up to her chairman as she was in the role of non-tenured but CAFT completely exonerated her afterwards.

D. Constitution and Bylaws update – Secretary of the Faculty, Katie Zeiders [01:30:00]

Hello, everyone. On behalf of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, I wanted to briefly update you on some constitutional changes that have passed general faculty votes.

In the runoff election last month, general faculty were asked to vote on two changes. The removal of Article 2, Section 2. This proposed change removes the section about individuals pursuing a degree at the university and being ineligible for membership of the general faculty. The Faculty Senate approved this change unanimously in the Fall of 2025, and this past general faculty vote by 82%.

The second change was Article 2, Section 1 and Section 5. This was the expansion of general faculty membership to include career-track faculty with at least half-time appointments. This also passed Faculty Senate unanimously in the Fall of 2025 and passed general faculty vote with an 81% approval.

The next step is that this is sent to the President's Office for review and approval. I sent this on April 8th, so we'll expect to hear back in July. If approved, I will work closely with the new secretary of the faculty and our excellent people in UAIR to make sure that this is changed and implemented in the Fall.

Since this is my last Senate meeting, I just want to take the time to say that we've done some really amazing work together, and it has been an honor to work so closely with all of you and faculty across the entire campus in shared governance work. I took on the secretary role two years ago, after two years in the CALES Faculty Council and two years as a CALES Faculty Senator. I told Mona and Leila when I came in that I had three goals: increase multi-year contracts and multi-year appointments for career-track faculty, expand voting rights for career-track faculty, and talk about land grant and extension as much as I could to all of you without annoying you all.

We've accomplished increases in multi-year appointments, increased these by 55% this year, and it was a collaborative effort. It really took listening to career-track faculty on the ground, researching ABOR policy, data analysis. It took the hard work of Andrea Romero's office and our faculty affairs deans in each of our colleges to implement this. There is still work to be done on this. We could issue almost 200 more multi-year appointments and remain within our ABOR guidelines. There are still full-rank career-track faculty who do not have multi-year appointments. We are close to accomplishing the constitutional change that expands the rights of career-track faculty in shared governance. This will add almost 400 new career-track faculty to general faculty ranks. Both are important because they provide more job security and more say for our career-track faculty and institutions.

There is much more work to be done. I have lots of ideas. You may not want to hear all of them, but I just want to say that it's critical to moving our university forward and in moving faculty shared governance forward, that we focus on goals, that Faculty Senate identifies clear, attainable goals that can be worked on with administrators. Yes, with administrators, to improve the lives of our faculty across the university. Although it may be tempting to focus all of our energy on the controversies of the day, we cannot lose sight of the real goals and initiatives that can make systemic changes in our institution.

I encourage us all to do that as we move forward. I am still in a role, the Provost Fellows for Research role, and as Joellen was talking about, advocating for research, Danielle Barefoot and I are doing that work, and we've met with over 30 faculty, staff, and administrators to talk about the challenges in research. It's a real need. I would be honored to

come as many times as you would like to share those thoughts and that research with Faculty Senate. So, thank you all so much and appreciate all your collaborations.

- Vice Chair Hymel stated her thanks for all of Secretary Zeider's work and accomplishments in the Faculty Senate.

10. **NEW BUSINESS [01:35:27]**

A. Kyl Institute for National Security and various projects – Senior Vice President for Research and Partnerships, Tomás Díaz de la Rubia [01:35:30]

- Vice Chair Hymel stated she understands Dr. Díaz de la Rubia is not present and has not sent a representative on his behalf. This item will therefore be bypassed.
- Senator Downing stated they invited Dr. Díaz de la Rubia who chose not to attend the Senate meeting, but there is still an issue to be discussed as a Senate, which is the defense institute.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran stated since there was a speaker assigned to speak on the issue, if the speaker is not present, it is up to the Chair of the meeting to determine whether she would like to acknowledge other speakers on the issue, but she does not have to. There can also be the decision to postpone the issue to a later meeting.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated at this point, she would like to move on to New Business Item B: Career Track Faculty Needs Committee update. If there is time at the end of the meeting, there is the possibility to return to these items for discussion.
- Senator Witte stated the ruling is that if there is a controversial matter and one is called on to speak, not showing up prevents discussion of the item. Even General Roberts would agree there is something wrong with this.
- Parliamentarian Miller-Cochran clarified she did not say Vice Chair Hymel cannot have discussion on the item, it is her choice on whether discussion will continue this item. Vice Chair Hymel has stated this will be moved to the end of the meeting.
- Senator Ziurys stated since there is a hard stop at 5:00 PM, she is concerned there will be no time for the email issue as CIO Elliot Cheu is not present in the meeting. The issue is supposed to be implemented on Friday.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated the meeting is moving to New Business Item B: Career Track Faculty Needs Committee update at this point.

B. Career Track Faculty Needs Committee update – Senator Kristin Little and Romi Wittman [01:37:

Senator Kristin Little [01:39:16]

This will be quick. Senator Romi Wittman could not be here today due to a family matter, so I will be doing this presentation. I don't know if you remember, but two years ago Chair Hudson convened a committee that was focusing on CT faculty needs. Two years ago, we created a survey that went out to all CT faculty.

A year ago, we finalized our report and submitted it to Faculty Senate, and Romi and I gave a brief presentation on our findings. Out of the 1,192 submissions, these were the main issues that we uncovered. I won't go ahead and read them here, but you can see pretty much what we continue to talk about all the time.

Based on those recommendations and issues that are concerning to career-track faculty, we asked Chair Hudson if she would reconvene the committee for another two years, so that we could start to address these important issues. We sent out a call for career-track faculty volunteers, and we had such an overwhelming number of people who were interested. We ended up with a committee of 15 members, some returning, but we were also looking for a wide range from different colleges. You can see on our list here that we have that. It's been an exciting year with all the different colleges represented.

What we have done this year is we've divided into subcommittees. Each committee now has probably five to seven members, depending on people's interests, and are focusing on a specific issue. Our first group is focusing on academic freedom and faculty governance. We're hoping to work closely with the Faculty Senate Shared Governance Committee. Our second group is working on workload, which is always a huge issue. I will quote Dr. Miller-Cochran, "Faculty working conditions are student learning conditions." That remains true today, and our workload continues to increase. We're hoping to work on that with administration.

Lastly, our third group is going to be focused on salary issues. They're doing research and collecting data with peer institutions. Our fourth group is looking at CT faculty and admin roles and what that entails. Our last group is looking at AI issues and CT faculty, and how they can be better supported. If you have any questions or concerns with CT faculty needs or other issues, you can contact me or Romi. We would be happy to hear anything else you'd like us to look at. Thank you

C. Email policy proposal – CIO Elliot Cheu [01:43:43]

Vice Chair Hymel stated CIO Cheu is not present at today's meeting, therefore she will bypass the item, in favor New Business Item D: Athletics Report.

D. [Athletics Report](#) – Faculty Athletics Representative, Ricardo Valerdi [01:44:28]

Good evening. Thanks for having me. Thank you. I'm going to give my Faculty Athletics Representative report. My name is Ricardo Valerdi, I'm a professor in the College of Engineering. I provided the written report, which is linked in the agenda, but I'm going to give you the 10 highlights, just like David Letterman would give his top 10 hits for the Tonight Show, if you remember.

I'm proud to say that the student athletes on this campus have the highest cumulative GPA in the history of athletics, 3.412 GPA, amazing. Also, the graduation success rate of student athletes is 92%, also amazing. We have the Scholar Athletes of the Year for the Big 12 in women's tennis, men's tennis, baseball, and men's basketball.

I also want to recognize my colleague, Marcia Rieke from Astronomy. She was selected as the Big 12 Faculty of the Year. I also want to recognize Professor Spece, Benson, Gerholz, Newman, who's in the back table there, for serving on the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee, which is the oversight committee that reports to President Garimella.

I'm also happy to report that there were no major NCAA violations. I was very careful in my wording. No laughter? Okay. Tough crowd. I also want to recognize that there are 126 student athletes graduating next week, and 95% post-graduate employment. For some of them, that includes the NBA.

I also want to acknowledge the collaboration from athletics on several initiatives, including Breakfast and Ball, which is where 50 faculty members attended a practice recently. Professor Carlos Vargas, I want to acknowledge his participation in the Houston away football game where he presented information about the NASA Aspera mission that he is the PI for, and it really allowed the U of A to highlight its own expertise in space and NASA research in Houston, just to show the Houston people that we know what we're doing. Also, the collaboration with the basketball team on the branding of the Galaxy Slam, which also highlighted achievements of our astronomy faculty.

We have a new head coach this year on campus, track and field. Andrew Dubs was hired, and he has a huge responsibility because he oversees men's and women's track, field, and cross country. There's really like 16 sports in one. I'm also proud to say that we're just wrapping up the annual student athlete feedback surveys, and the best result from that process is that 90% of the student athletes would choose the U of A again if given the opportunity. I think that's a positive result from the culture that exists there, but also the balance of academics and athletics. Thank you.

A. [Kyl Institute for National Security and various projects](#) – Senior Vice President for Research and Partnerships, Tomás Díaz de la Rubia [01:48:13]

Vice Chair Hymel stated she will return to this item for discussion, but she would like to first mention one thing about the proposed email policy. She has asked that a financial review be done of the policy due to the connected costs, and she is hoping that the comment period will be extended through the Summer. At this point, she believes comments are closed.

B. [Email policy proposal](#) – Senator Ted Downing [01:49:22]

The Committee of Eleven spent a long time with the email policy. The esteemed Chief Information Officer took as his first task, not to look at security issues, not to look at AI, but to look at the question of how we communicate one with another. That shows his priorities, and as I said, he has no qualifications in the area of Chief Information Officer. It's a huge mistake, but here he is.

Okay, the Committee of 11 looked carefully at this policy. Let me just refine the conclusions. I tried to send the Senate, last night our report. It didn't go through. It was blocked by something that happened with our own staff. So, we can't even communicate with one another without what appears to be some kind of review. Anyway, here's the conclusion of the Committee of 11 without reading the report. It's very detailed and technical.

The Committee of 11 found the proposed email policy revisions need substantial revision based on our concerns, which is proposed to start this week. We only react to the Senate sponsor, which happens to be Dr. Cheu. This policy will be in effect at the end of this week if he so decides. It needs substantial revisions based on our conclusions. One, due process and evidentiary standards. This links back to Senator Roberto Guzman's report. This is a great way to involve a lot of CAFT hearings, maybe dismissals the way it's organized. Number two, conflicts with ABOR policy and academic freedom. It is inconsistent with ABOR. Three, conflict with UHAP policies. Four, risk of elastic misconduct standards. Five, absence of safeguards against misrepresentation, even keeping of evidence if you get caught.

If somebody's looking at your email and they bring you in, they don't even have the need in that policy to keep all the context of your emails. They'll take the one that you did wrong, and you've had it. I can tell you because I can tell you a person whose performance evaluation, because he complained about 5,800 emails being stopped for taking a course, is now called underperforming. I've received that, based on me violating 7.01. So, guess what? You can get out.

Finally, there's huge constitutional implications, and those involving academic freedom and personal property rights when we communicate with our colleagues. With that, that's the Committee of 11.

[Questions and Comments](#) [01:52:29]

- Senator Witte moved **[Motion 2025/26-47]** to table the email policy proposal and to not allow it to go into effect over Summer 2026. Motion was seconded.
- Vice Chair Hymel stated as Senate, it cannot stop a policy from moving forward. However, there can be a vote to object the proposal.
- Senator Ziurys stated she fails to understand why a policy that affects faculty so egregiously is allowed to be implemented without trye Faculty input and reviewing First Amendment rights and University policy. This is dictatorship and it is someone imposing their will on the faculty with no reasonable discussion.
- Senator Barefoot stated the comment period is open through May 6th. What has been seen with a recent controversial policy, is that it was extended another month. Just because the feedback period ends on May 6th doesn't mean it goes into effect immediately. It sounds like they will be considering this over summer so she believes it is important to give them as much feedback as they can handle, because they then have to go through more pieces during the consideration process.
- Senator Zeiders asked Senator Ziurys to clearly lay out the First Amendment rights she is referring to, in a concise matter, to the rest of the faculty. She would like to see where in the policy it says that.
- Senator Ziurys stated she uses her email to write reviews for journal articles, grant proposals, and this is proprietary information. The University has no business going into her email and finding how she reviews a proposal. The NSF does not release their reviews until they feel. They do not put this in the public record immediately.
- **[Motion 2025/26-47]** to table the email policy proposal and to not allow it to go into effect over Summer 2026. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 30 in favor, 5 opposed, and 3 abstentions.

11. **Adjournment [02:00:28]**

Chair Hymel stated she will announce the results of the Elections and send a letter to outgoing Senators via email. She hopes everyone has a wonderful Summer. The May 4, 2026, meeting was adjourned at 5:01 PM.

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

Motions of May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2025/26-40] to approve the agenda of the May 4, 2026, Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-41] to approve the April 6, 2026, minutes. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-42] to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council: *the Proposal UG Minor Forensic Anthropology*. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-43] to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council: *Undergraduate Transfer Credit policy proposal*. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-44] to approve seconded motion from the Undergraduate Council: *the Undergraduate course Syllabus Policy and Template proposal*. Motion passed by unanimous consent.

[Motion 2025/26-45] to postpone Non-Consent Agenda Item: Graduate Course Syllabus Policy proposal to the September 2026 Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion passed with 26 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention.

[Motion 2025/26-46] to pass the Resolution on Hiring Practices. Motion was seconded. Motion passed with 32 in favor, 5 opposed, and 4 abstentions.

[Motion 2025/26-47] to table the email policy proposal and to not allow it to go into effect over Summer 2026. Motion passed with 30 in favor, 5 opposed, and 3 abstentions

Attachments Within the Minutes

1. Page 1, Action Item 2: Approval of the [Agenda](#)
2. Page 1, Action Item 4: Approval of the [minutes of April 6, 2026](#)
3. Page 8, Action Item 7: Consent Agenda: [Proposal UG Minor Forensic Anthropology](#), [Undergraduate Transfer Credit policy proposal](#), [Undergraduate course Syllabus Policy & Template proposal](#)
4. Page 8, Action Item 8: Non-consent agenda – Chair of Graduate Council, Phillip Waddell: [Graduate Course Syllabus policy proposal](#) and [UGC response to questions](#)
5. Page 8, Old Business Item A: [Vote on the Resolution on Hiring Practices](#)

6. Page 12, New Business Item 10B: [Career Track Faculty Needs Committee update](#)
7. Page 12, New Business Item 10D: [Athletics Report](#)
8. Written reports
 - a. [Gen Ed Office with UWGEC](#)
 - b. [Provost](#)
 - c. [Undergraduate Council](#)
 - d. [Committee Annual Reports](#)

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456