

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
OCTOBER 5, 2020**

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/>

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Melanie Hingle, called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle reminded Faculty Senators that the Faculty Officers have every intention to stay within the two-hour time-frame.

**Present:** Senators Acosta, Behrangi, Bourget, Brewer, Colina, Cooley, Cuillier, DiRoberto, Domin, Dong, Durán, Durand, Fink, Folks, Frey, Gephart, Gerald, Ghosh, Gordon, Goyal, Hammer, Hassan, Helm, Hildebrand, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, McDonald, Milbauer, Murphy, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Provencher, Rafelski, Reimann Robbins, Rosenblatt, Roussas, Ruggill, Russell, Sen, Singleton, Slepian, Smith, Spece, Stone, Sulkowski, Summers, Valerdi, Vedantam, M. Witte, and R. Witte.

**Absent:** Senators Brummund, Castro, Dial, Hiller, Hymel, Min Simpkins, Oxnam, and Rodrigues.

**2. \*APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 14, 2020 (VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY)**

The minutes of September 14, 2020 were approved via Qualtrics survey. Witte pointed out that a report from the Senior Vice President for Research, Discovery and Innovation is missing from the report section. Being a major cost center of the University, Faculty Senate knows nothing about the income and expenditures for the role of shared governance. Witte would like SVP Cantwell to provide a report for the November 2020 Faculty Senate meeting and every meeting thereafter. Witte offered to make a motion, or incorporate her request at the discretion of the Faculty Officers. Hingle said she would take the suggestion under advisement, and there is no reason for a motion. Gordon added that the Research Policy Committee fully endorsed Witte's proposal at an earlier committee meeting this semester. Later in the meeting in reference to Witte's statement, Brewer noted that any member of the General Faculty may bring suggested changes to the Bylaws or Constitution (for example that the SVP for Research or the CFO attend Faculty Senate meetings as an *ex officio* member).

**3. \*ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED ONE-TIME ADJUSTMEENT TO SPRING 2021 CALENDAR TO MITIGATE SPREAD OF COVID-19 WITH RATIONALE (WILL BE APPROVED VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)**

Folks stated that the proposal is to restructure the spring academic calendar to remove spring break, and falls in line with recommendations from epidemiologists nation-wide in an effort to reduce travel and gatherings during the pandemic. All AAU Universities are taking spring break off their calendars. Different options were considered such as starting a week later, but the problem surfaced that there wouldn't be a break in the semester. Two seven-week session are run within the semester framework, there is a need to give an opportunity for grading to happen at the end of the first seven-week session before the second session starts, thereby requiring the start and end dates to remain intact. The decision was made to break up the spring break days into multiple reading days inserted into the calendar where possible, and align them with Tucson Unified School District's planned holiday days. Calendar adjustment has strong support by Pima County. Singleton asked what other institutions are doing. Folks responded that some are starting a week later, and some are doing what we are proposing, but the decision is individualized to what is going on at each campus and whether the institutions are on a quarter/semester system. Faculty Senators are concerned about courses scheduled as modules on weekly or bi-monthly basis, and the effect of random days off. Ghosh said that for faculty who have labs, it will be impossible to run two labs during the same week. The Provost's Office is working with groups to make sure that labs can function in a differing way from normal classes. Goyal asked if starting the days off after March would be more prudent, since the crises may subside by the January/February 2021. Folks responded that the problem is compensating the two seven-week sessions and losing instructional time in the second seven-week session. Planning does not encompass a vaccine or medical miracle by the first couple of months of 2021. Robbins added that he felt it was unlikely we would have a vaccine in general use until 2022. Folks addressed moving to different phases of reopening campus and teaching modalities in the spring semester. Summers moved **[Motion 2020/21-13]** to accept the proposed One-Time adjustment to Spring Calendar to mitigate spread of COVID-19. Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

4 **\*EXECUTIVE SESSION: CONFIDENTIAL NAMING REQUEST (WILL BE APPROVED VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)**

5. **OPEN SESSION: STATEMENTS AT THE PODIUM ON ANY TOPIC, LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES – MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPEAKERS IS FOUR. NO DISCUSSION IS PERMITTED, AND NO VOTES WILL BE TAKEN.**

Senator Smith addressed the Faculty Senate as the “Last Person Standing”, as Smith is the last Emeritus Faculty Member serving on or involved in Faculty Senate. For years it was traditional for there to be several Emeritus Faculty serving as Senators. In recent years, Emeritus lost that involvement. While there are many groups represented in Senate, Emeritus Faculty have never had representation. It was disheartening that recently some people associated with Senate took the position that since there was low involvement from our retired, old faculty, and it would be best if we simply could eliminate their involvement. That, of course, has been a typical approach to dealing with under-represented groups, especially when participation of an under-represented group is low. We need not ask “why?” “How did we promote this low involvement?” “How could we increase the involvement?” Or “what is being lost by the lack of involvement of this valued group?” Rather it is much easier to just say, “let’s get rid of them.” Ageism, or prejudice against the assets of older people, of course, is currently alive and well throughout the world and, consistent with that, the assets of UArizona Emeritus faculty go ignored by our own Senate. I understand that the Senate effort of a few weeks ago to totally eliminate Emeritus faculty needed to be changed as ABOR does not allow the elimination; so the conclusion was made that Emeritus/retired Faculty involvement must continue to be tolerated by Senate. WE can do better than mere toleration. Certainly, communication could be improved. The only UA email list of current Emeritus faculty is owned by Faculty Senate. The Senate proposal is to start cutting names off that list. I wish the Senate to consider an action that the Emeritus faculty listserv owned by Faculty Senate continue to be retained in its entirety so that Senate keeps the option to be able to communicate with all Emeritus Faculty.

Associate Professor at the UA School of Journalism and affiliated faculty of the Center for Latin American Studies, Mexican American Studies, and History departments, Celeste González de Bustamante addressed the Faculty Senate. As a member of the Coalition for Academic Justice and a member of the United Campus Workers of Arizona, it is González de Bustamante’s pleasure to invite faculty, staff and students and members of the public to the Coalition for Academic Justice UCW-AZ Local 7065’s inaugural State of the University Address. The event will happen from 12-1:15 pm and a flier with details about how to access the address is in the chat. Our University community has navigated many challenges the past six months that include: 1) the mishandling of the re-entry to campus, 2) hundreds of layoffs and non-renewals, drastic furloughs and pay cuts, 3) the Ashford acquisition, and 4) the lack of shared governance. In the midst of these challenges, UArizona staff, students, and faculty, from the CAJUA and UCW-AZ have provided much needed leadership during this time. In our State of the University Address, we will present an overview of our significant challenges, while also bringing all University community members together to build collective solidarity. We also will talk about how we can reimagine our University. We aim to create a more informed and collaborative University of Arizona community. We hope to see you there tomorrow at 12:00 pm. We thank you very much for your time!

6. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEM: REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, ASUA, GPSC, GFFAC, GLOBAL CAMPUS SENATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, APAC, CSC, RPC, APPC, SAPC, DEI, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, GRADUATE COUNCIL**

There were no questions. Summers mentioned the Discourse Forum used for campus communication. Because there has been no activity on the Forum in the last month, Summers questions whether or not the Faculty Center should continue to pay for it. Acosta feels the Discourse Forum should be maintained as a mechanism to reach out to fellow faculty and deliberate. Russell concurs that more information is better.

7. **INFORMATION ITEM: ESTABLISHING A BASIC STUDENT NEEDS TASK FORCE – STUDENT REGENT, ANTHONY RUSK**

Rusk mentioned a new Food Insecurity and Housing Work Group that has been established after the Board of Regents fielded several comments from faculty and student leaders concerning student hunger and food insecurity and housing concerns. In response, ABOR Chair, Larry Penley, has tasked the Student Regents with establishing a work group on student food and housing insecurity. Rusk saw the need first-hand working at the Campus Pantry. Food insecurity is the limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe food, or the ability to acquire such food in a socially acceptable manner. Housing insecurity is a broad set of challenges such as the inability to pay rent or utilities, or the need to move frequently. Sixteen percent of students at a four-year institution lost weight due to not having enough money to pay for food. The stigma of eating Ramen and peanut butter sandwiches has become exacerbated considerably by the rising costs of tuition and housing. The UArizona Campus Pantry (Pantry) has been growing at an exponential rate. Last year, predating COVID-19, the Pantry was serving 1000 students per week. Three tons of food was distributed weekly. The breakdown of students served are 56% female, 44% male, 50% Pell Grant or low SES, while 37% live on campus, 42% are first generation, and 16% are Honors students. The ethnicity demographic is 23%

Hispanic, 33% international, 24% white, 5% African American, 7% Asian American, 2% Native American, 4% two or more races, <1% Pacific Islander, and 2% unknown/other. When addressing enrollment, achievement, and retention, the basic needs security of students is at the forefront. According to a national 2016 census, 43% of students experience housing insecurity, while 14% experience homelessness. At UArizona, 20% of undergraduates often or always experience housing insecurity, and there are seventy-five active participants in Fostering Success with the number growing. Fostering Success is a program where students who have experienced housing insecurity or homelessness can obtain peer mentoring for a better chance of success at UArizona. In addition to peer mentoring, students can obtain support through building networks, referrals, mental health access, community/belonging programming, crisis intervention, and coordinator involvement. Through Fostering Success, there is approximately an 89% retention rate compared to 78% for the same group of students at UArizona. The program began in 2018 with twelve students, and currently with seventy-five students, has seen a growth rate of 700%. The Food Insecurity and Housing Work Group's focus will be to study and assess the scope of student food insecurity and housing needs. The group will evaluate existing practices and invoke best practices while gathering essential student data. Campus-based policies will be put in place and/or reassessed according to national standards. The effort stretches beyond the Arizona borders with peer institution collaboration. After the current data is assessed, the Workgroup will distribute surveys to students in an effort to broaden its data collection and dig deeper into students' needs that may not be apparent. Rusk asks Faculty Senate to help gather all entities surrounding student needs into one room to join forces widely to eliminate silos and competition, and increase collaboration and best practices for marginalized students across the enterprise. Ottusch asked if satellite campuses and community colleges were going to be included in the Workgroup's efforts. Rusk responded that the goal of the Workforce is to tackle the enterprise solution as a tri-University system and level itself across the board since UArizona is significantly farther ahead than other Universities. One of ABOR's goals is to increase the transfer rate of community college students to the Universities as Associate's degrees become less needed and Bachelor's degrees become more prominent. Hingle mentioned that SAPC Chair, Diane Ohala, is serving on the Student Needs Coalition, and more about the efforts of that committee's work is in the SAPC report linked to the agenda. Frey asked about the obstacle of UArizona being a "food desert." Rusk explained that "food desert" refers to the closest grocery store being more than one mile away from campus, making it inconvenient to shop for groceries if the student doesn't own a car. Other obstacles include digging deeper to find out what food insecurity looks like, and to what degree students may face hunger issues. The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program is plagued with regulations and bureaucracy, making it difficult for students to engage in that program.

8. **INFORMATION ITEM: COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION – CHAIR, STEPHANIE TROUTMAN, VICE CHAIR AND FACULTY SENATOR, ABRAHAM ACOSTA, AND INTERIM CHAIR, REBECCA TSOSIE**

Troutman opened by informing Faculty Senate about the history of the committee, as well as committee endeavors. The Committee for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) hopes to address campus concerns in an organized way in the context of Faculty Senate with consistency. Tsosie, former Vice Provost for Inclusive Excellence in Academic Affairs, submitted a report to President Robbins and Provost Folks on August 19, 2019 outlining best practices for the structure for diversity and inclusion at institutions of higher learning. Tsosie's take-aways from her thirty-page report are: 1) Representational diversity does not automatically create inclusion, 2) Inclusion requires a set of intentional practices and a commitment to redefine the institution's culture to reflect a shared sense of identity and belonging, 3) Equity is a process of creating equivalent outcomes for members of underrepresented or marginalized groups, and 4) "Inclusive Excellence" reflects an understanding that the University must adopt specific diversity goals that are in alignment with its academic and research mission in order to operationalize inclusion. Four goals are essential to the success of a University's "diversity" mission: 1) Achieve access and equity for underrepresented groups, including students, staff, administrators, and faculty, 2) Create a multicultural and inclusive environment for the entire campus community, 3) Enhance domestic and international research and scholarship around diversity issues, and 4) Prepare all students to engage in a diverse and international global society. Tsosie has studied peer institutions across the country, and when she was the University of California at Los Angeles last year, studied their model extensively to see what makes an institution effective with its DEI mission. Across the board, Tsosie found that centralized leadership was extremely important and desirable at the executive level. An effective implementation structure is necessary for each of the ten key functions associated with DEI at a large public University, including access to data and data-driven policies and innovation, as well as alignment of diversity and inclusion with the academic and research mission of the University. Tsosie discussed the assessment of diversity and inclusion at UArizona and its historical background, finding it astonishing. UArizona's Commission on the Status of Women was the first to receive an advance grant to look at the position of women minorities. UArizona laid the framework for Arizona State University to follow. Key findings are that DEI functions are distributed across campus and vary for faculty and students across colleges. Longstanding Campus Cultural Center and Diversity Community Councils are set up to serve particular groups, but little effort to build synergy or inform the campus about key needs or issues is overwhelming. A history of decentralized leadership exists since 2014, and numerous transitions of the Chief Diversity Officer appointments, and the appointment transitions between the Office of the President and the Provost's Office. Recent groups such as the Diversity Coordinating Council and Diversity Task Force have made significant contributions, but it's unclear whether the efforts were appropriately

recognized or translated into policy innovations for the University. UArizona has considerable institutional strengths and very strong potential for growth in key areas relevant to DEI, with a long tradition of diversity hiring and programmatic development for Native American and Hispanic communities, particularly in Law, Public Health, Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Education, American Indian Studies, and Mexican-American Studies. UArizona's Hispanic Serving Institution status is another key area of strength, and our Land Grant University status is important in serving rural and tribal communities in important and enduring ways. In conclusion, Tsosie urges Faculty Senators to read her report, and send her any comments or thoughts. As a Research One University, UArizona is poised to generate transformative research and scholarship on national and global diversity issues.

Acosta said that alongside the more immediate and specific need to map and synchronize DEI related resources throughout campus, we reserve the opportunity to call attention to and to create calls for deliberation on campus-related incidents of bias and discrimination. The DEI committee takes as its mission to create a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion at UArizona. More than a committee, we want to foster a culture of decision-making and organizational development with fully-aligned principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion on a more general institutional level on campus. The current model struggles to flourish. Historically, the University historically has proven to be hostile and antagonistic to integrating the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion into its fabric. The deeply hierarchical structure has demonstrated a way to effectively obstruct ground-level efforts at democratization and desegregation. If we indeed hold diversity, equity, and inclusion as closely as we publicly declare, we must be willing to admit that much, if not all, of our traditional organizational structure actively works against their taking root. We should be willing to take responsibility and go against our tradition and build it anew. Acosta offered three changes to better serve the institution: 1) Departmental units continue to be run, not by democratically elected chairs to serve on a rotating basis, but rather by department heads appointed at the pleasure of the dean, and left in their respective roles far longer than is acceptable. The practice often produces toxic environments in the unit and begs the question, how can a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion flourish when units are prevented from determining their own leadership. 2) An unprecedented increase in spending on University administration making this institution top-heavy with administrative bloat. Administration is no less diverse than it was twenty-five years ago than it is today. The bloat is subsidized inequitably by siphoning resources away from other areas on campus where it is desperately needed. Simply, it is difficult to rationalize the need for so much administration, particularly with how little diversity, equity, and inclusion are served. An equitable right-sizing of the University should begin by significantly reducing the number of administrative positions on campus and ensuring a better reflection of the make-up of the campus community. 3) Lastly, the Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – a document that serves as a reminder that senior leadership are obligated to allow faculty governance parties to actively participate in University decision-making. A document such as this comes about when there is compelling need. The very existence of a document such as this speaks loudly to an entrenched, hierarchical structure of campus governance at UArizona, and to the inequitable and non-inclusive effects it generates. Principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion cannot simply take root at an institution like UArizona, and will only flourish when we have a relationship with an administration that proves to us such a measure is no longer necessary. UArizona is best served when the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusiveness ground our attempt to promote a vision such as this. It is the mission of the DEI Committee to contribute in whatever way we can in order to have these values come to fruition. Fink emphasized that not only underrepresented minorities be considered, but also Foreign Nationals, since they are faculty, staff, and students, and also suffer from inequities.

## **9. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: OPEN MEETING LAW AND SENATE BUSINESS MEETING WITH Q & A – SENATOR DAN MCDONALD**

McDonald spoke to compliance with Open Meeting Law with regard to how Faculty Senate meetings are conducted. McDonald believes that every Faculty Senator would agree that we should conduct our meeting with the openness and transparency that we would expect of others. Therefore, we should comply with the basic stipulations of Open Meeting Law as a matter of principle, regardless of whether or not we are required to comply with that law. Currently, we do comply for the most part by notifying constituents when and where our meetings will be held, the topics to be discussed and acted upon, the public can attend our meetings, and we post the minutes. McDonald would like to address the few areas where we fall short. On occasion, discussion and action is taken on items not listed on the agenda, nor related to the agenda items. The statute states, "...the public body may discuss, consider, or decide only those matters listed on the agenda and other matters related thereto." The "other matters" clause allows some flexibility, but is construed narrowly to be open and transparent. Even if those actions are well-intended, which McDonald thinks they are, it is clearly a violation of Open Meeting Law. The consequence is that those actions can be considered null and void. Provisions are made for emergency situations, such as unforeseen circumstances, but procedures must be followed in those situations. The Faculty Senate agenda item seen every month is "New business." In Open Meeting Law, that is defined as a generic agenda item and does not meet the required specificity of notice. Consideration to change or stipulate that no discussion or action will be taken on items raised, or that New business can be an opportunity to recommend items for future agendas. McDonald moved **[Motion 2020/21-11]** that the Faculty Senate commits to complying with Arizona Open Meeting Law. Motion was seconded, and is detailed at the end of these minutes. M. Witte said that the body needs to act on emergent issues, but constricting speech and action will make it

more difficult to deal with those emergent issues that may come to the Faculty Senate floor. McDonald reiterated that this is law that we somewhat follow, there are provisions for emergency situations and complying is a matter of principle. Smith strongly agrees with Witte. More constraints are not the answer given the situations that are arising presently. Russell agrees with Witte, and also feels Faculty Senate should comply with Open Meeting Law as narrowly as possible, otherwise issues will not be able to be heard for two months. Liberal use of emergency procedures is necessary. Fink asked if there is a mandate to follow Open Meeting Law. Spece responded that there are many ambiguities to the law. Hingle said that we operate as an open meeting, and leaning that way is preferable. The free-for-all at times needs to be cleaned up. McDonald concurred with Spece, but believes Faculty Senate should comply on a matter of principle, thereby improving the mechanism for order. Many avenues exist to be nimbler than a two-month time-frame, but discipline and order do not obstruct unforeseen matters, especially if they are known in advance. Emergencies can be stated as such, and procedures for such can be followed. Otherwise, we reduce our credibility as a body. Dysart feels the debate is lost when an item is not agendized, and to the extent that we can be a better functioning body if notice is given to constituents allows for better feedback and discussion. Summers agrees with Dysart, and points out that from a workload perspective, new items brought up in the meeting do not allow for any time to review, language hasn't been submitted prior to the meeting, which puts added burden on Faculty Center staff to decipher proper wording, loading the motion to the Qualtrics survey, and distributing the survey for the vote. Summers feels Faculty Senators can do much better by coming to the Faculty Officers in advance of the meeting to discuss agenda items they would like to move forward. Witte said that in the principles of shared governance, rash, unforeseen decisions have been made requiring quick action for either an emergency meeting or the next upcoming meeting. Clear and precise wording needs to be enacted for a vote on this motion, and made clear what the narrow reading of the Open Meeting Law prescribes. Smith said that with the President and Provost presentations at Faculty Senate, advance notice of topics is not stated. If Faculty Senate is prohibited from acting on any topics raised in discussions or from questions that arise during those discussions, it is not in Faculty Senate's best interest. Russell concurs. Hingle moved **[Motion 2020/21-12]** to table **[Motion 2020/21-11]** until the next Faculty Senate meeting for further discussion due to time constraints. Motion was seconded and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

**10. DISCUSSION ITEM: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS WITH RATIONALE – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER**

Brewer presented the documents under review and explained that changes to the Constitution and Bylaws can come forward from any constituency on campus. Some revisions require a vote of the General Faculty at the Spring General Faculty election, others are housekeeping changes. Brewer referenced M. Witte's previous suggestion to add the Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact as an *ex officio* member of Faculty Senate, which would require a simple change to the Bylaws to add that person to the membership. Faculty Senate determines whether or not an item is a housekeeping item, or requires a vote of the General Faculty. The current revisions were put into a Qualtrics survey for commentary by Faculty Senators. Brewer explained that Emeritus faculty are currently included in the General Faculty definition and the proposed new definition will move forward to a vote. That would return to using the criteria for how Emeritus faculty had been included in the past (getting 5 years in the General Faculty after retirement and then automatic additional five-year terms upon request). That criteria had been removed some years ago because there was not a good mechanism for keeping track of requests. Brewer noted that now we have systems that can easily do that. Smith said that her understanding was that Emeritus did not have to request additional five-year increments for voting privileges. Hudson opposes the voting change to Emeritus faculty, and feels this group should be included with permanent enfranchisement. Frey asked why the percentage of voting faculty matters in any election. Brewer responded that Emeritus faculty, overall, are not engaged in college or campus activities, and less than one percent have voted in recent elections. Voting privileges are not a matter of exclusion, but a matter of willingness to participate. Bourget referenced Section VIII, which refers to visiting or adjunct faculty, and requested that it remain in the definition as an exclusion. M. Witte suggested an opt-out for Emeritus faculty, and asked that the Emeritus definition be removed from voting, and to continue the discussion at a later date. **[Motions 2020/21-14 – 2020/21-18]** passed via Qualtrics survey and are detailed at the end of these minutes.

**11. DISCUSSION WITH PRESIDENT ROBBINS AND PROVOST FOLKS**

Robbins reported the furlough end date may be announced sometime this week. A presentation will be made to SPBAC on Wednesday, October 7, 2020. Spece asked what was meant by the end of the furlough. Robbins explained that the end of the furlough will mean no more pay cuts. Spece asked for clarification on the difference between a pay cut and furlough. Robbins said they are essentially the same thing. Bourget asked how some of the groups like GFFAC and SPBAC have participated in the decision-making process for determining the furlough end date. Robbins responded that part of the process involves SPBAC with the better-than-expected tuition revenue outcome, which will be shared at the October 7, 2020 SPBAC meeting. The campus community will be notified when the end date is determined. McDonald asked about the hiring pause, and requested streamlining the process for grant-funded hiring waivers due to loss of funding. Robbins stated if anyone is having a problem with grant-funded hiring waivers, to please contact him personally. Discussion with Provost Folks was deferred to agenda item #3. Folks said the metric behind moving to

phase two of reopening is based upon the University's 0.16 infection rate. Classroom or laboratory settings have not been a source of spreading the virus on any of the AAU campuses. Extra tracking mechanisms are being put into place in the event there is an outbreak. Phase two of reentry will begin on October 12, 2020 for in-person classes. Folks said that faculty will have to work with the chair or director on managing teaching schedules with the new calendar proposal. Folks addressed rewriting faculty contracts to reflect both salaries. New contracts will be issued when the salary adjustment is made with regard to the end of the furlough. Frey asked specifically about rewriting the current contracts. Folks responded that not signing current contracts presents problems because unsigned contracts prohibit the issuance of a subsequent contract. The same standard language will appear in all contracts, and a new contract will be issued a month prior to the furlough ending. [Folks followed up with Senate after the meeting to clarify that new contracts would be issued a month after the furlough ended, not before]. Folks addressed election of teaching modalities in the spring semester. She and the deans elected to stand by the same process that was prescribed in the fall semester. It is up to the heads, chairs, and directors to work with the faculty member who may need temporary working conditions, or those who are risk. Folks said she is soliciting input from deans, chairs, directors, and department heads for guiding principals for changes to RCM that would better meet our needs. A group was put together in 2018 to come forward with recommendations, and the current comments fall in line with that report. The overarching suggestion is that RCM be made simpler and easier to understand. SPBAC will be involved in the process or realigning RCM. Personal days used as furlough days can stay intact until the end of the fiscal year. Singleton asked if teaching modalities for courses will be visible to students for the spring semester. Folks said she would forward the suggestion.

## 12. **OTHER BUSINESS**

Bourget asked for an update on the Graduate Policy. Hudson asked if Resolutions and motions could be posted publicly on the Faculty Governance website.

## 13. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:23 p.m.

**Michael Brewer, Secretary of the Faculty**  
**Jane Cherry, Recording Secretary**

### **Appendix\***

\*Copies of material listed in the Appendix are attached to the original minutes and are on file in the Faculty Center.

1. **Faculty Senate Minutes of September 14, 2020**
2. **Proposed One-Time adjustment to Spring 2021 calendar to mitigate spread of COVID-19**
3. **Report from the President**
4. **Report from the Provost**
5. **Report from Faculty Officers**
6. **Report from ASUA**
7. **Report from GFFAC**
8. **Report from GCSAC**
9. **Report from RPC**
10. **Report from APPC**
11. **Report from SAPC**
12. **Report from DEI**
13. **Report from Undergraduate Council**
14. **Report from Graduate Council**
15. **Establishing a Basic Student Needs Task Force**
16. **Memorandum from Regents Professor Rebecca Tsosie to Provost Folks dated August 19, 2019**
17. **DEI Committee PowerPoint Presentation**
18. **Open Meeting Law definition**
19. **Constitution and Bylaws revisions with rationale**

### **Motions of the October 5, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2020/21-11]** that the Faculty Senate commits to complying with Arizona Open Meeting Law. Motion was seconded. Motion was tabled for further discussion due to time constraints.

**[Motion 2020/21-12]** to table Motion **[Motion 2020/21-11]**. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

**[Motion 2020/21-13]** to approve Proposed One-Time adjustment to Spring 2021 calendar to mitigate spread of COVID-19. Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-14]** Constitution Change – Clarify how/if voting privileges change when a faculty member's home college changes. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-15]** Constitution Change – Provide options for Senate/Senators to call an emergency Senate meeting. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

**Motion 2020/21-16]** Constitution Change – Make governance participation (and responsibility) equitable across faculty types within the General Faculty at all levels. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-17]** Bylaws Change – Require the selection of faculty for shared governance representation to follow uniform processes at all levels and for all purposes, as spelled out in the MOU on Shared Governance Understanding. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-18]** Housekeeping Change - Constitution – Designated Campus Colleague faculty may not be members of the General Faculty, per ABOR policy. Replacing "Individuals" with "Employees" will exclude DCC faculty from the General Faculty, thus bringing our criteria into alignment with ABOR Policy. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456