

**MINUTES
SPECIAL SESSION FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 26, 2021**

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 Special Session Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle announced that schedules for Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee for the AY21-22 are posted on the Faculty Governance website. The Special Session meeting was called by Chair of the Faculty, Jessica Summers, to address important business that Faculty Senate has had inadequate time to discuss. May 3, 2021 will be a regular Faculty Senate meeting and the last meeting of the semester.

Present: Senators Acosta, Behrangji, Bourget, Brewer, Cooley, Dial, DiRoberto, Domin, Dong, Durán, Fink, Frey, Gerald, Ghosh, Hammer, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, McDonald, Milbauer, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Reimann, Rosenblatt, Ruggill, Sen, Singleton, Smith, Spece, Summers, Vedantam, Vega, M. Witte, and R. Witte.

Absent: Senators Brummund, Castro, Colina, Cuillier, Durand, Folks, Gephart, Gordon, Goyal, Hassan, Hildebrand, Hiller, Jones, Kaufman, Min Simpkins, Murphy, Oxnam, Provencher, Robbins, Rodrigues, Roussas, Russell, Slepian, Stone, Sulkowski, and Valerdi.

2. *INFORMATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: PROPOSED CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES AND SURVEY PREVIEW – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER

Brewer went through each revision and asked for comments on each item. 1) Adding the Chief Research Officer as an ex officio member of Faculty Senate, replacing the Vice President Representative appointed by the President. No additional administrator will be added. If voting privileges are removed for administrators, this position will be non-voting. 2) Adding an administrator to Senate Standing Committees has been modified for the administrators to be available should the committee and/or committee chair call on them to attend meetings. 3) Adding flexibility to include a Postdoctoral Scholar to shared governance committees. 4) Adding a Representative from UITS to Senate Executive Committee membership. 5) Remove references to SAC and APAC and replace with UArizona Staff Council, but retain the same number of representatives (two). 6) Removing "Point of View Informal Mediation" as the service Human Resources once provided in the grievance process. The formal process no longer exists. 7) A recommendation to include ex officio members from Faculty Senate on the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils, as well as University-wide General Education Committee. 8) Require that the Committee on Elections post vote totals following all General Faculty elections. 9) Reformat wording on Undergraduate and University-wide General Education Committee to mirror the format of Graduate Council. 10) Removing references to the College Academic Administrators Council, or CAAC, in the Constitution. 11) Replace references to University of Arizona South with The College of Applied Science and Technology. 12) Rescinding Bylaws change previously approved by Faculty Senate (but not yet voted on by the General Faculty) to require all faculty representatives to Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to be either elected or appointed by an elected Faculty Officer. Hudson feels that shared governance mechanisms will be threatened with appointments to the Councils. Hammer said that elected college bodies are usually consulted, not administrators, to choose the college representatives appointed to the Councils. Ghosh understands Hudson's concerns, but the matter is quite complicated. Colleges are asked to provide representatives to sit on each Council, but the mechanisms vary on how each college chooses its representative. Most colleges do not provide any mechanism for the college representatives on the Councils to obtain college insights of the programs being discussed. The same can be said for Faculty Senators. Are we here representing the college views or our personal views? 13) Removing voting privileges for administrators with ex officio appointments on Faculty Senate. McDonald said that the feedback he has received is supportive of this change to the Bylaws. Brewer clarified that other ex officio members of Faculty Senate who are not administrators will still have voting privileges. M. Witte questioned the procedure that the Chair or Vice Chair of the Faculty being responsible all the appointments for Senate Standing committees, as well as some other committees. A process involving Faculty Senate consultation would more likely ensure that the diverse expertise needed is fulfilled in a more non-partisan manner. Witte suggested having a call to Faculty Senate for nominations, and Brewer said that addition can be easily added. Witte also suggested that having candidate statements available prior to any election would be helpful, instead of seeing who is running for seats at the time a faculty member opens up the survey to vote. Brewer said that the process can be implemented moving forward without any additional change to the Bylaws. Acosta questioned the need for having ex officio members in Faculty Senate at all, and why the body is not a fully elected,

voting body. Acosta asked if a discussion on this topic would be welcomed at this time. M. Witte said that this issue has been discussed for over a decade, and even those who feel very strongly that Faculty Senate is a faculty body, also feel that specific administrators should be present for accountability purposes. Having administrators present provides the opportunity to ask questions and examine responses, and also allows Faculty Senate and the public to obtain administrators' reports and for administrators to know how faculty think about numerous issues. Bourget suggested having one Faculty Senate meeting once per semester or per year that is only for Faculty Senators to discuss and debate issues, or possibly planning a retreat. Hudson requested that the order of items one and thirteen be reversed. McDonald agreed that the order should be changed so it is less confusing. Brewer also noted that the wording in the first section had not been changed to reflect the proposal to remove voting privileges from *ex officio* administrators, and agreed to change the wording prior to the vote. McDonald also asked if there is a provision for the body to vote into Executive Session. Brewer replied yes.

3. DISCUSSION ITEM: HOW FACULTY SENATE WANTS TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES AS A BODY – ALL MEMBERS

Acosta said that the Faculty Senate meetings need to be structured so there are portions for information items, portions to approve items, and then time for the body to deliberate privately over items that it deems private. Hingle reiterated previous suggestions such as live voting in meetings and the inclusion of a Parliamentarian, as well as formats that have worked in past years to make things work better as a body. M. Witte said that the current structure has made voting a secret ballot within Qualtrics, and allows for proxy votes from members who didn't attend the meeting. When Chair Nadel was in office, one-half hour to forty-five minutes of each meeting was devoted to a discussion item/question. Also, PowerPoint presentations are overused and should not be used at all. McDonald agrees with Acosta's comments, and supports the appointment of a Parliamentarian. PowerPoint presentations can be posted to the agenda, with the presenters invited for Q & A and discussion, rather than using up time showing presentations frame by frame. Hammer said that many participants are elected from constituencies outside of Tucson, but attend the Faculty Senate meetings in person. In light of the pandemic, Zoom and Qualtrics voting are reasonable accommodations. Hingle added that Robert's Rules allows for secret ballots with Faculty Senate voting. The voting results are provided to Faculty Senators after every meeting. Witte said you have to make a motion for a secret ballot, and currently there is no choice. Co-chair of APPC Dysart said that offering meetings with Zoom affords people like Hammer attendance at meetings without a four-hour commute, and herself who have small children at home, and opens up the meetings to more people who otherwise could not be in attendance. Conducting meetings with Zoom is how business will be conducted in the future moving forward. Hymel asked if Qualtrics voting could be limited to only Faculty Senators who attend the meetings, thereby excluding those who don't attend. A large part of what's missing with voting in Qualtrics is seeing colleagues raise hands and show opinions on discussions and/or voting. Hymel agrees with Dysart that more virtual participation will be likely once meetings are held in person. Spece feels that it is against democratic principles for Faculty Senators not in attendance to be able to vote on Faculty Senate matters outside the meeting. Hingle asked for a motion to take an immediate vote by the raising of hands to affirm that Faculty Senate votes in the most democratic process by Faculty Senators. M. Witte moved **[Motion 2020/21-39]** to reaffirm in-person voting, either by hand raise, voice, or roll call, by only attendees of the Faculty Senate meetings. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Faculty Center staff will append Parliamentary Procedures to future agendas. Faculty Senators discussed obtaining a Parliamentarian, which has been absent for the last five or six years. Brewer said the problem is finding someone who is interested. Faculty Senators in the College of Law will reach out and see if anyone in their college is interested. Following the Open Meeting Law was introduced by Senator McDonald and the motion failed. McDonald suggested taking the parts of the Open Meeting Law that resonate with Faculty Senators and apply them to Faculty Senate meetings. Faculty Senators discussed the Office of the General Counsel, and its advisement on behalf of the administration. In conclusion, Faculty Senate is not a public body. Brewer encouraged Faculty Senators to offer opinions and suggestions outside of Faculty Senate meetings. Hingle advised Faculty Senators that the Faculty Officers have been holding Senate Office Hours every Tuesday afternoon at 4:00 p.m. to gather input, and the Discourse Forum is still available online for Faculty Senators to use. Acosta suggested that the hesitation or lack of involvement with the Faculty Senate Office hours outside of meetings could be related to the desire to talk about matters as a group. Time for discussion during meetings, as was done in past years, is an excellent way to gather input from Faculty Senators. Hammer said that when he has utilized the Faculty Senate Office Hours, it has been beneficial to solve issues that arise outside of Senate with a small group. Ghosh suggested having Faculty Senators make a list of issues that they wish to discuss and debate during meetings, and choose the most popular subjects listed. Neumann reminded the body that this approach, the Round Table Discussions, used to be an agenda item on a regular basis at Faculty Senate meetings three or four years ago.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 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.

There were no appendices.

Motions of the April 26, 2021 Special Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2020/21-39] to reaffirm in-person voting, either by hand raise, voice, or roll call, by only attendees of the Faculty Senate meetings. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456