

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 13, 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 Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle welcomed new Faculty Senators Addis, Alfie, Bolger, Citera, Devereaux, Downing, Haskins, Ijagbemi, Kline, Lucas, Mansour, Schulz, J. Smith, Su, Zenenga, and Ziurys. Hingle reminded the body that this is a Faculty Senate business meeting, and everyone is welcome to attend, but only Faculty Senators may participate. Any Senators wishing to participate are asked to raise their virtual Zoom hand, and please stay muted when not speaking. The preferred method of voting is by a show of hands, which was voted on at the April 2021 Faculty Senate meeting. Robert's Rules of Order also recommends a hand-raise as the default method for voting. Faculty Senators may raise a real hand on camera and wait until voting has concluded, but using one's "zoom" hand is preferred.

Present: Senators Addis, Alfie, Behrangi, Bolger, Bourget, Brewer, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, Devereaux, DiRoberto, Domin, Downing, Durand, Fink, Folks, Gephart, Gerald, Gordon, Goyal, Hammer, Haskins, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Ijagbemi, Kline, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Lucas, McDonald, Milbauer, Murphy, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Robbins, Rosenblatt, Russell, Schulz, Sen, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, S. Smith, Stone, Su, Summers, Valerdi, Vedantam, M. Witte, R. Witte, and Zenenga. M. Stegeman served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Dial, Jones, Mansour, Reimann, Rodrigues, Vega, and Ziurys.

2. INFORMATION ITEM: INTRODUCTION OF THE FACULTY SENATE PARLIAMENTARIAN AND PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURES – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MELANIE HINGLE, AND PARLIAMENTARIAN MARK STEGEMAN

Hingle introduced Professor Stegeman from Eller College of Management, the new Faculty Senate Parliamentarian. The Faculty Senate has been absent a Parliamentarian for approximately ten years, and with continual improvements being made to the way Faculty Senate meetings are being conducted, and at the request of Faculty Senators, interested parties were sought to fill this important position. Stegeman was an experienced leader in governance at Tucson Unified School District where he served as Chair of the Governing Board, and in that capacity helped streamline and revise how the Board operated to allow greater focus on substantive issues. The Parliamentarian is a non-voting member of Faculty Senate and Senate Executive Committee and reports to the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate. Procedural questions should be directed to the Presiding Officer, and the Parliamentarian will then be asked to weigh in, as appropriate. Stegeman shared a PowerPoint presentation, introducing Parliamentary Procedure. Stegeman explained that the primary role of the Parliamentarian is to regulate disagreement and provide an orderly way to express and resolve disagreement. Benefits of regulating disagreement are 1) an orderly process for considering minority views, which can improve outcomes; 2) allows the body to move through its business efficiently, while allowing consideration of dissenting views; 3) adds legitimacy to the process internally. Members on the losing side of a debate are more likely to accept outcomes if they believe their views have been properly heard and votes properly taken; and 4) a strong process helps protect the body from external criticism, from whoever disagrees with the results. The roles of the Parliamentarian are to report to and advise the Presiding Officer, intervene if a procedural error has occurred, make no decision via vote, and answer questions posed by the Presiding Officer. Stegeman explained that the formal authorities for governing the body are Arizona Statutes, ABOR policies, the Faculty Constitution and Bylaws, Robert's Rules of Order, and the Presiding Officer, who has ultimate authority. Other documents also have relevance to Faculty Senate by age or origin, but those boundaries are not precisely clear. They are the Guidelines for Shared Governance (2005), Parliamentary Procedures to Accomplish Three Fundamental Objectives (2010), and Faculty Senator Guide to Shared Governance and Communication (recent). Stegeman will look at all documents in order of priority and hopes to resolve any issues that arise. The Faculty Senate is unusual in having no clear and internally adopted set of procedural rules. The listed documents do not combine to form a coherent whole. The main problem is the documents do not fit together and have obvious gaps. The Office of General Counsel has recently opined that Faculty Senate is not subject to Open Meeting Law. Stegeman offered that some portions of Open Meeting Law may interest Faculty Senate for adoption, but Stegeman's experience with Open Meeting Law with TUSD was not positive. Two basic principles for debate are to limit time allocated to speakers so all sides may speak and to disallow personal criticisms and allegations concerning motives. Debate ends by resolution by vote of the issue being debated, or by action of the Presiding Officer, or two-

thirds vote by the body (for cloture or a time limit). Most motions require a second, and a second is required before debate. Otherwise, the motion fails immediately. Motions must state clearly and completely their content so there is no ambiguity in the text or substance of what the body may approve. This statement may refer to written text submitted before the meeting. Seconded motions do not formally exist until the Presiding Officer recognizes that a motion is on the floor. If there is any ambiguity in the statement of the motion, then the Presiding Officer must restate it precisely for the record, which is good practice. The minutes must include the exact statement of any adopted motion. Stegeman will issue a summary taxonomy of main kinds of motions. The Senate Executive Committee sets the distributed agenda, but Robert's Rules states that that agenda does not become official and binding until the body accepts it, hence the reason for the addition of an agenda item to approve the agenda. The Faculty Senate adopts the distributed, or modified, agenda by majority vote at the beginning of the meeting. Once the agenda is set, it can be revised further by a two-thirds vote. McDonald asked what the process was for selecting Stegeman as Parliamentarian, and what is Stegeman going to do to refrain from offering opinions on the content of debate. Stegeman replied that he is committed to remaining neutral in his job as Parliamentarian, and agreed with McDonald that his opinions on Open Meeting Law were unnecessary. Hingle responded to McDonald's first question, that two people were nominated for the position of Parliamentarian, both were qualified, both had different perspectives, and the Faculty Officers chose Stegeman.

3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Presiding Officer Hingle explained that Parliamentarian Stegeman suggested being as inclusive as possible with the Faculty Senate agenda setting process, and having Faculty Senate approve the agenda at the beginning of every meeting, which will allow Faculty Senators the opportunity to address emergent issues should they arise. Approving the Faculty Senate agenda will now be a standing agenda item for all meetings. Hingle moved [**Motion 2021/22-1**] to accept the agenda as written. Downing seconded the motion. Presiding Officer Hingle corrected a procedural error later in the meeting to ask for discussion and a vote. [**Motion 2021/22-1**] passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

4. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2021

The minutes of May 3, 2021 were approved with five abstentions.

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 Little introduced herself as a Career-track Principal Lecturer and opened by thanking those who developed the UArizona COVID-19 protocols and acknowledged that many have been helpful in managing the stressful and uncertain time. Today, Little is representing her colleagues' growing concern regarding several instances of students in classrooms testing positive for COVID-19 and the protocol that forbids them from taking action to protect themselves and their students. The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) defines exposure as being within six feet of an infected person for fifteen minutes or longer. Most the classes at UArizona preclude social distancing and classes are longer than fifteen minutes. Furthermore, it is unknown who in our classrooms are vaccinated and instructors cannot ensure that students are properly masked at all times. There have been repeated occurrences of students talking in class one day and after attending the next class meeting, informing their instructors that they have tested positive. After a known exposure, the CDC recommends getting tested three to five days after exposure. This means classes continue for at least a week before those exposed should have a test much less receive results. The protocol states that an instructor cannot inform other students or transition online until hearing from the contact tracer or Dean of Students. After over seven days, neither the instructors nor students in these classes have been contacted. Faculty need to have control of their classes. Instructors feel that withholding information from the students is unethical. Everyone has a right to know that they have been exposed to COVID-19. Everyone has the right to go and have a test after exposure. Everyone's living situation is different. Not informing students immediately does not give them the opportunity to make an informed decision about getting a test and adjusting their behavior. Faculty and students need to have the agency to make the best decision to protect themselves and countless others that they are in contact with. Thank you.

6. Q & A ON REPORTS OTHER THAN THOSE FROM THE PRESIDENT OR PROVOST

There were no questions.

7. INFORMATION ITEM: SUMMARY OF CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES AND CHANGES TO UHAP COMING TO SENATE FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE VOTE IN OCTOBER – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER

Brewer was absent at this point in the meeting due to technical issues, so Hingle moved [**Motion 2021/22-2**] to table this item for discussion until the October Faculty Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Fink pointed out that votes

were not taken after the motion was seconded for this item and Agenda Item Three. Votes were then taken for both items. **[Motion 2021/22-2]** passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. M. Witte asked if the Presiding Officer, except in purely procedural matters, does not make motions. Motions are made by the body so the Presiding Officer can maintain neutrality on the issue. How is the Parliamentarian going to handle this in Faculty Senate. Stegeman responded that he did not see that restriction in the Faculty Bylaws. Robert's Rules of Order does not require the Presiding Officer to abstain from making motions, that rule is up to the discretion of the body. Witte affirmed that her point is discretionary, generally the discretion of the Presiding Officer is that they will come down on either side of an issue and leave it up to other members of Faculty Senate in order to maintain neutrality on something that may be controversial. Stegeman said that he cannot enforce a rule that he does not see in writing. The body may adopt that rule if it so chooses.

8. INFORMATION ITEM: FACULTY SENATE PRIORITIES BASED ON THE FACULTY SENATE POLL – CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, JESSICA SUMMERS

Summers shared a PowerPoint to show an example of what most Faculty Senators indicated was of main concern in the poll, academic freedom and freedom of speech. Summers brought this item forward to give Faculty Senators the opportunity to discuss whether further involvement in the poll was needed because less than half of Faculty Senators participated. ABOR has its own policy on academic freedom and freedom of speech, which was revised recently and included input from the Arizona Faculties Council. It states that "Universities must strive to ensure the fullest degree of intellectual freedom and freedom of expression." At UArizona, the Chicago Principles were adopted in December 2018 as part of the underlying mechanism for academic freedom and freedom of speech. UHAP Chapter 7 was also revised to include reference to academic freedom and freedom of speech. The poll revealed that people were concerned about, 1) legislative impact on academic freedom, and 2) looking for bias in faculty social media posts. Summers brings this in front of Faculty Senate to see if, a) the Faculty Senate wants to pursue this as a discussion item or topic of conversation in teacher meetings, or b) if anyone has anything to add to this topic. Items raised in the poll may be worth looking into either with an ad hoc committee or an existing committee to make sure that everyone understands the policies well enough to interpret them correctly and make good decisions moving forward. Addis asked for clarification on "bias and faculty social media." Summers responded that her interpretation is that faculty have social media accounts where they choose to express themselves publicly about their area of expertise and sometimes not in their area of expertise. As private citizens, one policy governs, but as members of the University community with areas of expertise there's another policy. There are "trolls" who go after faculty on social media for things that they have said and views they have expressed. Hudson asked if there was a committee that could look at this issue and report on it. Hingle responded that APPC might be the appropriate committee, since they've looked at similar issues. Fink asked if the issue was protecting faculty who post on a private account or reinforcing the University rules. A comment in chat asks if someone were to preambule a statement by saying they are posting as a private person and not as a faculty member is valid for reprieve. Clarification on what the issues are is necessary in order for a committee to examine those topics. Stegeman asked for restatement of the question. Hingle replied that this is more of a solicitation of the body for comments on what Summers is mentioning, or asking for feedback on whether or not Faculty Senate should have a discussion on the topic of academic freedom and freedom of expression at a future meeting, or something more general. Summers responded that if there is enough interest in these topics, and if Faculty Senate wants to discuss these issues because they resonate with the body as issues that need to be discussed, then the Faculty Officers can plan for an agenda item. If Faculty Senate sees that these topics are already addressed through the University's policies, then no discussion is needed. Slepian stated that this is a very slippery slope getting into the issue of social media posts, and advises that investigation needs to be done to see if there have been any problematic instances that anyone is aware of that need to be discussed. Beyond that, the more generic issue is if it's not a major issue currently, it could become a major issue in terms of discussion, but if there are some particular instances that are egregious or problematic, they should be brought to light rather than having a general discussion. Hymel reiterated Summers' initial comment that participation on the survey was low, and suggested getting more input from Faculty Senators a second time before deciding on an agenda item. Hurh agreed with Hymel. Because time is limited, it's difficult to make a priorities list on what Faculty Senate wants to do without knowing what might be kicked out of discussion as a result. After more responses are in, having a thematic list will allow the body to prioritize the interests of Faculty Senators.

9. INFORMATION ITEM AND Q & A: REMARKS BY PRESIDENT ROBERT ROBBINS AND PROVOST LIESL FOLKS

Folks shared a PowerPoint presentation and updated Faculty Senate on student retention rates. UArizona's first time/first year/full-time cohort retention rate is a tremendously important metric for the University, which is used extensively in rank and reputation measures. At the onset of the summer of 2021, numbers looked grave. The cohort was the group of students who had the end of high school disrupted by the beginning of the pandemic and came into their first full academic year in a discombobulated fashion and retention has been difficult this year. Folks would like to acknowledge the people across campus who came together to give their all to work on this group of students. The good news is that UArizona had its second highest level of retention in history. The bad news is the rate is still a drop from the prior year, 84% this year versus 85.5% the previous year. This particular group of students have struggled through

some very serious trauma because of the pandemic with lingering impacts that will be with them for quite some time. A tremendous amount of work is still ahead to maintain retention rates where they need to be. Folks offered resources and updates to address Little's concerns in Open Session. Folks requested that the campus community refer to the [COVID19.arizona.edu](https://www.arizona.edu/covid19) webpage and to please refer other people to that page. Because the pandemic continues to bring new circumstances, new information is consistently offered on the webpage. Work with coordination and advisory committees across campus means new information changes frequently. UArizona has worked hard to try to drive traffic to this webpage and keep the latest, up-to-date information in one place rather than replicating information over different websites. Another webpage highly recommended for frequent viewing is the Faculty/Instructor Resources at provost.arizona.edu/content/pac. The Academic Coordination group meets a couple of times a week and updates are made frequently with FAQ's that are received from instructors and answered as quickly as possible so the nexus between instruction and the pandemic are kept up-to-date. Folks thanked the Academic Coordination Committee led by Tina Deemer and Rob Stephan for their amazing work. Two webinars by faculty are available on the contact tracing program and vaccines and variants. Many questions have been fielded on temporary modified work conditions for faculty, which is the structure around situations where individuals feel that they need some modification to their work circumstances because of either their own risks because of the pandemic or they have caretaking responsibilities that put them into an at-risk category. Folks reiterated that academic unit leaders are absolutely responsible for course modality decisions that can be made, and always have been aside from the pandemic circumstances. When people need some sort of modification to their work conditions, the protocol is to work with the unit leader. The reason being that often if one change is going to be made, it creates a ripple effect through the entire academic program/department. The leaders work very hard to balance the evolving needs of individual instructors and faculty with our commitments to the students, and significant commitments have been made to students for in-person learning. Many may recognize that students in most cases are very grateful to be on campus and to be building a sense of community. Folks asks for patience because leaders are working very hard to make sense of and match the needs of their instructors/faculty with the needs of students and academic programs. Folks also points out that not everyone's wishes are going to be met. In-person work is required in many instances, and in the cases where people need leaves of absence, Human Resources teams have developed processes for those cases. Information about the processes are online at the link given, and if people have healthcare related issues and need support, Disability Resource Center (DRC) is available for support, but there is no need to involve DRC if an arrangement can be made with the academic leader. If circumstances involve caregiving responsibilities, that is outside the purview of the DRC. With those cases, we have asked Human Resources Specialists to step in if support is needed with an academic leader. Human Resources Specialists have more creative solutions to work around caregiving obstacles. Folks discussed the student COVID test – positive actions, which was sent in an email. Information from an individual student to an individual faculty member is often inaccurate. One circumstance is a student will say that they have COVID-19 and will not be coming to class. A person doesn't have COVID-19 until they have a positive test result back, and 95-90% of people who get tested for COVID-19 didn't contract it, and are suffering from another symptomatic, respiratory disease. The University is very intentional with that information and require students to go through the process that is required, which is to reach out to Campus Health Services with any health concerns and follow the Centers for Disease Control guidelines for isolation, fill in the safe notification form so that contact traces can start its process, and remind the student of their obligation to upload a positive test result if they have one. All positive cases are followed up on. Instructors are asked to fill in a reporting tool. Supervisors are asked to do a workplace protocol form, and the epidemiologists follow through on the next steps behind the scenes. Many people become alarmed when learning that a student they were in close contact with tests positive because no one follows up with that person, but the matter of human perception can be deceiving from the student's perspective or the contact's perspective. The University has an obligation not to reveal anyone's healthcare information to anyone else, and everyone at the University also needs to be protective of each individual's personal information while managing the pandemic. Folks stressed that the University has no documented cases of outbreaks in classroom settings. Although UArizona was not in high density operation last semester, many Universities across the country were, and like us were running intensive contact tracing processes, specifically looking for outbreaks in classrooms. That data shows that even classrooms operating at full capacity with everyone wearing face masks do not create spreader events. The data have been very robust on safety in classrooms as long as everyone keeps wearing face coverings. Milbauer inquired on behalf of several colleagues to clarify the modality change question. There seemed to a misunderstanding that any modality change request had to start with a pedagogical improvement argument. Is that no longer the case? And if it's a caretaker situation, does the decision then reside at the more localized level and not at the Provost Office? Folks responded to the first question that it was true for his academic unit when leadership was working to deliver on a commitment to students for in-person learning while balancing other issues. Quite a few faculty discovered that they did very well with hybrid learning circumstances, and campus didn't have the capacity for vast numbers of hybrid classes, so Associate Deans were asked to be thoughtful about a pedagogical advantage. The reason was that students with back-to-back classes were released to quickly get into a hybrid learning class found they had no quiet space to engage in a hybrid/online class. Decisions of this nature are being made at the local level. Folks said that pedagogy doesn't enter into caretaking situations. Unit heads are the main contact, but all changes go to the Provost's Office for final approval. Hudson wanted to clear up some contradictions in chat. For those people who do not have the safety net of the vaccine, can those people have a direct answer from their supervisor within three days. On the website that was given, it says that the decision is made at the Provost's level. What is the turn-around time?

Folks said she didn't have sufficient data, because she doesn't know when the conversation starts between the faculty member and their supervisor. Hudson asked if Folks could make a commitment to decide in twenty-four hours from the time she receives the request. Folks said that twenty-four hours is usually the turn-around time as decisions are made very quickly. Hudson said that since the Provost has an admirable commitment to students' needs and students' privacy, morale among faculty and staff would improve if Faculty Senate heard a clear statement of the same commitment to our working conditions. There are people for whom the vaccine and progressive vaccine coverage is not enough. The letter signed by concerned faculty sent the previous week was never answered. What is Plan B should the next variant of the disease prove to be more transmissible in classrooms? Folks responded that there are an enormous range of tools at our disposal; tracking the disease through wastewater-based epidemiology, testing on campus, and all tools can be ramped up. Whether vaccinated or not, Folks urges everyone to get tested regularly because it's difficult to tell what the health of the community is unless testing data comes in, but testing mandates are not possible because of Legislative conditions in the state. No matter what arises in the Coronavirus category, a process is in place with the tools to solve the problems. Folks can't imagine at this point that UArizona is not prepared to deal with whatever direction the pandemic heads, including shutting down campus. The campus has demonstrated extraordinary resilience in adjusting to the changing circumstances and are ready to adapt. Fink referred to the tools available, and would like to focus on the ventilation of classrooms and lab spaces. Facilities Management is supposedly adhering to the CDC guidelines, and in particular ASHRAE Standard 62.1. Why does Facilities Management list six-hour changes per hour as the baseline when the ASHRAE 62.1 The standard clearly provides a formula for the outflow air flow in the breathing zone, meaning in that room, which is dependent on the square footage of the space, the number of people in the space, the air required in accordance with the activity happening in that space (lecture versus construction in a lab) and the outflow air flow rates required for unit areas. In other words, one number doesn't fit all. How is this being addressed? Folks thanked Fink for his accurate explanation. Folks responded that there's many answers to that question, and when there's an enormous facilities operation, it's difficult to be granular at the communications level. The University has a number of small, portable carbon dioxide monitors that can be shared with any instructor who would like to test the airflow circumstances in their classroom and retrieve accurate data in that moment about the air flow situation in the classroom. Dancers in a classroom is quite different than students sitting studiously reading textbooks. The reason monitoring Co2 in the classroom is interesting is because it's a great indicator for the degree to which air is being exchanged in the room, but not if there are any levels of COVID-19 present. Please reach out to the Provost or Nina Bates and the appropriate person will be referred to help you. Fink said the ASHRAE Standards do provide for the activity in the classroom, but the question is if Facilities Management is actually adhering to the necessary turnaround as dictated by the formula versus saying they tried to do six turnarounds per hour. For example, Fink asserted that his classroom is only 64% covered, but according to Facilities Management it's 100% covered so there's a bit of discrepancy. Hurh asked about the process by which the unit directors make an affirmative decision for a faculty member, but then the Provost's Office can approve or deny that decision. Because some faculty have been turned down at the Provost level after having been approved at the unit level, what criteria is Folks using to make a different distinction between those proposals the unit heads have approved. Folks said to her recollection, she's only denied one case based on the fact it was not a strong argument. Hurh was aware of one case, and Folks and Hurh will discuss the situation privately. Hudson stated that the environmental indicators Fink spoke of, as well as the other tools for testing, the campus community would like to know that they are actively being used. The best indicators as contingency plans are being made, are the intelligent, thoughtful, hardworking people on the front lines, and it would be reassuring to know there is a direct and quick turnaround. Folks reiterated that everything that is being done is driven by UArizona's extraordinary faculty leaders. All PACC and PHACT members' names are online. No decisions are made without consultation from many experts to guide us through next steps forward. Wastewater data comes in every evening and is discussed the next morning, and is one of many monitoring systems in place. Folks can't stress enough how much time and effort so many people are dedicating to this extraordinary campus-wide effort. Fink said that there are many administrators and staff members who are currently working remotely, and what were the qualifying criteria applied to grant them that privilege, and what would need to change for faculty to be granted the same privilege. Folks responded that the only substantive team members who are working remotely is the IT team, and the reason being a space problem. Immuno-compromised or health compromised individuals have worked with their individual managers to decide whether remote work could be made possible, either on a part-time basis to reduce risk in some cases, or in many cases, extending working hours. What we learned through the pandemic is that students felt they were getting better service when we extended working hours. In some cases where staff are student facing, we've offset shifts to reduce density of people in individual workplaces. Fink asked if faculty were more disadvantaged. Folks responded that advisors actually have more face-to-face student responsibilities than instructors, and faculty have an advantage over most staff on how and where they want to work. Fink asked what happens if a faculty member falls sick. Folks responded that protocol has been worked out with Deans, Directors, and Department Heads. Normal protocol will be followed. The faculty members work with the unit leader to determine whether they are going to deliver a few classes online or if they are unwell, to have someone else step in for them for that period of time. All test results are reported to Pima County, making it impossible for anyone to hide a positive result.

Robbins spoke to the ICS and PHACT teams, as well as Assistant Vice President for Facilities Management, Chris Kopach's efforts to provide the highest-level filtration beyond what is required. Robbins suggested that Fink contact

Kopach to make sure the reading is correct. Robbins' understanding is that Facilities Management is looking into every classroom in every building to try to ensure that not only air turnover is above and beyond minimum standards, but also providing filtration and Co2 monitors mentioned by the Provost. Robbins is not sure how faculty members go about obtaining the Co2 monitor. Folks responded that any faculty interested can send her an email and she'll find out from Kopach who is gathering requests. Robbins thanked the campus community for all efforts put forth during this time. Compared to last year at this time, a 17% positivity rate is now below 2%. Senator Gerald was published in the *Arizona Daily Star* saying he was optimistic about where the pandemic numbers are headed. Holiday weekends and football games usually generate a spike in numbers, and waiting a few more weeks will be wise. As Hudson mentioned, there is a safety net with the vaccine. Over 50% of faculty staff and over 50% of students have downloaded vaccination statuses, and Robbins' sense is that the numbers are higher than that. If bloodwork were obtained to look at antibody levels on campus the numbers would be much higher because so many have been infected. Robbins encourages everyone, and this discussion is germane to all the issues that we are talking about today, if individuals have special circumstances, the Provost is overseeing a very workable process. The Disability Resource Center is involved, but anyone who is immunocompromised, undergoing cancer treatment, experiencing caretaking obstacles, please let us know. Robbins is enormously grateful to all the faculty who are providing in-person instruction compared to what was happening last year. Putting vaccination status aside, the key is testing, and we are not testing enough. It is Robbins' hope that the takeaway testing introduced today that will make it easier for individuals to get tested will be a help but not enough, and short of mandating vaccines or frequent testing, best efforts and practices are in effect. The use of wastewater epidemiology is helpful because if cases are uncovered, it allows for direct mandated testing. For every dormitory where there's been a wastewater hit, The University has received approval from the State of Arizona for mandatory testing for the residents occupying the dorms/buildings, including high-rises. The mandate ability in the high-rises is less stringent than the University's own residential facilities, but the wastewater epidemiology allows for mandatory testing. Testing is key because breakthrough infections, as with the Delta variant, means the person is not as sick but is highly more contagious and transmissible than the original strain. Globally vaccinated populations are the only cure. There is relatively good compliance with masking in classrooms, but transmission is not necessarily in the classroom. In the first couple of weeks of the new semester, over 50,000 disposable masks have been used. Milbauer asked about the low testing rates, and thanked Robbins for acknowledging them, but looking at that dashboard, 10,000 individuals tested in the last six weeks. The University has 16,000 employees and 46,000 students, or a 16% testing rate over six weeks, divided by six weeks is 2.7%. Milbauer also asked for reiteration of mandatory testing in conjunction with wastewater epidemiology. How does Dr. Richard Carmona's presence working with Governor Ducey impact the University's ability to make changes for vaccination and testing mandates? Robbins responded that once the University receives approval from the State to do mandatory testing of all residents of a facility where a positive wastewater hit occurs, all testing has to be completed within one month. Testing is done weekly. Testing rates are extremely low, considering in terms of capability being elevated from last year to perform up to 3,000 tests daily and currently at approximately 1,700 daily. With regard to Dr. Richard Carmona, Robbins feels it a positive move for the University. Having Carmona close to the Governor and his influence on mandatory vaccines/testing may take some time, but with the low numbers currently, isn't sure if his influence will prevail. McDonald asked if the current mask mandate stay in place beyond September 28, 2021 or the date that the statute goes into effect. Robbins replied that using the word "mandate" is being replaced with "requirement," and yes, it will continue all year under these conditions. In all the meetings previously held during the onset of the pandemic, no one saw the coming of the Delta variant or it being this effective at mutation. Delta is the survivor of all variants so far, and once contracted, antibodies will be in place for a year to eighteen months. Serology testing is available if anyone is concerned about levels of antibodies. Dudas added that another in-state University took a rather confrontational approach, which led to the Executive Order. UArizona works closely with public officials, and as Robbins pointed out, no mask mandate is in place but required masking is in place in classrooms and on campus. Two dormitories previously tested positive, with three more today with very low rates, but nevertheless, gives the University the opportunity to perform required testing. The University's platform is at the working level rather than at the political level. Murphy reiterated Robbins' comment about the variant, and colleagues have expressed concern that live online is not being offered as a teaching modality in spring 2022. Is this true, and if that decision has been made, why? Is there any wiggle room for it to be offered should the virus continue to be prevalent at this level. Folks responded that live online was offered as a pandemic measure and created confusion with iCourses and other online modalities. Sustaining live online will be a struggle due to market-driven reasons, as well as supporting students who are taking that class in between in-person commitments. Folks doesn't believe it will disappear forever, but hasn't had time to manage this aspect moving forward in a thoughtful way that serves the University's and student's needs. The decision was made before the Delta variant arrived. There is interest in how much enthusiasm there is from the faculty side for doing more live online when returning to relatively normal operations, and this issue will be raised with GCAAC and UCAAC. Robbins said he is always available for anyone to reach out to continue discussions of this nature.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION

Hingle moved [**Motion 2021/22-3**] to enter into Executive Session. Motion was seconded, passed, and is detailed at the end of these minutes. All Observers were asked to leave the meeting. Senators remained.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:17 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 May 3, 2021**
2. **Parliamentary Procedures**
3. **Faculty Senate Poll**

Motions of the May 3, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2021/22-1] Motion to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-2] Motion to table the Constitution and Bylaws presentation until the October Faculty Senate meeting because Senator Brewer was absent. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-3] Motion to move into Executive Session. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456