

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
AUGUST 3, 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 online. Hingle urged Senators to peruse the online meeting agenda; links to presentations are added continuously throughout the week for accessibility. Voting members of Faculty Senate and presenters are allowed to speak at Faculty Senate. The Faculty Officers invite suggestions on how to make these business meetings more functional for everyone. Many reports and presentations are not received until the day of the meeting. Every Tuesday from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m., the Faculty Officers will hold Office Hours to offer this time for the campus community to discuss concerns on any topic pertaining to Faculty Senate meetings and its functions. Faculty Senate is moving in timely, decisive action to respond to the campus community's craving for a more responsive Faculty Senate. Courtesy and professionalism are paramount in business meetings, and personal attacks will not be tolerated.

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

Absent: Senators Hiller and Reimann.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 6, 2020 (VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY)

The minutes of July 6, 2020 were approved with two abstentions.

3. 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.

Associate Professor in Women's and General Studies, Sandra Soto, addressed the Senate. Soto referred to herself as a "Cajuaña," and referenced those members of the Coalition for Academic Justice at the University of Arizona who identify as women. Cajuaña is an endearment that speaks the intimate and necessarily resilient Spanish idiom of the US/Mexico Borderlands, a Borderlands that, to invoke the late Gloria Anzaldúa, is always already wounded by settler colonialism, partition, neglect, and attrition of human life. Soto spent this past weekend trying to muster energy to strategize how best to use these two-minutes to amplify CAJUA's unwavering commitment to social justice and compassion. But every time she started jotting notes, she was taken by waves of grief. Soto speaks today as a grief-stricken daughter who lost her mother in April, her uncle two weeks ago, and her father last Sunday. Two of these deaths were hastened by COVID. All three of Soto's people died too soon. Bodies already attacked by cancers, high blood pressure, strokes, and diabetes. Illnesses that like COVID-19—*ravage* the *already* worn-out, busted-up, exhausted, de-valued bodies of people of color, Black people, Indigenous peoples, poor people. As Anzaldúa also wrote, to be born Mexican is to be born old. Soto doesn't pretend in these two minutes to have the kind of detached intellectual composure expected of a guest at a Faculty Senate meeting. And, in fact, *wants* the Senior Leadership Team—Robert Robbins, Liesl Folks, Lisa Rulney, Brent White (to name a few) to hear her pain. Soto also wants *any* of the rest of you here today who still have faith in those people to listen. Because all of the senior leadership team are about to steer the campus into a life-threatening experiment in which so many people in the already wound-filled borderlands will find themselves in my position. No one wants to be here, where I am. Phone calls in the middle of the night, unable to travel to hospitals a few states away, unable to honor the passing of your loved ones. No funeral. No ritual. And, perhaps most tragically, people will die alone—and they will *understand* that they are dying alone, and that will be confusing to them. Asking nurses to FaceTime you into hospital rooms and trying to explain to your mother why you are not there by her side. This sequential loss, compounded by the loneliness and isolation of quarantine, is nothing less than world-shattering. And I know that many of you must be experiencing your own pain right now. The grief that I and all of us will have to live with is interlaced now with the *anticipatory* grief of what *we know full well* will be around the next corner in these borderlands. We are a University *of* the borderlands. This University does not belong to those who are steering it. It belongs to the *people* of the borderlands. It belongs to the Tohono Odham people. It belongs to Gloria Anzaldúa. It belongs to our students. It belongs to those who you have fired. The people you have cavalierly laid

off do not have health care in this pandemic. The people who you plan to lay off will not have health care. From those layoffs, to Brent White's empire building at the expense of the countless Ashford University students who have been abused by its proven predatory abuse, to your reckless and chaotic "plans" for re-opening this university this Fall, to your non-disclosure agreements, to your constant denigration of students who are Black, Indigenous, and people of color. I have no confidence in you. None.

Graduate student, Ruth Oropeza, gives insight into an important yet neglected facet of re-entry: namely, the condition of graduate and professional students, a group crucial to the University campus. Before the devastation of COVID-19 and continuing today, graduate teaching and research assistants have labored on this campus meeting with students, grading, teaching, and leading sections. Most importantly, graduate students serve as intermediaries, offering support and resources to help UA undergraduates succeed. Graduate students also provide value through our studies and research, supporting the R1 status that the UA enjoys. We apply for grants, scholarships, and fellowships, funding our work and bringing prestige to this institution. GRA's also support the innovation and discovery happening in our campus labs. As both students and employees, we demonstrate our commitment to our own education as well as to the UA through our work. Despite this, the current organization of our campus leaves us vulnerable. Graduate students may have some influence on governing bodies, but we have little power within them. We have no say in our material circumstances, and many of us live in financially (and socially) precarious conditions which have only been exacerbated by the effects of COVID-19. In the last few months, Oropeza has been working alongside faculty and staff and have seen that they are also frustrated and exhausted. We had all been made to think that we had little to no power to protect ourselves, our colleagues, and our community. But, this is not true. We *can* protect one another. For example, while Oropeza does not have a vote in this forum, she appeals to all of you. Oropeza asks the voting members, other faculty in attendance, and the deans to use the power that all have to make remote-online teaching and learning the default modality for every graduate and professional student, with specific, limited exceptions. By allowing graduate and professional students who *can* work and attend class remotely do so, we can protect our grads while minimizing the risk to faculty, students, and staff who are on campus, helping to keep us *all* safe.

Senator M. Witte spoke to the distribution of Faculty Senate Minutes and Faculty Senate Agendas. Witte has repeatedly requested since the early 1990's when this distribution was discontinued - in her view to silence the faculty - the Faculty Senate minutes should be promptly distributed to the General Faculty via the faculty listserv not just merely posted on the faculty governance website. Witte will make such a formal motion if that is necessary. In these COVID-19 pandemic crisis times, this direct distribution is even more crucial to keep the faculty promptly informed as other memos from senior leadership are being received daily via the UA community and faculty listservs. Also, Witte suggests a Faculty Governance Highlight - a meaningful, full and unbiased one, be distributed at least weekly for the next few months to update the General Faculty on critical issues they read about only in the news media or after the fact. Also, as we seek to involve the faculty more broadly, beware of the proposed move by our faculty leaders to summarily disenfranchise the many hundreds of distinguished, loyal, and involved emeritus faculty as a "housekeeping" measure for the Constitution and Bylaws (this is really "house burning" of an already disengaged uninformed (except in July, 2020) General Faculty. The second issue relates to the August 24th reopening of the campus. Senate will consider a resolution today requesting formal involvement of shared governance in this process (rather than just press releases detailing top down schedules and conditions). Witte expects this date is set along with the proposed furlough date of August 10, 2020 because there isn't any backtracking of Administration decisions or meaningful response despite multiple faculty efforts to point out the bypassing of shared governance statute mandated-mechanisms and to provide careful fiscal analysis, alternative plans, and decisive faculty votes to delay implementation. Nonetheless, our College of Medicine National Institute of Health funded Summer Institute on Medical Ignorance has been open throughout June and July 2020 offering a full-time mix of in person, hybrid and remote experiences in biomedical research for 82 students comprised of thirty-four medical students, twelve undergraduates, and also thirty-six high school students (several in dorm rooms) from throughout Arizona, especially targeting disadvantaged students and underrepresented minorities. Following COVID-19 Centers for Disease Control and UArizona RII guidelines. waivers, checklists, mitigation strategies and personal preferences of faculty mentors and students opting for virtual experiences, these select students, who were promised summer salaries, worked forty hours a week conducting research, participating in interactive ZOOM seminars and career panels, submitting their daily questions, reviewing science videos, peer and near peer mentoring, writing reports, delivering PowerPoint presentations, and producing their own research videos (all video recorded for our YouTube channel). Despite the challenges and the limitations of "hands on" activities and personal interactions, students had more time to be "brain on", thinking and reflecting on science, and indicated that they would not have wanted to miss what for many a productive and even transformative experience. All student participants graduated on July 31st in an interactive Zoom format with Pima County Health Administrator and UArizona Professor Francisco Garcia delivering an inspirational message. Finally, in Witte's view, the outcome of reopening will rest largely on Residence Life oversight and student compliance particularly in the dorms and the unregulatable activities in off campus housing and related activities in the greater Tucson community. Also, priorities for "in person" should include not only "hands on" labs, "feet+ on" studios, and crushing body contact in football, but also "brain on" in person interactions with

role models/mentors. Regarding the prospects of a vaccine soon, I suggest reading former CDC Director Tom Frieden's July 31, 2020 Wall Street Journal piece on "Three Hurdles to a Safe Vaccine," and the most recent Chronicle of Higher Education article regarding hybrid experiences, "Worst of Both Worlds."

Senator Hudson addressed the Faculty Senate. When we remind ourselves that this university is located on the traditional and sacred lands of the Tohono O'odham nation and the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe that is not an endorsement of dispossession. We do not consent to the expropriation or waging of our intellectual property, our labor, our wages, our health, and our bodies. It is a reminder that we can only redeem a history of violence by making these stolen lands a home for the common good. This university is a public trust, a commons, a fragile ecosystem, a remarkable machine for the recombination and expansion of knowledge. The Ashford deal that we woke up to this morning is an insult to our university, to say the least. The Ashford deal promises this dubious entity just under 20% of our scarce tuition revenue for the next fifteen years. Ashford is owned by Zovio, a for-profit company, and has been called "the poster child of predatory recruitment practices." What a shame that all shared governance processes were bypassed to enact this degrading partnership. This deal highlights the importance of the matters before us today in Faculty Senate. If we don't deal with them, no one will. They are all intertwined. First, the financial management of the university. The determined imposition of austerity furloughs, layoffs and budget cuts that we anticipate are easier to understand in light of the project announced today. Second, shared governance reform. If we get to it today, please know that we will oppose the further curtailment of anti-democratic reforms to our Bylaws and Constitution. None of the major revisions to our Bylaws is "housekeeping," and the proposed changes will not gain the support of the supermajorities of the faculty needed to go through. The Ashford deal reminds us what happens when we get complacent about the responsibility of shared governance. Third, and most important, are the concerns about the reentry and return of students to campus. This issue affects all of our health and safety and the health and safety of our Tucson and Arizona and borderlands communities. In all these cases, our executive managers have sought to bypass our expertise, our wisdom, our citizenship, our love and care for each other. I will be requesting all the background materials on the Ashford deal to begin an investigation of whether it violates the letter, as well as the spirit of the statutory obligation for shared governance.

4. **ACTION ITEM: GENERAL FACULTY FINANCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GFFAC) UPDATE – CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, JESSICA SUMMERS, BRIAN BERRELLEZ, GUADALUPE LOZANO, FARID MATUK, RAVI GOYAL, CHRISTINA ROCHA, MAYELA TREVINO, SCOTT CEDERBURG, RON HAMMER, MONA HYMEL, MARCIA KLOTZ, RUTH OROPEZA, AND RUSS TOOMEY**

Senator Hammer opened with special thanks to the members of the Financial Sustainability Emergency Response Task Force Teams, namely the Students Working Group, Capitol Projects Working Group, Public Health Re-Entry Team, Workforce Working Group, Nicole Salazar, Chair, Operational Efficiencies Working Group, Provost Folks, CFO Rulney, and the Faculty Senate. GFFAC is the outcome of the General Faculty Assembly meeting on June 25, 2020. On June 15, 2020, the Coalition for Academic Justice at the UA (CAJUA) petitioned shared governance leaders, activating a General Assembly and the General Faculty vote to delay the furlough plan until mid-September 2020. On June 30, 2020, President Robbins agreed to delay the University Furlough Plan from July 1 to August 10, 2020. On July 10, 2020, Chair of the Faculty, Jessica Summers, assembled an *ad hoc* committee (GFFAC) made up of faculty, staff, and graduate students, including members of CAJUA. The committee's charge is that of a temporary, *ad hoc* committee established to work intensely with UArizona administrators to conduct a "deep dive" into the financial of the University, and develop a proposal to mitigate some or all of our anticipated losses via a report that outlines possible solutions/recommendations based on its analysis. Guidance for the role of this committee as a body of shared governance working in partnership with UArizona administration is outlined in the Guidelines for Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The committee will be tasked with cooperation, communication, and education of the University community at-large based on what is learned over its three-week duration. Hymel explained ARS 15-1601B, passed in 1992, which states that faculty members of each University shall participate in the governance of their respective Universities through their elected faculty representatives, and shall participate in the development of University policy. Faculty members have an obligation to participate in the governance of their respective institutions. According to UArizona's MOU, shared governance involves mutual participation in the development of policy decisions by both faculty and administration, and requires shared confidence between faculty members and administrators. Lozano reported that twenty-eight hours of meetings as a full committee over a three-week period included over 100 hours of research, six hours of meetings/Q&A time with CFO Rulney and Provost Folks, four hours of meeting/Q&A time with UArizona Working Groups of the Financial Sustainability Emergency Response Task Force, distribution of one faculty and staff survey on furlough and financial mitigation strategies with nearly 4,000 responses, and one upcoming report. Thirty-three percent of the faculty population participated in the survey (1,175). Survey responses for faculty showed 48% Tenured, 24% Career Track, 12% Tenure Track, 10% unknown, 7% Continuing, and 2% Continuing Eligible. Seventy-five percent of the surveyed faculty engage in mentoring/advising graduate students. The largest group to respond to the survey were staff, with 2,816, or 16% of the total staff population. The diversity of salary of the respondents showed that staff made significantly less than faculty, with a small outlier of the faculty population making more than \$200,000 annually. Salary reduction with regard to the furlough plan showed a 10-15% pay cut for

faculty, and approximately a 10% pay cut for staff. The survey question concerning job loss showed that 19% of faculty were very/extremely concerned about job loss, whereas 30% of staff were very/extremely concerned. With regard to faculty and staff seeking alternate employment due to the furlough, 38% of faculty and 25% of staff responded they were likely/extremely likely to seek employment elsewhere. For GFFAC's specific task, and considering alternative financial proposals for mitigation purposes, when respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the furlough plan setting to launch on August 10, 2020, 10% of faculty were satisfied/somewhat satisfied, and 22% of staff, respectively. Response to the question, "How strongly do you agree that UArizona find alternatives to the proposed furlough plan," 75% of faculty and 57% of staff responded affirmatively. Hymel reported that due to short time constraints, the committee had hoped to obtain de-identified data on employee salaries, FTE, grant sponsored projects funding and furlough rates in order to perform a more granular analysis on furlough information. The committee had planned to obtain desegregated summary information of the estimated impacts from revenue sources. Some information was obtained, but it was on a more summary and aggregated level and based on a moderate model scenario. Questions remain about the assumptions of shaping the various scenario models, various positive or negative thresholds, to determine toggling from one plan to another. With the summaries received, the committee was not able to perform a more detailed analysis. Cederburg reported that UArizona, like its peers, is experiencing large losses due to COVID-19 and can witness disruptions to all aspects of operations. Unlike UArizona's peer institutions, UArizona is mitigating its losses largely with a furlough program totaling \$79M with additional employee-related savings that push that number higher. The furlough plan has been presented to us as a primary mitigation tool, largely because salaries make up approximately 65% of the University's expenses overall. Furloughs start saving money as soon as they are implemented, so the furlough program has been pitched as a way to buy time and gives short-term cash savings. The University's most valuable asset is its people, but the furlough plan will do irreparable damage to the long-term health of the University. GFFAC believes there are alternatives to the furlough plan, in particular a combination of cash reserves in a line of credit that would give short-term financial flexibility in the next few months to find the best long-term strategic solutions rather than short-term cash savings. Hymel shared the 2020-21 project losses totaling \$281M. Projected loss mitigations total \$201M against the \$281M loss. Potential savings from debt restructuring are obtainable with salary and pay cuts, lower payroll taxes and retirement contributions, as well as travel and utility decline. Estimates on employee-related savings is approximately \$130M. GFFAC was only able to take an institutional look at the financial situation, and was not able to take budgeting issues into account. Looking at ABOR's peer financial strategies, some institutions have implemented furlough/pay cuts, layoffs/non-renewals, borrowing/line of credit, and salary freezes/hiring pauses. Eleven institutions have implemented borrowing/line of credit as a short-term solution to the COVID-19 pandemic. A comparison of furlough programs across the three other peer institutions shows an enormously large overage with UArizona. University of Minnesota, Michigan State, and University of Wisconsin follow, respectively. Over the past several months, there have been efforts across campus by various faculty and working groups to propose different types of furlough models, all being fairly smaller in overall size compared to the current model. The next highest model with the University of Minnesota showed an \$18M savings compared to UArizona's \$79M. UArizona's plan is 4.4 times larger than other peer institution furlough plans, and feedback from faculty and staff indicates that alternative plans be considered. GFFAC has proposed short-term (0-6 months), intermediate-term (3-12 months), and long-term alternatives. Short-term models would extend the time needed to implement long-term solutions. As UArizona entered the COVID-19 crisis, \$800M in operating funds/cash reserves were available. Balances have declined to \$570M to date. The goal range is in the lower end of ABOR's goal range for days cash on hand, but August 2020 will be a positive cash flow month due to incoming tuition, an estimated increase of ~\$280M. GFFAC believes cash reserves are a part of the solution, but it may not cover the full COVID-19 losses depending on the extent of actual the losses. Debt is a powerful management tool in a crisis situation. Eleven of fifteen peer institutions are using debt/borrowing as a COVID-19 financial mitigation strategy to smooth a one-time shock. U.S. corporations issued approximately \$30B in bonds in the first half of 2020, and only \$5B in the same period in 2019, seeing a six-time increase for 2020. A once-in-a-century pandemic is a textbook example in which a corporation can use debt to cover operating losses, and a financially prudent strategy to keep the organizational structure sound. Debt as a substitute for furloughs will prevent long-term damage to UArizona's most valuable asset, its people. At current long-term bond rates, a potential \$200M could be reduced to \$12M obligation per year for twenty years. Hymel reported that UArizona's ability to borrow is governed by Arizona State Law. Bonds can be issues to "acquire projects" (ARS 15-1683). Definitions are flexible for "acquire" and "projects." Commercial paper can be issues for "any costs and expenses related to a project" (ARS 15-1696). A line of credit is obtainable for "cash management or liquidity" (ARS 15-1682). Spending for operating expenses have no restrictions, and all borrowing options work in conjunction with ABOR. In 2016, the Arizona Legislature enacted a provision permitting ABOR to acquire lines of credit to assist with cash management and/or liquidity of its institutions. Nothing in Arizona law states that borrowing for operating expenses is prohibited. Cederburg reported that line of credit in conjunction with cash can potentially provide UArizona with short-term flexibility. A line of credit would be an agreement with a bank for \$250M. The bank would hold that money available and the institution would draw on that line of credit as needed. Board meeting minutes show that when ABOR was lobbying for the Legislature to pass this bill, lines of credit provide a contingency should the Universities ever need to address unanticipated, significant negative financial circumstances. Other universities have been taking this approach with large lines of credit; Michigan and Indiana requested \$1B, whereas Penn State less at \$250M. A \$250M line of credit would cost \$75K per year as compensation to the bank for providing that line of credit. On a scale of the \$2.2B budget, the \$75K is quite reasonable to bias the

amount of flexibility. When losses are unknown, cash management with a line of credit provides a flexible alternative to furloughs. Furloughs have been pitched as a way to buy time so administration can make other adjustments and preserve jobs. GFFAC believes that between cash reserves and a line of credit, this model is a less harmful and better tool with the same result. The long-term bond market rates are currently very attractive. Bonds could potentially be issued to spread the cuts over a longer period of time. Under current Arizona state law, a project is required to facilitate this model, and one option would be to offer bonds to build structures. Other forms of spending qualify under the law to include upgrading air filtration of existing buildings, adding technology to classrooms, and buying office furniture. A range of options can increase the size of the bond offering to obtain more cash. The other three in-state Universities might work with the State Legislature to relax constraints in the current law to allow issuance of bonds directly for operating expenses, and GFFAC believes that the University should continue to pursue these options. Cuts will need to be made and many groups on campus have been working on different models. The Financial Sustainability Emergency Response Task Force (FSERT) teams have each identified different options to provide cash savings for the long-term alternatives. Outsourcing auxiliaries, which Arizona State and Northern Arizona Universities have done, selling buildings or other assets, selling buildings with lease-back, improvements on operational efficiency, and local strategies from colleges and support units. GFFAC recommends eliminating or dramatically reducing the furlough plans and using short-term flexibility to find the best long-term solutions, rather than concentrating on short-term cash savings. Klotz discussed alternate furlough plans. To date, six alternate furlough plans have been submitted to UArizona for consideration between April and July 2020. GFFAC was informed by CFO Rulney and Provost Folks avoiding a furlough plan at this time was inevitable. Constraints on GFFAC to introduce alternate furlough plans included: 1) no underlying/disaggregated data was provided in order to directly design new models, and 2) senior leadership did not offer any updated savings target. GFFAC recommends that the current furlough plan only be used as a last resort in conjunction with other mitigation tools; that it be progressive with a “smooth curve” structure; that the floor be at the \$60K mark with a greater sacrifice in the higher income brackets; should work with net tuition revenue increases triggering a proportional decrease of furlough days/rates; be reexamined every three months; should review the process for layoffs and non-renewals, and that any plan minimize any future layoffs/non-renewals; enable employees to access retirement savings to offset the furlough plan; support dismissed employees in accessing federal unemployment benefits; and reversion to furlough days rather than flex days, particularly for non-administrative staff. Summers spoke about the role of shared governance in the GFFAC process. GFFAC was formed as an *ad hoc* committee in response to the need for a “deep dive” into existing data and resources. The committee feels this report is a comprehensive overview, but there is a much-needed change in terms of how shared governance engages going forward by increasing stakeholder input, addressing inequities in salary, building trust, and increasing communication. The aforementioned can and should be done before critical decisions are made, where shared governance partners have a seat at the table. Any disagreements or conflicts between shared governance and administrators can utilize the appropriate processes to deal with those conflicts in a public and transparent manner. Inclusion at the start of the decision-making process, with the MOU and state law as references, require that shared governance be at the table. University budget records should be open to the faculty and public. GFFAC struggled with acquiring data in a short timeline, but other standing committees such as SPBAC and Faculty Senate should have access to this data on a regular basis and be partners in the decision-making process. Where differences arise between administration and shared governance, administration must be as transparent as possible to its constituents and clear about how and why decisions are made, particularly if they are in conflict with shared governance. The MOU is currently being revised to provide explicit guidance and direction to all stakeholders in shared governance. The Shared Governance Review Committee will be renewed to work with administration on addressing shared governance decision-making, engagement, and workflows. Existing shared governance bodies will partner with administration to re-evaluate financial mitigation strategies from this day forward, particularly at each census date/review point, as well as re-evaluation of the furlough plan in October 2020 and March 2021. Oropeza reiterated the severity of the financial crisis on campus, stressing that the long-term health of the University as a whole is at stake. Layoffs and non-renewals have caused irreparable harm to the University. How we address the financial situation and combined short-term and long-term tools to mitigate the losses to the campus will not only have a monetary impact to the campus, but with the current model, a devastating effect on the relationships between students, staff, faculty, and administration, compromising the core values, integrity, compassion, exploration, adaptation, inclusion, and determination of our University. Summers moved **[Motion 2019/20-35]** that the University of Arizona commit to short-term borrowing options, such as obtaining a line of credit. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Summers moved **[Motion 2019/20-36]** that the University of Arizona commit to long-term borrowing options, such as issuing a bond. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Summer moved **[Motion 2019/20-37]** that the University of Arizona modify or eliminate its current furlough plan. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Summers moved **[Motion 2019/20-38]** that the University of Arizona budget and finance team include multiple stakeholders from shared governance (faculty, staff, and graduate students) to review, evaluate, and advise on future changes to the furlough and other mitigation strategies from here on out, particularly at critical time points (October 2020 and March 2021). Motion was seconded and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Senator Hurh asked for elaboration on the disaggregated data that the GFFAC requested and didn’t receive. Summers responded the committee’s detailed written report, which will hopefully be delivered to the senior leadership team later in the week, will contain some of the data requested, and it will be publicly shared at that time. Some data, especially employee data, is confidential and

permission levels to access that data were not attainable. The de-identified data was also not provided. More details will be forthcoming in the written report. Valerdi asked what administration and Rulney's reaction was to the borrowing aspect of today's report. Summers responded that GFFAC's report hasn't been shared until this Faculty Senate meeting. GFFAC has invited CFO Rulney to the SPBAC meeting on Wednesday, August 19, 2020, and to share the information with the senior leadership team on Thursday, August 20, 2020. Gordon asked for more detail on what would be involved for ABOR and the State Legislature to approve and seek a bond. Cederburg responded that a long-term bond would have to fit into a capital project, which in turn would have to be approved by both ABOR and the State Legislature. A change in law is being looked at to allow the Universities to issue bonds for operating expenses. The line of credit is through ABOR only and a bank. M. Witte said that this moment makes her proud to be a faculty member at UArizona, and stressed that this report should be distributed immediately to all faculty. Bourget asked if it would be safe to say that the lack of data provided had no effect on the outcome of the report. Summers responded that that is a fair assumption. Cederburg concurred that the bond market is huge, and \$200M is a small request, but large enough to satisfy the debt options currently at the institution. Gephart asked how lines of credit are managed for shortfalls and what the different perspectives are using lines of credit over bonds. Cederburg responded that lines of credit issued act like general revenue bonds, and the bond market doesn't have any interest in what the bonds are used for. The state government cares what the bond money is used for, so state laws are followed for issuance of bonds and the money is used specifically for that purpose. The line of credit would be similar to a general revenue bond, where the University agrees to pay it back. Our peers have been engaging in this practice in very large numbers, and upon investigating the practice in early July, Cederburg found forty-three different bond offerings totaling \$16B, averaging \$300M for each institution, taking place in June and July 2020. Eleven out of fifteen ABOR peers have engaged in this practice. The proposed furlough plan is supposed to save the University \$80M, but it's very difficult to quantify the long-term cost to the University for that plan. If UArizona loses its best faculty and staff over the furlough plan, how does the University recover? Few would object to borrowing \$120M for a building, and currently, the University could borrow that \$80M instead of implementing a furlough plan and save its most valuable asset.

5. INFORMATION ITEM: PROPOSED RESOLUTION FOR SAFE REOPENING OF CAMPUS – SENATOR JOE GERALD, WITH DISCUSSANTS KATE ELLINGSON, KASEY ERNST, AND STEPHANIE GRIFFIN

Gerald is seeking Faculty Senate support for a Resolution, to make publicly available, the criteria used to transition between phases of the reopening of campus. Gerald calls for the criteria to be periodically reassessed and revised in collaboration with the faculty. Gerald has circulated earlier drafts of the Resolution among colleagues, as well as allied constituents. The Resolution calls for Public Health criteria to ensure a safe campus reopening for students, staff, and faculty, as well as the broader communities in which they live, work, and play. To ensure these criteria reflect the values and preferences of all University stakeholders, multiple diverse perspectives must be considered in their development and in their use. Balancing the institution's economic security with its constituent's well-being can only be accomplished with transparent decision-making. The University has but one chance to reopen safely, as evidenced by the surge in COVID-19 cases, hospitalizations, and deaths that followed the May 2020 reopening of the broader Arizona economy. While current COVID trends are favorable, our community has yet to fully recover its capacity to care for all of its residents' healthcare needs. Preserving the scarce resources requires us to take graduated, measured steps and only proceed if the process is hot. Such caution is warranted because many of the mitigation programs we have in place are new and untested. This is not to criticize these efforts, but to acknowledge some critical failure modes have yet to be recognized. Identifying and correcting these in a timely manner is going to be paramount to our success. Ultimately, a successful reopening depends on adherence to recommended mitigation policies, behaviors, and programs. Many of these will occur off campus and requires that faculty, students, and staff trust University communications and its decisions. Having objective criteria and transparent decision-making are good public health practices because they foster the trust necessary for success. Gerald asks for Faculty Senate support of the Resolution. Goyal asked if the University Public Health experts working on the re-entry plan consulted with Gerald's team. Gerald responded that many of the College of Public Health faculty have been consulted in their domains of expertise. What Gerald is asking for with the Resolution, is for weigh-in from the broader elected faculty representation. Hudson asked if the gradual re-entry Resolution has been shared with the senior leadership team. Gerald responded that it has been shared with the Senate Executive Committee, but doesn't know if the senior leadership team has seen the phased plan. The phased approach to reopening, as well as a number of community and institutional metrics that have been developed have been shared with the senior leadership team. Gerald has hopes that the details of this phased plan and the specifics of the metrics are made more broadly available in order to evaluate them. The State Department of Public Health makes available the number of cases that have been identified, number of tests performed, reporting delays, hospitalization usage, and key institutional metrics will be important to inform the campus whether it's reasonable and appropriate to bring additional students to campus. Hudson asked if the staged re-entry plan is driven by the calendar rather than the public health data. Gerald responded that to his knowledge, the current re-entry plan cycles through each phase after one week. From a public health perspective, many in the College of Public Health are concerned that this may not align well with what we know about the biologic and epidemiologic characteristics of the SARS/COVID virus, in that the incubation period itself is one to two weeks, and it may take longer than one week to assess how the campus is affected. Ernst said that based on the incubation period, as well as to test the system itself, a period of three weeks would be

safe to assess transmission on campus. The systems that have been put in place can change continuously and rapidly, so before ramping up to the next stage, seeing how the system is responding is critical. Metrics for public health measures, turn-around time for tests, contact tracing, as well as community status monitoring, will need to be looked at to understand what phase the campus is in and make decisions accordingly. Ghosh told Senators about Gerald's blog, and wealth of information available, and local data for Pima County. Ghosh asked for three metrics for current cases that may help the campus feel safe. Ernst said a committee was formed under the Office of General Counsel to work on a series of metrics, but is not able to share. The Pima County Health Department website has a dashboard of nine metrics and currently all but two or three are in the red. Klotz asked what the hospital capacity should look like for people to return safely to campus and how the COVID-19 pandemic in Tucson figures into the calculations. Ernst doesn't have the latest numbers, but believes the hospital is at the 80% threshold, which would shift critical care plans in place. Summers asked on behalf of a Senator, what the metrics will be to decide to go fully online in fall 2020 should the number of cases grow. Gerald said that's what the Resolution addresses; that there will be more transparency and a more diverse array of stakeholders who participate in that conversation and make an informative decision. Criteria for re-entry used by administration to move forward safely needs to be assessed and reassessed, hence the reason for this Resolution. Hurh asked Gerald to elaborate why metrics cannot be shared and who is making that decision, and asked if language can be added to the Resolution to specify the criteria be developed in public health metrics. Gerald takes Hurh's suggestion as a friendly amendment to the Resolution. Ernst said that the College of Public Health team that gave its metrics presentation was told to keep further communications confidential and did not elaborate. Ghosh asked about specific and opposed to general metric numbers would be opening up the University for potential lawsuits, since the numbers change weekly, and what the consequences would be if the University fell short of the threshold. Ellingson said that part of these metrics should be considered in parallel with the Pima County Health partners since they have a footprint of the University, which indeed the University has an impact on. Ernst said that the metrics are complex, and requires nuance and subtlety to look at the metrics combined for a complete picture. Fink asked about increasing reports and studies that show antibodies may not last for more than three months. In light of vaccines being developed, has this information been factored into the metrics and re-entry plan. Gerald said the definitive answer is uncertain, but most are working under the premise of immunity lasting long enough to make it through one season. Since we have not gone through one season yet, nothing can be stated with any certainty. Gerald is involved in a \$7M Centers of Disease Control study to try to answer this very question by doing a serial longitudinal study on reinfection of healthcare workers to find out if there are long-lasting effects of immunity. Ernst said that it appears that there is a waning of antibodies, and whether that means the T-cell immunity is also compromised rather quickly is unknown. Studies like the one Gerald is involved in are critical to give any sort of scientific basis. Even if a vaccine is available, boosters will most probably be necessary. Ghosh moved **[Motion 2019/20-39]** to approve The Resolution as amended to be based in public health metrics. Motion was seconded and approved, and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

6. INFORMATION ITEM: ADMINISTRATIVE DIRECTIVE ON THE USE OF FACE COVERINGS, AND ATTENDANCE GUIDELINES – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, NEEL GHOSH

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed for a future Faculty Senate meeting.

7. INFORMATION ITEM: GENERAL EDUCATION REFRESH INITIATIVE – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR GENERAL EDUCATION, SUSAN MILLER-COCHRAN, AND ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, JOHN POLLARD

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed for a future Faculty Senate meeting.

8. INFORMATION ITEM: ESTABLISHING A STUDENT BASIC NEEDS COALITION AT UARIZONA TO SUPPORT ACADEIC SUCCESS AND RETENTION – STUDENT REGENT, ANTHONY RUSK

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed for a future Faculty Senate meeting.

9. INFORMATION ITEM: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS REVISIONS AND COMMITTEE UPDATE – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER

Due to time constraints, this item was postponed for a future Faculty Senate meeting.

10. DISCUSSION ITEM: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WITH ADMINISTRATORS – MODERATED BY CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, JESSICA SUMMERS

Hudson asked administrators why we have a date-driven phased re-entry rather than a data-driven phased re-entry plan. Robbins responded that the Campus Re-entry Task Force is watching the data on a daily basis, numbers of cases, ICU beds in hospitals, and deaths have all been declining in the past month. The curve is flattening and this gives the campus the best chance to reopen on August 24, 2020. The University has been testing its systems over the

summer. With over 7,000 individuals coming to campus over the summer, less than 100 cases have been reported. Robbins is extremely concerned about bringing students back to campus assimilating and following the rules. The day students return to campus, we will have mandatory testing prior to any dorm occupancy. Asymptomatic individuals who test positive are expected to be in the 250-300 range. De-ramping will occur when our number of cases exceed our ability to isolate individuals out of the general population when there are no hospital/ICU beds or ventilators, which falls in line with the consistent public health practice across the country. The University of Miami is headed by Dr. Julio Frenk. Frenk is the former dean of faculty at Harvard's School of Public Health, and was Mexico's Minister of Health. Frenk is opening his campus at a time when Miami is one of the hottest spots in the nation. Robbins has been in close contact with Frenk and that institution has no where near the testing capacity that UArizona has, nor is as prepared as UArizona campus. A recent New York Times article reported that a reporter was embedded in the process at the University of Kentucky, whose President is a world-renowned public health expert. Thirty-thousand students will be returning to that campus with testing before entry, with a face-to-face modality. At UArizona, 5,000 students will be returning face-to-face the first week, and several thousand in over 500 research labs. Provost Folks confirmed that the first week of re-entry would have 5,000 students, the second week 10,000 students, with a maximum of 20,000 students in the third week. The UArizona holds a "best in class" position with its trace testing program largely due to the efforts of faculty and staff over the summer months. Bourget asked for a response from the senior leadership team to the report GFFAC presented earlier in the meeting. Rulney thanked the committee for their dedication to producing such a comprehensive report in such a short period of time, and said that senior leadership is looking forward to the report for review and to determine if it aligns with UArizona's guiding principles. Robbins said he looks forward to the committee's report, and is hopeful that the prospect of borrowing money is in the University's future in order to alleviate some of the shortfall. Klotz stated that the most disturbing part of the Public Health presentation was that they couldn't answer pertinent questions due to restrictions from the Office of the General Counsel. Klotz said this echoes her concern about the Non-disclosure agreements that many of her colleagues signed in relation to the acquisition of Ashford University, and is consistent with a culture that is disallowing people from speaking freely about issues of the utmost importance in the management of the campus. Klotz asked senior leadership how they see these instances in relation to shared governance. Robbins said that other than HIPAA and FERPA issues, he is unaware of any restrictions that would disallow the sharing of data and will check into it. Ernst clarified that discussions within the committee and actual plans with metrics to move from one phase to the next were the things that couldn't be shared. Robbins feels that it's these exact issues that should be shared publicly and debated for balanced decision-making. Acosta stated that the acquisition of Ashford University was deliberated in secret with a chosen select group of University figures under the cover of Non-disclosure agreements, but not with an institutional body such as Faculty Senate or SPBAC, but rather a hand-picked group of people, no doubt composed of individuals friendly to administration and the programs. Acosta further stated that the Ashford deal was in the works and in process since March 2020, coinciding with University closure and COVID, and subsequently with the planning and development of the furlough plan. Given that the one only stipulation of any mitigation strategy seems to be the furlough plan, Acosta is concerned to the extent of how both plans for Ashford and the furloughs were being devised simultaneously with the possibility that one plan was being worked on to assist the other. Given that we now have a series of questionable/unethical deals that have been broken by current administration, including McKinsey and Calvary, Acosta would like to know to what extent does the current furlough plan allow for the University to carry out the Ashford deal. Robbins responded that the Ashford deal would actually do the opposite by flowing funds back to the University. McDonald stated that one of the most disconcerting statements made today during the GFFAC presentation was that the Provost and CFO informed GFFAC on July 22, 2020 that was no possibility of avoiding the furlough program. The reason for appointing this ad hoc committee was to seek alternatives that would mitigate the impact of the furlough plan. McDonald asks Rulney to clarify that statement and if in fact, administration is backing off of the proposal since hearing it here for the first time, or if it's dead on arrival. Rulney said the proposal submitted by GFFAC will definitely be considered, and it may come down to an alternative in conjunction with the furlough plan. The numbers used have been projections and they will change over time as the number of students who arrive in the fall better determined. The financial situation will be reviewed in October 2020 and again in March 2021 and budget/furlough projections will be adjusted at those times. Ottsuch stated that it a well-known fact that from developmental perspectives, adolescents aren't always prudent about decision-making. What kind of consultation has been performed with developmental scientists about how to mitigate those aspects of students making decisions around their peers in emotionally-charged situations and how we will handle them? Robbins' biggest concern is not what happens on campus, but what may happen off campus, and the risk of bringing the deadly virus back to campus. For real-time decisions, the antigen test is the one we will use because it can help identify asymptomatic people in ten minutes. Dr. Cecilia Rosales stated that there is no chance of having a meaningful reopening unless we engage with the students. Certainly, in public health, there's an ambassador program to be able to activate them to go out and help educate their peers. UArizona has one of the strongest EMT programs of any student base in the country with fifty-two certified students in the effort to educate their peers. Commitment and buy-in from our students is going to be paramount. A pledge to follow the rules will be offered for students to sign. Murphy asked about the decision made with Ashford University, and last evening's email stated that decisions were made in consultation with faculty and staff across campus, as well as the Regents. There are a number of bodies on campus elected to represent their respective constituencies, including Committee of Eleven and Faculty Senate. The purpose of which are to embody shared governance. A relatively small ad hoc group of faculty and staff who are not elected to,

or are responsible for their role in shared governance, whereas representatives of the broader faculty is not in any way transparent nor shared governance. Moreover, making participation and deliberations contingent on signing a Non-disclosure agreement is fundamentally contrary to the shared governance process of representative colleagues. As Acosta stated earlier, these patterns fundamentally undermine trust in the legitimacy of the senior leadership. The first question is, why wasn't the Faculty Senate involved in any of these discussions or decisions? Secondly, the serious concern about Ashford University itself, and the potential damage that can be done to our University. With a morally corrupt, abject failure such as Ashford University, being sued by a number of states and other entities, how can UArizona survive being tied to such a failure? Robbins responded that there were shared governance conversations with members of SPBAC, Faculty Senate, among others. The Non-disclosure agreements were put in place because it is a publicly traded company. Over 200 people were consulted, As far as Ashford's reputation, the nature of past practices as a for-profit, online business were predatory practices, and according to the accreditation report, many of those issues were addressed and corrected. Now, we will be bringing this University into a not-for-profit Arizona principled management. No previous liabilities for any lawsuits will be UArizona's responsibility. Robbins feels it's a good opportunity to serve these students who haven't been given an opportunity to go to a university as working adults or served in the military. Hudson asked Robbins if he would commit here and now to borrowing money to fund our temporary revenue shortfall and to continue our core mission, and will you commit here and now to sharing the metrics by which we make decisions about the health and safety of repopulating our campus and the surrounding community. Robbins responded that he will definitely commit to sharing the metrics regarding re-entry, but cannot commit here and now to making a loan. Those options will need to be explored. Robbins is very open to the possibility of borrowing, and this will be the core topic of SPBAC at its meeting on Wednesday, August 5, 2020. Bourget asked about the feedback received pertaining to Ashford, and if that feedback was positive or negative, or a mixture of both, and what objections were raised. The email sent earlier in the day raises more questions than answers. UArizona's own completion rate is pathetic compared to our peers, but Ashford's completion rate is 16%. Shouldn't we be focusing on our own students before embarking on this deal that already seems to be done, and can we be privy to some meaningful feedback from the shared governance entities to either halt or amend this deal. Robbins responded that he plans to have multiple discussions over the coming months about the oversight of academics with Ashford, which will be a not-for-profit entity. The new entity will be managed through an academic affiliation agreement with UArizona and separate with its own governing board. There will be opportunities for academic faculty oversight of the curriculum and how the University is operated. Ashford, furlough, and re-entry are each deserving of their own meeting on each topic. The numbers for Ashford persistence is at 78%. With fifty different start dates per year, the 16% number represents a first-time, full-time cohort. Goyal stated that currently the role of shared governance appears to be providing suggestions to administration, but shared governance doesn't have a say or any role in making decisions. Do you think it's time to improve the role of shared governance and involve some of the committee members in the actual decision-making? Robbins responded that there is always room for improvement on the process, and improvements can definitely be made. Soto asked Robbins when CAJUA Steering Committee members met with Provost Folks and CFO Rulney recently, they were pressing for information about the hundreds of people who have been laid off and not renewed and are concerned about how these people would fare with no health insurance during COVID-19. Folks stated at that time that it wouldn't be just hundreds, that the University was going to shrink by 14% and that there would be a lot of lay offs and firings. Soto asked Robbins for an explanation of what was going to be happening at the University. Robbins responded that this is the first time he's ever heard of such a thing, and Folks was no longer in the meeting for an explanation. Murphy asked what SPBAC's response to Ashford was, and who on the Executive Committee and Faculty Senate were involved in the discussions on Ashford. Summers added Vice Provost for Global Affairs, Brent White, as a panelist. Summers responded that the Faculty Officers, Chair of Committee of Eleven, Co-chairs of SPBAC, were all asked to sign Non-disclosure agreements, as well as the faculty members of SPBAC. All responses/recommendations were submitted to Brent White, and none of the involved parties knew of the decision until the announcement this morning with the email communication. Summers isn't sure if the Non-disclosure agreements are still in effect so the faculty members can share thoughts, but White said that he would check with the Office of General Counsel to find out the status of the agreements. Bourget asked the percentage of positive vs. negative feedback. White said the conversations were varied among different groups, and many were strongly opposed and many were strongly supportive. The exact percentage was not known because no poll had been taken. Hudson requested that Robbins and White release all paperwork associated with the Ashford deal. White said he wasn't opposed to providing any paperwork, as soon as it is legally feasible. White reported that Ashford was purchased for \$1.00. Any revenue from Ashford will be moved through the Global Campus to UArizona as a separate not-for-profit entity for which UArizona bears no financial responsibility or liability. The deal also includes substantial guarantees of operating income, which means that after the Global Campus costs and Zovio are paid, \$25M in the first five years has to remain paid up front. In years six through ten, another \$10M of government guarantee of operating income. Before Zovio gets one penny, it has to guarantee this amount of operating income, which will run the Global Campus, and a portion of which will be shared with UArizona. No UArizona tuition revenue will go to the Global Campus. Bourget asked if this was a conflict with UArizona Online, and why can't UArizona online attract the same minority and disadvantaged students. Since the majority of Ashford students are in the United States, why does this entity fall under UArizona Global. White responded that "Global" is a common name for domestic online institutions in the United States. White explained there are approximately 140 programs between the two institutions, of which fifteen overlap. Many of the programs serve a distinct population of students, and Ashford

programs are offered one at a time at five-week intervals, and start dates are fifty times a year, gearing toward working adults. Fifty percent of the Ashford students come from the south, 25% from the Midwest and 25% Northeast, and UArizona online has very few students from those regions. Hurh reiterated White's response that UArizona is not going to be contributing to Global Campus for the acquisition of Ashford. What we are contributing is the name, and much of the concern that faculty have is UArizona is associated with Ashford. As a top-tier, Research One State University, how can we lend UArizona's amount of value to Ashford's offerings, and how prepared are we to hold the faculty and staff of Ashford to UArizona's standards? Do the faculty at Ashford enjoy the same type of protections, promotion plans, tenure status that UArizona's faculty do? Will Ashford be included in shared governance? What type of standards to which we hold our own disciplines within UArizona be imposed on Ashford? If the not-for-profit doesn't work for Ashford, will UArizona be sacrificing its reputation as we become associated with a profit-making venture that depends upon the kind of business model where students do not succeed. White responded that Ashford will be a separate entity with its own accreditation. The faculty UArizona Global Campus is a different University and a separate not-for-profit. Matters pertaining to standards of faculty governance, promotion, and tenure will be decided within that institution. The accreditation report from WASC Senior College and University Commission will be shared and shows its faculty and staff are devoted to its mission to deliver high-quality education curriculum. Hurh asked about the governance structure and if Ashford will be governed by ABOR. White replied no, Ashford will not be governed by ABOR, and will have an independent Board as specified by WASC requirements. For a nine-member Board, four of those will be from UArizona, the other five will be appointed by UArizona. The President will be nominated by UArizona, and will then be approved by the independent Board. A joint academic committee consisting of faculty from UArizona and faculty from Global Campus would conduct evaluations and reviews, and make recommendations for improvement to the curriculum. Zovio will have no representation on the Board. Fink asked if former Dean of Engineering/Provost Jeff Goldberg have any role in the Ashford deal and will he have any role in the future campus. White responded that Goldberg is retired. He assisted until the end of June 2020. His role was to lead the Academic Due Diligence Team of Ashford. The Ashford Board will be non-compensated. Hingle asked Robbins if he was open to continuing the Ashford conversation in a Special Session and including shared governance in that conversation. Robbins agreed.

11. **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:02 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 July 6, 2020**
2. **Report from the President**
3. **Report from the Provost**
4. **Report from APAC**
5. **Report from Faculty Officers**
6. **General Faculty Financial Advisory Committee Update**
7. **Proposed Resolution for Safe Reopening of Campus**

Motions of the June 1, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2019/20-35] Motion that the University of Arizona commit to short-term borrowing options, such as obtaining a line of credit. Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2019/20-36] Motion that the University of Arizona commit to long-term borrowing options, such as issuing a bond. Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2019/20-37] that the University of Arizona modify or eliminate its current furlough plan Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2019/20-38] that the University of Arizona budget and finance team include multiple stakeholders from shared governance (faculty, staff, and graduate students) to review, evaluate, and advise on future changes to the furlough and other mitigation strategies from here on out, particularly at critical time points (October 2020 and March 2021). Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2019/20-39] Proposed Resolution for a Safe Reopening of Campus during the Covid-19 Pandemic. Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

WHEREAS, WE the Faculty Senate support the phased, graduated re-opening of the University that prioritizes essential learning activities while mitigating the risks those activities pose to students, staff and faculty.

AND, commend the University collaboration with the Faculty to develop the phased, graduated re-opening plan.

AND, recognize the need for timely and transparent communication on important policies and procedures that impact the educational, health, and financial matters of students, staff, and faculty.

AND, recognize the need to periodically reassess the risks and benefits of University activities in light of rapidly evolving conditions and knowledge.

WE, THEREFORE, call for the University to develop, periodically revise, and make publicly available criteria based in public health metrics that will be used to decide when transitions between the phases of pandemic operation are warranted.

FURTHERMORE, We call for these criteria to be developed and these decisions to be made using the principles of shared governance.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456