October 4, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting Q and A

1. How was the senate meeting disseminated?
        A timeline of events about the meeting can be found here. The meeting agenda was shared with the Faculty Senate on Sept 23, 2021, with instructions on advanced registration of the meeting and the motions received. The meeting agenda and motion document is on the Faculty Senate Office (FSO) website under the Faculty Senate tab. A Record story was run on Monday Sept 27, and a banner about the Faculty Senate meeting was added on the front page of the Faculty Senate Office website at the top with meeting information and link that day. When the meeting agenda was shared with the Faculty Senate, I also shared with the president of LEO. I sent several reminder emails over the week leading up to the meeting.

2. Why is advanced registration required?
        There were issues with last year's senate meeting with links sent to faculty senate members. This year we require advanced registration at least 24 hours before the meeting for remote attendance. This is necessary since the Zoom attendance is for faculty senate members. Members of the public, including faculty senate members, could still use livestream to access the meeting, should they forget to register for the meeting in advance. Providing Zoom link only to faculty senate members who plan on attending also ensure we can properly look at quorum and record the attendance. In-person attendance has on-site registration.

3. What happened to the livestream of the meeting?
        I apologize there was an issue with the livestream at the beginning of the meeting that was outside of my and FSO's control. FSO first reported to IT about livestream issue at 3:21 and we confirmed live steam was working at 3:25. IT has acknowledged the error was on their part for not communicating the appropriate link to the ITS infrastructure team. IT recorded the livestream because this is their standard practice for live stream.

4. Why were the votes taking place at different times?
        Votes for elected positions was open for 24 hour, and this was the practice we adopted for SACUA elections for the last two elections. I announced in the agenda shared in advance that the voting for the motions would take place for 48 hours. As I explained at the meeting, due to the realization that SACUA did not appoint a nominating committee for Secretary that our rule requires, we instead sought nomination from the floor and held the vote for the Secretary opened for 24 hours the following day.
        The targeted email scheduled to go out at 4:57 pm on 10/4 announcing the voting link to the faculty senate did not go out until 6:57 pm. While FSO submits targeted email request, the email goes through HR and ITS before it gets sent out. Since the email went out late, we revised the voting time to close at 7 pm on 10/6 (an extension of 2 hours), consistent with a 48-hour voting period.

5. Why does each motion has 8 minutes and the president and provost have 45 minutes?
        We receive 5 motions two weeks before the senate meeting. I divided the available time of 40 minutes equally for the 5 motions so each motion has 8 minutes. There were requests to cut the time for the president and the provost since they sent out a statement on the motions. Faculty who brought this up spoke of Robert's Rules of order that does not apply before the meeting is called to order. The president and the provost were invited to address the faculty and not to speak about the motions – they found out about the motions as with everybody else. David Potter (Secretary) and I did not agree to alter the agenda. If there were 2 motions, then each could receive 20 minutes. If we had 4 motions, each could receive 15 minutes. We were constraint by total time, and this was the best that we could do.
        President Schlissel and Provost Collins were scheduled for our Faculty Senate meeting back in early July (both the date and time) and this was the earliest fall date that both of them are available. The plan was for each of them to speak for 12 minutes and will have Q/A with senate members for the rest of the allotted time. This was decided before any of the motions were received.

6. Why were speakers on the floor asked to speak for 30 seconds?
        My initial announcement of 90 seconds to speak was for faculty who signed up to speak for/against the motions in advance (so they can prepare). As we had 5 motions and 40 minutes, each

motion received 8 minutes. The initial plan was for two pre-arranged speakers to speak for and two to speak against (90s x 4 is 6 minutes). It was always the plan that those who speak from the floor would receive less time. The remaining 2 minutes was planned for up to 4 speakers from the floor at 30 s each. It was never intended for the speaker on the floor to have 90 s (otherwise, there can be only one person to speak on the floor with 30 s remaining). After the close of speaker signup at noon on October 1, I learned that each motion received at most 2 speakers. I contacted all the pre-arranged speakers and gave them more time (they all know and acknowledged). Each motion had 4 minutes for the pre-arranged speakers and 4 minutes for the floor speakers (still a total of 8 minutes). The floor speaker was still kept 30 s to maximize the number of faculty who could speak. At every step of the agenda planning, David Potter was involved and in agreement of the procedure. It is a regret that several faculty thought speakers on the floor also has 90 s when it was not intended as such. Given the tight time constraints and the five motions, this plan was necessary to make the meeting manageable yet allow as many faculty be involved in the discussion as possible. I apologize for this confusion.

7. The pro/con comments were unavailable to view in an accessible format.

I first learned about the formatting issue of Google Sheet on 10/5 at ~10:45 am and I attended to it right away. The purpose of providing Google Form is for faculty to share arguments for or against on these motions that would appear in a Google Sheet. Given the availability of livestream recording of the meeting, the pro/con comments provide additional information for faculty's consideration. Unfortunately, Google Sheet does not automatically wrap text for new entries, so I had to periodically do this manually. I apologize that the comments were not immediately available in a readable format.