

**Faculty Assembly Meeting Minutes
Via Hybrid
2700 Posvar Hall and Zoom**

Wednesday, February 15, 2023

1. Call to Order

President Robin Kear called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Past Faculty Assembly Meeting

Kear asked for a motion to approve the minutes. On a motion duly made (Parker) and seconded (Kanthak) the minutes of the January 18, 2023 Faculty Assembly Meeting were approved as written.

3. Items of New Business.

None

4. Report of the Senate President, Robin Kear (submitted in written form)

To accommodate our other items of business, I will be giving a brief report today. First, I am horrified and saddened by what has happened at Michigan State University and the violence that effects any and all of our communities. I find words to be inadequate to express my fears, I cannot dwell on it, and I will switch to our routine matters.

University Policy up for Decommissioning

There are 14 University Policies up for decommissioning. These policies are almost entirely related to grading and other academic policies and were sent to Educational Policies Committee for discussion and comment. One policy was sent to Faculty Affairs for comment.

- Pursuant to our request for a decommissioning policy, they are available for public comment for 28 days, in this case until 2/27/23
- <https://www.policy.pitt.edu/policies-be-decommissioned>

University Policy Open for Comment

- Flexible Work draft policy, [ER 20 Flexible Work for Staff, Student Workers, and Temporary Employees](#) - Available for comment from 1/30/2023 to 2/27/2023
 - This policy is going through Staff Council, not through Senate Committees.
- Suggestions from any Pitt community member will be taken into consideration during the University's policy development process.

ELI Update

- There has been a meeting between the university, the union of Pitt faculty, and an ELI representative of the 8 whose contracts are at risk.

Senate Plenary

- Save the date: The Senate Plenary will be in-person on Tuesday April 4th from noon to 2:30 pm in the William Pitt Union Assembly Room. The Plenary is open to the entire Pitt community and includes lunch.
- The topic for this year's plenary will be 'Unsettled: Frames for Examining Generative Artificial Intelligence'. The goal is to include 5-6 Pitt speakers sharing their insights and expertise from different frameworks, educational, legal, philosophical, ethical, humanistic, technological. (If someone jumps to your mind as being perfect for this, please email me. I am confirming speakers now.)
- After one colleague reached out, we had a preliminary meeting with a group of wonderful, interested colleagues to hone the format and suggest participants. Out of that meeting, came the opportunity to collaborate with the Research, Ethics and Society Initiative (RESI) in Pitt Research for an in-depth treatment and deeper discussion of the topics raised in the Plenary in May after the term ends.
- I will let you know more details on both of these items as they develop and finalize.
- Related events around this topic:
 - Teaching Center: Feb. 17 at 1 pm: ChatGPT Events for Instructors
 - Pitt Cyber: Feb. 27, details forthcoming

Two items related to Budget discussions

- At last month's Senate Council, I brought to your attention changes to bargaining unit members ability to participate in unit-level Planning and Budget Committees.
 - I believe this is changing again to be more inclusive of bargaining unit members, shared governance and I will let you know when I know more.
- Last week, the yearly orientation meeting of the UPBC was held. The University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) is a committee that develops and votes on budget parameters for the Educational and General (E&G) operating budget, the capital budget, and others, and forwards them, along with recommendations on compensation increases, to the Chancellor. (This is outside the medical school budgeting.)
 - This committee has 8 Senate related appointments: 4 faculty at-large appointed by the President and Chancellor, the Senate President, and Chairs of three Senate Committees, BPC, CUPS, and Ed. Policies.
 - Despite some concern, I am happy to say that the faculty voice on this committee will be moving forward in the spirit of shared governance.

Thank you for your service and dedication to shared governance.

Any questions or comments on my report?

McCormick: I'd like to make a comment on ELI

The ELI would like to thank every individual, group, unit, school, committee, organization, and any other entity at University, local, national, and international levels who has shared their support for the ELI or taken any action to support the ELI over the last two months. We greatly appreciate your words and your wisdom.

The content of messages from the University community reflect common themes on how the ELI provides service to the University, and I would like to share them with you.

1. The ELI contributes to the Pitt experience for students.
2. The ELI contributes to the Pitt experience for employees and their families who attend non-credit classes using educational benefits.
3. The ELI contributes to University certificate- and degree- student recruitment, retention, and success.
4. The ELI contributes to University research success.
5. The ELI contributes to the University's vision of being a "model of equity, diversity, and inclusion" (Source: <https://www.diversity.pitt.edu/>)

Our hope is that your messages have helped inform the University of the value and necessity of having an English language center on campus and provide evidence of our argument that we are a University service center as well as a cost center.

We also hope to hear from the administration quickly about a reconsideration of closure. If we are to remain open, we now must dig ourselves out of a deeper hole because of the closure announcement. For example:

- The ELI has been pulled from the Department of Linguistics Day of Giving efforts for this year.
- We have spent two months during a peak recruitment time turning away applicants for the summer and coming academic year.
- We are on the verge of losing a contract with an overseas partner University that wants to send about 30 students in the fall.
- We are hearing from other university-based English language programs that agents with whom the ELI works are looking for new program partners because they have heard of the closure.
- We have to battle against a loss of confidence in the University of Pittsburgh that current students are feeling.

Every day of delay adds another hurdle.

If the University has a plan in mind, a key consideration is the intention of plan.

If the intention is to placate ELI supporters, with limited time and resources assigned to the ELI recovery efforts, then we will struggle to succeed.

If the intention is to elevate the ELI, with the full Power of Pitt behind the effort, then we increase our chances of success significantly. We know that the University of Pittsburgh's collaborative approach and

practices for addressing the pandemic are now an example for other institutions. I see no reason why a collaborative approach to rethinking university-based English language programs and English language support would not result in the University of Pittsburgh's ELI emerging as another example for other institutions.

So, the ELI asks for your continued perseverance and support to encourage a supportive and collaborative approach.

Thank you.

Kear; Thank you and I am sorry about the erosion of the work caused by this announcement.

Stoner: You referenced that there was a meeting between union reps and administration concerning the termination of the 8 faculty impacted by the ELI closure. Is a broader aspect concerning the impact of the closure being considered?

Kear: I don't know – I know it was positive, but I do not know the details.

5. Reports by and Announcements of the Special and Standing Committees of the Senate

Drone Policy

Katherine Wood, Research Co-Chair

On December 16th Allen DiPalma, Director of the Office of Trade Compliance and Anthony Graham, from the policy office, came to the research committee to present this policy, which has been in development since 2018. They gave a very thorough overview of the policy and it was unanimously approved by the research committee.

The policy was then presented by Allen DiPalma.

We received good feedback from the Senate committees. The term unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) is the official term used for this policy and it includes the vehicle, ground control station, payload, links and the people. FAA is now controlling outdoor drone policy and has issued new regulations. FAA placed more responsibility on drone flyers.

The 4 risks considered by this policy include; 1) FAA regulations; 2) Privacy; 3) Safety; 4) National security.

Extensive benchmarking was done with 35 other institutions. The policy was revised so that review and approval for drone use is not required and a simple notification will be recommended. Review and approval will be required for indoor flights.

Stoner: Most of the policy relates to intended domestic use but did the committee consider international use? For example, archeologists may purchase drones with University funds but use them in international sites. They should follow the law and guidelines of the countries in which they find themselves.

DiPalma: This is a good point, and we will investigate this. This could be an area for which we could provide guidance on our website.

Balaban: These unmanned systems may also be hooked up to a network of central controllers that could be in multiple locations, including abroad. Are we going to be concerned about that? People from abroad could be controlling drones here or in the city.

DiPalma: This is an interesting question and can you give me a scenario. Would this be a drone for educational or research use?

Balaban: It could be introduced in almost any way. The drone could be introduced by an intelligence agency to acquire information, but ostensibly stated to be conducting research. I am concerned about preventing the drones operating here from some forms of subversion. This is complicated as there could be multiple people in different places controlling these flights at the same time. There are a number of scenarios where this could be used as a back door in for various purposes. There might be some prudent controls needed.

DiPalma: This is where the policy intersects with export controls and national security. This is a huge discussion now across the country. Different government agencies are looking into these issues including DOD, DOS and DOC. The policy is not the correct medium for some of these issues

Balaban: We are open access as a university and this creates risks.

DiPalma: OSP keeps us informed about such risks and have been our best source of information.

Balaban: I wanted to point this out to highlight the complexity of these issues and that changes may be needed in the future.

Taboas: The policy states that approval is required for indoor flights but my concern is that approval may be needed for external flights around certain buildings. For example, there have been flights around the dental school, where the privacy of patients may be compromised. I believe the dental school was notified about the flights but it is not clear if they were asked if this was OK. I would ask the committee to reevaluate this question as to whether review and approval should be required for external flights around specific campus buildings.

DiPalma: This brings up some case law. The state of PA passed laws such that it is illegal to fly drones for surveillance, recklessly, or for contraband. The FAA and state laws state that it is OK to fly drones over private property, provided privacy and safety are assured, and also that entities cannot create their own rules. There is a concern that we would be in violation of local and state law if we were to introduce additional restrictions. I may need more legal advice on this point

Taboas: I understand. There was concern in our building when these flights occurred as people were surprised and they felt their privacy had been violated. Maybe a better notification system may be needed.

DiPalma: This was brought to our attention by the CUPS committee that a better communication with building facilities managers could be in place to notify when flights would be taking place so that there is no surprise.

Taboas: It is not just surprise as there should be a two way communication because sometimes you should not fly depending on what is going on in the building.

DiPalma: This is good point, and so we could include the facilities manager for a particular building during the notification process such that they can bring to light any events that might be too sensitive and that the flight should be scheduled for a different time. I will take that back.

Kear: sounds like this is a procedural issue about the process works, rather than related to the policy.

McCormick: It seems like this policy is dependent on state and federal rules and regulations that may be changing. Will there be a yearly review of policy based on changing regulations?

DiPalma: there is a process in the policy that allows for this.

Anthony: We do have a minor update process to allow revision of the policy.

Kear: There are other policies that have such procedures in place to take into account new rules/regulations.

Vote: Yes: 42; No: 1; Abstain: 3

IT Network Policy

lia Murtazashvili, CITC Chair

Murtazashvili: This is mainly an update to the previous policy. I ask Anthony Graham to provide the background for this policy.

Graham: The current policy has a lot of security jargon and network requirements that constantly change. The idea was to remove the reference to the particular standards and point out that these live on the IT website. It was better that the policy does not have to be modified every time these network standards change. This policy provides the authority for installing, maintaining, developing operating, documenting and supporting the network rather than proscribing specific details about the network. It reflects how the network has changed over the years. This policy does not describe the use of the network. It describes the ownership of the installation, development and operation of the network, and the use of the network will be covered in another policy.

Murtazashvili: The committee unanimously approved the policy as it is written. We liked that it provided a flexible framework that does not require constant modification as network parameters change, and the committee is very supportive of the policy. Any questions?

Taboas: On the section of connecting into PittNet. The way it is phrased in section IV the use of the word "or" reads that we explicitly prohibiting people from creating private networks that are not connected to PittNet. That is a problem for people who are connecting an old computer to a new one, and you can create private networks, but not connect them to PittNet.

Graham: A question, when you say private network would that not be connected to PittNet at all?

Taboas; Correct

Graham: Then that would not be covered by this policy?

Taboas: The wording is the problem.

Graham: So, we can change it to "or create private networks on University property *that connect to PittNet* without prior permission from Pitt IT." We can make that change.

Songer: There is no contact information listed in this policy and is there a reason for that?

Graham: The policy states that you need to contact Pitt IT and the specific contacts will be added.

Kear: There is a minor typo with an extra line break.

Graham: that has been fixed.

Kear: We will take a vote with these three changes to the policy.

Vote: Yes: 44 No: 0 Abstain: 4

6. Unfinished Business and /or New Business

Union and Shared Governance

Tyler Bickford, Bargaining Committee Chair, Union of Pitt Faculty

Kear:

Thank you for being here today, I am hopeful that your views will help us to clarify issues that have been facing shared governance and that we have been discussing for the past few months. We have been trying to navigate between the administration and the union around mandatory subjects of bargaining, while being cognizant of the rights of both sides, to continue open and transparent shared governance for the entire Pitt community.

The four main areas where uncertainty is impacting us right now are:

- number 1, three permanent Senate Committees and one ad hoc Committee are pondering their future during and after the negotiation period,
- number 2, the potential exclusion of bargaining unit members from budget discussions in unit-level PBCs, (although this could be changing)
- number 3, University Policy related to mandatory subjects and the change in policy committee memberships, and
- number 4, University Policy that is being created that only covers part of our Senate constituencies.

Bickford:

I am here to talk about the relationship between the union and shared governance.

It is important to say that faculty governance is a core value of our union. We voted to form a union because faculty wanted to have more say over our jobs.

To me, shared governance means activities that happen at all levels of the university, involving students and faculty committees etc.

Now that we have a union the administration cannot make changes to key aspects of our jobs without securing union approval. This is the key change that we voted on, and the union isn't going to compromise on that core right.

However, within that framework there are many ways to move collaboratively.

I will address three key areas:

- 1) Concerning mandatory subjects, which include salaries, hours etc, state law requires the administration to negotiate only with the union. That exclusive relationship is built into labor law to prevent side deals from being negotiated outside the union. As a union we are committed to protecting this key right of exclusive representation to this as this allows us to get the best contract for our faculty. Any legal restrictions apply to the administration but not to the faculty. There is nothing preventing discussions between faculty and chairs about any topic. There is nothing preventing supervisors from providing factual information to faculty, but no deals on mandatory subjects can be negotiated. There is also nothing preventing discussions between faculty, within or outside of the bargaining unit, on policies that impact students staff or faculty outside of

the bargaining unit. In general, academic subjects are not mandatory subjects and work on these can move forward as they have in the past through shared governance. Once there is a contract we will have an agreement that spells things out and many of the restrictions should go away.

I was not going to comment on the ELI, but I am going to as it is a good illustration of how we may continue to work together. The administration announced in December they were going to close the ELI. In general, decisions about programs are considered managerial prerogatives and not mandatory subjects of bargaining – but the effects of these decisions are mandatory subjects if people are getting laid off etc. The union has strong legal rights to advocate for and represent the specific members of the bargaining unit that are impacted by this decision. There are other structures of shared governance which do have the right to question the program decision. We have seen over the last few months that there has been a lot of advocacy from the Faculty Assembly, the committees and individuals questioning this decision. These shared governance structures cannot advocate for affected faculty. Having multiple avenues gives us more space to collaborate. There was a meeting with affected ELI faculty, administration and union yesterday. The administration has asked us not to share the information of the meeting. I am not going to say anything and would urge the admin to make their own announcement.

- 2) Permissive subjects are those with managerial prerogatives, such as academic or program decisions and these can move forward. If changes to these programs impact union members the administration is required to “meet and discuss” with the union about decisions. Their obligation is to meet and discuss and listen to union recommendations, but not necessarily to act on them. This could be problematic with such a big organization, and there could be a lot of “meet and discuss” meetings that would be necessary. We have come up with a process to streamline this that would allow existing governance structures, like Senate committees, to fulfil that meet and discuss requirement. We do have these legal rights, but we think that existing shared governance structure at the University are good places for that work to happen. We proposed this to the administration but have received no response from them. This should resolve many of the issues that have arisen recently concerning bargaining unit faculty participation in committees.
- 3) Local governance. Most governance happens at the local level of units and departments. For the contract we have proposed to delegate many of the decisions concerning promotions etc to the local units, since criteria vary from unit to unit. Thus, we have proposed that the existing structures within units should continue as normal. In the interim, until we have a contract, we propose that local governance continues as normal. The administration has not responded to that proposal, which has led to problems with local UPBC. They have instead moved forward with what is the most restrictive interpretation of their obligations under the law and the most disruptive.

At the end of the day, we all want the same thing concerning the security of our jobs and working conditions. We have been making real progress in the contract negotiation, on core

priorities. Having a union does not replace other forms of participation in decision making and the union does not think it should.

I will end with an invitation at the William Pitt union on February 24th at 10:30 am to ask the board of trustees to urge the administration to increase speed of negotiations.

Kear: I would like one point of clarification concerning the changes instituted by the administration, but it was my understanding that what had changed was a letter sent to the administration concerning direct dealing and unfair labor practice. This letter was sent in late October, and it seemed to trigger these changes to shared governance. This is based on my understanding as I cannot see the proposals you send or the letter. Can you clarify?

Bickford: That is a good question. My goal was to say that we had already made proposals that would make these changes unnecessary. We asked the administration to stop bringing us things that had already been negotiated by other groups, and to instead engage in negotiations on mandatory subjects directly with us.

Tashbook: I am trying to understand what the vision is between sharing the roles between shared governance and the union. My particular example is that of benefits. Are you saying that there would continue to be a benefits and welfare committee in the senate that would take on the role of meet and discuss. The union would then be negotiating with the benefits office and the vendors, of insurance for example?

Bickford: We would not negotiate with vendors of insurance, that would be the role of Pitt's administration. There are parts of shared governance that are likely to have more overlap with mandatory subjects of bargaining than others, and the majority of benefits do fall under mandatory subjects and will be negotiated.

Tashbook: I understand that but will there still be a role for this committee in the future?

Bickford: There are details to talk to. You would cover members that are not in the bargaining unit. I suspect there maybe permissive topics that your committee covers, I am happy to sit down and talk to you as I am not sure of the full portfolio of what your committee covers.

Kear: we are finding it really hard to separate the purview of these committees as they cover many constituencies.

Taboas: It is clear that shared governance and union need to work together and thank you for being here. Can you speak to the definition of "negotiate"? The state university of NY has narrowed the definition to "the shared governance body cannot negotiate contractual language". If this is the case, then most activities of shared governance could continue unimpeded. Can you clarify what your definition is in relation to mandatory and permissive subjects? Secondly, what is your vision of how the union and shared governance would work together?

Bickford. Once we have our first contract the boundaries of negotiate will be much clearer. What you are saying is broadly right and the challenge right now is that we do not have the final contract yet that sets those boundaries.

On the question of collaboration, if we were to say that the meet and discuss can take place through existing Senate committees, we would want to designate someone to train who would be able to identify issues important to the union.

Taboas: Your answer is not clear, and it did not really make sense to me. I was looking to hear that once we have a contract it is still OK for the Senate to discuss matters of contract with the administration you just can't negotiate contracts with the University.

Bickford: We not proposing any disruption such that anyone has any special say over what happens in existing committees. We would just want to have someone on the committee who understands the union and can report to us.

Taboas: Would this be for all committees or just a subset?

Bickford: It would be for committees that would meet that meet and discuss obligation. If the administration would rather continue to work on issues through senate committees that works for us, but we would just need to keep informed as to what is being discussed.

Kear: The meet and discuss obligation would be much broader than just mandatory subjects. I would hope that Senate would be involved in the discussion of how to implement these matters. It sounds like you do have latitude on what negotiate means and I would like to reiterate that however the final wording comes out we would like to have influence on that and interpret what that means for us.

Scott: I want to bring home the point that the union does not represent all the faculty. The SOM is not included. We are all represented by the shared governance system, and this is really important. Having all of the faculty involved in discussion about how things will change under the CBA is of paramount importance. Being someone looking at this from the outside and being very invested in shared governance I do not feel the union is being transparent about what they are planning to take over. Important time in the shared governance because the union does not represent everyone.

Bickford: Are there specific issues that you are concerned with?

Scott: It covers everything. The whole university is represented by the faculty senate. One example is the recent IPA policy when the administration was not able to present this because of the threats that had been made by the union. Having that adversarial relationship between the union and the administration is probably going to continue and this is not present in shared governance. We have been able to get a lot of things done because there is not that adversarial attitude. It prevents things getting done that affect me and other SOM faculty and it is very frustrating. There does not seem to be a specific plan to include shared governance, and this is important.

Bickford: it is important to say that nothing prevents policies being developed to apply to SOM faculty. Concerning the IPA policy we asked administration to send it to us but I do not believe we received it. The majority of things are permissive subjects. Our position is that in these areas the existing system can continue. There are areas in which in the present system the SOM is already excluded such as salary pool discussions. So, this may not be that disruptive to SOM faculty. Although I would be happy to talk with SOM faculty about developing plans to advocate for salary, benefits and the tenure system.

Scott: I understand the separation between the SOM and the rest of the University. When you talk about these subjects you talk about it as if it refers to the faculty writ large and I want to

remind you and everybody that it does not. Shared governance does cover us. It is disingenuous to say that you did not know about the IPA policy as there was a lengthy period for public comment, as is the case for all policies.

Kanthak: I wanted to follow up on the question regarding transparency. Many SOM faculty complain that they don't know what's happening with the union negotiations and our response as members of the bargaining unit is that we don't know either. One example is the October letter, as we hear one thing from you and another from the administration about what this letter said and I wish I could see the letter. I understand you don't want to share this letter with the membership. I would like to know how the union leadership makes decisions about what the bargaining unit can see or not see.

Bickford: We have an elected Council of Representatives that oversees the whole process. I am still unclear as to what specific issues the SOM faculty are most concerned about.

Kear: I have seen issues brought up in the research committee when they want to bring up issues concerning the pay of research workers but this cannot be discussed by the administration.

Bickford: For right now they can have those discussions about SOM faculty.

Bonneau: The SOM faculty are concerned that what has worked for SOM in the past will go away. There is not a lot of trust that the union is going to do any better and that the SOM will be left behind. The concern is that discussions that happened before this mysterious letter was sent have now stopped. Concerning transparency and accountability the union has a Council of Representatives that is not an elected body by the faculty. I can only vote for people in my division at my level. As a tenured faculty member in Social Sciences, I only have one representative on that council of 77 members. The bargaining committee is not elected by the faculty it is elected by the Council, thus my vote means a lot less there than on the University Senate. This is why many faculty in the SOM and outside are concerned about the process.

Bickford: I understand the concerns of SOM. Many hundreds of part time faculty who are fully enfranchised in our union, and we just received a counterproposal from administration on academic freedom that applies to all bargaining unit faculty including part-time faculty, and that would be enforceable. We can get the administration to agree a new policy, the SOM can ask that the policy could also apply to the SOM.

Bonneau: There is nothing in current policy that states that academic freedom does not apply to part-time faculty. Having it in writing is more assurance but are we giving anything up in the negotiation when we already have it? I find it strange that someone who teaches one class every two years has the same vote as someone who teaches 4 classes a year.

Bickford: I'm deeply committed to the principle that our part-time colleagues are our full colleagues. We are making real progress on job security, contract renewal, pay and the grievance procedure that would benefit all bargaining unit members including the 2/3 that are appointment stream faculty.

Reed: My concern is the SOM faculty has been excluded from any discussion on anything that involves the bargaining unit. The university has told us things that we did not think were part of the CBA were, so we were excluded from those discussions. We don't know that our views are

being represented. The university could have set up different rules for union and nonunion faculty which is a concern.

Songer: It is not clear if elements of shared governance will go into the contract.

Bickford: Yes, we have proposed that shared governance at the local level will continue as before and that the Senate can fulfil some of these functions.

Songer: I would recommend that Senate leadership have some input into this.

Taboas: I want to make the point that the Senate tries to represent everyone, all faculty, students and staff. We don't draw distinctions between types of faculty or kinds of staff. We weren't able to get everything and that is why we have a union now. It behooves us to recognize that the administration, Senate and union all need each other, but we need to be clear in defining our roles. This needs to be done now, and the longer we wait people will become fearful because change can be frightening. Please sit down and figure things out.

Kear: I need an acknowledgment of these unintended consequences and how we are working through them. We are confronted with different issues now and it is hard to figure out who can talk about what etc. I would welcome more collaboration on what that means both in a formal way, but also with us as a partner.

Bickford: I acknowledge that the Senate has encountered difficulties in the last few months.

Kear: I hope we continue our dialogue. Thank you, Tyler for coming to talk with us and answering questions – we appreciate it.

7. Announcements

None

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 pm.

Documents from the meeting are available at the University Senate website:

<http://www.univsenate.pitt.edu/faculty-assembly>

Respectfully submitted,

Penelope (Penny) Morel

Secretary, University Senate

Members attending: Balaban, Bell, Bircher, Bonneau, Bratman, Buchanich, Burton, Conley, Cousins, Damiani, Denman, Falcione, Fort, Glynn, Guterma, Jacobs, Jones, Kanthak, Kear, Keown, Kohanbash, Lemery, Massanelli, Mauk, McCormick, Melnick, Molinaro, Morel, Morris, Murtazashvili I., Murtazashvili J., Nguyen, Pacella-LaBarbara, Paljug, Parker, Paterson, Pitetti, Potoski, Reed, Scott, Shafiq, Shephard, Songer, Stoner, Streeter, Swigonova, Taboas, Tashbook, Tokowicz, Tudorascu, Wood G., Wood K., Zack

Members not attending: Almarza, Archibald, Bench, Cutsumbis, Dallal, Epitropoulos, Giandomenico-Meaner, Hall, Lewin, Mahboobin, Maier, Newman, Oyler, Salcido, Schmidt, Schuster, Triplette, Wert, Yates, Yearwood

*Excused attendance: Kovacs, Labrinidis, Sant

Others attending: Bickford, Ciccocioppo, Collister, DeVallejo, DiPalma, Graham, Jones, Klem, Ledger, Manges, Mucklo, O'Neill, Ringler, SantaCasa, Schackner, Stonesifer, Tuttle, Wells, Wilson

* Notified Senate office