

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
November 2, 2015**

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

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair of the Faculty Michael Brewer at 3:02 p.m. in the Old Main Silver and Sage Room.

Present: Senators Abraham, Aleamoni, Armstrong, Brecci, Brewer, Brock, Colina, Conway, Cuillier, Dahlgran, Dai, Duran, Fountain, Fregosi, Galilee-Belfer, Ghosh, Guertin, Harris, Hazen, Labate, Leafgren, Lee, Martin, McKean, Meixner, Najafi, Nadel, Neumann, O'Keeffe, Pau, Pietz, Polakowski, Ray, Ritter, Story, Silverman, Smith, Spece, A. Vaillancourt, R. Vaillancourt, Visscher, M. Witte, R. Witte and Yeager.

Absent: Senators Ayoun, Comrie, Cox, Cuello, Felix, Finnegan, Hammer, Hart, Hildebrand, Johnson, Jull, Miller, Moreno, Netherton, Paiewonsky, Rees, Richardson, Russell, Schwartz, Simmons, Snyder, Sun, Valerdi, and Parliamentarian J.C. Mutchler.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 5, 2015

The minutes of October 5, 2015 were approved.

3. ACTION ITEM: RESOLUTION FROM THE ACADEMIC PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE: THE FACULTY SENATE STRONGLY RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA SUPPORT HEALTH BENEFITS FOR TRANSGENDER EMPLOYEES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Senator Cuillier, at the last Senate meeting, spoke in open session to advise the Senate that the UA currently does not offer health benefits to support transgender employees and/or their dependents. Brewer explained that this change in health benefits would have to be implemented at the state level, since the UA's health benefits are provided by the Arizona Department of Administration. Resolutions from all three in-state universities will be brought before ABOR so that the requested inclusion to the health benefits can be requested to the legislature and brought to the Arizona Department of Administration.

Questions and comments included: 1) Senator Silverman asked if employees of the University who are in same-sex relationships can take advantage of the University's health benefits. Brewer replied yes. 2) Senator Conway asked how many transgender people this provision would affect. Senator A. Vaillancourt replied that currently, it is a very small percentage, less than 1%, and the majority are parents who are concerned about the needs of their children. The student health plan is an Arizona Board of Regents plan, whereas the UA health plan is through the Arizona Department of Administration. With no further questions, Brewer asked for a motion [**Motion 2015/16-3**] to approve the Resolution. Motion was seconded and passed with one abstention, and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

4. REPORT FROM THE FACULTY OFFICERS

Nadel reported that the quality brainstorming groups formed on teaching and research have met and are working to complete a report in approximately one month. The ABOR breakfast is being planned and fourteen students have been contacted and invited to participate. Ten students have responded affirmatively, and the roundtable will be set up with students, faculty and Regents at every table. The Non-tenure track *ad hoc* committee will be releasing its survey relating to non-tenure track faculty in approximately one more week after testing is finalized.

5. QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR ASUA, GPSC AND APAC REPORTS

There were no questions.

6. REPORT BY PROVOST COMRIE

Provost Comrie was absent.

7. REPORT FROM PRESIDENT HART

Senior Associate to the President and Secretary to the University, Jon Dudas reported in Hart's absence. Dudas reported that there was a special legislative session with Governor Ducey pertaining to the K-12 lawsuit, and there is speculation that if a settlement is reached, there will be a better sense of how funding for the UA will go forward. No official motions went forward at this time. The ABOR meeting will be hosted at the UA on November 18-30, 2015 with a focus on health sciences relating to *Never Settle*. The upcoming ABOR meeting

will also be an opportune time to highlight the benefits concerning the relationship with Banner Health and the new opportunities it brings for the UA.

8. QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR PROVOST, PRESIDENT AND FACULTY OFFICER REPORTS

Questions and comments included: 1) Senator McKean asked who was responsible for changing Spring Commencement from Saturday to Friday. Senior Vice Provost Gail Burd responded that the students prefer Friday night rather than Saturday, but kept Saturday last year due to short notice and a speaker who was only available on Saturday. 2) Silverman asked that Dudas pass on his comments to President Hart. One of the highlights of the Senate meetings are the updates that the President provides. President Hart doesn't share much of anything newsworthy and her statements are not in-depth with any forthcoming information that the general University population isn't already aware of. Dudas asked Silverman if it would be more beneficial if the updates be in written or oral form. Silverman said that since written reports were never done in the past, and if she doesn't want to write things for the report, that an oral presentation with useful information would be welcome. Nadel asked if the format was part of the problem. Silverman said that it makes no difference in what manner the information is presented, as long as useful information is given in the report. 3) Senator M. Witte said that the Senate had a presentation by the Vice President for Research where many questions are raised, but no answers are given. 4) Senator Galilee-Belfer said that it makes sense that the ABOR presentation will focus on the health sciences, but hopes that the fields not directly in the health sciences that support health research will also be addressed. 5) Senator Duran asked about proposition 301's lawsuit and what the UA's role will be in the conversation. Dudas responded that ABOR will respond that the Universities will take no specific position.

9. ACTION ITEM; APPROVAL OF THE MS IN ANIMAL AND BIOMEDICAL INDUSTRIES/PRE-PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM AND THE DOCTOR OF VETERINARY MEDICINE/PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM – DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND LIFE SCIENCES, SHANE BURGESS

Senator Conway asked what the unsubsidized cost for registering in the first year would be and how many students are expected to enroll in the first year. Burgess responded that the in-state tuition cost would be approximately \$13,000 and a conservative estimate on enrolled students is 500. Conway asked if there was a limit on students going into the second year. Burgess responded 100 students. Silverman asked what the difference is between this proposal and the University starting a school of veterinary science. Will the end result be the same? Burgess said that students will be graduating with a DVM degree, but the big difference is the Master's degree which gives students a better chance of being accepted to a veterinary school. Brewer asked for a motion [**Motion 2015/16-4**] to approve the MS in Animal and Biomedical Industries/Pre-professional program and the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine/Professional Program. Motion was seconded and passed with one abstention, and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

10. ACTION ITEM: HYDROLOGY AND WATER RESOURCES AND ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES TRANSFORMATION MERGER PROPOSAL – SENATOR THOMAS MEIXNER AND ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES HEAD, ERIC BETTERTON

Brewer asked for a motion [**Motion 2015/16-5**] to approve the Hydrology and Water Resources and Atmospheric Sciences Transformation Proposal. Motion was seconded and passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

11. OPEN SESSION

Senator M. Witte addressed the Senate with concerns about the Office of Research and Discovery. The minutes of the previous Senate meeting outlined issues that have been raised and no answers have been received. Witte reiterated the "Offender's List" of delinquent senior faculty who repeatedly submit grant paperwork late. The "No Fly List" consists of faculty who are not allowed to submit grant paperwork and Witte would like to know who is in charge of designating the individuals on the list. One person on the list has generated a \$1.5M grant and Witte questions whether or not the individuals on the list have received apologies from the proper authorities. The cluster hiring process supposedly was broadcast campus-wide, but Witte never received any information about such a process. The shared governance process is not being followed since the Research Policy Committee, of which Witte is a member, has never been asked to meet to discuss any of the cluster hiring issues. The last item is the discontinuance of the undergraduate research program administered by the Honors College. For over thirty years, thousands of students have been supported in music, art, law, etc., and the program is being terminated without any discussion by the faculty involved. The program was implemented by the Research Policy Committee cooperatively with the Vice President for Research Office to give \$30K per year to students across campus. Witte wants answers to her questions and also wants to know why faculty committees are not being used for these very important decision issues.

12. LOOKING AHEAD: A STRUCTURED DISCUSSION AMONG SENATORS ON THE QUALITY OF TEACHING – SENIOR VICE PROVOST, GAIL BURD

Burd explained that Chair of the Faculty Nadel had previously asked the faculty if they wanted to participate in the brainstorming groups to look at quality of teaching or quality of research. There is a group of approximately twenty-five faculty who have been selected to define and measure quality in each category. Papers were placed on each table for Senators to write down responses to questions, and open discussions were encouraged. Burd introduced Associate Vice Provost for Instruction and Assessment, Debra Tomanek, who also directs the Science Teacher Preparation Program in the College of Science. The first question Burd asked Senators to discuss was, "What are the characteristics of quality teaching?" Answers by table included: 1) relevant and up-to-date content, 2) people don't care how much you know until they know how much you care, 3) creating a community respect in the classroom, 4) engaging teaching coupled with assessment, 5) inspired to be curious or question what they know, 6) students are also responsible for their part of the quality assessment, 7) the communication between the teacher and student and student to student is important, 8) clear expectations from both students and professors, and 9) learning objectives. Individual comments included: 1) McKean mentioned that with learning expectations/student outcomes, the

delivery of content has to match how one designs assessment and outcomes. 2) M. Witte said that the distinction between short-term and long-term effects of teaching, which are seldom measured, may be much more important in the long run. 3) Najafi mentioned that there is a wealth of information on the quality of teaching, and wondered if the committee that was formed can summarize the information available. McKean said that the teaching quality task force's report is linked on the agenda. 4) Aleamoni mentioned the ability to structure the learning environment to successfully teach large and small courses. 5) Silverman said being enthusiastic and interesting. 6) Smith said that teachers who teach online/distance learning courses are not familiar with the standards for quality distance learning. Burd said that national standards are listed online, and within the Office of Instruction and Assessment there are learning specialists designed to help faculty with online course development, and UA Online under Vin Del Casino has hired many specialists who have developed courses for online programs. Ray mentioned feedback to students in a timely manner. Burd showed a summarization of characteristics in the PowerPoint presentation. Burd asked Senators to discuss how one would measure, improve and reward quality teaching. Comments by tables included 1) getting feedback from peers on teaching performance, 2) student evaluations (TCE's) are important, but not the current ones the UA uses, 3) making sure to have multiple sources of information, so that what is identified can be measured reliably 4) pre- and post-assessment, 5) measurement is multi-dimensional and cannot be reduced to a single metric, 6) survey of student engagement, 7) paper format of student evaluations rather than online format, 8) measuring student performance in a successive course, 9) class monitoring by peers. Tomanek responded to the peer review of teaching observation protocol, which is a process that one engages in with the observer and person being observed, finding out what is of value to observe, and finally, discussion on how one improves in the area of teaching. Individual comments included: 1) Najafi said that some of the metrics cannot be generalized, and having measurements that are more specific to a departmental area would be helpful. 2) McKean said that context and content specific information is important to specificity of teaching evaluations. 3) Aleamoni said that when measuring teaching quality, the process is subjective and objectivity is almost impossible. 4) Vice Provost Tom Miller said that the Department of Surgery has had robust conversations concerning long-term assessments as faculty proceed through residency. The challenges remain open, but documentation exists. The central protocol for main campus is useful, but it would be more useful if faculty who work in laboratory settings and studio settings were to think about best practices. Peer review protocol is not simply an observational protocol, it also models some behaviors, and actually helps people think about the qualities of teaching they are working with. Burd said that it is up to each department to determine which special areas within the observation tool are important and have those be the focus. The faculty member who is trying to obtain formative evaluation of their teaching, would ask the person observing and use specific areas within the observation tool. The observation tool is available on the Office of Instruction and Assessment website. Burd encourages conversations within the faculty member's department on how to use the tool for formative improvement of teaching and also summative evaluation for Promotion and Tenure. Concerning improvement of teaching, McKean said that communication between faculty members about best practices, and use of the protocol to have those discussions is one way to approach improvement within teaching. Nadel said that it would be useful if the department spent more time talking to faculty about teaching quality. Smith said that teaching is a process. In the process of the development of teaching over time, evaluations should be used as a long-term tool rather than just for the period of time being evaluated. Burd asked the Senate about available rewards for teaching quality. Dahlgran said that good instruction can be its own reward. R. Vaillancourt said that teaching awards fall into the rewards category. R. Witte said that seeing students' success in the long-term metrics may not be prevalent immediately. M. Witte said that smaller classes could be a reward for teachers who normally teach large classes. McKean mentioned merit pay as a reward. Silverman said that teaching is part of Promotion and Tenure and evaluations done each year, and teaching should be shown in different ways. M. Witte said sabbaticals and the opportunity to travel to conferences are rewards. Visscher said that better facilities, equipment and resources are also ways to reward faculty. Burd said that faculty coming together within a department, or collaborating across departments and forming groups, would be welcome with the Office of Instruction and Assessment. The most important aspect is that the students learn. Are students prepared for the next class? A dialogue is required between the faculty teaching the first course and faculty teaching the second course to make sure the content, learning outcomes, and skill set are in place before students take the second course. Some things done on the UA campus include the Task Force on Teaching Quality, the UA has received a grant from the Association of American Universities STEM Project to redesign five foundation STEM classes, along with workshops and faculty learning communities. The UA has developed six collaborative learning spaces and faculty workshops are currently being held through the Office of Instruction and Assessment on assigning and grading written work. Burd recommended the book, *Make It Stick (2014) P.C. Brown, H.L. Roediger III, M.A. McDaniel*. The book focuses on how students learn with practice, the retrieval process and self-testing. Research shows that with active learning classes as opposed to traditional lecture classes, students' learning gains are improved and they fail less. In large classrooms, active learning is possible by separating students into small groups for discussion. The Freeman Study specifically outlines how students learn. Tomanek said that what's notable about the Freeman Study is that as a meta-study, 600 manuscripts were collected and 245 experiments were conducted satisfactorily that met the requirements of comparison between traditional lecture classes and active learning classes. The percentage of lecture time in a course directly correlates to the amount of student engagement. The more lecture time, the less student engagement. The collaborative spaces on campus are Chavez for thirty students, ILC for sixty students, the Science-Engineering Library for 260 students, Biosciences West for 112 students, and the ENR2 Lecture Hall for 597 students. M. Witte asked if active learning has been implemented outside of the sciences. Burd responded that there is one in Criminal Justice and two in Psychology. Five new spaces are being planned per year. Galilee-Belfer asked about the difference in workload between traditional versus active learning classes. Two years ago, faculty learning community participants designed one active process they would use for one week in the classroom and report back how it worked. A second follow-up process was designed for comparison. Martin asked if teaching assistant funding will be increasing to expand the program. Burd responded that there will not be any additional teaching assistants, but the program contains undergraduate preceptors who are taking a course for credit to facilitate the instruction and/or students who have taken the course previously. Miller said that research shows if faculty spend less time on preparation and more time on activities for students to engage in, the class experience is more effective. Brock said that getting feedback from students is crucial since not all instructors are aware of the best way to teach students. Nadel said that given there is no one-size-fits-all approach to teaching, he asked if there is another change in teaching pedagogy over the course of four years that may be more effective to the students' learning experience. Tomanek responded that hands-on, one-on-one active learning works at all levels, there is always a need to know what is unknown at every stage of the student's development. If instruction is organized for the need-to-know to emerge, the active learning process is engaged. Fregosi said that active learning processes needs to come from the faculty. In the College of Medicine when the faculty had no input with the change into small group instruction, the ramifications were detrimental. Faculty found that the change was extremely labor intensive,

and outcome scores did not improve. The first year, outcome scores actually decreased. There is no evidence after seven or eight years of any increase in scores, and there has not been any noticeable benefit. M. Witte said that small group teaching may appear to be easier, but in fact is more difficult due to the close-knit interaction faculty have with the students.

13. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Barbara McKean, 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. Minutes of October 5, 2015
2. Report from Faculty Officers
4. Report from APAC
5. Report from the Provost
6. Report from the President
7. MS in Animal and Biomedical Industries/Pre-professional program and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine/Professional program
8. Hydrology and Water Resources and Atmospheric Sciences transformation merger proposal
9. Final Report of the Task Force on Teaching Quality

Motions of the Meeting of October 5, 2015

Motion 2015/16-3 Resolution from the Academic Personnel Policy Committee: The Faculty Senate strongly recommends that the University of Arizona support health benefits for transgender employees and their dependents. Motion carried.

Motion 2015/16-4 Approval of the MS in Animal and Biomedical Industries/Pre-professional program and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine/Professional Program. Motion carried with one abstention.

Motion 2015/16-5 Approval of the Hydrology and Water Resources and Atmospheric Sciences transformation merger proposal. Motion carried.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456