

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
February 1, 2016**

**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 3:04 p.m. in the Old Main Silver and Sage Room. Brewer announced that the nomination process was culminating on Friday, February 5, 2016. To date, only six petitions have been received for College Representative seats. Brewer urged Senators to please pick up petitions that were available and inform colleagues that involvement in University governance is welcome.

Present: Senators Abraham, Armstrong, Breci, Brewer, Colina, Comrie, Conway, Cuillier, Dahlgran, Duran, Felix, Finnegan, Fountain, Galilee-Belfer, Ghosh, Guertin, Hammer, Hart, Hazen, Johnson, Labate, Leafgren, Lee, Martin, McClain, McKean, Nadel, Neumann, Paiewonsky, Pietz, Ray, Richardson, Russell, Silverman, Smith, Story, A. Vaillancourt, and M. Witte.

Absent: Senators Aleamoni, Brock, Cox, Cuello, Dai (sabbatical), Fregosi, Harris, Hildebrand, Jull, Meixner, Miller, Moreno, Najafi, Netherton, O'Keeffe, Pau, Polakowski, Rees, Ritter, Schwartz, Simmons, Snyder, Spece, Sun, R. Vaillancourt, Valerdi, Visscher, R. Witte and Yeager.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2016

The minutes of January 25, 2016 were approved.

3. QUESTION AND ANSWER FOR PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, ASUA, GPSC AND APAC REPORTS

Senator Martin asked President Hart about the modest increase from the Governor's budget, and wanted to know if the Legislature has a vision for a budget increase. Hart responded that the answer is as diverse as the Legislators themselves. Some of the leadership does not favor public dollars being spent on private education, because many believe that education only benefits the recipient of the degree. If a conservative budget can be agreed upon, the legislature will agree to support the model the Governor has recommended and increase funding. A positive approach is for the State of Arizona to make a commitment to its future, and fund Arizona resident students for 50% of the tuition cost which would generate another 40% in funding. Senator Silverman asked for clarification for the new funding formula for residents. Hart said that the minutes from the November ABOR meeting outline a more complicated overall request than the simple funding of Arizona resident students. The State Constitution says that higher education is the responsibility of the state and should be as close to free as possible. The Regents responding to the Governor's meeting in April came up with a simple relationship between the state, the Constitution, and the citizens of the state, which is funding for Arizona residents. The current state funding portion covers approximately one-third of the actual cost of an average degree, but the UA has a much more expensive assortment of degrees. Senator McKean asked ASUA about goals to improve departments to seek greater voice for students. McKean suggested that ASUA to explain to departments what it can offer. Senator Finnegan said that ASUA mainly provides many resources for funding toward organizations and clubs on campus. Career development, making sure students are well-represented in their college, and bringing in speakers are different ways that ASUA helps students. ASUA visited with the College Academic Administrators Council to speak to the deans and associate deans about opportunities for students. McKean asked Comrie about the \$250 prescription relief criteria for graduate students, and if this could be used as a recruitment tool, and if it was ongoing. Comrie said that there is a tri-state University healthcare company negotiation on what rates will be, and as time progresses over the negotiated period, deductibles and benefits can change. Senator Cuillier asked Hart if there were items on the upcoming ABOR agenda besides the academic strategic plan that would highly impact the UA. Hart said Arizona State University's in-depth financial and operating report is scheduled and quality issues will be part of the ABOR meeting. Hart commended the faculty leadership at the UA for bringing quality issues to the forefront of the Senate discussions.

4. INFORMATION ITEM: UPDATE ON THE COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN, CO-CHAIR OF THE FACULTY AFFAIRS WORKGROUP, BECKY MOSHER

Mosher is an Assistant Professor in the School of Plant Sciences. Mosher explained that the Commission on the Status of Women has been on the UA campus for the last couple of decades. The Commission is a steward of quality, inclusion and diversity on campus. Different workgroups were formed that focus on different issues faculty face, one recently being a workgroup on Faculty Affairs. The workgroup has developed an infographic on ways gender bias has been used in letters of reference. The Commission on the Status of Women holds workshops, and led one last semester on Combatting Imposter Syndrome with the help of Senator Galilee-Belfer. Luncheons are also being held to bring faculty together to form peer networking groups, with the next one scheduled for Friday, February 6, 2016.

5. OPEN SESSION

There were no speakers.

6. **INFORMATION ITEM: OPEN ACCESS AD HOC COMMITTEE REPORT – COMMITTEE CHAIR DAN LEE AND SHAN SUTTON**

Lee introduced the newest member of the *ad hoc* committee who joined the Library last year from Oregon State, where they undertook a similar process and eventually passed and implemented an Open Access policy. Open Access is also referred to as public access for journal articles available for online reading. Scholarship is more likely accessible with the availability of Open Access, and in an open letter to Congress, twenty-five Nobel Prize winners wrote a letter explaining the benefits of Open Access and how it accelerates research. There are several studies that show an increase in citations and readership. Making the UA's research available to the public fits into the land-grant mission of the University. There are two different approaches to Open Access; the "Gold" and "Green" models. Gold Open Access involves journals that have shifted away from charging readers/libraries for access to their content. Instead, they employ other budgetary mechanisms, such as charging authors "article processing charges" (APCs) or using subsidies from parent institutions or other partners to fund the cost of publication with neither author nor reader being charged. In either case, scholarly publishing of the quality that researchers expect has costs and these costs need to be accounted for in some manner. Gold Open Access has been most successful in the medical and life sciences with several Open Access journals among the highest ranked in the field. However, there has been recent growth in Open Access in Humanities and Social Sciences with the launch of Open Humanities Press in the UK, as well as the Collabra journal and Luminos monograph publishing program from the University of California Press. In the Green Open Access model, authors typically publish in subscription-based journals, but also deposit the final accepted manuscripts of their articles into an Open Access repository through which that version is made freely available to the public. These repositories are often managed by universities as institutional repositories (e.g., At UA, <http://arizona.openrepository.com/arizona/>) that focus on capturing the research outputs of their scholars, or by research funding agencies that focus on capturing the outputs of the research they fund (i.e., NIH's PubMed Central), or by scholars themselves via disciplinary repositories such as ArXiv (Physics, Mathematics, Computer Science and related fields) or the Social Science Research Network (SSRN). Based on models and best practices employed by peer universities with Open Access policies, such an Open Access policy would likely be implemented through the University Libraries and the Campus Repository it manages. The general process involves Library faculty and staff engaging in the following steps: 1) Track the publication of new articles by faculty, 2) When a new article is detected, send an email to the faculty author(s) requesting that they submit the final accepted manuscript version of the article to the Campus Repository in association with the Open Access Policy. The manuscript can be submitted as a PDF via email attachment or through an easy-to-use web form, 3) If the author does not want to submit the requested manuscript, he or she may simply request a waiver to the deposit requirement that is automatically granted. The waiver request can occur via email or an easy-to-use web form, 4) Once the manuscript is deposited into the repository, it will be made freely accessible on the web in ways that optimize its discoverability by web search engines such as Google. If the publisher of the article requires an embargo period before the manuscript is made accessible, the library will observe that embargo unless otherwise instructed by the author. (The library monitors publisher embargo policies and will act accordingly.) Although it is hoped that UA faculty will embrace the benefits of greater access to their articles through deposit in the repository, there is no coercive mechanism that will be applied to those who do not submit their article manuscripts, or request waivers. Nonetheless, these Open Access policies "shift the default" from lack of explicit permission for Open Access dissemination of faculty articles to explicit permission for Open Access dissemination of faculty articles. The UA Faculty Senate Task Force on Open Access advances for Faculty Senate consideration an Open Access policy similar to those at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and the University of California system, both of which utilized standard policy language first established by the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences in 2008. Such an approach is in alignment with the existing ABOR and UA Intellectual Property Policy, which indicates that covered individuals (including faculty members) grant the University a right to use scholarly works for "teaching, research, and other noncommercial University purposes."

Questions and comments included: 1) Silverman asked about the oversight of the policy, specifically, "The Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost will be jointly responsible for implementing this policy, resolving disputes concerning its interpretation and application, and recommending any changes to the Faculty. Any changes to the text of the policy will require approval by the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Provost. The Faculty Senate and University of Arizona will review the policy within three years and a report will be presented to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate calls upon university units to develop and monitor mechanisms that would render implementation and compliance with the policy as convenient as possible for the Faculty." Silverman disagrees with the recommendation that it is within the Faculty Senate's purview to resolve disputes concerning interpretation and application, and specify whether or not another committee or body at the University would be responsible for resolving disputes. Sutton responded that the language is standard in other policies and intended that if the Faculty Senate is establishing policy, then Senate should have a say in a revision or interpretation of the policy, and the Provost is seen as a representative of the University's administration. On a practical level, policies of this type are implemented and overseen by the Libraries. 2) McKean asked about whose responsibility it would be to track the authors when a new piece is published. Sutton said that the institutional repository is a database through which the UA makes research outputs available and houses the final accepted manuscripts. The University Library monitors publishing patterns to see when UA faculty submits articles, then the Library reaches out to those faculty. Embargo policies range from six months to twenty-four months. 3) Senator McClain asked how the process interacts with the journals. All publishers have policies around sharing published works. The Library would monitor those policies. 4) Senator Russell asked about applying waivers to the policy. Sutton said that a request can be made easily online. 5) Nadel asked what the benefit to faculty would be. Sutton replied that benefits would include wider readership, impact and preservation. Martin asked if resources were being allocated to undertake the large task of monitoring publications. Sutton said some additional staff will track publications, but mature models are in place that the UA can emulate and are prepared to make it happen. McKean suggested making a work-flow chart to see how Open Access might work. Nadel asked what would be the next appropriate step for Senate. Lee said that a policy proposal to bring back as a faculty policy.

7. **A STRUCTURED DISCUSSION AMONG SENATORS ON DEFINING, ASSESSING AND SUPPORTING THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AND SCHOLARSHIP – VICE PRESIDENT FOR HUMAN RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONAL**

EFFECTIVENESS, ALLISON VAILLANCOURT, VICE PRESIDENT FOR STRATEGIC PLANING AND ANALYSIS, BARBARA BRYSON AND CHAIR OF THE FACULTY LYNN NADEL.

Nadel told Senators that last semester, ABOR was including metrics and quality indicators in its strategic plans. Two work groups were formed to define, measure and support the domains of quality of teaching/learning and scholarship and how the UA can feed the aspects into the ABOR level and approach. Table discussions on teaching quality ensued, with the main ideas shared after discussion.

Table #1: Communication with diverse and large groups of people,

Table #2: Be able to see syllabi in advance of registration to be able to look at the course load and have last year's syllabus posted for reference,

Table #3: With respect to assessment, there is disappointment that Teacher Course Evaluations are still used as an assessment tool, and inversely correlated with teaching quality. The importance of lining up the additional resources the UA has such as peer evaluations. Bringing in a broader view of a liberal education into the importance of teaching so that there is something larger than course-by-course,

Table #4: A better way to assess learning after graduation and classes have ended,

Table #5: On the support side, Internet technology and application development,

Table #6: Quality teaching includes a stable teaching force that is dedicated to longevity,

Table #7: Add to the assessment long-term outcomes, and the broader theme is, instead of looking at the minimum, looking at the excellence in teaching.

Tables discussed scholarship quality with main ideas shared after discussion:

Table #1: Recognizing diversity of scholarship,

Table #2: Different forms of measure for quality given that different professions require different standards,

Table #3: Student indicators/student impact seems to weed-out graduate students except as a target population. Adding dimensions to assessment,

Table #4: Know your audience, from colleagues to legislatures. It is the responsibility for us to report metrics that are important to our own endeavors,

Table #5: Issues pertaining to potential bias excluding a subjective index and symmetry between qualitative index and the indicator side. Scholarship is not a big enough word – creative work, research and scholarship,

Table #6: Assessing more student involvement in the quantitative indicators such as listing students as co-authors or collaborators. One of the quantitative indicators talks about expenditures for tenure/tenure-eligible faculty, but many non-tenure track faculty also are involved in scholarship and should also be include,

Table #7: Peers are in the best position to assess actual quality of scholarship or research.

12. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:56 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 January 25, 2016
2. Report from Faculty Officers
3. Report from ASUA
4. Report from GPSC
5. Report from APAC
6. Report from the Provost
7. Report from the President
8. Open Access *ad hoc* Committee Report
9. Quality Scholarship Draft Proposal
10. Quality Teaching Draft Proposal

Motions of the Meeting of February 1, 2016

There were no motions for this meeting.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456