

The University of Arizona®
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
1216 E. Mabel St. (PO Box 210456)
621.1342
facultycenter@email.arizona.edu

Minutes: November 16, 2020

3:00-5:00 p.m.

VIA ZOOM

<https://arizona.zoom.us/j/9503583576>

Present: M Hingle (Chair), M Brewer, J Dudas, J Durán, T Dysart, L Folks, N Ghosh,
P Gordon, R Hammer, S Helm, L Hudson, J Lawrence, W Neumann, D Ohala, S Sen,
T Singleton, J Summers

Absent: B Brummund and S Troutman

Guest: J Curry

Call to Order

Chair Hingle called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes of October 19, 2020

The minutes of October 19, 2020 were approved.

UPDATES

President's Office – Secretary of the University, Jon Dudas

Dudas took questions. Ghosh asked about the laying off of an employee in Athletics and local news coverage. Dudas responded that the former employee was interviewed and said disparaging things about the University and its students. Athletics is down tens of millions of dollars, and there were many lay-offs due to decreased revenue. Gordon asked if staff in Athletics are paid with University funds or Athletics funds. Dudas responded with Athletics funds. Hammer asked about the Ashford announcement from the President today, and if there will be an anticipated rollout or discussion in the form of town halls or forums, whereby the University community can ask questions. Dudas responded that after completion of the acquisition, the President will likely schedule question and answer forums. Folks added that contractual business side is furiously being transitioned to avoid any hiccups to students, staff, and faculty at Ashford. Hudson asked when the Affiliation Agreement would be available. Folks responded that she didn't know, and wasn't sure if it had been created yet. Hudson added that the University's acquisition is based on conditional approval from WASC and Zovio, and it would be helpful if communications from administration would not imply that the acquisition is a done deal.

Provost – Liesl Folks

Folks presented a PowerPoint for a new hire proposal for a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. Undergraduate education programs have had poor outcomes for retention and completion, and feels the need to focus on making sure that the University is meeting students' educational aspirations in a timely manner. The University's ranking reputation, as well as our ability to attract students suffers as a result. Operationally, UArizona is missing a strong leader to oversee all undergraduate education. Primary responsibilities would be to facilitate and coordinate the undergraduate enterprise within the context of our land-grant mission and designation as an Hispanic Serving Institution; provide guidance to academic units and foster strong collaboration across campus; oversee the General Education Program and ensure integration with majors, minors, and certificates; elevate campus-wide focus on strategic objectives for undergraduate student success and satisfaction; and ensure that investments support equitable outcomes for all students. The University's history shows that we've previously had people in this administrative role under different titles, but none since 2008. Currently, four senior leaders are involved in undergraduate education, but there is no one to oversee the entire program to tie it all together. Similar roles exist at thirty-eight AAU Peer Public Universities, with the exception being UArizona. Folks asked committee members if the search for this position should be internal or external. Hingle feels that if there is willingness and expertise within, that it makes sense to hire internally. Brewer feels that it's important to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the other positions associated with Gen Ed, because over time, roles have changed and also that the MOU on Shared Governance should be followed in putting together the search team. Folks responded that there would definitely be some realignment of duties. Ohala said she is confused, because the four people currently associated with Gen Ed were much needed at the time of hire, and the explanation at that time was that Gen Ed would be completely overseen by those four positions, and now told that it would be in the University's best interest to hire someone to oversee those four positions. Folks responded that that needs for an organization change over time, and looking at the current numbers, it's necessary for our institution to double down on our success as undergraduate educators without losing sight of how good the institution is at research and graduate education. Organizational structures need to evolve with time to meet the needs of the institution at the moment. Ohala feels that hiring internally is preferable amid the hiring freeze. Gordon asked about consolidating the team in place instead of adding a new position. Folks responded that the undergraduate retention/completion challenge needs to be focused on in order to remain in the top 100 University rankings, and a task of this magnitude will require a need for the new position. Ghosh feels an internal search would make the most sense because an internal hire would be more knowledgeable of the inner workings at the institution. However, a hire at this level will not be favorable with anyone at this time amongst a pandemic, furloughs, budget cuts, etc. Explaining how the existing team of four fit under the new umbrella of Vice Provost needs to be clarified, and pushback will be expected. Durán explained the history when UArizona underwent a transformation many years ago to a student-centered University, coinciding with the University's last Vice President for Instruction/Dean of University College's position terminating. At that time, the focus was on recruiting as many research students as possible. An internal search would be better budget-wise, but also consolidating the lines and delegating responsibilities so it doesn't appear that the Provost's Office is expanding while units at the University are shrinking. Curry favors the creation of the new position and feels that retention/completion is a time-consuming endeavor that faculty are not equipped to handle. The Gen Ed program is more substantial than ever, and feels the program warrants fine-tuning in order to tackle the challenges the campus experiences with retention/completion.

Folks shared a PowerPoint on the Proposed Transition of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) to Activity Informed Budgeting (AIB) Guiding Principles. Folks explained that there is considerable time pressure to make changes to the current RCM model with something that is simple and straight-

forward. The AIB model is still in its infancy and a new model does not exist at this time, but guiding principles have been developed and have been connected to the Strategic Plan. The guiding principles that have come forward have been developed by CFO Rulney, Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact, Cantwell, and Folks, after obtaining feedback from campus. Lowering complexity is necessary to enhance strategic alignment from the department level to the leadership of the University because the current budget does not work seamlessly throughout the institution. Not all RCM activity drivers have proved useful to incentivize positive management outcomes, since some significant revenues flow outside of RCM via different metrics and *ad hoc* deals. Head, chairs, and directors are faced with challenges to understand how to change local circumstances for their faculty and students. Lowering complexity would help because it will allow for understanding organizational flow of funds. The weighting of undergraduate credit hours differentially has created a campus culture problem in that different disciplines have a sense of being more or less valued by the organization. A broad support to emphasize teaching effort as a major driver in any revisions to RCM with tuition revenues flowing out in proportion to credit hours delivered. Student credit hours will be the major driver with AIB, since teaching is the core work that generates tuition revenue. AIB aligns with activity metrics that pertain to positive student outcomes, such as retention, completion, and number of degrees awarded, and the current RCM model does not. As a result, the current budget model focuses on the delivery of student credit hours and majors enrolled, rather the outcome of our students. UArizona will maintain a strong commitment going forward to continue to encourage interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary innovation teaching and research. GDP's are working well, but UArizona does not have the same mechanisms at the undergraduate level. The current financial and administrative (F & A) distribution ((indirect costs or overhead) needs to be simplified to ensure transparency. Currently, there are three different rates for F & A cost recovery distribution to colleges, adding complexity. Additionally, Primary Investigators do not necessarily receive F & A shares to support lab costs or to incentivize further grant efforts. AIB is designed to stimulate and reward innovation and growth, new revenues for the University, or improvements in retention and completion. Favorable student outcomes are not addressed in our current budget model. Central support units, current excluded from the current model, will be funded in proportion to activity where appropriate. AIB will simplify activity taxes and space charges. Under RCM, space charges have not allowed us to actively manage built infrastructure, and trading of space between units is not facilitated. Outcomes were not addressed with RCM. The goal is to remove the complexity of the RCM model for easier understanding. All tuition revenues will be treated the same, no matter the delivery platform. Currently, undergraduate and graduate tuition revenues from fall and spring semesters are handled within RCM, excluding summer, winter, distance, global, online, and continuing education tuition revenues. Summer and winter tuition revenues are handled via established, but separate formulas. Global, online, distance, and continuing education revenues are currently handled via a series of *ad hoc* negotiated deals with colleges. The proposal is that tuition revenue coming from a credit bearing course should be treated in similar ways to alleviate running a series of *ad hoc* budgetary processes to understand the macro picture about how tuition flows through the institution. Graduate tuition will be treated differently from undergraduate tuition. Per the original RCM model, deans made the decision how allocations were to flow to the units. Colleges were asked to develop college-specific activity-informed distribution models for academic units. Some have, but many have not, leading to uneven experiences for academic unit leaders, staff, and faculty. There is no activity-based flow to the department level, which leaves uncertainty in departments about how they can manage effectively to drive futures forward in terms of revenues. Preventing deficit budgeting will help minimize structural deficits from emerging, and budget guidance on carry-forwards/contingency fund levels would support improved decision-making. Including all major revenue sources within one budget model would make this approach more manageable for leaders. AIB will establish activity-informed budgets for central support units, where currently there is a lack of transparency. Support for

RII services should scale with research and innovation to enable consistent, high-quality staffing of required RII compliance and administrative functions to deliver great service to faculty. AIB will allow better management of funds centrally to meet institutional strategic needs, and those of the college. Sources need to be available for colleges to set up a new department, obtain seed faculty, and meeting the strategic objectives of the college. Under the current budget model, this undertaking would be virtually impossible. The term “subvention” will be replaced with the phrase Strategic Budget Adjustment (SBA). SBA’s are likely needed to address cost-of-instruction and cost-of-infrastructure differences in transparent ways. RCM is highly transparent, since allocation worksheets are available for review and analysis, but the complexity of the RCM model makes it challenging to digest for non-experts. Ad Hoc deals have created suspicion about preferential treatments for various units across campus. Some revenue streams are outside of RCM and are not as transparently managed. General Education needs to be funded appropriately without perverse incentives. Currently Gen Ed has not been actively managed to optimize numbers of courses and seats to meet demand. Colleges have introduced many new courses in order to secure a share of the Gen Ed revenues, reducing the efficiency of the Gen Ed program overall. The current budget model will continue into FY 2021. Finally, the Cooperative Extension will be excluded from AIB because it is captured within RCM, is appropriated by a line item with the state government, and generates no tuition revenues. The current budget model does not align with the University’s strategic goals, and only speaks to the work-in-progress instead of outcomes and impacts. Student fees run out of the budget model. AIB will incorporate revenue sharing models that are easy for everyone to understand so that collaboration across college boundaries and within colleges is stimulated, supported, and encouraged. Graduate tuition is differentiated by the support infrastructure for graduate students, which resides in the colleges, whereas the support infrastructure for undergraduate students resides centrally. When a new academic program is implemented, the revenues flow to it in the same year allowing the hiring of faculty, which absolves having to ask the dean or Provost for assistance. Activity drivers are being pulled together to align with the University’s guiding principles, but no working models have been developed thus far.

Chair of the Faculty – Jessica Summers

Summers discussed her upcoming spring sabbatical that was brought up at the last Faculty Senate meeting so committee members could discuss the issue. Summers asked Hudson to speak to her intentions. Hudson stated that the job of shared governance is important, and is aware how hard the three Faculty Officers, as well as Faculty Center staff, work. The idea is that when someone has an opportunity to take a sabbatical or needs a short-term recess, there should be a process in place for someone to fill that gap, rather than delegating the Faculty Chair’s work on the other two Faculty Officers. The Bylaws have a mechanism for replacing a Senator or General Faculty committee member with the next highest vote-getter in a particular election. The Vice Chair takes over the responsibilities of the Chair in absentia, but there is no mechanism for filling the role of the Vice Chair for the short duration. Summers shared the Constitution’s provision for temporary absence of the Chair of the Faculty. Summers made clear that the Constitution would have to be revised, and took comments from committee members. Hammer referenced the term outlined in the Constitution, which is six months or less, rather than six months or longer. For the latter, a special election would take place. Summers’ sabbatical falls within the former. Folks stated that a sabbatical is not an absence in the conventional sense of the word. People continue to work through sabbaticals. Summers said she is planning to attend regular meetings under her purview, but some meetings will be attended by the Vice Chair and Secretary. Dysart feels there is no structural issue since this issue is addressed in the Constitution. Since the Vice Chair and Secretary have stepped up to take on certain responsibilities in Summers’ absence, there is no issue. The Constitution does not address any next-highest vote getter in an election for Chair

of the Faculty to take over duties in the event the seat is vacated. Summers requested that Hudson have consideration and bring ideas to the Senate Executive Committee for discussion prior to bringing them up at a Faculty Senate meeting. Durán said that next highest vote-getters are sought in many instances with committee and Faculty Senate, because the vacancies occur more often. The previous Chair of the Faculty went on sabbatical for six months and his duties were covered in his absence. Ghosh mentioned that the fact that Hudson brought up the issue in Faculty Senate created a very adversarial and tense confrontation. Summers asked Hudson if she would like the committee to take a vote on moving forward with her idea. Hudson said that she would like to further discuss the issue at the next Senate Executive Committee meeting and possibly vote on her suggestion at that time. Brewer said that Senate Executive Committee could forward the amendment to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee upon its approval of Hudson's future ideas.

Summers asked Hudson about the Special Session Faculty Senate meeting scheduled for November 23, 2020 to receive the Global Campus Senate Advisory Committee's report on the Ashford acquisition, and if she had an agenda to share with the committee. Hingle asked if the committee members have approved the agenda, and Hudson responded that she has only shared the proposed agenda with Hingle. Hudson proposes to share a brief report by the end of this week, and is planning on an introduction to the committee charge and process, a brief background of the Ashford acquisition, and an overview of three main topics; governance issues, quality of education issues, and financial strategy issues. Committee recommendations will conclude the presentation. Summers asked if there will be voting or Resolutions brought forward at the meeting. Hudson responded that there are no plans for any voting at the meeting. Hammer asked if this was a report similar in structure to the GFFAC report to Faculty Senate. Folks reported that she will not be available to attend on November 23, 2020. Hudson asked Folks if November 30, 2020 would be accommodating. Folks responded that she has 4:00 to 5:00 available on November 30, 2020. Hudson agreed that moving the meeting to the following week would be preferable in order for Folks to be in attendance. Ghosh suggested having all materials posted on the agenda by November 23, 2020. Invitation lists were discussed.

Secretary of the Faculty – Michael Brewer

No report.

SPBAC – Sabrina Helm and Barry Brummund

Helm reported that the committee discussed revenue distribution with regard to summer, winter, and online courses that Folks previously discussed. The committee discussed guiding principles for AIB and that discussion will continue at the November 18, 2020 meeting.

Graduate Council – Ron Hammer

Hammer reported that he will have an informational report for Faculty Senate with items approved by the Council, but that no proposals will be forthcoming at the upcoming meeting.

Undergraduate Council – Neel Ghosh

Ghosh reported that two proposals, Syllabus Template Title IX Amendment and Undergraduate Certificate Policy Amendment have been added to the agenda for approval at the December 7, 2020 Faculty Senate meeting. Additional approved proposals will be coming forward in the near future.

C11 – Javier Durán

No report.

Vice Chair of the Faculty – Melanie Hingle

No report.

IT Liasion – Jeremy Frumkin

Frumkin was absent.

APAC/CSC – Jennifer Lawrence

Lawrence reported that both Councils are working on a mutual shared governance organizational agreement for finalizing APAC and CSC into one assembly. ASUA is also looking at the mental health days that have replaced spring break, and trying to offer some alternatives for instructors' schedules for exams/projects surrounding the mental health days to make it easier on students. The rise in COVID-19 numbers recently are forcing students to look at graduation and other major events differently.

ASUA – Tara Singleton

Singleton reported that ASUA is looking at the spring calendar and figured out ways to hold its larger events. will have an early voting location in the Student Union. Outsourcing is also of concern to UArizona students

GPSC – Shilpita Sen

Sen reported that GPSC is focusing on providing a grab and go Thanksgiving dinner for students on campus, and GPSC is working with the Student Union Events and Residential Life to carry out providing meals for 200 students and their families. Graduate students are concerned about what things will look like in the upcoming semester in terms of compliance for getting tested for COVID-19. Advance information from the Dean of Students Office will be appreciated to outline any restrictions associated thereto.

RPC – Paul Gordon

Gordon reported that the committee met with RII staff to discuss RPC's proposal on the governance policies of Core Facilities. Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Impact, Elizabeth Cantwell, mentioned that she had attended Faculty Senate meetings in the past, but had never been called on to report. Gordon would like to know if Cantwell can be made a permanent member of Faculty Senate along with other administrators at the University. Gordon feels it would be in the best interest of Faculty Senate to have Cantwell report on a regular basis.

APPC – Ron Hammer and Tessa Dysart

Dysart reported that the committee meeting for this week has been canceled.

SAPC – Diane Ohala

Ohala suggested bringing Dani Carrillo, a representative from Fostering Success to a Faculty Senate meeting to make a presentation because many at the University do not know that the office exists. Fostering Success helps students with housing issues and students in the foster system. Ghosh suggested having all the groups who are geared to help students be scheduled at the same time for a more concise presentation. Ohala has devised a paragraph she has available on her home page with all of the student resources in order to better inform students of the help available. Ohala feels that the UArizona home page should contain a drop-down for student resources so students can view available resources with one click, as well as all resources visible on the Dean of Students page. Folks asked for an

email reminder so she could assist. Ohala mentioned that students feel that some of the fees they are being charged should be eliminated since they are not on campus. Folks responded that the combined health and recreation fee is not divisible. Ohala asked about the email from the Registrar concerning academic ineligibility that was sent to students. Under the current pandemic conditions, there will be many students considered ineligible who otherwise wouldn't be. A survey was to be filled out by students to outline circumstances that might be detrimental to keeping up course load. If the survey isn't submitted by January 8, 2021, all classes get dropped.

Committee for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion – Stephanie Troutman

Troutman was absent.

Other business

There was no other business.

Review agenda for the December 7, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting

The item was deferred.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.

Recorded and transcribed by Jane Cherry