

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

Minutes: September 20, 2021

3:00-5:00 p.m.

VIA ZOOM

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

Present: M Hingle (Chair), M Brewer, M Bolger, B Brummund, C Casey, J Dudas, T Dysart, W Fink, P Gordon, R Hammer, S Helm, M Hymel, K Kline, J Lawrence, W Neumann, D Ohala, S Sen, M Stegeman (Parliamentarian), J Summers, and R Tsosie

Absent: J Curry and L Folks

Guest: J Frumkin, IT Liaison

Call to Order

Chair Hingle called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m.

Approval of the Agenda

Hingle moved to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. The meeting agenda was approved as written.

Approval of the Minutes of August 30, 2021

The minutes of August 30, 2021 were approved with one amendment and one abstention.

UPDATES

Vice Chair of the Faculty – Melanie Hingle

Hingle reported that a Special Faculty Senate Executive Session meeting is scheduled for September 27, 2021 from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. The appropriate people will be present to answer questions about the item being discussed. All documentation has been sent out to Faculty Senators in advance in order for them to ask appropriate questions.

Secretary of the Faculty – Michael Brewer

Brewer reported that his computer died on Monday preventing him from attending and presenting at the Faculty Senate meeting, but was able to join by phone for the second half of the meeting. Brewer plans to introduce the Constitution and Bylaws revisions for discussion at the October Faculty Senate meeting, and will take the temperature of Faculty Senators to possibly move for a vote of approval. One point of contention has been the Grievance Flow Chart, which visually outlines the grievance process. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Romero and Associate Counsel Miller were consulted in the process, and

although not much is drastically changing with the grievance process, Brewer decided to bequeath the responsibility to the grievance committees themselves. After the grievance process changes are made in the Constitution and Bylaws, the flow chart will then be ready for final updating. Dysart, who had input from the APPC standpoint, agreed that input from all constituencies would be prudent.

IT Liasion – Jeremy Frumkin

Frumkin updated the committee that many individuals' dedication and hard work have rectified the Wi-Fi authentication problems. UITS is continuing to work with Cisco and Microsoft to ensure that redundancy, stability, and capabilities on an ongoing basis remain intact. UITS will continue to dig into the root causes of the problem and ensure the infrastructure is in place that will lower the risk of the incident happening again. Brummund reported that the gravity has been reduced from severity one (all UITS personnel working 24/7) to severity two (working on regular business hours). After making several changes, the bug in the system is still present. Workarounds and mitigation were put in place to minimize impact of the bug. Brummund shared charts to show user connectivity/devices per user and successful/failed connections for the first three weeks of since the incident occurred. The graph showed 2,500 less users during week one, with 1.6 devices on average per person connected, increasing to 1.73 devices in the subsequent weeks. The graph shows that the average user connects approximately eighty times daily to Wi-Fi walking around campus, therefore, Wi-Fi connections engage up to a 1,500-foot range, becoming faulty at the 700-800-foot range. Devices continuously connect over and over again to the campus network without most people's knowledge. During week one, there were 4.5M failed connections. Although it's fairly common for a high volume of failed connections due to loss of radio frequency as a person moves around campus, UITS can distill too many failures consistent with the August 26th incident and knowing the activity was likely not related to people walking through different Wi-Fi ranges. Brummund shared a graph of server activity with successful versus incomplete authentications on August 26th from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. A severe outage spiked at 10:45 a.m. between the 9:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. classes. In week two, server activity was somewhat normalizing and showed many successful connections after installing a bug fix from Cisco. In week three, two other significant workarounds were put in place and connectivity at peak times had minimal failures (800) relative to the number of successful connections. UITS is still actively working with Cisco and Microsoft to fix the problem because the failure is between how those two technologies work with each other. Hingle asked if there was any way the campus community could be of help. Brummund responded that a retreat is scheduled for Thursday afternoon to discuss that aspect. There are many things the University can do and has done a good job of doing, such as making investment into Strategic Plan IT projects like Data Warehouse or TRELIS. The University has not invested as much into the behind-the-scenes core information technology infrastructure, as that realm is largely funded through RCM allocations, which have declined over the course of the last decade. The money that UITS is using to support core infrastructure things like network, authentication, and consumer accounts (retiree support) is an ever-shrinking budget. The average age of the 15,000 network devices on campus is older than the iPhone, and approximately \$10M can easily be used for deferred maintenance in network equipment alone. A proposal will be made for the Provost to address core IT infrastructure updating. A major component of AIB is formulaic or structural funding for support services, which if was present with RCM, would not have accumulated the kind of deficit we have today. The University has grown over time, and small distributions to support units over time definitely add up, and when not addressed, accumulate deficit. Frumkin said that he will have more updates next month on initiatives moving forward with Google Drive and research data storage because of a shift in direction due to Google changing its business model.

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

Dudas reported from the UArizona Washington D. C. office. Dudas explained that the office in Washington, D.C. was conceived a few years ago as part of the Strategic Plan. The grand opening was intended to be in April 2020, which was postponed until today. The leased floor of office space is close to the White House, with goals to obtain better funding opportunities for research. The office also provides a hub for UArizona's Federal Relations Office. UArizona now has a place to invite agency heads, Senators, and Members of Congress to see what the University is working on, and allows agencies to fashion grants specifically for UArizona early in the process rather than responding to grant submissions. The head of Government-Community Relations is Steve Voeller, who is the former Chief of Staff for Senator Flake. Assistant Vice President, Julia Smith, heads the Federal Relations Office. Brummund added that the federal government funds approximately \$700M of UArizona operations. Direct and indirect federally funded research, teaching, and service is approximately \$450M, and \$250M in Title IV federally funded student aid. These numbers are three times the state appropriation the State of Arizona provides to the University. The University of Arizona's mission is completely aligned with the State of Arizona, but the federal flow of funding into the institution is very relevant. Casey asked if President Robbins was planning on sending out an explanation why there wasn't a weekly campus briefing this morning. More people are aware of the football loss than the visit to Washington, D.C. Dudas responded that he would make sure a notification would be sent out to campus. Hingle responded that the latest email from President Robbins does state that there won't be a briefing today, but it's buried at the end.

Chair of the Faculty – Jessica Summers

Summers reported that she met with University Risk Management earlier today to discuss hiring and retention of faculty. Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Romero's statistics for voluntary departure of faculty last year is comparable to previous years. Summers believes that many faculty may be stymied by the furlough and may be looking for employment elsewhere, but could not find employment last year. The University will present to ABOR's auditing committee to prepare for an upcoming audit. Summers hopes that a conversation about supporting IT will be planned for an upcoming SPBAC meeting. After speaking to the head of IT support in the College of Education, a self-study could be one way to find out how funding and strategic investments can support the college, not just from an infrastructure perspective, but also from an instructional technology perspective. Every college is responsible for its own technology instruction. Gordon asked if Banner employees who hold a UArizona title are part of the data when looking at retention and turnover. Summers said that the data is broken down by categories of employees and that DCC's may not be included. Brewer said that DCC's have all privileges, but are not UArizona employees and would not show up in the numbers, but could be looked at separately. Hammer agreed that the employee title will be a University title, but that subset of faculty are employed by Banner. GFFAC did an outstanding job communicating the importance of ending the furlough as soon as possible in order to help retain faculty.

Provost – Liesl Folks

Folks was absent.

SPBAC – Sabrina Helm and Barry Brummund

Brummund reported that the last meeting was spent discussing the undergraduate allocation; the potential for AIB allocating by majors versus degrees, or versus a combination of the two, or potentially not allocating by majors or degrees and strictly on the undergraduate side by student credit hours. AIB discussions are typically fifteen to twenty minute discussion items at each meeting, but this one in

particular was scheduled as a more lengthy, high-quality engaged discussion. Brummund received direct messages and emails from a dozen members during the course of the meeting and shortly afterward thanking him for the deep discussion of one of the component parts of AIB. Brummund would like to schedule more deep-dive discussions on AIB in the coming months. Materials will be shared with others.

University-Wide General Education Committee – Joan Curry

Curry was absent. Hingle advised that a UWGEC update is scheduled for the next Faculty Senate meeting. A Faculty Senator sent an email requesting an update from UWGEC on the General Education Refresh process, with a list of questions to be answered. Hingle's concern is that Curry will not be able to answer all of the questions and will need assistance from the Provost to give answers regarding the content approval process, faculty's role in the process, and how the General Education Office process works. Hingle asked the committee for guidance on how detailed the presentation should be, because feedback from last semester's two presentations was unfavorable. Bolger shares the concern that limiting the update will only encourage more questions. Having someone from the General Education Office present to answer questions, should they arise, would be prudent. Brewer suggested having Curry prepare a committee report with updates her committee is working on that could be attached to the agenda in advance of the meeting. Hammer agreed. Fink asked who can speak formidably to most the questions. Hingle responded Curry, Miller-Cochran, and the Provost. A detailed website has been developed for the General Education Office that is very informative. Summers suggested that Curry make a presentation with any data component and ask Miller-Cochran to be present to answer questions not associated with UWGEC updates. Brewer suggested having topics submitted in advance of the meeting so questions can be answered succinctly and efficiently. Brummund stated that SPBAC had an equally difficult conversation concerning the Gen Ed Refresh in the spring, and subsequently followed up in the fall with materials from Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Greg Heileman, and the discussion was much improved. Hingle suggested soliciting Faculty Senate to get an idea of what topics of interest Curry should address in her presentation/report.

Graduate Council – Ron Hammer

Hammer reported that the Graduate Council has met twice since the last meeting, and the main topic of discussion has been the graduate student Financial Stress Survey. The level of frustration and despair in some cases is astounding. Colleges are aware of the situations, but faculty are not necessarily aware of graduate student problems.

Undergraduate Council – Molly Bolger

Bolger reported that UGC conducted its first full meeting and passed a new Minor in Environment Occupation Health attached to the agenda. UGC now has two Faculty Senators for representation on the Council, but both will be unavailable for the spring semester. Dysart noted a typo on the proposal. Brewer added that Faculty Senate representation on the Councils is going to be written into the Bylaws, but a delay may be in order to see how the appointments work. The possibility of reducing the number of Senators for the Senate Standing Committees may be prudent since Faculty Senators are being asked to serve in additional capacities and the numbers of available Faculty Senators is dwindling.

UArizona Staff Council – Jennifer Lawrence

Lawrence reported that the Staff Council met the previous week and are in the process of setting the agenda for the upcoming year, including Town Halls and discussions about AIB. The Council is looking at issues related to the Classified Staff population and recall rights because since there are no new Classified Staff positions, there's no recall rights available for those employees. In the event of a lay-off, Classified Staff, under the contract terms, were guaranteed a recall offer for an identical position, which

is apparently no longer on the table. Discussions with Human Resources have begun to address this contractual issue. The new UArizona Staff Council website should be up later this week, which includes the new logos. The Council is the first group in shared governance to be joining the marketing cloud. Brummund asked if the Council was going to be staffed by the Faculty Center. Lawrance said discussions with the Provost weren't final. Summers said that she is hoping that the staff at the Faculty Center will be able to support the Council when the new hire comes on board

ASUA – Kyle Kline

Kline reported that Volunteer Services within ASUA is the only remaining position to be filled. Campus Pantry and Campus Closet are fully up and running. The Club Fair was successful and hassle-free. The ASUA Senate has passed a resolution, "A Resolution calling on The University of Arizona to Commit to Full Fossil Fuel Divestment." The UArizona Foundation currently has \$64M invested in fossil fuel funds, and both ASUA and GPSC have called on UArizona leadership to fully divest by fiscal year 2025, make a public declaration by the end of the fiscal year 2022 stating the University's intent, and essentially mirror Arizona State University's Sustainable and Socially Conscious Investment Fund, which is part of Environmentally Social Governance (ESG). Kline watched the Washington, D.C. broadcast earlier in the day and President Robbins mentioned the divestment. Approximately 7%, or \$64M is invested in energy portfolios. ASUA President Vega is discussing this issue with CFO Lisa Rulney, and more outreach should be forthcoming from the UArizona Foundation.

GPSC – Shilpita Sen

Sen reported that GPSC is fully supporting the divestment effort led by ASUA and has been signed by all Council members, and a meeting with CFO Rulney will be forthcoming. Sen referred to the Graduate Financial Stress report previously mentioned by Hammer. GPSC will be working on a position letter, which will be sent to the chairs SPBAC and Faculty Senate. Sen encourages everyone to read the seventy-six-page report, and hopes that everyone advocates for students at the University be paid at a level that helps sustain them while finishing degrees, and that the wages paid are sustainable to the cost of living in Tucson. Hingle shared the report in chat.

C11 – Wolfgang Fink

Fink reported that the committee discussed who it would like to invite as a guests to speak to the committee, and ventilation of rooms in lecture halls/lab spaces across campus.

APPC – Tessa Dysart

Dysart reported that Brewer brought the grievance policy updates to the committee for feedback. The committee will be meeting again in two weeks.

SAPC – Co-chairs Diane Ohala and Cheryl Casey

Casey reported that the committee is formulating priorities based on instructor experiences and questions from students. One major issue coming to light is finding student support for COVID information and protocols. Videos made by Campus Health were released the day after the committee met, and Casey provided a link to the videos in chat. Casey said that although the videos are helpful, only 555 views out of a campus of 47,000 is low. The committee is struggling with siloed messaging and not knowing what and how messaging is being pushed out to students. Casey attended a training session hosted by Student Success and Retention Innovation's Senior Researcher, Sarah Kyte, on using micro-messaging to enhance student success. Casey shared resources in chat. The Library User Experience Group is engaging in work related to messaging, and SAPC member Jeff Stone's research centers around this topic. The problem is how to get information about available resources and services

to students is a vast problem that many are trying to solve. Casey attended the Student Success Conference that UArizona sponsored and one of the highlights was a keynote speaker from Georgia State University, who also serves as Executive Director for the National Institute for Student Success, and shared some of the small tweaks Georgia State University made to improve communication to its students, most notably an Artificial Intelligence Chat Bot. The University found that students had more questions at 1:00 a.m. rather than at 9:00 a.m. when offices were open. Students also felt more comfortable asking a Bot questions because it was less judgmental than a real person. The committee is looking at sharing the Basic Student Needs report. The Campus Pantry has had a steady increase of use since the first week of school, and 898 students visited last week. A suggestion was made for the committee to look at academic policies such as pass/fail and last day to withdraw, and changes that were made to the policies due to COVID-19, which are now reverting back to the original written policy, and seeing if there is any impact on student success relating to these policy changes. A second look might be in order rather than returning to the status quo. Hingle asked Kline if the videos were shared with students via ASUA. Kline responded that his organization is not able to send campus-wide communications without the approval of the Dean of Students, Kendal Washington White. Normally communications are announced in the ASUA Newsletter, but a campus-wide communication was approved and is forthcoming. Hingle asked if Casey and the committee would contact the Associate Dean of Students who is ex officio on the committee about including this issue in the communication. Casey said she would make sure to ask that the videos be distributed to students.

Committee for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion – Rebecca Tsosie

Tsosie reported that the committee had its first meeting. One member had to step down due to unforeseeable conflicts, but the seat has been filled. Tsosie asked for clarification on matters coming to the committee, specifically whether they are committee related issues or University related issues. A campus colleague emailed Tsosie about the critical race theory issue because the State Legislature banned teaching of the subject in K-12 public schools, as well as government institutions. Tsosie asked if there was someone on campus looking into this issue or if an inventory is being conducted to see if critical race theory is being taught at the institution and how this legislative decision is impacting people on campus. Tsosie said there is a national movement obstructing government intrusion on this issue. Another colleague emailed Tsosie regarding the DEI training offered on campus and informed her that there is section of the training that is inappropriate and needs to be addressed. Tsosie questions who is authorized to teach this type of training and if trainers are vetted and by whom. The DEI Committee met and decided they didn't want to perform an inventory of Inclusive Excellence and how it is perceived. The Committee would like access to all the national surveys that measure faculty satisfaction on issues concerning DEI, and asked committee members to weigh in. The Committee is requesting a meeting with Associate Vice Provost for Diversity and Inclusion, Ivy Banks, but Tsosie has not seen any communication between Faculty Senate and her office regarding issues the committee is interested in, such as cuts in the budget and its effects on international graduate students, staff, and the marginalized communities served. The University does not have an Executive Office in association with the President and Provost and their analogous offices, thereby making it difficult to get answer to many issues concerning DEI. Hingle said that Romero's office could provide the committee the survey data they are requesting. Summers weighed in on critical race theory saying it's a faculty issue, therefore a shared governance issue because it affects scholarship and good instruction for those who don't have job protection with tenure. Summers feels it is comparable to the sanction against Mexican-American studies and K-12. Many faculty published on the academic freedom piece and scholarship piece and made it nationally known. Summers asked for clarification on the DEI training. Tsosie said she hadn't yet taken the training, but apparently there was a misperception about what inclusion requires and what anti-discrimination law requires. Anti-discrimination is very precise and very legal, and inclusion if much

different, and people who took the training felt that there was some attempt to conflate that and to minimize practices that are inclusive and supportive of faculty diversity. Summers said she thought the person responsible for the training is Vice President of University Initiatives, Celina Ramirez. Brewer said that all of the other Senate Standing Committees are policy committees, and if there is an administrator that can work with the committee to provide input, they should be invited to attend the committee. The challenge is figuring out who that person(s) might be for the DEI Committee.

RPC – Paul Gordon

No report.

Other business

There was no other business.

Review agenda for the October 4, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

Hingle discussed agenda items for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting and explained to Stegeman that since there were so few items on the agenda at this time, additions to the agenda would be decided on in the coming two weeks before the meeting. Stegeman advised to approve the items currently on the agenda, and bring additions to Faculty Senate agenda for approval at the meeting. Hingle moved to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and the agenda was approved.

Adjournment

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Recorded and transcribed by Jane Cherry