

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 1, 2021**

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

Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate, Melanie Hingle, called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle reminded the body that this is a Faculty Senate business meeting, and everyone is welcome to attend, but only Faculty Senators may participate. Any Senators wishing to participate are asked to raise their virtual Zoom hand, and please stay muted when not speaking. The preferred method of voting is by a show of hands, which was voted on at the April 2021 Faculty Senate meeting. Robert's Rules of Order also recommends a hand-raise as the default method for voting. Faculty Senators may raise a real hand on camera and wait until voting has concluded, but using one's "zoom" hand is preferred.

Present: Senators Alfie, Behrangi, Bolger, Bourget, Brewer, Brummund, Casey, Citera, Cooley, DiRoberto, Domin, Downing, Durán, Fink, Folks, Gephart, Gerald, Gordon, Hammer, Haskins, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Ijagbemi, Jones, Kline, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Little, Lucas, McDonald, Milbauer, Murphy, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Reimann, Robbins, Rosenblatt, Russell, Schulz, Sen, Simmons, Slepian, J. Smith, S. Stone, Su, Summers, Vedantam, Vega, M. Witte, Zenenga and Ziurys. M. Stegeman served as Parliamentarian.

Absent: Senators Addis, Devereaux, Dial, Goyal, Lee, Mansour, Rodrigues, Valerdi, and R. Witte.

2. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

Hingle asked for [**Motion 2021/22-12**] to approve today's meeting agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

3. ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 2021

The minutes of October 4, 2021 were approved as written.

4. OPEN SESSION: STATEMENTS AT THE PODIUM ON ANY TOPIC, LIMITED TO TWO MINUTES – MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPEAKERS IS FOUR. NO DISCUSSION IS PERMITTED, AND NO VOTES WILL BE TAKEN.

Associate Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Mike Staten addressed the Faculty Senate. I would like to share with you the following statement on behalf of CALS Leadership, to formally acknowledge and praise our Career Track faculty. As CALS Associate Dean for Instruction and a fellow faculty member, I am very aware of the tremendous impact Career Track faculty have on our students. They are quite literally shaping the future of Arizona, and enabling thousands of young people to launch successful careers and elevate their lifetime income trajectories. In CALS, Career Track faculty comprise just over ¼ of all Faculty FTE but deliver the majority of student credit hours taught by the college. This is by design. We hire our Career Track faculty for their technical subject matter expertise and for their excellence in the classroom. Many have already established research careers but discovered a passion for teaching along the way. In these Career Track positions we've asked them to specialize in teaching and focus their time on developing and delivering new courses. We've placed our trust in their professionalism and competence. And that trust has been well rewarded, as CALS instruction has flourished in both quantity and quality over the past six years. Given their outsized role in delivering our courses, Career Track faculty also bore the brunt of the pandemic shift to online delivery, and led the way for their tenured and tenure-track colleagues in adopting new instructional technology to convert their courses to Live Online and hybrid delivery. Many Continuing faculty have told me they are eternally grateful for the coaching they received from their Career Track colleagues over the past 18 months. If there was ever a question of Career Track faculty being viewed by their tenured colleagues as playing a lesser role in the core mission of CALS, that was thoroughly dispelled by the experience of the pandemic. Our Career Track faculty are experts at instruction, and we are grateful to have them. As we emerge from the pandemic, it would be entirely appropriate for the Faculty Senate to recognize the important contribution of Career Track faculty to this university's mission. I would especially like to call out the approximately one dozen Career Track faculty from across campus who have been instrumental in the recent General Education Curriculum Refresh. Their expertise, insights, and passions for doing right by our students have been exemplary and deserve special recognition. Speaking directly now to all

Career Track faculty across this campus, I sincerely hope that you see yourselves as full partners in our efforts toward building a better University of Arizona together. Thank you.

Honors College Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, John Pollard, addressed the Faculty Senate. Pollard said that one thing he misses most about in-person Faculty Senate meetings is being in a room in Old Main and the ability to look out the windows and see students, which is a good reminder of why we are all here, what the just cause is, and what the University is all about. Students. As the planning for the new General Education program started years ago, through the hundreds of faculty who have engaged in the planning, and focus groups who are invited to participate in the process, the faculty on the UGC and UWGEC committees that have vetted the curriculum, they have all shared one vision centered around the students, our just cause. Pollard calls on everyone to keep students in mind when discussing the curriculum because that is the reason we are here. None of us would be here if it wasn't for our students. Let's keep them in the front of our minds today as we discuss and debate things as we do as faculty, our just cause which is our students. Thank you.

APPC Chair, Tessa Dysart, addressed the Faculty Senate. Dysart wanted to bring to Faculty Senate's attention an event that happened on campus a week and a half ago – the first Tribal Leaders Summit. The Summit brought together tribal leaders from Arizona, Washington, and Oklahoma, and the purpose of the Summit was to find ways that the University can better serve tribes and native students. If anyone passed by the main hall, University programs and research focused on tribal communities. Dysart attended the lunch on Friday, and the reason she attended was because Principal Chief David Hill of the Muskogee Creek Nation spoke, and his remarks were significant to her for two main reasons. First, the Muskogee Creek Nation recently won a major Supreme Court case that recognized the existence of the tribal reservation even though it was common knowledge that the tribe had been disestablished since Oklahoma became a state. Dysart explained that this court ruling is perhaps the most significant in Indian law of this generation. Second, Dysart is a member of the Muskogee Creek Nation, her grandmother leaving the tribal lands as a child. Dysart's grandmother traveled to California during the Dust Bowl, and Dysart was raised in Oregon. Although Dysart never had a physical connection to the tribe living in Oklahoma, the heritage is an important part of who she is. To hear Principal Chief Hill speak about COVID-19 and how it impacted the tribe was touching. Dysart thanked President Robbins for organizing the Summit and his commitment to native students and hiring native faculty.

Senator DiRoberto addressed the Faculty Senate as a member of the University-Wide General Education Committee, and as a part of a group working with the Committee on a more substantial response to Faculty Senate, should one be needed, the Committee would like to respond to statements made at the previous Faculty Senate meeting held on October 4, 2021. In brief, we object strongly to several characterizations that were made, and dispute these assertions. 1) that any group of faculty has been excluded from participating in the Gen Ed Refresh process. This process has been open to all who are willing to participate. 2) That the proposed General Education curriculum short trips learning for discovery. The proposed curriculum provides increased emphasis on learning for discovery in all of the primary areas of natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and fine arts. 3) That it is unreasonable to ask that current General Education courses, regardless of their popularity or claim, be reviewed for fit in the new model. The proposed Gen Ed model differs from the current one and review for inclusion is a simple matter of ensuring fit and appropriateness. 4) That it is unreasonable to ask senior, tenured, or Regent faculty to engage in any sort of consultation or training. We see value in ensuring that all faculty participating in general education understand the model that they are participating in. A significant problem in the current model is ensuring that at least in general education courses, we provide instruction consistent with best practices for equity, inclusion, and accessibility in the classroom. 5) That UWGEC isn't really part of shared governance because UWGEC members aren't elected. UWGEC is established in the Constitution and Bylaws as a Committee, with shared governance responsibilities. Finally, Career Track faculty have had, and continue to bring important, substantial curricular and pedagogical academic knowledge, experience, and perspectives to the General Education process. Statements made in the previous meeting questioning the validity of Career Track faculty participation is at best disappointing and is not consistent with our institutional values.

5. REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, APPC, RPC, SAPC, DEI, GRADUATE COUNCIL, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, SPBAC, ASUS, GPSC, UARIZONA STAFF COUNCIL

Downing asked President Robbins if the pandemic would have led to a credible University revenue shortfall exceeding \$250M. In April of 2021, a graduated furlough and pay reduction program was instituted with the objective to generate \$93M in savings. Arizona State University and Northern Arizona University did not institute such a program. Fortunately, our primary source of anticipated revenue loss of net tuition revenue did not happen, thereby permitting the furloughs to cease ahead of schedule. The retained faculty and staff compensation became a windfall, not shortfall, and the Federal Cares Act added another \$33.2M of unanticipated revenue. Rumors and fragments of information are swirling around campus as to what happened to the windfall, the dollars swept from employee's paychecks and their families. Downing has no idea whether it is true, but one is that the faculty request that the windfall be returned to them and their families was supported by middle management, but subsequently denied. Another is that the funds are being used to pay outstanding unit debts or that the windfall is being redistributed to other employees as raises. As stated, Downing

doesn't have any idea what's true and what's false. When will the faculty see a report of the precise amount and sources of furlough and pay reduction funds by units and how will this unanticipated windfall be reallocated. Thank you for your leadership. Robbins responded that written statements have been given to the same effect, but thinks an appropriate answer will require CFO Rulney to present to Faculty Senate to outline exactly where the money went. Robbins heard a report today that the University is still behind, even though good progress has been made on net tuition revenue, the University is still behind where it would like to be with the budget and wouldn't characterize anything as a windfall by any stretch of the imagination. The furlough was cut short, and he is sensitive to the fact that an explanation be made as to where the money went. There are certainly many places that had shortfalls as a result of the lack of tuition in the first year of the pandemic, and it's clear we've made great progress currently, but net tuition revenue is approximately \$20M off of where the budget should be right now, so there aren't any of funds available to be returned to furloughed personnel. Fink said that on October 1, 2021, the Committee of Eleven sent a request to you for immediate action regarding air quality across campus in the lecture halls. Have you received the email and attached memorandum, which was a study by subject matter experts in terms of showing some of the shortfalls in some rooms, and has there been any action taken by demonstration to alleviate that problem which literally affects all of us faculty. Robbins responded that the Provost and Incident Command Center were working on your request. Robbins' understanding is that part of the Public Health Advisory Team, their domain experts have looked at all classrooms and there is a detailed report from Associate Vice President for Facilities Management, Chris Kopach on the air handling quality of each and every classroom. There are portable units that can be utilized, and also smaller CO2 monitors that have been made available. Robbins' understanding is that Kopach has taken the request very seriously. Fink said that Kopach's report is what he is referring to and there are shortcomings reported, especially in relation to the ASHRAE standard, which the University is adhering to and also per CDC guidelines. We will be more than happy to bring the subject matter expert to the table if you were to provide us or put us in touch with the respective decision-makers in order to point out the shortcomings so that they can be addressed. Robbins responded that a long discussion about this issue at Public Health Advisory Task Force (PHACT) meeting and there may be two different standards that are being compared like apples to oranges. Fink said that is correct because the standard has been revised five or six times since its first inception. Many factors have to be taken into consideration; how many people in the room, the activity, room size, and turnaround time of air per hour. Robbins said that Kopach was confident that increasing airflow in certain areas is possible. Sen shared the link to the spreadsheet in Chat. Folks suggested reaching out to respective building managers to obtain a CO2 monitor. Gerald, who serves as Co-chair of the PHACT Committee informed Fink that the expert on environmental conditions and air quality is Dr. Paloma Beamer, and invited Fink to attend one of the meetings or arrange for a special meeting to add to the conversation. Ziurys said that mold is more of a danger on campus than CO2 levels. Many buildings on campus have leaky roofs and leaky bathrooms. Robbins said that a recruit who was coming to the medical school had a significant other who suffered from exposure to black mold. Robbins was under the assumption that there was no mold in Arizona due to the dry climate, but found out that Arizona has the seventh highest rate of mold in buildings in the country. When money from the legislature has been obtained for deferred maintenance, work on older buildings has been extensive, and this point will be taken back to Kopach, Gerald and Beamer who are the experts in this area. Folks addressed the budget issue. In the summer of 2020, the forecast whether the University would see an impact of approximately \$250M in lost revenue, which was well in excess of anything previously experienced. By fall 2020, enrollment numbers proved to be better than expected, although still down compared to 2019 by a significant amount and well short of what had been projected pre-pandemic. A few months later, the state and federal governments provided approximately \$220M in targeted relief that flowed primarily through to students. The amount that came to the University had strings attached meaning that 50% of the money was sent straight out the door to support the students who were in dire straights due to job losses in retail, and food and beverage service. Although a large sum of money was allocated to the University, it wasn't designated for the University directly for its own financial woes. The money that was so desperately needed enabled the University to keep students enrolled to a much larger extent than would have been otherwise possible. Roll forward to the end of the FY21 and even with the furlough, there was a \$17M loss in revenue that had been budgeted for pre-pandemic. There isn't a pot of gold that would enable an undoing of the furlough, because even with the furlough the University fell \$70M short of where projections hoped to be, which means that expenditures had to be reduced by \$70M in order to get through FY21. Folks seconded Robbins' recommendation to have CFO Rulney walk through all the pieces. Bourget responded that if Rulney presents at Faculty Senate, she would be interested to know where is the strategic planning for the current faculty and staff, and how does that fit into the strategic priority and investment of UArizona in the coming years. Although this ties slightly to the furlough, but moreover, what are the plans to address low compensation compared to our peer institutions, and plans to redress the decrease in faculty from last year with more students to teach this year. Folks responded that faculty headcount has grown back into pre-pandemic numbers, but there's been a shift in lower tenure-track/tenure-eligible faculty and slightly higher Career-track faculty so there is a slight change in ratio only. Hopefully, the delta is short-term because it takes longer to bring in tenure-track faculty and many units did not hire for a year. Faculty headcount is expected to grow overall this year because of the increased student headcount, but currently faculty headcount is not down overall. Downing said that spreadsheets would be helpful to show the shift since he's worried about a couple of departments that think money was swept from the entire department and they've calculated what the salaries are in that department, and are hearing about raises for some individuals and not others. Showing the details and specifics, in addition to a verbal presentation would be helpful to show what happened. Folks responded that all furlough savings were held at

the college level, so there was no sweeping of funds to the center. This allowed colleges to offset the loss of revenues generated through tuition revenue. Smaller number of students, lower headcount of students and students took a lower number of credit hours, presumably to save money in this tough period during the pandemic. This allowed colleges to meet their budgets for personnel costs through the pandemic with minimum harm to their workforces. The colleges would need to provide departmental information on individual departments. Provost Folks will ask Ruiney to prepare a written summary that hopefully will easily interpreted. Robbins said that the reserves in all the colleges exceeded the amount of the furlough, banishing the urban legend that central administration raided the reserves in the colleges. Summers said she had included in the Officers' Report a summary for moving forward with expectations for Faculty Senate. Summers has prepared a couple of polls to make sure that she understands what Faculty Senators want. The first issue deals with policy and process related to curriculum, and Summers reminded everyone that when programs are approved, what Faculty Senate sees is the product of hours, weeks, and months of scrutiny by faculty who have volunteered to do the work. The information Faculty Senate sees for the first time has already been vetted and voted on by faculty who are willing to do the work necessary to approve programs before Faculty Senate's approval. There are three major curriculum committees that do this work; UWGEC, Undergraduate Council, and Graduate Council. Polls have been created to ask how much the body knows about what these committees do, and possibly take that information and provide more context about the work the committee perform. The poll showed that most people know a little bit about UWGEC, UGC, and GC. The next polls pertain to interaction during Faculty Senate meetings. Summers stated that there are over seventy Faculty Senators and everyone should have a voice, but many do not speak up. The poll showed that most everyone agrees that it's important that everyone has a voice, and 68% of participants say that there has been a time when they have not felt comfortable speaking up. Oftentimes, Faculty Senate is thought of how it once was, but we need to think about Faculty Senate in the way that it is moving forward. Dr. Mark Stegeman serving as Parliamentarian is enforcing guidelines and everyone needs to feel comfortable adhering to the guidelines rigorously, and to coming to meetings prepared. Raising new agenda items is a good idea, but having materials to share in advance would help everyone understand what is being voted on. The reason a Special Faculty Senate meeting was called on the naming issue was because there wasn't enough information to be informed. Faculty Senators asked the Faculty Officers for more information and they obliged to the request.

6. **ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA: UNDERGRADUATE MINOR IN NEUROSCIENCE; UNDERGRADUATE MINOR AETI COMMUNITY INNOVATION; DOUBLE USE OF COURSES AMENDMENT – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, MOLLY BOLGER**

Seconded [Motion 2021/22-13] Undergraduate Minor in Neuroscience, Seconded [Motion 2021/22-14] Undergraduate Minor AETI Community Innovation, and Seconded [Motion 2021/22-15] Double Use of Courses Amendment all carried and are detailed at the end of these minutes.

7. **INFORMATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: SENATE RESOLUTION ON COLLEGE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEES – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER**

Brewer explained that the Resolution's purpose is to make Deans aware and give faculty within colleges the responsibility and leverage to create elected Faculty Advisory Committees within the colleges. This requirement is part of UHAP 7.09 and every college is required to have an elected Faculty Advisory Committee as part of shared governance within each college. Colleges have adhered to this policy in different ways. The Faculty Officers have met with Deans to insure an Advisory Council is part of the its college shared governance structure, but not all have complied. Having a clear mechanism to elect or appoint individuals for different committees or service opportunities from an advisory committee falls in line with UHAP 7.09 College Governance requirements. Downing added that it should be implicit in the Resolution that shared governance makes a preference for elected representatives as opposed to appointed representatives. Brewer responded that UHAP does specify elected representatives for its Faculty Advisory Committees in its policy, but as far as whether or not those representatives are then elected within the college by all of the faculty in the college or they are appointed by its elected faculty representatives within the college, either had been allowed for in the Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding. In that agreement, the process has been slightly more expansive to allow for diversity or other factors. Downing stated that being appointed by elected people is not a democratic process, and would like the wording in the document to reflect the difference. Bolger said that as Chair of Undergraduate Council, this is a very positive development and allows for opportunity to bring all colleges in unison with this requirement for more shared governance procedures, but wanted to know about term limits on these elected committees. Brewer said the first step is to get the Faculty Advisory Committees in place by 2023 in order for the groups to be accountable. Once the College Councils are in order, the Bylaws need to be revised and the process takes a good deal of time. Fink said that if the subsequent appointing of faculty shared governance representatives is delegated to the Faculty Advisory Committee, then it should say so explicitly. Brewer responded that the word "appointed" could be changed to "selected." Simmons said that often times there are not an over abundance of faculty who are willing to serve on committees, because as Chair of his college's Faculty Advisory Committee, the committee drew new Bylaws and a call for nominations to serve on the Committee yielded no nominations. Keeping the language flexible will allow for a less pressure when it comes to finding people who will actually serve. M. Witte said

she is Vice Chair of the Dean's Faculty Advisory Committee in the College of Medicine, which was implemented in the 1990's as a result of a Dean's review that Witte participated in. There is an abundance of faculty who are willing to serve, and it is considered an honor to be chosen to serve. The functioning of the committee is good and meaningful because they are able to address questions and concerns that don't get answered. Functionality of the committee is not for rubber-stamping curriculum changes. Having documents to review ahead of time is crucial, and it's up to the members to make sure they function in a truly shared governance fashion. Brewer asked for **[Motion 2021/22-16]** to approve the amended Resolution, replacing "appointed" with "selected." Downing insisted that elected is preferred over the need for appointed, which coincides with ABOR and state law, and consistency between documents is essential. Fink agreed. Brewer said that the Bylaws would dictate how members were chosen, and the Resolution only states the requirement for the committee itself. Motion was seconded. **[Motion 2021/22-16]** passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

8. INFORMATION AND POSIBLE ACTION ITEM: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES AND CHANGES SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER

Brewer introduced a couple of additions since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Brewer asked for **[Motion 2021/22-17]** to approve the Constitution and Bylaws revisions. Downing moved **[Motion 2021/22-18]** to postpone the motion until the next Faculty Senate meeting because the preamble mentions the two other in-state Universities, and Article I of the Constitution should reference the core principle of the fact that the Faculty Senate as a body is the unit that represents faculty governance, along with Committee of Eleven. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Slepian asked for clarification on what will be accomplished within the month in terms of discussions, understanding, and other things. With all due respect, we are kicking the can down the road, otherwise Faculty Senate will be back in a month with the same lack of understanding. Hudson asked what the basis is for limiting the grievance to five pages, since supporting documentation may exceed that limit. Romero responded that five pages is similar to other kinds of summaries submitted on campus, and will make submissions more concise and clearer. There is no mention of appendices and those can be added. The thirty days is only an indication of time limit for response since none was previously mentioned.

9. INFORMATION ITEM: CHANGES TO UHAP – VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY AFFAIRS, ANDREA ROMERO

Romero opened by explaining that the revisions to UHAP Chapter Six parallel the revisions to the Faculty Bylaws grievance policy specific to the process for faculty who seek redress from grievances related to Appointed Personnel or faculty that may include college or unit leadership. The revisions are mainly for greater clarity in regard to content of the grievance submission, a timeline now set for thirty days, and also a little more clarity on the roles of the Provost and CAFT. Other changes are seeking to limit the grievance to five pages that will include the basis for the complaint, a summary of efforts to informally resolve the grievance, and proposed resolution. The hope is to make this policy clearer to faculty. Hudson asked if the end of the process is the Provost for final review with no other administrative review. Brewer said that in UHAP 6.03, the Provost's decision is final and not subject to further administrative review has not changed. After UHAP process completion, the grievance can then fall into the Faculty Bylaws jurisdiction. Simmons agrees with Hudson that a five-page limit seems rather short in order to document inception of a grieved situation to possible outcomes and suggests lengthening the limit. Downing said that even though grievances are attempted to be resolved formally, the documents become legal documents if courts get involved, and does not recommend increasing the probability of these cases being limited to the grievant. M. Witte said that opinion should not come from the Office of General Counsel, but rather from a Faculty Senator or lawyer in the Law School. The most important thing is fairness, and care should be taken in limiting people. Milbauer said the page limitation could be a suggestion since some faculty prefer guidance on how to proceed.

10. INFORMATION ITEM: Q & A REGARDING GENERAL EDUCATION MATERIALS FOR FACULTY SENATE AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM AND POLICY APPROVAL PROCESSES – VICE PROVOST FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, GREG HEILEMAN, AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, SUSAN MILLER-COCHRAN

Heileman presented a graph outlining the streamlined academic program approvals process and explained all facets of the processes. Hudson said her concern was with the last stage of the flowchart. The Faculty Bylaws are very clear that a parallel process is not allowed, even if it has become tradition since 2018 whereby the ABOR Academic Affairs Committee and the Faculty Senate are simultaneously approving any proposed program, "Among the functions to be exercised by the Faculty Senate, are a) to recommend curricula and degrees for approval while matters pertaining to courses, major/minor requirements, kinds of degrees, requirements for each will originate in the various colleges. The final formulation which is to be recommended to the Board of Regents shall be determined by the Faculty Senate." Hudson feels there is a need to remedy any careless notice that has crept in, and thinks this is probably not only the case based on records from 2020 and 2021, there is a tradition of forwarding things to the ABOR Academic Affairs Committee without the approval of the Faculty Senate. Folks spoke about the lengthy and cumbersome flow chart in

2019. Faculty Senate's final approval is one step that cannot be dispensed. Because different entities have seen different proposals of different lengths, parallel process and different formatting requirements have concealed a number of substantive differences which are very important. Hudson in no way implies that anyone who has worked on any stage of the process are not to be commended for their hard work and good intentions, but ultimately it is the Faculty Senate's legal obligation to vet the document(s) before it goes to ABOR. Heileman said that he is committed to looking into this to figure out a right way to get shared governance to work. M. Witte said that this is the exact reason why Faculty Senate, with an almost two to one vote, asked that ABOR be informed of the fact that it had not approved the curriculum. The Faculty Senate voted, were asked to sign a petition, and Witte would like to make a very important point because it's a constitutional crisis. When the Faculty Senate votes, it doesn't vote as individuals but as a body, and that vote is binding on the Chair to communicate that vote not as a signed petition. If in the future the body votes contrary to the wishes of the faculty leadership, which it did in this case, the faculty leadership as leaders must carry that forward. If this continues, it would mean that anytime the Faculty leaders agree with a majority vote of the Faculty Senate, that the vote will go forward and that cannot be tolerated. Summers spoke to Hudson's comment, "something that we can all agree on" that that is in fact an assumption, and what Summers feels people are struggling with as Faculty Senators who don't speak up is the assumption that their opinions are the same as her opinions. Secondly, all of the Constitution and Bylaws are subject to not only University policy, but ABOR policy as well. The Faculty Constitution and Bylaws set guidance, but are not the final word on what this body can and cannot do. The Faculty Senate is advisory, and pertaining to curriculum issues, the Faculty Senate should have the final word, but there may be cases where they don't. This issue is more important than whether ABOR can approve something parallel to ABOR approving something. Ziurys asked why there is a Faculty Senate if anything it votes on can be overwritten? This is one of the reasons Downing wanted the State Law in the Constitution instead of the preamble, so possibly someone can answer this question. M. Witte said the Faculty Senate's approval is a matter of a vote, it is a fact that it approves, but if it can be overwritten, that's a problem to live with. The approval is a fact, cannot be denied, or not be transmitted to the Board of Regents, and should be carried out by our faculty leaders that the will of the Faculty Senate has made its determination. Summers called Point of Order because the faculty leaders carried out what Witte is accusing faculty leaders of not doing. Witte called Summers' Point of Order an interruption. Point of Order has been made, and continued with the implication that somehow those who had the majority vote and convinced the majority to vote at the last Faculty Senate meeting are suppressing speech, the speech of those who voted against it. Witte posits that it could just as well be the opposite and one might consider that those who sit at the head table with the gavel have a certain degree of power with the administrators in the Faculty Senate, and that may be more intimidating than Hudson speaking eloquently or stridently, or myself doing the same, and may be the reason we don't have free speech. Remember, civility is not civil rights. The civil rights movement came out of not listening to the civility. The Faculty Senate rejected formally a civility code brought forth by the administrators, possibly by Vice Provost Holly Smith, because Faculty Senate felt it was an infringement on our constitutional rights and our civil rights. Miller-Cochran clarified that her title is the Executive Director of General Education and Professor of English, not the Executive Director of Undergraduate Education. Miller-Cochran expressed her gratitude to the over 100 faculty whose work and commitment, time and energy has been spent thinking through the planning and revision of General Education, beginning with the formulation of the Gen Ed Task Force in December 2017. Pages six through nine of the PDF document include many of the names. Miller-Cochran expressed deep gratitude to the students, both undergraduate and graduate who have participated, and who continue to participate on committees and focus groups. Staff members have partnered with our office tirelessly and are grateful for their efforts, including IT staff, the Registrar's Office, curricular affairs, advisors, marketing and communication, transfer staff, and many other employees whose expertise is essential as decisions are made about implementation and rollout. Our office relies on these networks of communication and expertise to make sure that every decision that is made is keeping students' best interests in mind. The new General Education curriculum is exciting because it emphasizes high-impact learning practices and how it responds directly to the issues that students and faculty identified in the current Gen Ed program. It provides opportunities for students to reflect on their learning to make meaningful connections to their majors, and it builds more intentional scaffolding between courses and learning experiences to facilitate transfer of learning for students. The number of courses that have gone through the Quick-Start/revision process and the incredible work that faculty are doing has been highlighted as the proposals have been reviewed. In response to the motion made at the previous Faculty Senate meeting on October 4, 2021, the documents submitted for this meeting answer many questions that Faculty Senators had, but Miller-Cochran wanted to address a few misunderstandings that may be underlying the most frequently asked questions. The purpose of the new General Education Office is to facilitate communication about General Education, and to mitigate some of the specific issues that faculty and administrators identified throughout the refresh process as problems in the current management of General Education. Those include facilitating communication and collaboration between colleges about scheduling decisions, monitoring and analyzing enrollment trends, conducting assessment of student learning outcomes in General Education, conducting program-wide assessment, providing robust administrative support to UWGEC and providing instructional support in Gen Ed that encourages consistency and high-quality instruction across all courses. The Gen Ed Office makes sure that faculty are continuously involved to address specific requirements from ABOR, that faculty are the ones driving the curriculum changes. The document linked to agenda for this meeting provides some further information about items that seem to be points of confusion about the development and implementation of Gen Ed. The learning outcomes for the new Gen Ed are the same learning outcomes as in the current Gen Ed. The Curriculum

Working Group had a very lengthy discussion in the spring of 2020 with a large group of faculty. Learning outcomes were looked at from multiple directions, and finally decided that learning outcomes were not the issue. The new General Education Program, unlike other academic programs that come through for approval, is large and organic in nature and is a continual work in progress. One area UGC emphasized during the shared governance approval process was phasing in some aspects of the new program to make it feasible and workable, and that's what has been done. For example, the attributes, which many of you are familiar with, are not required for students for graduation for the first two years. Several parts of the curriculum that intend to be developed through resources across the curriculum are still in development, and to that end, are still in the very early stages of developing what our responses are going to look like for things like the American institutions and civic knowledge requirement, critical thinking, and oral communication. Task Forces of faculty will be working on the aforementioned. Miller-Cochran asked Faculty Senators or their colleagues who have expertise in these areas to please volunteer with their expertise. Finally, the assessments have not been developed and launched. In fact, only one of the four assessments required by ABOR has been fully completed to begin data collection with the three in-state Universities in partnership with ABOR, and that is written communication. The process has started with quantitative reasoning, but it's still in its early stages. Critical thinking, American institutions, and civic knowledge have not yet launched because ABOR staff hasn't released its process yet. The process of putting together Task Forces of faculty across the University is to implement a core group to work on these different areas as assessments are being developed to make sure that faculty are the ones driving the conversations. The rule of thumb with written communications and quantitative reasoning is to come to those conversations with ideas already in hand to drive best practices for assessment in those areas and have a sense of what needs to be supported as a University. One of the primary concerns raised by Faculty Senate and across campus has been the need for more information and updates by Gen Ed. Trying to get on everyone's agenda is not the best approach and doesn't work well, and to that end one of the things that has been developed is a new implementation update website that will work in real time for the implementation process, specifically where different courses are in the approval process. Miller-Cochran proposes that the Office of General Education provide a monthly report during the implementation period to UCAAC, Heads Up and Faculty Senate. Hudson is pleased that the Provost's Office is in support of improving communications and providing necessary staff support for many of the things we do as faculty, but it appears from the flowchart that the new program is a done deal and there are many things that Faculty Senate has not discussed and has not approved. Hudson showed a comparison in Chat of the ABOR and Faculty Senate Gen Ed packages and noted discrepancies between the two. ABOR received substantially more information about civics and American institutions than Faculty Senate. In addition, there's questions whether writing is required or not required, or merely strongly suggested. The Faculty Senate does not know how oral communications, which is highly valued by ABOR, will be assessed or integrated into the classes. There are contradictory passages about critical thinking and scaffolding, whether diversity and inclusion are a component of the entire Gen Ed program, or whether they are simply parts of the courses that are labeled with diversity inclusion attributes. The curriculum maps are not identical, and all of this shows that more times needs to be taken to take the correct steps to do this correctly. There are questions about the timeline and whether this implementation starts next semester, or, as Hudson read, the attributes don't start until 2024. Miller-Cochran said that all of the things Hudson mentioned are listed in the documentation provided for the meeting, including the side-by-side comparison of the two proposals to Faculty Senate and to ABOR. Hudson proposes that implementation of the Gen Ed package be delayed until Faculty Senate has had discussions. Bourget asked about the flowchart that showed the role of the Gen Ed Office in pre-approving Gen Ed courses. What will be the criteria if the Gen Ed Office declines, will it stop there. Certainly it is common knowledge that Gen Ed hasn't changed for twenty years, but the structure has remained and actual offerings constantly change because new courses are offered and faculty update their courses. With the new flowchart, how will that factor in to potential new courses being proposed that reflect advances in the field and interest from students. Miller-Cochran responded that the Office of General Education doesn't have any official role in approving anything. UWGEC's role is to approve courses. The flowchart and the process of program approval is beyond the scope of only Gen Ed, which is not necessarily under its purview. What Gen Ed does is provide guidance and talked through with the academic/associate deans and colleges, which courses are coming through. Much of that is based on projections and trends related to enrollment, and how the transition process is working, so that is really more of a question of timing than anything else. The Faculty Coordinators and the different areas of the Gen Ed curriculum also provide feedback to help support the review of the committees, subcommittees, and UWGEC based on different areas of expertise, so again Gen Ed is not voting on any proposals and has no say in the approval process of the proposals. That lies with the voting members of UWGEC. Simmons questioned the motion of the April 5, 2021 and its wording in the Qualtrics survey. Hingle responded that the exact wording is in the minutes from that meeting that stand as the official record. Russell said that she would feel more comfortable seeing a peer review of the Gen Ed program. The process where we are invited to participate is not one Russell is familiar with, because when she submits a proposal to the National Science Foundation or NASA, the proposal is reviewed rigorously by peers and it is mandatory to respond to the reviews or the article will not be published or the grant will not be funded. Working hard on something is not the same as demonstrating effectiveness, or a critical, careful, well-done review of the pedagogy underlying the program, the budget details on how much this is going to cost, or metrics for success and how this is going to add to the University's effectiveness and retention. With all of the extensive efforts being put forth, Russell would like to see each piece rigorously reviewed not by the people who wrote the program, but the by the people affected by the program or outside scholars. Concerns raised should be addressed and not dismissed, and urges for a formal peer review. Bolger

said that what she experiences through Undergraduate Council is akin to a peer review. The Council had a number of very lengthy meetings and asked that many documents be revised and resubmitted with changes. Some of those have been presented today. The Council members were not insiders to the program and had to learn an immense amount of information and had to respond and give feedback. The faculty were represented from all units across campus. UWGEC spent more time on different aspects of the program. Bolger doesn't think it's a fair statement that a peer review has not been completed on the program. Miller-Cochran reiterated that UGC reviewed the program, policies, and curriculum for an entire semester, UWGEC did the same in the fall of 2020, amounting to a year's worth of peer review by faculty who were not involved in the writing of the initial proposal. Miller-Cochran agreed with Russell, and has been contemplating not only on what happens now, but how things move forward as data is received, how students are doing in classes, meeting learning outcomes, how faculty are responding, and need to have a mechanism to respond and revise if needed. General Education is not reviewed as a program by the University, and believes that needs to change with going through the APR process which involves writing a robust self-study, and internal and external review by people who have expertise in these areas. Bolger's point is an important one, in that the work of the shared governance committees as they reviewed the program as it went forward is part of the peer review process, and there were no comments or recommendations that UGC or UWGEC made that were dismissed. In that process there were several issues that needed to be addressed and shifts were made to the program. Slepian agrees that the process is ongoing with improvements continually being made. Ziurys said that excluding certain groups from the decision-making process means that the outcome is not going to be as good as it could have been, which seems to be the main objection she is hearing from her constituencies around campus. Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the Honors College, John Pollard, said students appreciate and value, and what is known from the research in learning, is that engaging students in the classroom in the construction of knowledge, moving them from knowledge consumers to knowledge creators, and affording students that environment, which is at the base of this new curriculum is the most important issue. Of course, one may want to contextualize reasoning with relevant research, but Pollard wants to be very clear that talking about research may not be the most effective way to engage students with learning. When spaces are created such as collaborative learning, when we engage students in understanding the reasoning behind how we construct knowledge in constructing amazing things in research, seeing that way of thinking is where we can be effective. Relying on the research, teaching, and learning is how we engage our students moving forward. The most successful curriculum development projects at the University occur between collaborations between Career-track and Tenure-track faculty. If any group is ignored and not a part of the collaboration, then we implicitly suppress the contribution of the Career-track faculty, which I am one. Career-track faculty work hard at this institution and are some of the most student-centered, caring faculty that UArizona employs. Career-track faculty collaborate arm-in-arm with tenured faculty, and that unification is what is essential to this institution and needs to be discussed. Ijagbemi commented that the narrative that people have been left out is simply not true. Invitations were sent out several times with regard to this program and people who wanted to participate did so, and some people chose not to participate. The people that chose not to participate cannot now say they were shut out of participating. That is a false narrative. Secondly, on the UWGEC approval process where the comparison was made to NSF or grant funding and the faculty member receives acceptance or denial. As a member of UWGEC, that is not how UWGEC functions. As a member of the subgroup that looks at proposals as they come in, if the subcommittee feels that a particular proposal does not fit either the curriculum category or the attribute that is proposed, the subcommittee doesn't just refuse the proposal and throw it out. The subcommittee will work with the faculty member to see where the proposal will fit into another category or will work with the proposer to rectify and properly place the proposal. It is unfair to compare the approval process for Gen Ed with the application process for grants and funding because they don't have any relevance. M. Witte said that students are not a homogeneous body, and that different faculty will appeal to different students' needs.

11. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Michael Brewer, 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. Faculty Senate Minutes of October 4, 2021**
- 2. Report from the President**
- 3. Report from the Provost**
- 4. Report from the Faculty Officers**
- 5. Report from APPC**
- 6. Report from Graduate Council**
- 7. Report from SPBAC**

8. Undergraduate Minor in Neuroscience
9. Undergraduate Minor AETI Community Innovation
10. Double Use of Courses Amendment
11. Senate Resolution on College Faculty Advisory Committees
12. Summary of changes to the Constitution
13. Summary of changes to the Bylaws
14. Summary of UHAP Changes
15. University-Wide General Education Committee Academic Program and Policy Approval Process

Motions of November 1, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2021/22-12] Motion to approve the agenda. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

[Motion 2021/22-13] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Undergraduate Minor in Neuroscience. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-14] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Undergraduate Minor AETI Community Innovation. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-15] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council Double Use of Courses Amendment. Motion carried.

[Motion 2021/22-16] Motion to approve the amended Senate Resolution on College Faculty Advisory Committees. Motion was seconded and passed.

[Motion 2021/22-17] Motion to approve the Constitution and Bylaws revisions. Motion failed.

[Motion 2021/22-18] Motion to postpone approval of the Constitution and Bylaws revisions until the next Faculty Senate meeting because the preamble mentions the two other in-state Universities, and Article I of the Constitution should reference the core principle of the fact that the Faculty Senate as a body is the unit that represents faculty governance, along with Committee of Eleven. Motion was seconded. Motion passed.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456