

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 5, 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 3:00 p.m. via Zoom. Hingle reminded Faculty Senators to raise their "Zoom hand" in order to speak, and to keep comments short and on point. Only voting members of Faculty Senate may speak and comment. Hingle announced that Honorary Degrees will be voted on at the conclusion of the meeting, and that Faculty Senators can self-nominate for seats on the Shared Governance Review Committee, Grievance Clearinghouse Committee, and Senate Executive Committee.

Present: Senators Acosta, Behrangi, Bourget, Brewer, Brummund, Castro, Colina, Cooley, Dial, DiRoberto, Domin, Dong, Durán, Durand, Fink, Folks, Frey, Gephart, Gerald, Ghosh, Gordon, Goyal, Hammer, Helm, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, Milbauer, Min Simpkins, Murphy, Neumann, Oxnam, Ottusch, Pau, Provencher, Rafelski, Reimann, Robbins, Rosenblatt, Roussas, Ruggill, Russell, Sen, Singleton, Slepian, Smith, Spece, Stone, Sulkowski, Summers, Vedantam, Vega, M. Witte, and R. Witte.

Absent: Senators Cuillier, Hassan, Hildebrand, Jones, Hiller, Kaufman, McDonald, and Rodrigues.

2. *ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MARCH 1, 2021 (WILL BE VOTED ON VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)

The minutes of March 1, 2021 were approved with one abstention via Qualtrics survey.

3. *ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA: MA RESEARCH FOR SOCIAL CHANGE; CREDIT FOR PRIOR LEARNING- POLICY REVISION FOR MASTER'S PROGRAM – CHAIR OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL, RON HAMMER (WILL BE VOTED ON VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)

Murphy asked Hammer about seconded **[Motion 2020/21-34]** MA Research for Social Change and if there was any overlap with the Human Rights Online MA, since the Department Head for that program was not aware of the new program. Hammer said that overlap is overseen by Chair of the Graduate College, Andrew Carnie, and will check with him during the meeting. **[Motion 2020/21-34]** carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded **[Motion 2020/21-35]** Credit for Prior Learning – Policy Revision for Master's Program carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

4. *ACTION ITEM: BS IN MEDICINE: LETTERS OBJECTING TO THE BS IN MEDICINE PROPOSAL FROM COLLEGE OF SCIENCE; RESPONSE LETTER TO THE OPPOSITION FOR THE BS IN MEDICINE PROGRAM; UGC DISCUSSION SUPPLEMENT – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, NEEL GHOSH (WILL BE VOTED ON AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)

Seconded **[Motion 2020/21-36]** from Undergraduate Council, BS in Medicine, was presented for discussion. Hammer said that after reading various questions that faculty posed, he wanted to know how this program was optimum for students. Department Head Todd Vanderah answered the question by stating that the program allows for significant growth and will continue to strengthen UArizona as a place to achieve a degree in healthcare and medicine. There is a growing need for jobs and careers in this particular area. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics cites that for the next ten to twenty years, the growth area is enormous. The four other degree-issuing institutions in the State of Arizona have put together a BS in Medical Studies or Medical Sciences and those programs continue to grow. UArizona is the only institution with a College of Medicine without a BS degree in Medical Studies/Science. There are examples of UArizona undergraduates with interest in this particular area who have limited exposure to some of the alternatives to medicine. Many students do not have the opportunity to take courses directly from experienced physicians, which this program will allow students to do. The program will address unmet needs of some students entering medical school, and more importantly, there are students that are applying to medical school with a misunderstanding of what it takes to become a physician. The program will deliver to meet both those needs. Many medical schools have decreased the basic sciences curriculum, including pathology and pharmacology, and are pushing toward clinical experience with the basic sciences being moved to the undergraduate level. The program is not another pre-professional program, and it has various emphases that allow students to differentiate their interests, including medical technology, medicine and

society, integrative medicine track, as well as the traditional basic medical science track. Vanderah believes that the introductory courses will give students a view on medical issues and the health care system from a physician-based view, incorporating many of these things using a case-based approach within the courses and utilizing program solving in the field of medicine. The program will deliver health and medical care in the context of day-to-day practice relative to what physicians do on a daily basis. The Basic Medical Sciences track does have some broad range of existing elective courses in collaboration with many different groups, so the program includes classes from Biochemistry, MCB, Molecular Medicine, Nutrition, Immunology, Patho-Physiology, Histology, and Pharmacology, with an effort not to duplicate courses in the Basic Medical Sciences and use courses from other programs. The program offers maximum opportunities for collaboration between colleges, not just between Health Sciences, but across campus, offering other relevant courses from other college's programs and departments. Emphasis has been made to integrate medicine into other BA and BS programs across campus, and double-majoring can create a minor in Medicine that may be very lucrative to some other programs. Resources have been placed into the program, and a Director has been hired for the program, with plans to hire an Associate Director, as well as staff and student advisors to orchestrate its success. Resources have been promised for extensive recruitment and advertisement of the program with the intention of bringing more students into UArizona. Over 900 faculty are willing to put in time, mentorship, and teaching into the program. The title of the program has been under scrutiny and Vanderah certainly understands if a name change of the program needs to take place. Hudson referenced the letters of concern accompanying the proposal. Hudson asked if he met in-person with all those opposing the program, and if so, is there a Memorandum of Understanding that will direct the flow of the resources and articulate the frameworks for the collaborations. The paper trail does not show the response from the letter writers to your proposed solutions, nor is there any Memorandum of Understanding with any collaborative department. Vanderah replied that he has reached out to some in opposition, but not all. Diroberto spoke on behalf of the College of Applied Science and Technology and stated that the college believes there will be opportunities for partnership in the future and fully support this initiative. Slepian said that this is where the world is going, this is where dynamic, progressive Universities are going, and if we don't take advantage of this opportunity, the University will be missing the boat in big ways. The program creates fantastic opportunities for collaboration, The concerns raised are minor compared to the maximum value, gain, and cutting-edge status that will expand UArizona in the field of medical science, which is incorporated into many other components of new technologies and new dimensions of science. Spece said that he is involved in the College of Law's BA in Law for several years, and this program seems very analogous. The BA in Law is found to be very beneficial to students, faculty and the institution. Russell said that she took a look at the requirements and matched it with what was suggested in order to pass the MCAT, and nothing matches. There are several missing classes for performing well on the MCAT, and why would students risk not doing well on the MCAT with this program. Slepian said he has been involved with Vanderah since the onset of developing the program, and the development of the program was not intended to be the pathway to medical school, but a larger domain of medical science including clinical laboratory work, informatics, and remote medicine. The program expands the space of health science, and a disclaimer can be implemented to alert students that the program is not the pathway to a medical degree. By not offering the program, it keeps the University in a conventional box. Rafelski commented that the program is wrongly formulated and doesn't have the required classes, does have a required home, and misleads students to think it is a correct path to become a doctor of medicine. Singleton asked how the demand from students was assessed. Vanderah said that a recent UGC poll of 300 students showed 60% were in favor of the program. In the design of the program, discussion with students pertaining to the MCAT and the fact that there are many, not all students are going toward the MCAT goal. M. Witte said it's a well-designed program and fills a gap that other Arizona schools have already filled. Witte feels it's an unwise choice to call it a Bachelor of Science in Medicine because in some countries, enrollees from other countries will assume it is a degree to practice medicine. For fund flows, if enrollment is over and above the current pre-medical courses that are used by most medical students in preparation, and subtract from the courses like Biochemistry, Neuroscience, and Physiology, then it's a serious problem that has to be looked at on a yearly basis to see if there is a reverse fund flow. The other point is shared governance. Witte only heard of the program through the grapevine and was never brought to the faculty in the College of Medicine for discussion of all these issues. There has been difficulty discussing the curriculum and often find out drastic changes have happened, even when they've harmed our students with step one scores. Witte thinks that the program would have passed in the College of Medicine, despite the current name of the program. The program has been approved by all the Deans, Vice Presidents, the President, and even the Board of Regents, but the process needs to start at the bottom up, with the faculty. Associate Professor Bolger spoke representing the College of Science. Bolger has concerns that the BS in Medicine program does not actually prepare students for a pre-medical degree. Many courses are missing and it doesn't meet the requirements of 70% of medical schools. The program fails to prepare students for careers in two-year accredited programs that provide specific job training. For example, Pima Community College (PCC) is accredited by the National Board of Respiratory Care to prepare students for careers in respiratory therapy. PCC curriculum includes coursework for principles and mechanical ventilation, advanced cardiovascular life support, as well as opportunity for experience with patients. The BS in Medicine does not support this focus. The program is advertising that students will be able to become phlebotomists, massage therapists, home health aide, and these careers require minimal training and have salaries in the \$25-30K a year range. Bolger feels it is disingenuous to be putting forward a BS in Medicine since the program doesn't meet any of the requirements of any of the careers listed. Ghosh said that based on the discussion, and several comments in Chat, Faculty Senators have asked why this

proposal has moved forward to Faculty Senate for approval. UGC has never experienced any proposal/program like this one. Typically, a proposal comes to UGC, possibly some changes are made, and it moves to Faculty Senate and it's approved. Since Faculty Senate is the ultimate approval body, it needs to think about this carefully. Although both sides raise good points, and this is the proper place to have this discussion, bottom line is that it's still undecided and another review session is needed. Seconded [Motion 2020/21-36] was postponed.

5. **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.**

Katie Zeiders, Associate Professor in the Norton School of Family and Consumer Sciences in the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and United Campus Worker of Arizona Union Member, addressed the Faculty Senate. On Friday, April 23rd from 4-5pm, the United Campus Workers Union of Arizona (Local 7065) will be hosting a faculty recruitment event. This is a time that all non-union faculty can attend and learn more about the work that we are doing. It's important work - we are working on legislative issues, including the recent bills aimed at reducing public education funding and voting rights, larger healthcare concerns, including increases in premiums and limited options, and faculty specific topics, include equitable pay and contracts to contingent and non-tenure track faculty. The more voices and faculty we have in our union, the stronger we become, so we welcome all our colleagues. Join us Friday, April 23rd from 4-5pm. Zeiders requested that the Faculty Senate allow the Union members to send announcements about the meeting on the Faculty listserv. Hingle explained that since no votes are taken in Open Session, Union information will be appended to the minutes. Zoom link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83072871372>

6. **INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEM: REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, ASUA, GPSC, APAC, CSC, RPC, APPC, SAPC, DEI, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, GRADUATE COUNCIL**

M. Witte asked faculty leadership about the Qualtrics voting mechanism, because a motion was passed that Faculty Senate would employ hand votes at the meetings. Witte feels this is a serious problem and another example of not following shared governance procedures. Faculty Senate has become a secret ballot organization. Faculty Senators who are not present and have not received minutes also vote, and they are not informed about the issues raised at the meetings. Witte urges the Faculty Senate to be democratic and use hand votes instead of Qualtrics and have an open ballot box. Bourget asked the Faculty Officers about her request to bring back the Graduate Faculty Policy for review of curriculum and delivery of instruction. The Graduate College is pushing colleges to adopt the policy with very limited changes allowed to customize to the unique situations every unit has on campus, Hammer responded that the urgency to respond and implement is not on the entire Graduate Faculty Policy itself, but on each program's submission of criteria for who their members would be so that those individuals named by the programs can have a statement in their contract delineating they are members of the graduate faculty. That's where the urgency lies, but it does not have to be done this year. The request is for the individual program and is not up to the Graduate College, since the individual program sets the criteria. Bourget said that a significant portion of the document presented to the units specifies that no change is allowed to certain sections, and those sections were never approved by Faculty Senate. This situation is creating hardship, as the document is not clear, and units are trying to understand how the policy was approved by Graduate Council. After some pushback, and being told that the sections were not allowed to be changed, shared governance is not being employed with this policy and Faculty Senate should have the last vote on it. Hammer said that he would take Bourget's concerns back to Graduate Council, because Graduate Council is one of the shared governance bodies of the Faculty Senate. Bourget stated that even if Hammer brings her concerns to Graduate Council, the policy has to come back to Faculty Senate for approval to follow proper procedure. Fink asked Robbins and Folks about the confirmed arrival of the more contagious and lethal COVID-19 mutation B117 on campus. With the statewide reopening of restaurants, movie theaters, etc., and the nationwide emergence of a fourth wave of infections, what is your reasoning for enforcing in-person teaching for the remaining six weeks of the current spring semester, and more so, what are your plans for the upcoming fall semester, especially given the fact that not everyone will be vaccinated for various reasons. Robbins responded that UArizona consults with the Public Health Advisory Committee, and Dr. Mike Worobey, who is in attendance today, can better address the B117 strain more succinctly. Taking all the recommendations into account with the POD administering more than 150,000 vaccines, by summer, UArizona will have exceed President Biden's goal. The positivity rate on campus is extremely low, which warranted the decision. Worobey added that the B117 COVID-19 variant is more transmissible and causes more severe outcomes, but the situation for Arizona is a little different where the variant is concerned because the variant reached the state in the late stages of spreading. In terms of the local spread of the B117 and B1429 highly transmissible variants, there is a .3% positivity rate which is low. If things start spinning in the out of control direction, and positivity rates climb, of course the University will respond accordingly. Fink said that as of last night, scientists in at Aarhus University in Denmark have cautioned the discovery of a new mutation, which basically has all the potential to circumvent the vaccines, so that is a concern people need to know and focus on as well. In the end, will six months from time of vaccination still hold up and tackle the new mutations. Hudson said that there doesn't seem to be a uniform policy across campus for different teaching modalities. Some people have mandated in-person classes starting in the fall? Is there a uniform policy across

campus and what is the procedure for someone who feels that there's pressure from their department head or college to return to in-person classes. What should that person do if they're feeling pressured. Folks responded that the process hasn't changed for asking for a temporary work modification and the process has worked excellently to support everyone through the entire pandemic. Folks will drop the link into Chat, and encourages people to work directly with their direct supervisor if they have any concerns. If the person has HIPPA-related information they don't feel comfortable sharing, then working with the Disability Resource Center to have a work accommodation, or their HR partner is also a willing participant in that dialogue. Folks added that the process has been working seamlessly across campus and there's been zero conflicts that were not easily able to be resolved. To be clear, it is the University's expectation to be moving into normal operations in fall 2021. There may be some mitigations at that point, and there will be some people who will not be able to receive vaccinations, so the University has to be very thoughtful about that population and their risks. The efficacy of the vaccine against the variants continues to hold up to scientific scrutiny and have to continue to keep the pressure on the vaccination process to create dead ends in the spread. The lower the transmission rate goes, the more the people among us who are at risk and can't be vaccinated, are protected by our herd immunity. Getting back to normal requires two things; lots of vaccinated people who stop the spread, and those people who protect the unvaccinated population. Very high rates of vaccinations have been reported for faculty and staff, and furious efforts are being made to fully vaccinate students before they return home for the summer. Hudson added that the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences would like a breakdown of the second \$15.5M from the CARES Act. Numbers were provided for the student support side, and Hudson understands that there is possibly \$4M left for distribution. Bourget asked Robbins about the University joining the consortium with fellow Universities and community colleges to look in to the future of higher education. In the roster of members, one person stands out from McKinsey and Company. Their credibility is questioned due to consulting with Big Pharma and the current opioid crisis. Why is there a representative from a global search organization on that roster. Robbins responded that McKinsey was brought in by the organizers of the consortium to help provide some organizational structure and communication. McKinsey has taken a very strong stance on their role in dealing with the opioid crisis and their consulting with pharmaceutical companies and have made public apologies for their role. The higher education group inside McKinsey was not involved in that aspect, and the consortium, which is made up historically of black colleges/universities and community college presidents, is looking at what can be done for the group of students from 2020 and current students who would be graduating in 2021 to help them find jobs and opportunities with novel and innovative programs.

7. **INFORMATION ITEM: FSERT WORKING GROUP – VICE PRESIDENT FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT, KASEY URQUIDEZ, WITH WORKING GROUP MEMBERS MELANIE HINGLE, JIM FLORIAN, MARY VENEZIA, AND RAVNEET CHADNA**

Urquidez introduced the working group and presented her PowerPoint "Bridging the gap: Financial aid, academic success, and tuition revenue in a changing market." The goal of the group is to be transparent and help build knowledge with the campus, and to help others better understand the background and the context of the work the group is doing, the different modalities available, different campuses, and how those all play a role into the model, institutional goals, as well as nuances related to enrollment revenue, discounting, and competition. The group's focus also looks at what we should be doing as a campus to help increase revenue, while serving our students to the very best of our ability. Urquidez said that when fall numbers started to come in, the working group knew that it needed to offer more to help campus to understand its position related to student enrollment and finances and what that looked like. Enrollment was up by 1,000 students in the fall, and the first and second-year retention rate was the highest ever. This raised the question as to why there wasn't the same increased revenue associated with the increased retention rate. The group is interested in feedback from campus constituents for additional materials and resources. The significant decrease in state funding has resulted in increased dependency on tuition revenue. Enrollment has grown in numbers, but net tuition revenue per student has declined as students change modalities to meet their goals. Spring census information shows a decrease of \$45M with main campus. Affordability was cited as the main reason a student chose not to attend UArizona and selected a different institution. Flagship universities in forty-six states grew their non-need-based aid by 65% over the past five years. In 2013-14, the goal was to lower the discount rate from 30% to 23% as part of the Never Settle Strategic Plan, which resulted in a decline in first-year enrollments due to affordability concerns. In 2016-17, the University increased aid to improve retention and completion, and to ensure competitive aid packages for academically talented students and those with financial need. Currently, the goals laid out as part of the Strategic Plan have shown to be working positively. Bringing in a more academically prepared incoming class has increased the GPA in the top 10%, and were able to bring in the most ethnically diverse class to date. Four-year graduation rates have continued to move up, which falls in line with completion goals. Private and public institutions alike are seeing a rising discount rate and fewer net tuition revenue dollars coming in due to the competition, so the focus has been on bringing in classes and retaining them. In a few years, there will be a decline in the number of high school graduation age students who are considered the traditional population for first-year students. Different populations of students will be targeted in order to grow the number of students who are considering UArizona. In addition, the demographics are shifting greatly, so there will be many more students that will be from first generation and/or diverse backgrounds from lower income families. What can we do as a campus to make sure that we are serving the population and teaching our overarching goals, which includes new students and new revenues to sustain the University. M. Witte asked for a breakdown of

diversity groups. Russell asked where the money from the furloughs was used. Folks replied that a \$250M deficit was predicted at the onset of the pandemic due to lost tuition revenue from out-of-state and international students not returning to campus. The furlough money was used to offset the deficit for a year, which reduced it to \$183M. UArizona is grateful to the Federal Government for helping shrink the deficit a bit more. Reports will be made available online publicly. Spece commented that some of the furlough monies should be returned to the University community given that the predicted deficit was less than expected.

8. **INFORMATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: GENERAL EDUCATION REFRESH – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, SUSAN MILLER-COCHRAN, CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, NEEL GHOSH, CHAIR OF UWGEC, JOAN CURRY, AND MOLLY BOLGER (WILL BE VOTED ON VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)**

Ghosh opened by telling Faculty Senate that he has been working with UGC and Miller-Cochran for the last three months to fine tune the implementation of the new General Education program. Fundamentals are that students must have thirty-two credit hours, but also to think deeply about perspective and how people in different areas of the University think, and how students should be exposed to their way of thinking as they are educated. Other key elements taken into consideration were that the General Education program be overseen by a group and there is a mechanism for assessment of critical thinking, how people are learning, and to provide topics that ABOR was interested in offering. Originally General Education was assigned to Pillar One of the Strategic Plan for initial comments and then moved under Miller-Cochran's purview where she and a small group of people initiated due diligence to formulate the program. Miller-Cochran reached out to all facets of the University for input on the curriculum, and that curriculum grew out of the vast amount of input received. The result is a nice compliment of different ways to critically think and how to reimagine how the University will offer the General Education program. The new program addresses diversity, how to look for diverse, less scientific types of evidence and where to find it, and is a carefully rounded General Education course of study. Miller-Cochran, Curry from UWGEC, and Bolger from MCB asked different instructors involved in general education to prepare syllabi structured around the new Gen Ed program in accordance with UWGEC specifications. The General Education Office offered to help instructors formulate new syllabi to encompass the reimagined General Education program driven by modern teaching concepts and active learning, including signature projects at the end of each course. A holistic approach to learning differentiates this new program from the old, where a student would solely take multiple classes, and this opportunity puts everything together into a media-guided process that embraces different approaches to learning and offers quality course structure. In this program, students can double count courses up to nine credits in any major in any college as long as the courses have elements of General Education built into them. There was concern that the critical curriculum for some courses, such as chemistry and hard sciences, would be diluted, but that will not be the case. After much UGC discussion over the last three months, it largely voted in favor of the new program. The votes are posted. Everyone involved in the process is here today to answer questions, and Ghosh encourages the President and Provost to make resources available to the faculty who developed such courses and hope those resources exist to do so. Russell said she is distressed because she would like to know what the return on investment is, and what metrics are being used to accommodate the suggestions from ABOR. As one who teaches general education courses, this program seems much more fundamental and an attack on science. The requirement is going from nine basic science units to three units. The literal word science is not even mentioned, the method, content, or evidence-based requirement. Ghosh responded that instead of only scientific evidence, the shift has been made to other disciplines that ask quantitative questions and address what would be called rhetoric in a different way and logic as opposed to carbon dating. How much natural science should play a role in students' education versus the social sciences. How much of both do students need, and it's an open floor question with many sides. Miller-Cochran thanked Ghosh for his introduction and addressed the return on investment point. Currently, there is no assessment plan for General Education. There is no way to determine whether or not what we are doing with General Education is helping students to learn what we intend to teach. There is classroom-based assessment happening in individual classes, but as a program have not been looking at whether or not the way General Education is structured to accomplish what has been intended. One of the primary goals when the new General Education program was designed was to create a clear and robust assessment program. There are four areas ABOR is requiring for assessment, sciences writ large is not one of them, but quantitative reasoning is required and what is focused on. The change in credit hours is concerning to many, especially the College of Science. One of the things in the design of the program is to make sure there is a better emphasis on quantitative reasoning on how students use data to build strong arguments. Quantitative reasoning runs across many different disciplines and not just science. Emphasis was placed on all the different disciplinary areas and different disciplinary perspectives and to make sure that students are exposed to, and have chance to think about how these all come together as they're trying to solve what are often described as grand challenges. Students need to have different disciplinary perspectives to be familiar with and come in conversation together so that they can address specific problems, and that's what will happen in the building connections courses. Sciences are not being downplayed in any way, but the concern is that the General Education program as it's been constructed may not always be emphasizing all of the different disciplinary perspectives that are important for students to have access to as well. Russell said that analytics can be done, and have been done on individual professors in classes, where you can actually see if a student takes someone's class, are they likely to take another class, are they

likely to graduate, will they get better grades on future classes. Return on investment means retention, which improves UA Arizona's prestige and ranking and improves the bottom line for the University and students. These are all things that can be assessed in General Education classes. Teaching students to understand certain concepts that has been decided they need to know is not analytics and hard numbers and evidence. Hingle stated that ABOR has a set of requirements that are mandated to refresh the General Education program. Russell reiterated that cutting the natural sciences in a school that is famous for the natural sciences is counterproductive. Miller-Cochran said that it is feasible to look at analytics in individual courses, but there is a vast difference between looking at courses individually and a program-based assessment and looking at the program as a whole. Pollard said that the curriculum is focusing on ways of thinking and ways of reasoning as opposed to straight up building knowledge. Scientific reasoning is contextualized by what we do; studying the climate, studying psychology, archaeology, chemistry, etc. The way a student thinks about evidence and its role and value in our society is what the student will take with them. Students will not remember the details of robot floats or molecular structures, but they will remember the way of thinking that went to generate that type of instrumentation or the ways of looking at data and evidence and how they value it. Social scientists engage in scientific reasoning, many departments do. This way of thinking can be promoted in many courses and the building connections courses, or interdisciplinary courses, are illustrating the boundaries between where scientific reasoning can be contextualized with really big challenges and ideas. Climate change is not going to be solved by the scientists. It will probably be solved by economists or social scientists. Russell disagreed. Hudson asked about procedural issues. Hudson has also taught large General Education classes and is worried about the speed with which this is being driven through, and thinks there are many conversations with many stakeholders from around the University that still need to happen. To roll this program out by Spring 2022 seems a little too soon. Northern Arizona University is rolling out their General Education program in fall 2022, which seems like a more reasonable time-frame to give everyone who teaches these classes a fuller opportunity to participate. When watching ABOR meetings, there is a sense that this is being driven by ABOR and statute says that, in fact, curricular matters are the purview of the faculty. ABOR is interested in a Civics and American Institutions component that has not previously existed in our program, and Hudson is concerned that possibly the natural science classes are being replaced. This is a prime example of the peril of centralized planning. A pre-existing model where each department was incentivized to put up their best General Education efforts. Students can choose between that, and are in danger of wiping that away with centralized group think. Miller-Cochran replied that the visibility of the effort has been greater recently to revise the General Education curriculum, but the effort has been ongoing since 2018 when the Task Force was convened by Senior Vice Provost, Gail Burd. Approximately twenty people participated initially, and that led to a summer group at a General Education Institute with the American Association of College and Universities when a report was generated. In spring 2018, data from faculty, undergraduate students, alumni, and community stakeholders was generated to determine what is working and what isn't working about our curriculum. The impetus to revisit General Education came prior to the ABOR policy, which now certainly gives some urgency in terms of thinking about a timeline, and whether or not anything needs to change due to compliance issues. Miller-Cochran started leading the team in November 2019, and in January 2020, convened as many people as were willing to come together to review the data. Approximately fifty faculty participated, but many declined. The roll out was delayed one semester, much due to upheaval from COVID-19. Miller-Cochran clarified that the revision undertaking was prior to ABOR's policy, and the team is trying to involve as many faculty as possible who have expertise in General Education areas. One of the drives the team has is to increase student autonomy and agency, since it is known to be part of what motivates students and potentially can help retain them at the University. Relating to civic knowledge, there are ways for us to do that as an institution and make sure those components are included in the curriculum without mandating something that takes away faculty autonomy, and designing the curriculum that takes away student autonomy and selecting classes. Bourget asked who will design and teach entry and exit courses. Is the unit prefix an existing prefix or is it going to be a new prefix. Who will take care of these courses. The program will require growing central administration and the presentation earlier showed that student enrollment will potentially decline. Faculty has stayed stagnant, and although growing the faculty does not seem to be in any plan, administration continues to grow. How does this program fit into the financial stability of the institution. Is any attention being placed on advanced placement credits that students currently receive for General Education advanced credit. Miller-Cochran said that in terms of AP, IB, Cambridge and other exams that students sometimes use for credit, the policies that are being worked on list all of those and equivalencies and are working closely with the Transfer Office and Registrar's Office to make sure different ways that students' transfer credits taken elsewhere are accounted for. The biggest challenge is with the building connections courses because they don't have easy equivalence, and some members of the General Education team are working closely with the Transfer Office to determine both rules we can develop so that the transfer articulations are easier to determine and then also guidelines for figuring out how to count courses and credit that we don't have a clear map for. The exams mentioned will carry General Education credit. The two one-unit courses will have some outlying issues that still remain to be resolved. One is determining some of the details about how those courses are offered/structured, how the colleges are participating, and how they're staffed. A group of General Education team members are working solely on this aspect because each college has different ways that they respond to introductory courses and consistency has to be maintained. The other is how the funding for General Education classes will move forward. Miller-Cochran is hopeful that Faculty Senate can provide some guidance and discussion about what the shared governance process should look like as issues are resolved. Tremendous input has been received from UWGEC and UGC, but Faculty Senate is an important resource for making sure that we are

following shared governance processes. Ottusch asked about the timing overview of current General Education courses and submission for new General Education courses and the approval of that process. When will a copy of the new guidelines be available for the faculty of the General Education program. Pollard responded that the current courses being submitted are being gathered by Associate Deans from the various colleges who are working with the departments. Courses are being submitted in three segments with segment one being offered in spring of 2022. A quick start training/onboarding will be scheduled for May. Segment two will be loading courses for fall 2022, and segment three encompasses new courses because the building connections part of the curriculum is the new series of interdisciplinary courses where new course development will be necessary. Hingle asked Miller-Cochran for next steps on engaging Faculty Senate. Miller-Cochran asked for a group of interested Faculty Senators to start the conversation. Ghosh suggested a small Faculty Senate committee that is either elected or appointed by the Presiding Officer would be very helpful to engage with Miller-Cochran. Hingle will accept self-nominations from Faculty Senators and pass them on to Miller-Cochran. Russell thanked Miller-Cochran for her effort. Hudson mentioned that the agenda did not state that the General Education Refresh would be voted on and it was listed only as an Information Item. Hingle responded that it was a clerical error, and “possible action item” was omitted, but that many times motions are made during meetings and move forward for a vote without it being listed on the agenda. Russell stated that Faculty Senators choose to attend meetings based on what is scheduled to be voted on. Hingle moved **[Motion 2020/21-37]** to vote on the General Education process and implementation and moving forward with the program, not content since content is still being finalized. Motion was seconded. Motion passed and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

9. INFORMATION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ITEM: CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS REVISIONS AND QUALTRICS VOTING PREVIEW – SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER

Brewer reviewed the process for Constitution and Bylaws changes. The pending changes are available on the Faculty Governance website and were sent out individually to all Faculty Senators after the previous Faculty Senate meeting. The first change is to add the Senior Vice President for Research as an *ex officio*, non-voting member of Faculty Senate. Cantwell suggested changing the language to Chief Research Officer of the University to bypass any future title changes for that position. The second change provides flexibility for the Vice Chair of the Faculty to add non-voting *ex officio* representatives to the Senate Standing Committees. Brewer explained that it has been beneficial on certain committees for communication with administration and decision making. In the past four years, a Postdoctoral Scholar has been added to some committees, and it’s been beneficial to the committee and scholar, and adding this to the Bylaws gives that flexibility to the committee chair. Approximately five years ago, the Senate Executive Committee unofficially added an IT Liaison to its membership and it’s worked out well. The Bylaws change would allow for the CIO or their designee to attend permanently as an *ex officio*, non-voting member. Staff Advisory Council (SAC) and Appointed Professionals Advisory Council (APAC) will be merging into one organization, Arizona Staff Council, and the housekeeping changes are outlined in the document. The same number of voting representatives will remain on Faculty Senate. The Point of View Mediation process no longer exists in Human Resources, and the change is to remove the informal grievance process from the Bylaws. Next, a recommendation to include *ex officio* members of Faculty Senate to the University-Wide General Education Committee, Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. A suggestion to require that the Committee on Elections post vote totals with the election results. M. Witte asked why each item wasn’t being discussed individually. Witte said she opposed to adding *ex officio* members appointed by the Chair/Vice Chair of the Faculty to the Senate Standing committees. Witte explained that these are faculty committees and administrators should not be allowed to hold a permanent seat, even if non-voting. If the committee would like to invite an administrator to a meeting, this practice would be appropriate. Witte stated this should be rejected by Faculty Senate and would like to make a motion to strike this change from the Bylaws revisions. Hingle explained that if there is opposition to anything to be voted on, a vote of “no” on the ballot is appropriate. Witte argued that this is more than a “no” vote, it’s a matter of principle. Witte moved **[Motion 2020/21-38]** that this item be removed for consideration and not be voted on. Motion was seconded. Hingle reiterated that the items were moved forward from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee for a Faculty Senate vote. Witte said that things of this nature should be discussed and voted on in the Faculty Senate meeting, and not put on a secret ballot with no discussion. Many Faculty Senators are uninformed about the Bylaws and what they mean to the Faculty Senate and the faculty. Brewer asked if any committee chairs present could speak to this proposed change. Hammer said that APPC has not addressed this issue, but they could discuss it at the next meeting and bring it back to Faculty Senate. Brewer was under the assumption that RPC was having misunderstandings with the Office of Research, Innovation, and Impact (RII) when implementing the Cores policy. Witte responded that when RPC was able to meet with only its committee members, it made for more productive meetings with RII staff. RPC was able to solve problems through true shared governance without any administrators sitting on the committee because the committee was able to strategize and discuss matters and come up with a plan that turned out to be acceptable to all parties. Hammer revised his comment to add that having Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Romero attend APPC meetings has been very helpful to gain perspective from administration’s viewpoint on certain matters. Stone added that when he chaired SAPC, the committee found it useful to have the Vice Provost come and discuss issues the committee was working on for students, but the Vice Provost was not present at every meeting, and only when the committee asked for that perspective. Hudson said that she agrees with Stone. It can be very useful to have the right people in the room when they can add to the discussion. What’s concerning is diluting the faculty voice

on any of these committees or in the Faculty Senate. Hudson said she was more concerned about the first change of adding another administrator from the Research Office to the Faculty Senate roster. Brewer explained that it would eliminate the Vice President Representative appointed by the President, and the number of administrators would remain the same. Witte reiterated that deliberations on committees involves interactions with administrators, and the committees should have judgement reserved as to who they want present at their meetings. The item needs to return to Faculty Senate for fuller discussion, and at this point, should not be voted on. Brewer continued with a housekeeping change to make General Education, Undergraduate and Graduate Council look more uniform; a housekeeping change on simply removing "College Academic Administrators Council" from the Constitution; a housekeeping change to change UA South to the College of Applied Science and Technology. After hearing strongly from UWGEC, Undergraduate, and Graduate Councils, all entities strongly suggested to rescind a change that was previously approved where all memberships had to be elected by the colleges. All three entities have voiced concerns that this mechanism will not work. Hudson called for Point of Order to address the second motion on the floor. She noted that Acosta had suggested in chat to call a Special Faculty Senate meeting to deliberate, given that the changes are confusing. Brewer suggested giving feedback in Qualtrics so he has a better understanding of the issues, and would then be able to bring changes back to the Constitution and Bylaws Committee. Hingle suggested having an hour at the next Faculty Senate meeting devoted to the aforementioned issues. Witte said that thirty minutes would be sufficient, but is not in favor of Faculty Senators not present at the meeting and not involved in the discussion voting on such matters. Summers said that Qualtrics is the best, most efficient way to vote on matters in Faculty Senate. Qualtrics hasn't been utilized before because we haven't had a pandemic before. Nothing is secret and nothing is being hidden from anyone, and the Faculty Senate doesn't have the staff infrastructure to adequately handle hand votes during the meeting in an efficient manner. Hingle encourages anyone who has questions to join the Faculty Senate office hours every Tuesday afternoon from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. **[Motion 2020/21-38]** passed since the body decided that voting on the Constitution and Bylaws changes be postponed for further discussion.

10. INFORMATION ITEM: CHANGES TO EMAIL FOR RETIREES AND THOSE OTHERWISE LEAVING THE UNIVERSITY – EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR STUDENT AND ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGIES, DARCY VAN PATTEN, AND SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER

Van Patten opened by stating that email service changes are forthcoming. Currently, when someone leaves the University, there is a sixty-day grace period where they retain access to their email and Office 365 after separation of employment. This causes some concern for the Office of General Counsel. Retiree email is supported on Office 365 for life, and that will not change, although how it is supported will be changed to reduce cost and administrative overhead. The two primary domains are @arizona.edu for faculty, staff, and DCC's, and @email.arizona.edu for students and retirees. Two email domains create some complication with single sign on for some tools, such as Box, making collaboration difficult. The goal is to reduce the cost of support to fairly low-usage service for retirees, while still retaining the commitment of email for life for those who want to use it. UITS would like to simplify single sign on and reduce administrative overhead, making collaboration with sign on tools a better functioning operation. A working group was formed with representation from Human Resources, Faculty Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, and from Faculty Shared Governance, Michael Brewer, who took proposed changes to many constituencies across the University. Data shows that 68% of retirees did not log into their email service since 2017. A philosophy for equitable treatment is being undertaken for faculty and staff. There will no impact on Emeritus faculty. What's changing is UITS is moving toward an opt-in model for retiree email, which means that anyone retiring from the institution will be invited to opt-in to retain your email service, and the retiree can request to retain departmental/college domains. This will reduce the compliance oversight and reduce the amount of time UITS and the Office of General Counsel spend on eDiscovery and email holds, which in turn, reduces costs. UITS will deprovision access to email in Office 365 upon separation, aligning with industry standards. When a person leaves an institution, access to information resources is severed mitigating risk and compliance. Students will be moved to @arizona.edu to simplify single sign on and reduce the technical customizations for the two-domain model for things like D2L and other academic technologies. In January 2021, presentations were made to two different leadership groups, and scheduled to present to Faculty Senate, which was postponed. At the beginning of March, the opt-in service went live, and to date, 136 retirees out of approximately 800 have opted in to retain their email service. Monthly reminder emails are being sent to those who have not opted in, and UITS will monitor the list of opt ins and continue to send reminders. The 24/7 Help Desk has fielded a number of calls and emails providing support to a large audience who have had questions. At the end of June 2021, the process to remove access to email and Office 365 for separating employees who are neither retiree nor Emeritus will begin. At that juncture, the final switch-over for retirees who have opted in will start routing their email to Google, and on August 29, 2021, access to Office 365 will cease. The six-month transition period allows us to do that continual communication, and allows us to help those who need help opting into email and moving personal content. Smith asked as an Emeritus faculty member, if she needed to do anything. Van Patten responded no. All @email.arizona.edu accounts be routed to @arizona.edu. Rafelski asked about graduate students who finish with a degree and become employees for a period of time lose their email because they are terminated as employees. Van Patten said that the alumni email will continue to get routed.

11. **INFORMATION ITEM: COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN UPDATE ON THE LEADERSHIP AND COMMUNICATION SURVEY QUANTITATIVE REPORT AND QUALITATIVE REPORT – CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE OF ELEVEN, JAVIER DURAN**

Duran informed Faculty Senate that the Quantitative results of the Leadership and Communication Survey that the committee did last fall has been linked to the agenda. Duran thanked his colleagues on the Committee of Eleven who performed the work to get the data sorted out. Duran invited the campus community to a Town Hall on April 16, 2021, from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. and have extended an invitation to President Robbins, Provost Folks, and CFO Rulney to join in the conversation and find proactive ways to respond to our colleagues. The invitation will also be circulated to the three groups who participated in the survey; faculty, graduate students, and staff. Witte said that time limits will be enforced at the Town Hall to two minutes. Questions not addressed at the Town Hall will be archived and addressed at a later date.

12. **INFORMATION ITEM: PROPOSED CHANGES TO UHAP CHAPTERS THREE AND FOUR WITH PRESENTATION ON THE ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS – VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY AFFAIRS, ANDREA ROMERO**

Romero stated that based on comments and feedback from last month's presentation, three significant changes were made. 1) Career Track faculty who are at their initial rank are now included in annual meetings with Department Heads. 2) Units have to give a thirty days advance notice for faculty to submit their materials before the annual review. 3) The composition of the peer review committee should be diverse, including all tracks and ranks. Brewer stated that the policy will be available for a thirty-day vetting period online for the campus community to give feedback. At present, Faculty Senators are able to provide feedback from this meeting in Qualtrics. Blakely said that a change was made from "meets expectations" to "meets or exceeds expectations."

13. **DISCUSSION ITEM: NEW BUSINESS FOR THE MAY 3, 2021 FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

There was no discussion.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:03 P.M. 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 March 1, 2021**
2. **MA Research for Social Change**
3. **Credit for Prior Learning-Policy Revision for Master's Program**
4. **BS In Medicine**
5. **Letters Objecting to BS in Medicine Proposal from College of Science**
6. **Response Letter to the Opposition Letters for the BS in Medicine Program**
7. **UGC Discussion Supplement**
8. **President's Report**
9. **Provost's Report**
10. **Faculty Officers' Report**
11. **ASUA Report**
12. **Graduate Council Report**
13. **FSERT Working Group**
14. **General Education Refresh**
15. **Constitution Revisions**
16. **Bylaws Revisions**
17. **Qualtrics Voting Preview**
18. **Changes to Email for Retirees and those otherwise leaving the university**
19. **C11 Quantitative Report**
20. **C11 Qualitative Report**
21. **UHAP Chapter Three Revisions**
22. **UHAP Chapter Four Revisions**

23. UHAP Chapters Three and Four PowerPoint Presentation

Motions of the April 5, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting

[Motion 2020/21-34] Seconded motion from Graduate Council MA Research for Social Change. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2020/21-35] Seconded motion from Graduate Council Credit for Prior Learning – Policy Revision for Master’s Program. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2020/21-36] Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council BS in Medicine. Motion was postponed.

[Motion 2020/21-37] to vote on the General Education process and implementation and moving forward with the program, not content since content is still being finalized. Motion was seconded. Motion passed via Qualtrics survey.

[Motion 2020/21-38] to remove the appointment of administrators to Senate Standing Committees in the Bylaws. Motion was seconded. Voting on the Constitution and Bylaws revisions was postponed for further discussion.

FACULTY CENTER
1216 E. Mabel
PO Box 210456