Minutes
Wednesday, June 3, 2020
9:00-10:30am via Zoom


Observers: J. Dudas, R. Miller, S. Pawar, A. Romero

Presenters: Richard Carmona, Distinguished Professor of Public Health and Lead for the University's Campus Reentry Plan Working Group; Liesl Folks, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Robert Stephan, Teaching and Learning Group Lead, Implementation Planning Team, Campus Re-Entry Plan Working Group

Call to Order
Co-Chair Helm called the meeting to order at 9:02 am

Approval of the Minutes of May 20, 2020
The May 20, 2020 minutes were approved.

Update and Statement on Protests
President Robbins
Robbins provided a statement to the committee regarding recent protests and policing and expressed the need for data, formal review, and analysis of root causes of violence involving the police. He expressed the need for a system to track performance of police units. He stated administrators are reviewing UAPD and said there is a need to provide support to all members of the community, especially students of color. He provided an update on the hiring of a new vice president for equity and inclusion, stating hiring for this position was discussed at Faculty Senate.

Follow up: In an email after the SPBAC meeting Celina Ramirez, Vice President, University Initiatives, added the search for this position is ongoing and once finalists have been chosen, there will be campus-wide forums open to everyone.

1 Questions asked on chat that remained unanswered during the regular meeting were forwarded to the relevant presenters for follow-up reports and answers. Presenters’ resulting answers are marked as “follow-up” in the minutes.
Committee members shared resources on the topic and CFO Lisa Rulney agreed to share this information with UAPD advisory council.

**Update on Campus Reentry Plan**

Richard Carmona, Distinguished Professor of Public Health and Lead for the University’s Campus Reentry Plan Working Group

Carmona updated the committee on the multi-disciplinary approach to reopening the University he has been asked to create by President Robbins. He outlined the incident command system used to assess hazards, which will bring together diverse persons who have the unique intellectual property needed to solve problems. He stated a team of experts in incident command have been assembled to handle every aspect of what the University needs to do for reentry and risk mitigation. Experts in logistics, planning, and operations have been brought together for the last two weeks and the President and Provost are briefed on a regular basis.

Committee members asked for differences between the process Carmona is running and the process UA already has in place. Carmona stated incident command runs operations during large events and that the process he has established is similar to what UA has in place but better prepared to address challenges.

Members asked when a final decision will be made regarding reentry with students, faculty, and staff physically on campus. Carmona said President Robbins needs a plan of recommendation by July 24th (1 month to students returning). President Robbins added there will be guidance for faculty, staff, and students.

Committee members asked Carmona if the Student EMS on campus program be expanded and trained to deal with COVID-19 issues. Carmona responded he has met with student EMTs twice and sees the scope of their practice expanding and involving educating students. He stated they will be used in a broader capacity providing training and assisting as “ambassadors of health”. Also, they will help with compliance with ensuring low transmissibility on campus. Carmona indicated the need for an engaged student population to ensure the student voice is represented.

Members asked if people will be allowed on campus if there are new cases of COVID-19 in Tucson and how social distancing will be observed during the transition between classes and in shared spaces such as the Student Union. Carmona responded CDC and WHO guidelines will be followed and the reentry team is receiving and reviewing recommendations to determine best practices for the University. President Robbins stated if the decision is made to come back to campus, there will still be active infections in Tucson. He said a vaccine is realistically 1-2 academic years away. Carmona said there will be tracking, and epidemiologists will be providing information on a local, state, and national level to determine where new cases originate. A platform will be built for all students to be checked daily. Carmona expects new cases but states the real challenge will be mitigation. President Robbins said depending on contact tracing, the face-to-face experience on campus will be totally different but there will be ways to ensure maximum protection if face-to-face education resumes in the fall.

**Follow up:** In Zoom chat, a committee member asked Carmona to explain the difference between having antibodies (for people who did contract Covid-19 and recovered) and a vaccine? In an email Carmona later responded: Antibodies naturally arise after an immune system recognizes a foreign pathogen and manufactures a product (antibody) against the pathogen. A vaccine is essentially a manufactured attenuated antigen which elicits an immune response (antibodies) which may protect the person from future antigenic challenges.
Follow up: A Committee member asked if the Incident Command team is being paid for their work outside of any salaries they already receive from the university. In an email, staff from Carmona’s office later responded: The ICS team has not finalized payments for its members and contracts are still being drawn up. These external partners come with a unique set of experience (specific to ICS to engage complex multifactorial challenges globally) necessary to further the President’s direction and benefit the university. These senior professionals know they will be compensated well below market value for their profession. Based on their previous salaries and their current market consulting rates this would not be the right group to use for salary comparison.

Follow up: A committee member asked Carmona: On a related topic, speaking as a representative, I’ve heard from staff that they feel the public community often hears information/news before the University community. They feel like they need to monitor public news media to stay up to date with University news. While this may be largely perception, is there a way to perhaps remedy this in some way (such as staging communications), particularly for re-entry plans? Carmona responded in an email: We have already begun weekly press conferences featuring President Robbins, myself and a rotating set of students, staff and faculty. We will also shortly begin a daily situation report.

Follow up: A committee member asked: Could we ask to have an EMT assigned as health educator for each department? I could envisage having them connect to our majors and visit in person and hybrid classes to remind them especially if they are fellow students. Might we be able to find some modest funds to pay them? Carmona responded in email: I have already engaged the student EMTs and other student life club reps. In addition, we plan to review an additional scope of practice for our EMT’s.

Update on Plans for In-Person Teaching and Learning

Liesl Folks, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; Robert Stephan, Teaching and Learning Group Lead, Implementation Planning Team, Campus Re-Entry Plan Working Group

Stephan updated committee members on efforts of the Teaching and Learning Reentry Group consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators who have been working to promote safety and return to the classroom. He outlined safety measures and their impacts. General safety protocols included: required face coverings; standardized language for all syllabi; disinfection of materials at entry to classroom and teaching station; readjustment of the flow of people into and out of classrooms; spacing out students in classrooms. He recommended a 50% capacity for classrooms and classes will either move to a larger space to meet in person or instructors may move to a modality that meets with sub-groups of students in person on a regular basis. He stated the need to deal with indoor spaces first and also the group is looking at ways to take advantage of outdoor spaces on campus.

Stephan shared a presentation with the committee about balancing the goal of health and safety with a robust offering of classes. He shared four proposed course formats, including:

- In-Person (offered with enhanced health protections including wearing face coverings and decreased classroom density)
- Flex In-Person (Mix of in-person and online modes)
- Live Online (Instructor and students are online simultaneously, and the instructor provides content on a live online platform)
- iCourse (Students and instructors not required to be online simultaneously and students complete work through D2L)

Stephan stated goals of the modalities included having classes available to everyone if they have to quarantine, which may involve the use of recorded lectures.
Folks expressed the need to find a balance between adhering to guidance for education to minimize spread of COVID-19 and retaining/attracting students to the University and resulting tuition revenue. She said the group currently suggests that at least 50% of any given degree program may be delivered with some face-to-face learning modality and the iCourse curriculum will be left as it is currently. She stated this puts responsibility on heads, chairs, and department directors to balance modality tradeoffs against the needs of faculty. She believed the University would still be able to offer an in-person experience to students and expressed online educators do not command the salaries of UA faculty because of the importance and value of the in-person experience. Stephan stated the need for flexibility and one goal was to ensure faculty agency in making decisions.

Co-Chair Brummund asked for elaboration on thresholds and Stephan responded that originally the most equitable threshold was based on number of seats and credit hours. He shared that was rethought as it forced large classes to be in person or flex in-person which poses an equity issue as many large classes are taught by those with the least career security. He stated a threshold determined by section, not by seat number, may work better and sometimes large classes may not be most conducive to online modalities. Folks expressed that there will not be a one-size-fits-all option and that faculty and staff must communicate clearly with their unit leadership if they need modified work conditions.

Members asked if there is an enrollment cap on in-person classes in that students will be automatically moved to live online or flex in-person modalities once the cap is reached? Folks responded that caps are sometimes set by faculty load or classroom size. She stated once guidelines are finalized, classrooms will need to be reallocated and classes moved to appropriately sized spaces. This process will depend on learning from faculty which classes will be delivered in each modality and if many classes are online, that will free up space on campus. She said this does not mean a smaller cap on in-person classes and will not create an additional barrier to students enrolling in classes needed by degree programs.

Folks and Stephan shared that deadlines are still under discussion. Folks has seen a draft that has to go to President Robbins for approval. As soon as that process is complete, work on assigning classrooms can begin.

Follow up: In a Zoom chat message, a committee member stated: We need to plan for a lot more outdoor facilities, once we get into October we can use our lovely outdoor fresher campus. Stephan responded in an email after the meeting: We’re currently looking to finalize indoor classroom policies, but we haven’t excluded the idea of using outdoor space as well. There are some hurdles (e.g., heat in Aug & Sept, accessibility for all students, technology) but it is something we’ll investigate.

Follow up: Co-chair Helm commented in chat: As a program we are told that 50 percent of classes need to be in-person (75% for GenEd classes). Is that 50 percent mark a budgetary requirement, meaning that we can ask for in-person tuition as long as we offer at least 50 percent of classes in-person? Folks and Stephan responded: You’re right to point out a tension between giving faculty the agency to choose and setting minimum modality percentages. In our current version of the plan, we plan to set percentage benchmarks as a “goal” rather than a mandate. We’d like to encourage non-vulnerable faculty to teach in-person or flex in-person, but the final decisions will need to come from dialog between individual faculty members and the department head/chair/director. Rob Stephan added that “My sense is that this is not a budgetary requirement, but rather a standard that we want to be able to convey to students and parents who want to know the level of in-person instruction in the fall.”
Follow up: A committee member asked: Is it 50% of courses or 50% of seats? Stephan responded: In our most recent version of the guidelines, we recommend leaving the method of calculation up to the colleges and departments. For some it might make more sense to calculate based on seats, for others based on sections. This still needs admin approval, however.

The committee member also asked: When will the switch to larger classrooms be possible? Can we have faculty make decisions about whether to be in person/flex? Stephan responded: Requesting a larger room will occur at the same time as selecting course modalities. Our goal is to give colleges 2 weeks to finalize course modalities and room change requests once the guidelines have been finalized. Selections will then be sent to the registrar and RCS to make changes in the system.

Follow up: A committee member asked: Will there be additional technology (i.e. cameras) for enabling live-streaming to the 1/2 of the students who are not there during in-person rotation? Stephan responded via email: We’re planning to outfit each room with the capability to stream and record audio and media (e.g., PowerPoint slides) through the computer. We plan to develop a process for faculty to request additional technology (e.g., video cameras or document cameras for recording/streaming). It’s not yet clear whether that process will run through colleges or through central.

Follow up: A committee member asked: I am curious about how the colleges and units will decide on the expected percentages and how will this be ”negotiated” with the faculty/instructional personnel... will there be a prescribed process to make this clear? Stephan responded via email: You’re right to point out a tension between giving faculty the agency to choose and setting minimum modality percentages. In our current version of the plan, we plan to set percentage benchmarks as a “goal” rather than a mandate. We’d like to encourage non-vulnerable faculty to teach in-person or flex in-person, but we’d like to leave the final decision up to each individual faculty member. So as of now, we don’t envision a standardized process that must be adhered to in order to select teaching modality.

Follow up: A committee member asked: Shouldn’t priority be given to courses which really should be conducted in person like language classes as opposed to courses which are more manageable online? Stephan responded via email: I think it make sense to leave these decisions up to the colleges and departments as much as possible. Our current version of the guidelines aims to help facilitate this by giving departments/colleges flexibility in terms of how they aim for their 50% goal (i.e., whether they calculate by sections or seats).

Follow up: A committee member commented: I appreciate the immense complexity of all these decisions - but decisions by faculty rely on information re: individual classroom capacities - especially the largest ones such as ENR2. So hopefully the RCS and Facilities folks can provide that info soon to enable faculty to make their decisions about teaching modality. Stephan responded: The current plan is to recommend 50% capacity across the board with a 250-person hard cap. So, courses in those large rooms would need to either cap enrollment at 250 if they want students to meet in-person each class, or cap at, say, 500 and have ½ the class meet live one day and the other ½ meets live the next day. These numbers have not yet been finalized, but once they are, updated room capacities will be distributed to deans and unit heads.

Updates
Lisa Rulney, Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Business Affairs
Rulney updated the committee on financial scenarios and asked for feedback on documents shared with the committee after the meeting. She provided information on COVID-19 scenarios for AY20-21 including:
**Scenario 0: Medical Solution**
- Widely available and utilized treatment or vaccine by September
- US Embassies issue student visas based on video interviews
- No travel restrictions remain
- Students are excited to return to campus and engage in face to face learning

**Scenario 1: Best Case**
- SARS-CoV019 spread is effectively being reduced over time in Arizona
- Robust state-wide and campus test, trace, and treat protocols exist
- Moderate physical distancing measures maintained
- Domestic and international travel restrictions eased

**Scenario 2: Moderate Case**
- SARS-CoV-19 spread continues steadily across Arizona
- State-wide and campus test, trace, and treat protocols slowly ramp up
- Strong physical distancing measures maintained
- Domestic travel eases some but international travel ban persists

**Scenario 3: Worst Case**
- SARS-CoV-19 spread increases across Arizona and the USA through the fall
- Test and trace protocols remain highly constrained
- Strong physical distancing measures maintained
- Domestic and international travel restrictions persist

Rulney stated Scenario 2: Moderate Case was currently used for projections. She shared the enrollment headcount was down, but not as dramatically as anticipated. Rulney expressed the importance of enrollment mix alongside enrollment numbers because there could be a loss of tuition revenue based on a change in mix of students who choose to attend UA.

Rulney also shared net tuition revenue scenarios for AY21-22 alongside projected shortfalls (Scenario 0: - $50m; Scenario 1: - $63m; Scenario 2: - $96m; Scenario 3: - $131m).

She stated savings from the furlough/pay reduction and hiring pause will not be swept institutionally.

Rulney anticipates a decrease in undergraduate enrollment ($96m net tuition revenue decrease); an increase in graduate enrollment ($250K net tuition revenue increase). Estimated budget impacts will be communicated to administrators and deans mid to late July. Rulney also stated the RCM model will be used for FY21 activity and at least one reconciliation will be necessary after a better understanding of FY21 net tuition revenue is ascertained.

Committee members asked Rulney if changes to the RCM weighting factors were possible. Rulney said changes to the RCM model will incorporate new metrics and the budget will be based upon projected FY22 activity.

**Shilpita Sen, GPSC President**
Sen updated the committee on work to generate ideas for graduate student orientation with the desire to ensure all students starting at UA are prepared with appropriate resources. She said international students may not be able to travel and most students have not received communication from departments on how to resume teaching. She will send out information regarding campus partner hiring and is working on a policy section of the GPSC website about the CARES Act.
**Tara Singleton, ASUA President**
Singleton shared ASUA hiring was intended to continue through April and June. The organization internal structure was revised, and some hiring moved to next semester. Student services and programs without large physical gatherings are being looked at as well as including students in reentry processes.

**Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 10:28am.