



## **Faculty Senate Minutes March 1, 2021**

Publisher	University of Arizona Faculty Senate (Tucson, AZ)
Download date	22/09/2021 00:37:13
Link to Item	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10150/657632">http://hdl.handle.net/10150/657632</a>

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE  
MARCH 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**

The 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, Dong, Durán, Fink, Folks, Frey, Gephart, Gerald, Ghosh, Gordon, Hammer, Hassan, Helm, Hildebrand, Hingle, Hudson, Hurh, Hymel, Kaufman, Knox, Lawrence, Leafgren, Lee, Little, McDonald, Milbauer, Min Simpkins, Murphy, Neumann, Ottusch, Pau, Rafelski, Robbins, Rodrigues, Rosenblatt, Roussas, Ruggill, Russell, Sen, Singleton, Slepian, Smith, Spece, Stone, Summers, Vedantam, M. Witte, and R. Witte.

**Absent:** Senators Cuillier, Domin, Durand, Goyal, Hiller, Oxnam, Provencher, Reimann, Sulkowski, and Vega.

**2. \*ACTION ITEM: APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2021 (WILL BE APPROVED VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)**

The minutes of January 25, 2021 were approved with one abstention via Qualtrics survey.

**3. \*ACTION ITEM: CONSENT AGENDA: BA IN DESIGN ARTS AND PRACTICE; BA IN LIVE AND IMMERSIVE ARTS; BA IN WELLNESS AND HP PRACTICE; UG MINOR IN ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING; UG MINOR IN AGING AND POPULATION HEALTH; UG MINOR IN eSPORT; UG MINOR IN GLOBAL HEALTH; UG MINOR IN ONE HEALTH – CHAIR OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, NEEL GHOSH (WILL BE VOTED ON VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)**

Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-26**] BA in Design Arts and Practice carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-27**] BA in Live and Immersive Arts carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-28**] BA in Wellness and HP Practice carried and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-29**] UG Minor in Additive Manufacturing carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-30**] UG Minor in Aging and Population Health carried and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-31**] UG Minor in eSport carried and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-32**] UG Minor in Global Health carried via Qualtrics Survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes. Seconded [**Motion 2020/21-33**] UG Minor in One Health carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

**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.**

Professor David Gibbs addressed the Faculty Senate with regard to his involvement with the group Kochs Off Campus as it relates to the Freedom Center in the Department of Political Economy and Moral Sciences (PEMS). Both PEMS and the Freedom Center are extraordinarily non-transparent. For twenty-three months, both entities have refused to release donor information on the multiple hundred-thousand-dollar donations from unidentified donors. Under state law, they are required to release information and have refused to do so. Basic questions are raised of fundamental disrespect for the public, an attitude of not playing by the rules, and these entities may have a great deal to hide. One wonders, a) who are these donors, and, b) why are they allowed to get away with not releasing basic information to the public. This is in direct contrast to its Libertarian philosophy, which is based on transparency and respect for taxpayers, but demonstrates that they haven't felt any need to be held accountable. Questions are raised about the kind of moral standard this holds for our students, and based on that fact alone, UArizona should reject any expansion of this program. Furthermore, this is a political program mainly to appeal to the right wing of the Republican Party with people like Mark Finchem as a main supporter of the Freedom Center and its creation of PEMS. The letter written by former Provost Jeffrey Goldberg that accompanies the package endorsing PEMS, acknowledges the political benefits of the

department and program, and again, this is not the way UArizona is supposed to be operating and not a healthy sign for this University. I urge you to reject any expansion of this program.

Professor Theodore Downing addressed the Faculty Senate regarding the most recent General Faculty General Election. Downing stated that last week, the Republican controlled North Dakota Senate vote [43-3] not to reveal the vote count in future Presidential Elections until after the electoral college votes. The University of Arizona election go a step further by never disclosing the vote counts. Without disclosure of the full vote count, the integrity of any election cannot be determined. At today's meeting, the Committee on Elections will present their response to Downing's February 15, 2021 letter – a letter that has not been disclosed. Downing asks why the committee did not address his primary concern for the non-disclosure of the vote count issue and why it was not shared with Faculty Senators and candidates as he had requested. The response confuses three distinct components of an election; 1) The voting counting system, 2) The ballot – the form that is used to cast multiple votes for multiple offices, and, 3) The actual votes. Advocates of election integrity would be chilled to find that their report reveals that the UArizona Qualtrics electronic "survey voting" system, as it is called, allowed the committee to violate a voter's right to a secret ballot by linking duplicate votes to an individual's login ID. Downing's letter expressed another major concern. Downing's research discovered the election is being run using flawed survey software not marketed as election software by Qualtrics. The software manufacturer publicly identifies three easily opened "backdoors" – backdoors that give any voter a chance to cast multiple ballots and votes. The Committee on Elections and the CIO verified Downing's research, finding extra ballots and unknown votes were cast in the current and previous elections. Downing was informed that the software can be tweaked to prevent multiple votes, but his suggestion to adopt a standardized, mailed paper ballot as used by Pima County has been rejected. Electronic elections, without paper, cannot be verified. The election of faculty representatives is mandated by Arizona law. Fearless faculty fought to empower your rights as elected faculty representatives. The leadership of the AAUP intentionally inserted "elected faculty representatives" twice in the Arizona Shared Governance Law ARS 15-1601b. As a state Legislator specializing in election integrity, Downing fought hard and passed a law assuring Arizona voters the right to vote on paper ballots that are hand-counted and audited. The Faculty Senate must show the same respect for their constituents and colleagues, the voting faculty. Let's stop the music rather than dance to the tune that is to the right of the North Dakota Republicans. Please fix it. Downing requests that his undisclosed letter to the Committee on Elections be placed on the record. (Downing's February 15, 2021 letter is appended to these minutes).

Student Regent Anthony Rusk and Director of Research and Assessment in Student Services, Lucas Schalewski updated Faculty Senate on the Student Basic Needs Coalition. Significant progress has been made since the last report to Faculty Senate. The Basic Needs Coalition is a collection of individuals on campus who have a shared passion for understanding issues of basic needs of the student body at the University of Arizona. Some of the participants are Vice Chair Hingle, SAPC Chair Ohala, and directors of the Campus Pantry, and the group addresses student food, housing, mental health, and financial insecurities of the student population, and where resources can be developed to understand what will benefit students and what is not working for students. The Basic Need Coalition is inextricably tied to the Arizona Board of Regents' Basic Needs Working Group, helping to inform the Regents' Working Group of UArizona students' needs. A survey was developed and is currently distributed among all enrolled students on main campus. The Coalition asks that if anyone interacts with main campus students, to please urge them to fill out the survey, which is being distributed through Campus Life.

Professor Jeremy Vetter addressed the Faculty Senate expressing concerns about the MA in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics on today's Faculty Senate agenda for approval. While Vetter supports academic freedom to its maximum extent, and has no qualms against any of the individual faculty who do fascinating work in the PEMS Department. However, many have concerns not only about the Freedom Center, but its many offspring and units that have been created in its wake to best be described as donor-driven disciplines. The donors are a network of rightwing, Libertarian donors, especially the Koch brothers, but also many others that have conferences together and have been funding upwards of 350 different Universities nation-wide to entrench their ideology. Vetter is not insinuating that everyone affiliated with these units has the same ideology, but the history of PEMS and its creation to offer this Master of Arts degree, has not held to the standards that are required for an open process of establishing a new unit on campus. To refresh the memory of some who may not have been on Faculty Senate in August of 2017, the PEMS department come out of nowhere for many of us who do political economy work on campus across many different units (two dozen faculty across many different departments) who work in political economy – historians, anthropologists, and geographers, who've never been involved in the conceptualization of PEMS. The Guidelines for Reorganization and Mergers of Units on Campus require that when a new department is created, and is populated by faculty from existing departments, that there be a wide consultative process. This has never taken place, so I would urge that the Faculty Senate slow down the creation of new proposals from this unit until it can be much more broad-based.

5. **INFORMATION ITEM: FACULTY ELECTIONS UPDATE AND COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS MINUTES WITH POWERPOINT – CIO BARRY BRUMMUND, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY MANAGER, ADAM BROKAMP,**

**CHAIR OF THE COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS, RYAN SHIN, WITH COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS MEMBERS  
KAYLE SKORUPSKI AND BENJAMIN JENS**

Brummund thanked the Faculty Senate for the time and opportunity to speak today. A number of different people have been involved in putting together the materials for the incident response to the most recent General Faculty General Election. Brummund explained that Qualtrics is utilized as enterprise survey software tool for UArizona, Arizona State University, and Northern Arizona University. Thirteen thousand surveys per year are conducted at UArizona. The Faculty Center started using Qualtrics in 2016 specifically for the University of Arizona General Faculty elections. Brummund outlined the pre-election workflow. Two weeks prior to the election, a blank survey template is copied over from a previous year, updating as necessary for the recent election. An updated list of eligible voting faculty is queried in Analytics and uploaded into the survey tool. The flow of the process is verified, and pertinent questions and selections are added for each item. The survey is tested one week prior to elections starting, and the survey is opened and goes live at the specified time. On Monday, February 15, 2021, a voting faculty member and candidate expressed concern about the Faculty Center's survey tool (Qualtrics) for faculty elections and the potential for "ballot box stuffing." Faculty Senate leadership asked UITS to conduct a review of the Faculty Center's voting software to investigate the concern. The ballot box stuffing option in Qualtrics has flaws and can be circumvented in numerous ways, and UITS developed authentication and custom survey logic that are the best methods to prevent duplicate votes. Election survey logic requires voters to sign-in with University's WebAuth Authenticator. Voting code, name, NetID, and voter email are captured. NetID is compared to the list of eligible voters. If a match is found, and the contact does not show a previous submission, voter can submit a vote. The voter must confirm their submission, and the submission is recorded. If a match is found, and the contact does show a previous submission, the voter receives a message that their vote was already submitted. If no match is found, the voter receives a message that they are not eligible to vote. Unfortunately, there was a bug in this eight-step authentication process, and UITS realizes this is disruptive to the Faculty Senate, General Faculty at-large, and the University. The bug in the process begs the question if the configuration error affected any election outcomes. After discovering the issue, UITS analyzed all previous votes since shifting from the custom web tool to Qualtrics in 2016, and it was determined the configuration issue originated in the 2019 General Election survey. In downloading the election results for the elections since the bug had been introduced, UITS made use of the duplicate checking capability in Excel to identify the duplicates and then the Committee on Elections looked at each of the different duplicate votes specifically to assess the impact on the particular election. In the General Election for 2019 there were two duplicates, in the 2020 General Election there were six duplicates, and in the 2021 General Election there were four duplicates. For the 2021 General Election, removing the four duplicate votes caused a tie between the fourth and fifth candidates for SPBAC, which ultimately led to a coin toss to determine which candidate would move to the Runoff Election. UITS recommends a number of follow-ups: 1) Conduct a code review, 2) Create a test script and add a test condition attempting to complete the survey more than once, and 3) Review the survey results data specifically looking for duplicate submissions. It's best practice to add dedicated test conditions to all eight branches of logic to make sure the logic is working correctly. Once the election is concluded, the underlying survey data will be run through to specifically seek out duplicates. Russell asked if there was output on votes cast by college and if a report for every election, past and present, is available. Hingle added that Faculty Senate should decide as a body how the data should be presented for more extensive reporting. Smith raised concerns about the small number of retired faculty who vote, and the University using University email addresses the faculty member retired with for contact. Smith is concerned if there has ever been an investigation into who are eligible voters and how the list maintains accuracy. Smith said a voting member in her college is retained on the voter list and the faculty member died in 2016. Brewer responded that the voting list currently is more accurate than it's ever been, since the census is drawn from data in UAccess. Previously, census materials were sent manually to all departments and colleges and were filled out by the Business Manager. For deceased faculty, a death notice or death certificate needs to be submitted to Workforce Systems for the faculty member to be removed from the system. M. Witte said she has checked on several Emeritus faculty in Health Sciences and all of them are actively working, all have retained UArizona emails, and none of them have gotten any election email notices or the C11 survey. Witte would like to know how the disenfranchised Emeritus faculty can be franchised back into the faculty listserv system. Brewer asked for the names of the faculty who are not receiving communications, and is more than happy to share the list of Emeritus faculty currently in the UArizona system. If people are inadvertently not being pulled into the system, those can be rectified quickly. Hudson spoke for Professor Downing who asked that his letter of concern from February 15, 2021 be distributed to all Faculty Senators and as part of the Faculty Senate record. The voter list is public in a public election. Without paper ballots, there is no way to verify the votes. Hudson said that no one is casting aspersions on the staff at the Faculty Center or the CIO of the University, but there needs to be easily accessible information. Downing raises a question about ballots versus votes, since each ballot has multiple votes, and the distinction made in the PowerPoint presentation might work according to computer science logic, but it doesn't conform to electoral technical practice. Hudson added that as a person involved in the 2020 General Election, one of the duplicate votes brought her candidacy into a tie with Hingle, which was resolved with a coin toss. The seat could have easily gone to the wrong person as a result of said coin toss. Chair Shin stated that in the last four years of election data that was reviewed, the election outcomes remained legitimate despite duplicate votes. The Committee on Elections worked rigorously for three days to identify issues from the raw data, and had

enough data to make informed decisions. Hudson added that the issues with the election are not about people, it's about the system.

6. **ACTION ITEM: NON-CONSENT AGENDA: MA IN PHILOSOPHY, POLITICS, AND ECONOMICS – CHAIR OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL, RON HAMMER, POLITICAL ECONOMY AND MORAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT HEAD, VLAD TARKO (WILL BE VOTED ON VIA QUALTRICS SURVEY AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING)**

Hammer introduced Political Economy and Moral Science Department Head, Vlad Tarko. Tarko addressed the previous Open Session comments and stated that he is unaware of the allegations since all the faculty in PEMS have only been hired in the last two years. Tarko is not familiar with the history predating his association with PEMS, but assured that there is no connection between PEMS and the Freedom Center. At one time, there was a conflict between PEMS and the Freedom Center due to faculty who were hired, and the Koch Foundation initially offered funding support for one faculty position, but retracted that support after they didn't approve of the faculty who were hired. Presently, there is no connection between the Freedom Center and the Koch Foundation. The reason the MA program was developed is to address the need for the Philosophy, Politics, Economics (PPE) as a booming research field, and cutting-edge research in moral and political philosophy use technical skills and knowledge from social science which is difficult to acquire in undergraduate philosophy. The Master's program will bridge the gap that currently exists at the University of Arizona in the PPE field, and build and extend resources in PEMS for the demand seen nationally for PPE programs. Having an Master's program in PPE will allow UArizona to become competitive in a demanding market. Hammer added that Graduate Council feels the program is highly rigorous and has great distinction compared to any of the past programs. Hudson asked as a preeminent scholar of polycentricity and biographer of Eleanor Ostrom, and very much in the lineage of Michael Polanyi, does PEMS understand why people are worried about the possible effect of Koch-related money on the fragile polycentric commons that is the University? Tarko responded that the Koch Foundation retracted their money, and the worry is based on something that no longer exists. Hudson asked about the Kochs Off Campus' open records request, which the group received last week. Only reviewing a budget survey document from the request, Hudson said it seemed to indicate that \$225,000, approximately one-third of the 2020 budget, was given as gifts from outside donors and an additional \$60,000 came from the UArizona Foundation. Tarko said that he didn't know, since he's only been Department Head for a few months. Hudson said that she would abstain from the vote on the Master's program until she could be certain of the money flow going in and out of the department. Bourget asked Tarko to clarify if the program is primarily marketed as an accelerated Master's degree. From the proposal, it appears the emphasis is an accelerated MA and not first as a Master's degree of its own standing, and to recruit to current undergraduates in the program. Tarko responded that the program will include both an accelerated Master's and Master's. The first year is going to be the accelerated Master's and then the full Master's program. The reason being is from a survey given to the Philosophy, Politics, Economics, and Law (PPEL) students, and one-third expressed interest in the accelerated Master's. Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) Dean, J.P. Jones reiterated that the program is rigorous and is an interdisciplinary field that is rapidly growing. PPEL has its own journal and professional association. The course is an Oxbridge degree taken by Pete Buttigieg when he attended Oxford. The Freedom Center, under the purview of Research, Innovation, and Impact, is a prominent research center, and along with the academic work of the four faculty in the Political Economy and Moral Science department, that the kind of issues raised about the interweaving of the Freedom Center and PEMS can be put to rest, as Senior Vice President Cantwell did on her visit to Faculty Senate on January 25, 2021. Numerous avenues flow money to the University, and Jones doesn't know why anyone would withhold a vote not knowing if this person or that person or some portion of money was funded by Koch or any other donor, and Jones encourages everyone to vote on the degree based on its own merits. The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request was filed in April 2019, before any of the current faculty in the department were hired. Jones was only made aware of the FOIA since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Jones is working with central administration to quickly respond to the request, and neither the college nor the former and present Department Heads were aware of the request. There are 160 students registered for this degree, 36% are students of color, 40% are in the Honors College, and half are women. Forthcoming opportunities involve offering this degree to students at the micro-campus, as well as Global Campus, and also as a stand-alone Master's degree. For faculty within SBS who have theoretical and political interest around questions of democracy and justice, it is encouraged that they get involved in helping shape and contribute to this new Master's degree. Seconded **[Motion 2020/21-24]** carried via Qualtrics survey and is detailed at the end of these minutes.

7. **INFORMATION ITEM: REVISION TO THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR AND PROPOSAL TO EXTEND ORIENTATION FOR FALL 2022 - VICE PRESIDENT FOR ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT, KASEY URQUIDEZ, AND REGISTRAR, ALEX UNDERWOOD**

Urquidez opened by explaining the benefits of the extended orientation program, which would enhance student-focused onboarding, build and strengthen community, assist in a smoother transition to college, educate incoming students with "just in time" information, increase connections, and support retention efforts. Registration will continue to be held during the summer, but instead of one day where students meet partially with the colleges, extending into a multi-day session to allow students to engage in different activities, as well as allow time for academic units to engage with students prior

to starting classes. The events would take place on main campus, and would be directed toward domestic and international first-year and transfer students. Research models include Texas A & M Fish Camp, Berkeley Getting Your Bearings, Cal Poly (SLO) Week of Welcome (WOW!), Iowa State Destination Iowa State, University of Kentucky K Week, and University of Tennessee The New Vols Experience. Twenty-five examples are linked in the agenda. In order to create better connections from the start, the first day of fall semester classes would move to a Wednesday and provide a structured transitional “extended orientation” for new main campus students (and their families/supporters) Sunday/Monday-Tuesday. Programming will focus on creating peer connections, developing a sense of Wildcat Identity, preparing for academic experiences, learning campus traditions, understanding policies, and engaging in cultural competency development. Student Success and Retention Innovation and Welcome would oversee the first day of classes for a smooth transition/hand off. Research has shown that the expected outcomes include increased academic performance, a sense of belonging, more student involvement, increased student retention, overall student satisfaction. Small group connections and programming with student leaders will be offered. Entire incoming class options will include New Student Convocation, interest sessions, Title IX conversation and training, cultural competency training and Diversity, Equity and Inclusion panels, financial literacy/education, and introducing General Education. Separate programming tracks will be offered for first-year versus transfer students, as well as separate parent/supporter programming. Timing for Extended Orientation introduction would be Fall 2022 in alignment with the introduction of the new General Education program. A calendar change will assist in compliance and operational issues resulting from current calendaring issues. The University Registrar is currently working on calendar models and associated impact for campus review. Changes need to be shared with ABOR one year in advance and approved by Faculty Senate. After sharing this with many constituencies on campus, a virtual pilot will be scheduled for this coming fall by the Orientation Advisory Committee. Registrar Underwood explained that moving fall term to begin on a Wednesday from a Monday would structurally change the fall term. Additionally, the summer term begins immediately after the fall term. A couple of different proposals are being looked at, with guidance from the Provost’s Office and Associate Deans with the goal to have a finalized proposal for consideration for the upcoming Faculty Senate meeting on April 5, 2021. Starting the fall term on a Wednesday would also allow the use of the extra days for a fall break, and right-size the summer term to thirteen weeks. Bourget asked if the issue for the change is a retention issue or other issues. Changing an entire academic calendar to increase retention is a huge impact on everyone to create an additional three days of orientation for new students. The slide outlined an increased enrollment fee to cover the cost. Where is the rest of the money coming from? Is there data from the other Universities’ who have extended orientation on retention rate increase? Urquidez responded that this is one effort in the toolkit to help students feel more connected to and supported on campus if the University were able to provide them with a much broader scale of information that they aren’t able to get or understand at the time of registering for classes in the summer. The additional \$25 cost to the student for the enrollment fee would be the only additional cost and rolled into the enrollment fee. Students are able to defer the enrollment fee until school commences as part of their financial aid package. The build-in of the program will be part of the full cost of attendance, so it will not negatively impact the student. An online version of the orientation will be offered if students and/or families cannot attend to help them connect. Campus constituencies feel that this is a piece to the puzzle to help students succeed. Urquidez welcomed Faculty Senators to email her with any questions and she will follow up. Chair of SAPC, Diane Ohala, asked how the change will impact the end of the fall semester with “Dead Day” before finals begin. Underwood responded that the intention was to keep the spring term the same and keep the end of the fall semester the same going into winter session. The only shift will be the beginning of the fall term with the addition of a fall break. Russell said she would like to see hard-nosed metrics on the retention factor, because every time a calendar change goes into effect, an enormous amount of labor is involved to change all class syllabi. What is the significant, quantifiable gain over time?

**8. INFORMATION ITEM: COVID-19 FACULTY SURVEY – VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY AFFAIRS, ANDREA ROMERO, AND ASSOCIATE VICE PROVOST FOR THE OFFICE OF INSTRUCTION AND ASSESSMENT, LISA ELFRING**

Elfring opened by explaining the survey was a collaboration between the Office of the Provost and the Office of Instruction and Assessment. The Spring 2020 COVID-19 survey was to learn more about what was going on with the concerns of faculty and instructors, and this survey was followed up with a fall 2020 survey. Many of the items were the same for both surveys, so patterns across the two semesters were looked at. Today’s presentation will give a high-level summary of the results. More details will be shared during a live chat with Provost Folks on March 9, 2021 at 3:00 p.m. For the fall 2020 survey, 922 faculty and instructors participated; 40% were tenure-track, 22.5% career-track, 7.4% continuing status track, 6.0% adjunct/visiting, 1.7 staff, 0.8% graduate students and 21.6% no response. Key findings showed 1:1 meeting with students and teaching teams providing feedback on coursework were the most effective remote teaching strategies. Eighty-three percent of the instructors polled provided opportunities during the semester for students to give feedback. The most challenging technical issues were students’ lack of access to reliable internet, additional costs to buy or upgrade technology at home, and lack of digital replacement for face-to-face collaboration tools. Remote strategies that worked in the spring also worked in the fall, and it was reported that remote learning was less challenging in the fall compared to the spring semester. Strategies for engaging synchronous classes were rated less challenging, as was accessing library resources. Survey results showed that respondents worried about students’

health and well-being, and there was significant concern about student disengagement in class. Respondents felt that Deans, Directors, and Department Heads were the most helpful resources on campus to help them navigate the pandemic. Forty-six percent of respondents indicated they did not know how to contribute questions, ideas, or opinions through shared governance processes. Respondents reported that one of the main themes was students seemed somewhat disengaged during remote learning and was a significant challenge for instructors (camera and microphone off). Mental health, access to technical support and the political situation in the fall showed up as significant barriers to online modalities. The results from fall 2020 have been presented to the strategic leadership and IT leadership teams. Efforts are underway to address some of the challenges identified in the surveys, including challenges with the people who have significant caretaking responsibilities at home and are looking for funding to provide relief for those who have invested in upgrading technology at home. Romero added that 45% of respondents indicated that they had experienced some level of exclusionary, intimidating, offensive and/or hostile conduct from members of the University last fall. A speaker series illuminating Our Best Work Environment kicks off tomorrow, with several throughout the semester to help forge all of us in the right direction. Hingle was astonished that 46% of respondents didn't know how to ask questions or contribute through shared governance mechanisms. Hingle asked how change could be facilitated. Elfring responded that as someone who is a teaching intensive faculty member, she didn't realize for an extremely long time what Faculty Senate did or how it related to the work she was doing as a primary instructional faculty member. Elfring feels that although lack of knowledge of shared governance mechanisms plays a part in the results, she doesn't think it is representative of everyone. Elfring said there are added concerns for career-track faculty members, and thinks helping them understand how and why their role plays an important part in the governance of the University, and apprising them to keep watch on Faculty Senate activities, which would be a good starting point. Romero encourages everyone to reach out to new faculty as they come to campus, and to encourage them to get involved in shared governance processes. Hingle added that last year, the onboarding of new Faculty Senators was implemented for the first time, and as elected officials, she encourages the Faculty Senate body to stay connected and gather input from constituents.

**9. PROPOSED CHANGES TO UHAP CHAPTERS THREE AND FOUR ON THE ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS – DIRECTOR, SCHOOL OF ART, COLIN BLAKELY, AND VICE PROVOST FOR FACULTY AFFAIRS, ANDREA ROMERO**

Blakely reported on the status of the two-year initiative to collect feedback on the annual review process for faculty, with the intention of recommending significant revisions to the current UHAP language that informs annual reviews. The review originates in response to long-standing questions and concerns that have been expressed around the efficacy of the current process. Two Task Forces were convened; one consisting of sixty faculty members, chaired by Hammer, and one consisting of twelve Department Heads, chaired by Blakely. Membership for both Task Forces was derived by an open call. The Task Forces began meeting in early 2020 for approximately six months to develop a set of recommendations around annual review. In August of the 2020 academic year, Hammer and Blakey met with Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, Andrea Romero, and Secretary of the Faculty, Michael Brewer to work intensively on taking the recommendations and looking at where the recommendations could be ratified in the current UHAP language. A well-developed draft was formulated at the beginning of 2021. Recommendation set forth were: 1) Streamlining the process to reduce overall burden on Department Heads and Annual Review Committees, 2) Annual reviews should be more formative and less evaluative, 3) Ratings rather than scores should be employed in the metric. Fewer than five levels of rating are preferred, 4) The annual review process should be consistent across the University, and 5) the rigor of the process should be tiered to meet varying needs based on faculty rank. The proposed changes are consistent between both Chapter 3.2 (Career and Tenure Track) and Chapter 4A.2 (Continuing status track) policy. Two levels of ratings for peer committee (“meets or exceeds expectations” or “does not meet expectations.” The Department Head would provide more than one level of rating in the case of “does not meet expectations” to indicate “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory”. Peer review committee provides formative feedback that is shared with the faculty member. Feedback will be brief and will use a University form. Fewer required annual meetings. Department Head will be required to meet as follows: 1) Annually for all tenure-eligible faculty, regardless of rating, 2) When the rating in any category is “needs improvement” or “unsatisfactory” for Tenured or Career-track faculty, and 3) as requested by faculty members. The Post-tenure/college committee sends comments to Department Head to ensure meeting with tenured faculty at least once every five years. Over the past several weeks, the draft of proposed recommendations, as well as proposed UHAP changes has been circulating among the Deans' Council, Academic Personnel Policy Committee, Head's Up Steering Committee, and the Faculty Affairs network. The team would like Faculty Senate engagement in this process to look over the proposed changes, make comments, and get questions answered. In the upcoming weeks, another set of revisions will be made to the UHAP language, and at its conclusion, the team would like share the final language in its entirety with Faculty Senate for discussion before its final thirty-day review period. With response to Faculty Senators' questions regarding Career-track and Continuing-track faculty included in the annual review process, Brewer answered that in UHAP Chapter 4, Continuing-eligible academic professionals would be treated in the same manner as Tenure-eligible faculty members. Career-track faculty are in parallel with Tenure-track faculty. Gerald said he has chaired his department's APR committee for the past two years, and he and his peers find the APR data entry process through UAVitae the most burdensome. Most complaints would disappear if that system was more user-

friendly. For the “does not meet expectations” designation, Gerald encourages a change in terminology to include “partially meets” due to the fact that in most cases, the question is rarely that the person does not meet all expectations, but rather partially meets some. Gerald questions why peer evaluators would have a two-level rating system and administrators would have a three-level system, which could elevate the distinction of the “does not meet” category from a minor consequence for peer review committee into a major consequence for administrator review. Blakely responded that major changes will be forthcoming to UAVitae alongside the changes that are being proposed to the annual review process. With regard to the “does not meet expectations” and the difference in ratings between the peer review committee and administrator, the framework that was developed around the difference is that the peer review committee is doing a first pass focusing on the formative feedback. If the faculty member did not meet expectations, it could be that was an unsatisfactory level of performance, but that is was passed onto the Head to deliberate as to which of those levels within does not meet expectations. Romero added that Faculty Development Plans and Performance Improvement Plans have a shared governance component to the process where there are people from the Peer Review Committee who participate with the Department Head and faculty member to develop the plan. McDonald said that he has heard from Professors of Practice in Career-track who feel as though they should have mandatory meetings as well to acquire feedback annually, at least up to a certain level of promotion. Romero responded that everyone will receive written feedback annually from the Department Head, but it’s a matter of policy whether it will be mandatory for a face-to-face meeting. McDonald added that more is accomplished in a face-to-face meeting than would happen in writing, because a faculty member can ask questions and get them answered. The face-to-face meeting should be the default rather than an opt-in. and one should be able to opt-out if the evaluation is positive. Romero said that McDonald’s suggestion could be added to professors at the assistant rank for Career-track to make it mandatory for that group. Blakely said that a faculty member can always request a meeting, which doesn’t have the same impact as a mandatory meeting. Bourget asked about reducing the evaluation to two levels of ratings. Does it indicate merit raises will be abolished? How will contributions be recognized for people who deserve more than meets or exceeds expectations? If merit raises were more common, there would be less complaining about having to put in enormous amounts of time doing these evaluations. Fink said he has served and chaired on the post-tenure review committee for his college. Every college has its own review process. How would the campus conform to one uniform process and how are you going to simplify the process? Romero said that uniformity in the process has been a major concern. Romero hopes that the policy changes that will be put in place, the new form, as well as guidelines from Faculty Affairs, will provide a sufficient structure of uniformity across campus and keep things manageable. The changes to UAVitae have been slow due to the pandemic, but hopes that the changes will be put in place by the fall semester. Russell added that simplifying the process will be a good thing. Making sure the rubric has more carrots and less sticks would be a plus. The current process falls in line with more of a beating and showing inadequacies than showing the wonderful work that all of the faculty do at the University.

**10. INFORMATION ITEM: CAREER-TRACK FACULTY SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE UPDATE – CO-CHAIRS BILL NEUMANN AND KASI KIEHLBAUGH**

Neumann reported that the role of the ad hoc committee is to look at issues surrounding promotion, participation, shared governance, and opportunities for professional development. Committees of this type have been empaneled by the Faculty Senate for the last eight years. Neumann explained the make-up and membership of the committee. The committee has engaged with a number of different stakeholders across campus, including APPC, Dean’s Council, and SPBAC. The committee has made a difference over the years, and has recently been focusing on the salary equity study and bringing salaries in line with peers. The report was brought to and supported by the Provost. Non-tenure track has moved into Career-track as members of the General Faculty. Last year, the committee did a deep dive into faculty titles and found 235 distinct titles for Career-track faculty, as opposed to three on the professorial side, which created difficulties with consistency and approach to review. A Department Head’s Task Force on Career-track Faculty published a best practice that was developed by Brian Erstad in the College of Pharmacy, and all reports are available on the Faculty Affairs webpage. The recommendation of the committee was to harmonize Career-track faculty titles across all units to facilitate appropriate recognition of the contributions of Career-track faculty and to improve institutional culture. The AAUP has a number of recommendations for minimum standards for contingent faculty. They are: 1) Description of duties, 2) Regular evaluations, 3) Compensation and promotion based on duties, 4) Timely notice of non-reappointment, 5) Ensuring conditions necessary to perform assigned duties, 6) Inclusion in department and institutional governance, and 7) Consideration for full-time employment if part-time. The first three on this list will have a significant contribution. The University is leader in many of these areas currently, and a focus on titles will only help further. The rationale coincides with the previous information item; seek to provide clear paths for promotion and multi-year contracts, seek increased clarity on promotion criteria and annual review evaluation criteria, and provide framework to permit salary equity study for Career-track faculty. Fewer titles allow comparisons within title and within rank by gender/racial indication. Currently, the committee is looking at titles that focus on the two tracks that exist within Career Track. Lecturer ranks include Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer. Professional titles include Assistant, Associate, and Full Clinical Professor, Assistant, Associate and Full Research Professor, and a more expanded and inclusive view of Professor of Practice titles. Neumann explained the instructional roles for each faculty title per UHAP definitions. Proposed changes are to expand the definition of Professor of Practice to include those with



a focus on the teaching and learning experience as their primary practice, expand definition of Lecturer track to include graduate classes, and review appropriateness of including Instructor title as Career-track because it does not have a promotion pathway, Recommended considerations include both Lecturer and Professorial titles to continue to be eligible for multi-year appointments, faculty who do not currently hold one of the existing recommended titles would need to discuss with their Department Head which title is most appropriate (existing professorial titles not defined in UHAP, e.g. Associate Professor, Career Track, or Associate Teaching Professor would generally be realigned to a Professor of Practice title), some faculty who hold a recommended title may find that their duties are not aligned with the definition and may choose to change titles for better alignment and evaluation review, Changing of titles in the next year could be done at annual contract renewal. Track transfers within the Career Track would be waived for FY21-22 in order to facilitate title harmonization. McDonald added that Career-track titles and Cooperative Extension are not reflected in the presentation, which consist of Assistant, Associate, and Extension Agent, and non-continuing track Assistant, Associate and Full Extension Agents. Will those be addressed in the proposal? Neumann responded that if the faculty member is truly in the Career Track, then the question becomes about realigning titles into one of the categories, and if not, there is broader discussion around a variety of other titles outside of Career Track, which is outside of the scope of the committee and what they are working on. Romero responded that those faculty may be under UHAP Chapter Four as academic professionals. Ghosh said that some faculty mentioned that Professor of Practice is a preferred title of choice as opposed to teaching professor or some other title, and alignment is good thing so people know how to treat them, but if a faculty member has a title they are accustomed to and it's changed, a personal explanation to the faculty member would be appropriate to avoid hurt feelings. Neumann stated that a lot of committee discussion has centered around not compartmentalizing or taking away opportunity. Professor of Practice has a diverse history at the University as to its meaning, and the committee coalesced to use Professor of Practice since it exists in ABOR and UHAP, as working on the definition of the role and then working around any kind of concerns people have. One of the complications with Career Track is often the number of relationships that exist outside the Academy and professional designations that are tied to it as well. This is an initial starting point and not the committee's final report. This is an update. Romero added that what was prevalent among Career Track faculty was that they didn't want to be pigeon-holed into one type of activity, and they want to have flexibility even if they primarily teach. Career Track faculty want the ability to do research or service, and the same is true with research faculty when it comes to teaching. Some units are not fully on board with that philosophy, and the Professor of Practice title provided a wider scope and range of professional activities to be considered in the workload.

**11. INFORMATION ITEM: ADDITIONAL CONSTITUTION AND BYLAWS CHANGES – VICE CHAIR OF THE FACULTY, MICHAEL BREWER**

Brewer stated that the changes were straight-forward. Adding the Senior Vice President for Research as an *ex officio* member of Faculty Senate, thereby eliminating the Vice President Representative was a change that had been suggested by Faculty Senators. Adding the option of having more flexibility to add non-voting *ex officio* representatives and Postdoctoral Scholars to Faculty Senate Standing Committees. Inclusion of CIO or their designée as a member of Senate Executive Committee. Housekeeping changes to remove SAC and APAC to University Staff. Eliminating "Point of View Mediation Service" in the grievance process since the service doesn't exist anymore. Including *ex officio* members of Faculty Senate on both Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. Have the Committee on Elections post vote totals with election results. Reformat wording on Undergraduate and Graduate Council. Remove CAAC from the Constitution. Hudson said that she would like to change *ex officio* administrators in Faculty Senate who have voting privileges to non-voting members. M. Witte feels the changes are being rushed, and would like more time for discussion. Brewer urged Faculty Senators to look at the changes and prepare for a more in-depth discussion at the April Faculty Senate meeting.

**12. INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION ITEM: REPORTS FROM THE PRESIDENT, PROVOST, FACULTY OFFICERS, ASUA, GPSC, GFFAC, GLOBAL CAMPUS SENATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE, APAC, CSC, RPC, APPC, SAPC, DEI, UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL, GRADUATE COUNCIL**

This item was deferred.

**13. DISCUSSION ITEM: NEW BUSINESS FOR THE APRIL 5, 2021 FACULTY SENATE MEETING**

Hudson shared three Resolutions that she will bring before Senate Executive Committee at its next meeting: 1. The Committee on Elections shall release all vote counts of future general faculty elections starting with the March 2021 runoff election. The Committee is encouraged to seek guidance on best practices and procedure from the Arizona Secretary of State's office as well as Pima County elections officials and other non-partisan experts approved by the Faculty Senate. The Committee on Elections will release publicly the vote counts -without violating the principle of the confidentiality of the vote - of all previous elections going back to the adoption of the current system in 2016, by a date to be determined. 2. The existing system of one person, one vote with full confidentiality should be ensured by a paper ballot vote-by-mail system comparable to that used in Pima County elections, with ballots mailed to all faculty

eligible to vote. Guidance on best practices and procedure should be sought from the Arizona Secretary of State's office as well as Pima County elections officials and other non-partisan experts approved by the Faculty Senate. 3. After the conclusion of the runoff election in March 2021 and not later than the May 2021 meeting, the Faculty Senate will develop, discuss, approve and make public an election procedures manual that prioritizes best practices of election integrity, including public access to the eligible voting list, auditing, election observers and transparency equal to or stronger than that of the best practices of Pima County.

#### 14. **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:36 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 January 25, 2021**
2. **BA in Design Arts and Practice**
3. **BA in Live and Immersive Arts**
4. **BA in Wellness and HP Practice**
5. **UG Minor in Additive Manufacturing**
6. **UG Minor in Aging and Population Health**
7. **UG Minor in eSport**
8. **UG Minor in Global Health**
9. **UG Minor in One Health**
10. **MA in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics**
11. **Faculty Elections Update**
12. **Committee on Elections Minutes**
13. **Report from the President**
14. **Report from the Provost**
15. **Report from Faculty Officers**
16. **Report from APPC**
17. **Report from Graduate Council**
18. **Report from RPC**

#### **Motions of the March 1, 2021 Faculty Senate Meeting**

**[Motion 2020/21-26]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council BA in Design Arts and Practice. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-27]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council BA in Live and Immersive Arts. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-28]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council BA in Wellness and HP Practice. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-29]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council UG Minor in Additive Manufacturing. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-30]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council UG Minor in Aging and Population Health. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-31]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council UG Minor in eSport. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-32]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council UG Minor in Global Health. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-33]** Seconded motion from Undergraduate Council UG Minor in One Health. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

**[Motion 2020/21-24]** Seconded motion from Graduate Council MA in Philosophy, Politics, and Economics. Motion carried via Qualtrics survey.

FACULTY CENTER  
1216 E. Mabel  
PO Box 210456