Meeting Minutes

University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate

Tuesday, January 14, 2014

**Attendance:**

College of Business: Jim Downey (2014), Kaye McKinzie (2015), Don Bradley (2016)

College of Education: Shoudong Feng (2014), Alicia Cotabish (2015), Jud Copeland (2016)

College of Fine Arts and Communication: Lanette Grate (2014), Garry Craig Powell (2015), Christian Carichner (2016)

College of Health and Behavioral Sciences: Melissa Shock (2014), K.C. Poole (2015), Alexandra Marshall (2016)

College of Liberal Arts: Clayton Crockett (2014), Jacob Held (2015), Chris Craun (2016)

College of Natural Science and Mathematics: Charles Watson (2014), Rahul Mehta (2015), Ben Rowley (2016)

At Large Senators: Brian Bolter (2014), Doug Isanhart (2014), Debbie Bratton (2015), Art Lichtenstein (2015), Kim Eskola (2016), Amber Wilson (2016)

Part-Time: Deb Forssman Hill (2014)

1. Call to Order
2. Comments: President Courtway
	1. President Courtway was unable to attend.
3. Comments: Provost Runge
	1. The president and upper administrators are presenting the budget to state board of higher education and other state officials.
	2. The feedback from the Higher Learning Commission visit last semester continues to be positive. Received draft report that is going to HLC. It was a very strong report in many aspects. The review team has recommended to the commission that our next accreditation will last through the 2019-2020 school year.
	3. The UCA Enrollment Management Plan (recruitment, retention, logistics) is available online. Many people are working diligently on this.
	4. There has been a reorganization in the communications area at the university level. Jeff Pitchford has been reassigned to Academic Affairs and will take the lead on working with two year institutions on agreements for transfer of credit. There will be a search for VP of University and Government Relations (Jeff Pitchford’s previous position) this spring. Transfer students will be an important piece of our enrollment management efforts.
	5. Many thanks to the faculty for working on accommodating the needs of our students during the adjusted finals week schedule.
	6. There is a committee working on revising admissions criteria. Incremental changes will be implemented to raise admissions standards fall 2015. This will be addressed at the Board of Trustees meeting on February 22, 2014.
	7. Chief Technology Officer search update: Tony Flack will have an on-campus interview January 21-22, 2014. He is currently at Middle Tennessee State University. We will be finalizing the campus technology plan in the coming months. The other final candidate for this position has withdrawn. There will be an open meeting during Mr. Flack’s interview process, so that the campus can get to know him and ask questions. More information will be available soon.
	8. Dean Searches—Graduate School, Health and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, are all in the process of checking references. The committees are hoping to begin on campus interviews by the end of the month.
	9. The Faculty Handbook Committee is continuing to work. Items will be coming to Senate in the coming months.
	10. Dr. Glenn is chairing a committee for centralized room scheduling of classrooms across campus. They will be looking at software to make the process more efficient. The committee is hoping to start this in the Fall 2014. Specialized spaces (labs, etc.) will receive special consideration in the process and taken out of the centralized scheduling system.
	11. Search for Registrar has been completed. Becky Rasnick has been appointed as Registrar. A national search will open for Director of Athletic Advising soon.
	12. The UCA team from Computer Science that competed in Russia was named one of the top AR tech stories 2013 *by Arkansas Business Weekly.*
4. Minutes: November 12, 2013
	1. Motion to approve minutes as amended by Senator Copeland, second by Senator Eskola.
	2. Approved unanimously.
5. Report: Faculty Issues for Instructional Technology: Dr. Jonathan Glenn, Associate Provost for Academic Services and Student Success
	1. **Please see report from Dr. Glenn—attached to the end of these minutes**.
6. Consideration for Approval: New Advisor Questions; Dr. Wendy Lucas, Associate Provost for Assessment and Enrollment Support.
	1. Overall update/summary by Dr. Wendy Lucas: The purpose of this is to add another evaluation that would ask students about their advising process. No data is currently being collected and advising is the frontline with regards to retention of students. We want to be more efficient and best serve students. This evaluation was created by the Student Evaluation of Teachers Committee. Smart Evals can process out the outliers (all 1 scores and the like) to make this information and feedback more useful. Faculty can be trained to spot patterns. We have to keep the assessment short. We need the data to get started.
	2. Senator Crockett submitted the following questions/feedback from the College. of Liberal Arts (Faculty comments and questions are in regular font; the portions in bold and italics indicate Dr. Lucas’ responses, as requested in the minutes by Senators)
		1. I like the questions that evaluate the interaction with the advisor, but I think there need to be more detailed questions related to the student's own understanding and use of advising information and systems. The first one addresses this, but it is too general: we need to ask them questions that probe their awareness of who their advisors are, how to contact them, where to get information about majors, the undergrad bulletin, whether or nor they make an effort to meet with an advisor in their major and/or minor fields before registering. ***The Academic Advising Center is asking them these questions as a “quiz” before they register and then reviewing and emphasizing anything students were getting wrong in subsequent advising sessions.*** I think that it would be very useful to collect data on these points, since this seems to be the weakest point of the advising system. Students do not declare majors or stick with old majors, they get someone to life their holds, and do not know where to find descriptions of the majors or the courses. I think it is important to evaluate their understanding of advising as well as how effectively the advisors are helping them (which the second part of the evaluation addresses).
		2. One of the things that the Provost requested in his budget for next year was money for a core of academic advisors. I don't know if he will get the money, but it sounded like his plan was to have at least one advisor for each college. Before a program of evaluation is developed, you might want to see what he has planned in this area and whether it will make sense to proceed***. Yes, that request is ranked #7 on the list. We will ultimately need more than what was in the recommendation this cycle if these are approved. Advisors in the AAC are not being evaluated either (they would be with these questions), so regardless we need this data to make decisions about the process.***
		3. Thank you for soliciting feedback. I hope the committee reviews and discusses the literature on course evaluations before they add/delete items or modify the format; otherwise, we may not be getting the most valid, reliable, and ultimately useful data as possible. I'm also a bit worried that we're making the form too long and may turn off some students in the process. ***Both this question set and the new student eval questions are within the best practices guidelines of 12 questions or less.***  Moreover, even if we confirm that students have met with their advisors, the new advisor items give us little information about student engagement in the process. Rather than the one general question (item #1), perhaps we should ask whether they do any of the following: (1) consult the Undergraduate Bulletin before meeting with an advisor; (2) review program or major check sheets before the meeting; (3) save the sheets/info they receive during advising, if they receive any info; (4) take notes during advising sessions; (5) refer to advising session notes or other info (e.g., Bulletin) when registering; (6) create a long-term plan for graduation; if yes, do they refer to program or university material (e.g., Bulletin)? These are obviously just some suggestions. My larger point is that we don't ask for any substantive data regarding whether students take an active role in their own advising and career planning. ***Again, I’m not sure how much honesty you are going to get from students on this and I’m not sure how this will help us with the process as it’s about student preparedness. Faculty can’t guarantee students come to class as prepared as we’d like, so I’m not sure how we can guarantee getting them to do so for advising sessions.***  Again, the overall list of items could get too large, or the literature might suggest other strategies and items. ***This question set was built from literature and suggested strategies.***  Also, some of the items listed under item #2 are what might be called "contingency items," or items that should be answered only if appropriate given prior questions or responses; for example, if a student asked an advisor about career options, then item d is appropriate; if not asked, then later analysis of the item can produce misleading results. ***There will be N/As for questions***.
		4. I am generally inclined to strongly oppose this suggestion. Our tenure/ promotion/merit structure already has ample student evaluation representation in it and no more needs to be added. Concerning advising specifically, there is no standardization of training towards that end and there are diverse levels of advising volumes on the part of individuals (i.e., some advise few and some are full-time advisors). It would be very difficult to sort out the data for comparative / evaluative purposes. ***The AAC is implementing training this semester and will share best practices information, etc. We know that there is a wide discrepancy on how faculty have been trained as advisors. We also know that advisors are carrying different loads of advisees. That is also going to be analyzed.*** On the more philosophical side, I do not like the implication that the burden of advising lies with the faculty anyway. The students are intelligent adults who can (or should be able to) read lists, rules, and options and make sensible, intelligent choices for their own graduation path. ***Part of why UCA has historically had faculty advisors is that students need more than advising holds lifted. They want to know about graduate school, internships, job opportunities…they are trying to make informed career decisions beyond the nuts and bolts of did they have all the classes checked off to graduate. That’s the other side of advising and what faculty have the qualifications to help with.***
		5. Overall, I think the advisor evaluation form looks good. I do have a question about 2, d, though. Most of my advisees don't ask me about career possibilities. How could the student response to that item reflect something like "Didn't ask"? ***Yes, there would be a not applicable option.***
	3. Senator Feng submitted questions from the College of Education—
		1. Faculty A--I know it's been tabled--but one of my greatest concerns about ALL of the evaluations here at UCA is that none of them ask the students questions about their work and effort levels. At other universities I've been at, questions such as "I have attended all of my advising appointments", or "I communicate often with my adviser", or "I gave my full/75%/50%/etc attention to this class" and so forth are asked to gauge the student's honesty and how much personal responsibility they took in a class or with their adviser relationship. It is inappropriate to base so much decision making (i.e. promotion, tenure) on evaluations that do not fairly look at both the instructor or adviser's roll, and the amount of responsibility the student took in their own learning. I would appreciate the university looking more deeply into research about obtaining accuracy in such evaluations and data.
			1. ***We are asking them if they come prepared (1st question), but I’m not convinced (based on the literature and my experience with student evals) that asking students this is going to give the honest answers faculty hope for. Our current software provider is putting some new things in place that will take into account students who always rate everyone low. Everyone involved in this process is concerned about accurate data.***
		2. Faculty B--While I understand the need to gather some information from students about advising and I can see how it might be helpful. I do take issue with the incessant need to evaluate and assess everything we do. It is my opinion that this is one more thing that takes some of the joy of teaching away. It is yet another way for students to exert power over professors and instructors when they are upset and lacking the maturity and resourcefulness to resolve conflict, ask probing questions and accept constructive feedback when offered.
			1. ***As faculty we are constantly assessing and evaluating what we do: did this lecture work, did this assignment challenge students the way I wanted, was my syllabus clear about expectations, etc. I think what we find challenging about other kinds of evaluation and assessment is that sometimes the comment by a cranky student upsets us because it was one person. Administrators who look at evaluations know that there isn’t one piece of data alone that should be used to assess something. Student evals (about course or advisor) would be one piece of trying to continuously improve. If the process of advising isn’t working now, we need to know what needs improving so we can move forward. It’s the process we are concerned about.***
	4. Discussion by Provost Runge, Senator Bolter, Senator Bradley, Senator Grate, Senator Craun, Senator McKinzie, and Senator Eskola .
	5. Dr. Lucas: ***We have never collected data about the advising process. Without the data, we can’t move forward to make changes and improvements to best serve students and faculty***.
	6. Motion to table this until we establish training, standards, best practices, and responsibilities for all faculty/advisors by Senator McKinzie, second by Senator Copeland.
		1. Motion passes unanimously
7. Consideration for Adoption: Revision to University Admissions Committee: Dr. Don Bradley, Chair, Committee on Committees: Dr. Wendy Lucas, Associate Provost for Assessment and Enrollment Support
	1. See attached marked up document for University Admissions Committee
	2. Motion to approve this committee as amended by Senator Bradley, second by Senator Rowley.
		1. Motion passes unanimously
8. Progress Report on Standing Committee Actions:
	1. Senator Craun reported that his committee has been gathering the requested information and will be meeting on Wednesday, January 15, 2014 to discuss.
	2. Senator Poole and Senator Bolter report that committees are forming and moving forward to make progress.
9. Faculty Concerns
	1. Senator Bradley—I have heard that some classes are being held during x-period with required attendance. Can the Provost look into this?
	2. Senator Crockett— *“As a College of Liberal Arts faculty member, I am concerned and disappointed by UCA Administration's reckless lack of concern for student, staff, and faculty safety during inclement weather on the first day of classes (Thursday, January 9). On Wednesday night (January 10), most Faulkner County schools had implemented their inclement weather policy by 9:30 PM. Rather than being proactive and responsible, UCA announced the closure of campus due to inclement weather at 5:42 AM (Thursday, January 9). As a faculty member who teaches an 8:00 AM class M-F, I arrived to campus at 5:30 AM in order to make last preparations before class. I parked in the Faculty/Staff parking lot located behind the President's House along South BLVD. The sidewalk and the block of South BLVD/ Donaghey was covered by a half an inch of ice. On my way to Harrin Hall, I slipped on the ice and fell in the middle of South BLVD with a UCA-issued laptop in hand. I crawled to the President's House yard with a bruised hip and bleeding hand. After finally arriving at Harrin Hall around 5:50 AM, I checked my e-mail and received notice of UCA's campus closure. While Arkansas weather can be unpredictable, Faculty Senate should strongly urge UCA Administration to be more proactive and timely in future implementation of inclement weather policies.”*
	3. Senator Eskola— “*The faculty in the CHBS have expressed concern over the late admissions of new and transfer students in the past two weeks. It has been extremely difficult for advisors to find open courses for these students to take and the instructors having to accept students in a class that is over the capacity. I did speak with Wendy Lucas about the problems and she is very aware of the frustrations with faculty and students. Her office is working on solutions.*”
	4. Senator Grate—“*This concern is in regard to money requests that Academic Affairs is planning to put forward. While step raises are on the list, no other raises are mentioned. We need regular and planned COLA's, merit raises, and a continuing effort to fix equity problems. President Courtway said at his investiture that competitive compensation was a strategic priority.”*
	5. Senator Forsman Hill—"*Can you please give me an update on the social security issue for part-time faculty at UCA?"*
	6. Senator McKinzie*—“At the "first" (and only one so far) meeting of UCA's Diversity Advisary Counsel (DAC) last semester I brought up the issue of counsel member terms. The Board Policy states that the DAC is to draw 1/2 of the members for 1 and the other half for 2 year terms. I pointed out that the policy clearly directs DAC to do this. The DAC chose to not do this and ask that the Faculty Senate (FS) determine the length of terms for each member. Request guidance be sent back to DAC.”*
	7. Senator Bratton*—“Concerning the semester starting on a Monday instead of Thursday. Are we adding 3 days of instruction or losing 2 days?”*
	8. Senator Craun*—"It seems like there is an increasing number of non-residents taking residential college classes, or at least residential FYS classes. While there is a need to fit these students in somewhere, one intent of residential colleges was to create a stable and secure learning community. Since some of these classrooms are in semi-private wings of the dorm (EDGE, for instance) and since these students are not residents, their inclusion may present a security risk and seems counter to the original intent of the program. Perhaps there is a better way to provide for these students while maintaining the residential college community?"*
10. Announcements
	1. Senator Wilson-Next meeting I will have two recommendations for consideration. One will deal with a change to the bylaws. The other will regard how to spend the $25,000 Faculty Senate received from the Coca-Cola contracts.
	2. Senator Rowley—Get your flu shots!
11. Adjournment
	1. Motion to adjourn Senator Wilson, second by Senator Rowley

ATTACHED REPORT

Information Technology Questions: Faculty Senate

Questions received: 2013-10-03 with an addition 2013-11-26

Report date: 2014-01-14

Reported by J. A. Glenn

The questions and observations received appear to relate to several categories, not all of them, strictly speaking, related directly to central IT. My responses below are supplemented by information I requested from the Department of Information Technology (central IT) and from the Instructional Development Center (IDC), but I am responsible for the content of this report and for any errors it may contain.

Category 1: email

* E-mail capacity allotted to faculty lacks storage capacity, now requiring archiving to save e-mails. Is it true the archiving can only be done from a PC computer?

No, archiving from GroupWise can be done on both Windows-based and OS-X-based computers. As for sufficient storage capacity, comparisons with Google archives (for example) are unreasonable, given the relative difference in storage capacity and enterprise size of UCA and these implementations. Employee mailboxes at UCA are set, by default, at 500 MB. The amount available to allocate depends on actual physical capacity on servers in the datacenter and backup systems. If we can afford more infrastructure (increased space), we can allocate more space to mailboxes.

* Group Wise is clunky and is limited in its ability to work seamlessly with other devices (e.g., Kindle Fire, Google Apps, Gmail, ....).

I am guessing that the implied question is this: Why don’t we move to a different email system? The most immediate and relevant response is that such a decision is momentous enough to need to be driven by a strategic plan. [Comments here about where the planning process is and why it was delayed.]

* Issue related to lost GroupWise archive files. To summarize the concerns briefly: (1) a faculty member lost all emails in a GroupWise archive, and these included “legal publishing documents”; (2) why can’t we simply move to Gmail and what are the legal concerns about it when “huge amounts of universities across the nation are going to it”?; (3) this faculty member will be personally setting up a Gmail account for professional use and will use GroupWise only “for information from faculty members.”

The instance itself, I am told, involved a corrupted archive file. There is no way to tell why the file became corrupted, but databases do sometimes become corrupted. I agree that the loss of significant amounts of email can be catastrophic, and I do not in any way blame the faculty member for being upset and angry. At the same time, I should also say that an email archive is probably never the best place to keep important legal documents.

Here are a few notes I sent to legal counsel and Dr. Watson when I received the report of this issue:

There has been considerable discussion over time about the use of Gmail as an email provider. The standard “retail” Google TOS agreement is unacceptable for a university as you will be able to determine for yourself if you actually review – and this fact is what is referenced in the assertion that "legal won't let us" move to Gmail – but (and many haven't been aware of this in earlier conversations) Google is in fact willing to negotiate an education-friendlier TOS when a university adopts their applications. The fact is, though, that the faculty member voicing this concern may have put university business information at risk by moving to what I call "retail Gmail" without the protection of a negotiated university-specific TOS.

Frankly, I think it fair to say that the issue is more complicated than either the advocates or the opponents of such a move admit. . . . [M]any universities that use Gmail choose to move to Google for their students' email accounts but not for their faculty/staff accounts. I'm not saying that makes sense – raises its own problems, I deem –but it is, I believe, the case.

I should point out as well that this is not non-controversial on other campuses: the same kinds of debates one hears on UCA’s campus are on-going on many campuses, with both sides of the issue pressing their points vigorously.

Category 2: IT support and helpdesk performance (coverage, accessibility, etc.)

* The IT help desk appears incapable of responding to calls and faculty needs - much less student needs. Calls being forward to an answering machine where calls are not retrieved until the next day or later is not adequate service to the university community
* There is limited IT support at night and on weekends: no one answers when called; calls are too frequently not returned until the next day, if then.

From central IT’s point of view: Helpdesk employees are level 1 support, they are not Admins. Often level 2 support is needed after hours.[[1]](#footnote-1) We do not have level 2 support after hours; however, they do often forward their office phone to their cell when they are not available. IT leadership advises against them doing this for obvious reasons.

IT leadership understands that during the first three weeks of class, one absolutely cannot respond to things in a timely manner. We have three full-time staff working the helpdesk, trying to respond to voicemail, answering calls and emails, and responding to walk-ins. Other staff frequently pitch in as they can to share some of the Helpdesk overload. If any calls come in after evening staff goes home, it is the next morning before they are called or emailed back.

Central IT analyzed Helpdesk calls that came in on the third full day of class (last fall) between the hours of 9:00 am and 10:00 am. Calls were coming in at a rate of 72 calls for that hour. One can expect, when returning the calls, to be on the phone with the caller for an average of nine minutes. Some can be resolved in less than three minutes, but some will require twenty minutes. During this time, calls do not stop, they just continue to stack up in the queue. At the same time, a line of walk-ins is stretching out the door, students who are between classes and are getting very angry because Helpdesk staff are on the phone helping someone and not helping them. It's a no-win situation.

With this being said, especially at the start of a term, it very well may be the second day before a client gets called back.

My own addition to these observations: Recognizing that user support (and particularly Helpdesk support) is a significant issue – and identified as such from a variety of sources – the Instructional Technology Group has adopted this as one of its main initiatives this year. They will make recommendations about a number of issues: (1) appropriate levels of staffing and appropriate competencies for those staff; (2) coverage (we often say 24/7, but we have little evidence so far that that kind of coverage would be necessary); (3) the possibility of outsourcing support for some applications/systems.

* IT staff is hidden behind unlisted phone numbers, and it's almost impossible to contact anyone in IT in a timely manner. No other unit on campus, including the president, refuses to take phone calls from faculty.

From Central IT’s point of view: our numbers are hidden so that clients will be encouraged to call the helpdesk. The helpdesk can solve 60–70% of the calls that come in. If it wasn't for these numbers being hidden, these calls would come to whoever the client’s favorite IT person is at the time and would take away from staff who are concentrating on development of new technology and support of our current technology. There are several offices on campus who manage their callers this way. We have never "refused" calls from faculty or students! It is very likely that they are required to leave a voicemail for someone to return but they are not refused.

My personal opinion is that the best resolution to this issue is appropriate administrative support staffing in IT, so that (as in the case of most deans’ offices and their No Call Info caller id’s) a real person can filter and direct calls and time them appropriately.

Category 3: adequacy of infrastructure and equipment support

* There is a lack of up to date hardware and software in the College of Business computers. Problems exist in faculty offices, classrooms and computer labs. There is a lack of competent staff to service equipment in a timely manner.

This is a question that should be directed to the college itself. Central IT does not purchase computers to replace aging ones throughout the campus. The question does, however, raise additional questions and observations that may be appropriately mentioned in this context:

* Does central IT need to fund computer lab updates? Budget?
* Does central IT need to fund office computer updates? Budget?
* The COB was fully populated (offices and classrooms) with new computers that are now three years old.
* COB does have its own tech person who is responsible for COB labs. Central IT does assist when needed.
* If any calls come in regarding staff computers, they are normally responded to the same day.

I should add that one of the planning issues on the table is (and has been for some time) a funded refresh cycle for computing equipment for faculty/staff and labs.

* There is concern for the technology and wiring in the Prince Center; faculty find it difficult to do their jobs with the level of IT performance in that building.

This problem is currently being addressed. The provost made funds available in the fall to begin addressing the inadequate network wiring in the Prince Center and (I think) three other buildings. Estimates and a project plan are being prepared, and then the project will need to be bid. At that point, the project need not be excessively lengthy. We were surprised by how quickly the similar project in the library this past summer could be completed.

Category 4: instructional technology training

* There is a need for more training on Blackboard for both faculty and students.
* Blackboard Collaborate does not allow faculty to preload class content ahead of time. In comparison, Centra allowed faculty load class content for an entire semester . Also, when you load content into Collaborate, you cannot access it on another computer

Training (Note: These responses were developed last fall, so some of the time references are now anachronistic.)

This question seems to address two different areas of concern. The first implied is the *frequency* of training provided for faculty. The IDC has offered 62 and 66 sessions of the required parts 1 and 2 introductory training respectively since March, 2013. These trainings were attended by 279 and 238 faculty, respectively. There is also an online version of the introductory training that has been completed by 125 faculty. In response to an expressed need, we developed an online training tailored to GAs/TAs who require only the grading functions (September, 2013). So far, this has been completed by one student.

In addition to providing a plethora of introductory training options, the IDC has provided significant support through individual consultations and just-in-time training. In the last five months, we have provided 35 face-to-face consultations with faculty, 350 phone consultations, and 272 support responses via email (as of Oct. 10 at 12:00).

To address the second aspect of the question, i.e., *depth of training*, this fall (2013) the IDC launched a series of training sessions intended to look deeper into various Bb Learn tools and options. The events (Rethinking Your Course Organization; Tests, Surveys, & Pools – Going Deeper; and Utilizing Bb Collaboration Tools) have respectively been attended by 6, 1, and 0 faculty.

In thinking about the future, the IDC has already announced plans to offer two additional trainings intended to take a closer look at Blackboard entitled Preparing Your Course for the Move and Rethinking Your Course Organization (repeat). There will also be two more iterations of the introductory training offered in December to accommodate new faculty and current faculty who will not be using Blackboard until the spring semester (Part 1: Dec. 2 and 9; Part 2: Dec. 6 and 13). The IDC is currently in the process of planning spring programs and will continue to be responsive to faculty needs.

Centra vs. Collaborate

There is an option to preload content into Collaborate sessions using Elluminate Plan!, a free side product that allows moderators to pre-build a full class session. Faculty and support staff recently completed Collaborate Training with Blackboard on September 26 where Elluminate Plan! was briefly mentioned. The move to Bb Collaborate was a quick move necessitated by a lack of support from Centra; thus, this is simply a growing pain that will pass as we all learn the system better.

1. Level 1 (basic front line type problems): Password Resets, Browser Cache Clears, Java Cache Clears, Browser Cookie Clears, PIN Lookup, WiFi issue troubleshooting. Level 2 (more complex problems): Correcting Configuration Issues with a service; Correcting Configuration issues with a Server; Correcting Configuration issues with Email Accounts; Correcting Configuration issues with Course Shells; Server down issues. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)