



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, March 14, 2008, 1:00 p.m.

Donaghey Student Center A & B

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Amrhein, Anson, Bunch, Chadwick, Cheatham, Dhonau, Eshleman, Estes, Ramsey, Smith, Vinikas, CB— Brice, Holland, Nickels. CE— Barrett, Garner, Kushner, Lindsay). CEIT— Jovanovich, Patangia, Trammel, Tschumi, Wright.. LAW— Aiyetoro, Foster. LIBRARY— Macheak (*alt.*). CPS— Faust, Robertson, Turturro. CSM— Chen, Elsalloukh, Perkins, Sims, Tarasenko, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Belcher, Ford, Williams.

Absent: CAHSS— English, Levernier. CB— Edison, Watts. CE— Moley. CEIT — Bayrak. CPS— Gregg, Montague, Robinson. LAW— Fitzhugh. LIBRARY— Medin. CPS— Gregg, Montague, Robinson. CSM—Davis, Douglas, Kosmatov, Rurup. EX OFFICIO— Bates, Rayaz.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Ford declared it to be 1:00 p.m. and called the meeting to order. He acknowledged the new seating arrangement, and asked that senators be seated at the ring of tables and guests in the chairs just outside the circle.

The secretary called the roll.

II. Review of minutes

The minutes of the February 15, 2008, meeting were reviewed. Motion and second to accept the minutes. **Motion carried on voice vote.**

III Announcements

President Ford, in light of the very full agenda, asked that we remember and take our lead in discussion from the word *staccato*. With a disclaimer of any pretension to musical knowledge, he said he understood it to mean “short and punchy.”

Ford recognized that it’s rapidly approaching time to convene the Committee on Committees to make appointments to all our Senate committees for the next year. He asked that senators do all they can do to help recruit good volunteers to stand for the elected committees and councils and to volunteer for the others.

IV. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor let the Senate know that next week there will be a public announcement of the formation of a Committee on Campus Safety, which will comprise, along with campus representatives of faculty and staff, four people from off campus, including the head of the Arkansas office of the F.B.I. and Little Rock's chief of police. The chancellor pointed out as well that we have at least two faculty members with special qualifications and widely recognized expertise in this area, whose appointments he will be pleased to announce as well.

The group will be charged with reviewing general policies around the campus regarded matters of safety, beyond just the emergency notification system. (The chancellor did, parenthetically, hope everyone is aware we have instituted text messaging as an option in the campus emergency messaging system.) He asked all those present to submit concerns, comments, and recommendations to the public safety committee.

In sympathy and good wishes for our pursuit of such a full agenda, the chancellor noted that as long as he can remember, we've seen the pace of business pick up smartly about mid-March. We survive it always, he said, and emerge around May 1 most often with quite a sense of accomplishment.

The chancellor encouraged the Faculty Senate to give heightened attention to the work going on around increasing our retention of students. If we don't take action this semester, it could easily mean a year's delay before we can move forward as we must.

He commended those who have spent time on retention approaches, including Undergraduate Council and the *ad hoc* committees. The chancellor reiterated for the Senate his two pieces of advice: In as many instances as you can, keep the policy or procedures as simple as possible. And second, we need to pay attention to principle in what we do, but we above all need to be practical. For example, it's true that if we require an FYE course, we'll have students who have to give up an elective. We all like our electives, the chancellor said, and took the opportunity to commend political science electives to all students. However, it is also true that if we don't hang onto students, our funding will suffer, and we'll have less altogether to offer to students.

B. Provost Belcher

The provost offered a brief update on budget season. He hasn't quite yet completed his presentation for the Chancellor's hearings yet, but he has decided on how he will organize his request for new funds. The first priority is, as always, salary increases, this time in five categories: the usual merit-based increases, equity adjustments, moving our averages closer to SREB averages, increasing promotion increments, and pay for part-time faculty members. Other priorities include recruitment and retention, instruction, research, graduate assistants, and infrastructure, and finally, some things like increased bandwidth.

He derived these priorities from his budgets hearings, and consultation with the Deans Council and with the Faculty Senate's Planning and Finance Committee.

Belcher remarked that the Senate should today hear about a proposed model for our developmental program. The impetus for the plan, he said, came from his office. which pulled together a group of people from several areas, including reading, writing, and math faculty.

He also noted that the work of the Tenure Committee coming forward for discussion today strikes him as very important. He underscored the wisdom of revisiting our campuswide guidelines periodically. He has read the present report and recommendation twice, and finds it to be very good work, for which he commended the committee. There are, he also said, some provisions he disagrees with, and he'll communicate those to the committee as the process for review goes on. The provost hopes all of us will do the same in the interest of emerging with the best guidelines we can develop.

C. *Reports of Standing Committees*

Preceding the reports of Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council, the president noted that we have not done well recently in ensuring that there are regular reports updating the Senate on the work of these two hard-working bodies. The president noted that the executive committee, the chairs of the Council's, and the provost's staff are working to institute a new and better process.

1. *Graduate Council, Anne Lindsay, Chair*

Lindsay distributed a handout (see attachment A) summarizing the work of the Graduate Council this year. She alerted the Senate to a couple of policy issues coming to the Senate for approval at its next meeting.

Lindsay noted some issues that have been raised in the Council but not yet addressed: 1) Course proliferation, which raises the prospect of dead courses still in the system that need to be pruned, and of duplication of courses, 2) advance notices of degree programs that come through the Council, where the Council is asked to comment on resources but does not have sufficient information to do so, 3) revisions to the curriculum change form, and 4) updating the Graduate Student Handbook, which she noted, desperately needs it.

Lindsay observed that she's putting in place a system that will generate a very brief summary of minutes each time the Council meets along with a link to the minutes, which are available on the Web. The summary and link will be distributed to all faculty, probably through the provost's office, where it can be combined with concurrent reports from Undergraduate Council.

When Lindsay invited questions, the first had to do with whether the Council gets regular updates on new degree programs in the state. Graduate School Dean Sikes fielded the question, and said they're available on the ADHE web site, and that Susan Hoffpauir, associate vice chancellor to the provost, gets notice and when she does, sends them to the deans. Robertson said that sounds like a great process, and that it would be wise, at a minimum, to add the chair of the Graduate Council to that distribution list.

Wright said he has found the Council to have been making some fairly serious policy decisions about which we've learned only later or through a side door, and that this has lately caused difficulty. We may be in our departments, he observed, making policy decisions that are in conflict without our even knowing it.

Wright named as an example changes in what happens with the awarding of a grade of "no credit." His department didn't realize that assigning a grade of no credit means putting a student on academic probation. He asked that we require prompt and appropriate posting of such changes in policy to keep all

faculty apprised. Lindsay said that's not in Graduate Council's authority to require, so she couldn't respond.

2. *Undergraduate Council. Jamie Byrne, Chair*

Byrne reported briefly on the Council's activities, as follows:

- a. Undergraduate Council heard from Carol Thompson regarding the First Year Experience Program. Tabled.
- b. Undergraduate Council approved, with some changes, Sandra Robertson's Academic Success program for students with developmental needs.
- c. Undergraduate Council approved the proposal to make all fine arts classes 3 credits and eliminate the FNAR 2300 and FNAR 2301 courses
- d. Undergraduate Council is working on the revision of the Curriculum Change Forms to make them more user-friendly.
- e. Undergraduate Council, as noted earlier by Anne Lindsay, will be working with Graduate Council on a method to better communicate the actions of the councils to the faculty.

In closing, Byrne encouraged senators to communicate with the faculties in their colleges and encourage them to begin thinking about their representatives to Undergraduate Council for next year..

3. *Tenure Committee, Gary Geissler, Chair. (See attachments B and C.)*

Before introducing Geissler, Ford explained that both he and the provost had asked the Tenure Committee to do what they've done, following the recommendation of last year's Roles and Rewards Task Force, who had discovered a number of tenure-and-promotion-related issues that deserve further examination. Ford noted also that today we are not deciding, but are only discussing and giving guidance to the committee as they continue their work and bring proposals for action to the Senate next month..

Geissler began by reemphasizing some of comments he'd made in this letter to the president and the Senate (attachment B). He thanked the committee for their diligence and hard work. Geissler, who was a member of the Roles and Rewards Task Force, observed that they found in their hearings and meetings all over campus a consistent and high level of concern about tenure and promotion (T&P) practices and dissatisfaction about our current policies.

Our present guidelines, he said, do not specifically state that each department must have written criteria for promotion and tenure, nor do they specifically state that those guidelines must be presented to faculty at the time of their hire. There are no details about how votes are taken, or about how T&P documents should be formatted. The areas the Tenure Committee found lacking as they looked at other universities are exactly the things that we heard faculty being most concerned about. The Committee characterized the present campuswide guidelines as unclear, inconsistent, and outdated.

Geissler said the committee expects a good debate on its recommendations since there has been a lot of give and take within the committee, made up of sixteen elected members, two from each college. He said they've come up with the best document they could by this time, and they do regard it as a work in progress. The committee is glad to engage in wider discussion, and is committed to doing so. Noting the obvious time constraints

in today's meeting, Geissler proposed using this spot on the agenda to begin, and noted they're planning a series of open meetings across the campus through which the discussion can continue..

Geissler proposed to walk the Senate through the proposals (see attachment C), and try to identify quickly those areas of agreement and disagreement.

Six members of the committee were present, and Geissler encouraged them to chime in.

A slightly different version was distributed at today's meeting than the one attached to the agenda, and Geissler quickly pointed out the differences. He noted that Ken Gallant objected to one recent change, and that his good name as a protector of the interests of the Bowen School of Law should remain unchallenged.

In the first proposal: the committee found our existing language too vague, in that, for example, simply meeting the requirement to "adopt criteria" might permit those criteria not actually to be written down.

Concern was expressed about such very specific front-end criteria leading perhaps to more inflexibility than we'd like, especially as we see faculty members growing in directions that fit departmental needs but that might not match perfectly with what they started out with. Looking for language that balances the need for full informing of new faculty with the need for flexibility as both departments and tenure candidates change....

Jovanovich and Lindsay both noted that the "catalog rule" having to do with students' choosing which catalog version applies to them when the roles change during their matriculation might be useful here: let tenure candidates choose the document under which they are judged.

Beginning with the first proposal, Wright raised his general concern that the document is far too specific for a universitywide set of guideline. It removes too much authority from departments.

Gallant, a member of the committee, was recognized, and shared how he believes committee members were seeing these issues. Observed that they all understand criteria for tenure or promotion must be not only quantitative but qualitative, and there will always be those judgments about quality.

Foster observed that there are criteria for removal of tenure now listed in the faculty handbook, and suggested these could also be used as a basis for denying tenure.

In connection with the second proposal, the observation was made that the lists there are already in place in policy. Wright commented that in his opinion they're bad, and would be worth revisiting in a search for general language that would better serve all departments in the university. Holzer pointed the senators to language later in the document that speaks to examples of scholarship "appropriate to the discipline." Aiyetoro said such language would indeed deal with the objection, and perhaps should routinely be added to lists in our tenure policy.

Chadwick said her faculty was reminded that the Roles and Rewards Task Force had done significant work in defining scholarly activity, and asked if the language is consistent between the two documents. Geissler said he thinks it is.

Cheatham raised a general question about whether the committee had been aware of the distinction between “shall” and “should,” and suggested that “shall”s belong in a policy, while “should”s perhaps don’t.

Several questions were raised in connection with the third proposal about whether language is as clear as it ought to be, and about agreement with other university policies, such as those on nonreappointment. Suggestion made that any references to weighting be left to departments. Question raised about the intent of the “if considered” language in reference to student evaluations.

Tschumi suggested that perhaps some of the document could be designated as guidance to departments rather than as requirements candidates must meet. Jovanovich suggested that perhaps the entire document should be written in this way. Much of the language of the document sounds like it’s written with the candidate or the department-level tenure and promotion committee as the intended audience, rather than the departments as the audience.

Moving on to the fourth proposal, Jovanovich pointed out some inconsistency in when and how reports are shared and with whom. Members of the committee confirmed that the intended policy was that whenever a written report regarding tenure or promotion is prepared, it shall be shared with the candidate as it is shared with others specified by the policy. Cheatham raised a question about the specificity of the language about midtenure review taking place with the candidate and the chair and dean, which was surely not meant to exclude other faculty from participating. Wright added that other parts of the document seem to say clearly that midtenure review is to be done by the tenure committee itself, and not by chair, dean, or another faculty committee. Ramsey spotted a single reference to mentoring, and Geissler said they had moved toward language about “advising” rather than mentoring, and may have missed that instance.

Jovanovich said there’s an intersection of policies that needs to be explored: he understands there’s another section in the Faculty Handbook that says the annual review is the primary referent for tenure and promotion decisions.

There may be a bunch of things in the fifth proposal that violate our governance process: for example, faculties have the authority to initiate and develop governance documents; deans do not approve governance documents; and not all departments put their T&P documents in their governance documents. Review of governance documents every five years would be an enormous and onerous process.

Jovanovich asked that the final policy make clear that recommendation about tenure cannot be made unilaterally by administrators.

There was lengthy discussion about third-year review, centering on the implications of such review.

Several senators affirmed that there should indeed not be an across-the-board requirement for a college-level tenure and promotion committee. While we worry about adding too many hoops for candidates, we worry also about providing good protection for candidates, and for faculties in making their recommendations.

President Ford ended the discussion after more than an hour.

4. Calendar and Schedule Committee, Amy Barnes, Chair

Barnes distributed a draft schedule for AY 2011-12, which will come to the Senate for a decision at the next Senate meeting. She said we cannot yet know when spring break will be since ours is pegged to the Little Rock School District's, and we schedule far in advance of them.

D. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

1. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Freedom, Rick Peltz, Chair. (See attachment d.)

Peltz briefly reviewed the content of the committee's report, and suggested that by accepting the report of the committee, work can go forward on the committee's recommendations.

Tschumi noted that the language of the report excludes full-time, nontenured faculty members, and by doing so creates an unfortunate gap. Peltz agreed with the sentiment, and said the committee saw that issue as outside the scope of its responsibility. He thinks including nontenured full-time faculty in these protections might require changes in the law, and would certainly require changes in Board policy.

Robertson moved to suspend the rules in order to approve the report. Ramsey seconded. Motion passed on voice vote.

Robertson moved that the Senate accept the ad hoc committee's report, and that the executive committee assign the results of the ad hoc committee's work to appropriate committees for action. Tschumi seconded. Motion carried on voice vote.

The parliamentarian noted the absence of a quorum as several senators left following this vote. The chair asked the pleasure of the remaining senators. Faust and Aiyetoro both expressed the desirability of hearing the reports of those who had sat through such long discussion.

2. Ad Hoc Committee for University Professor Rank, John DiPippa, Chair

Ramsey reported for the ad hoc committee. He hopes there will be a recommendation for action ready in advance of the next meeting. He spoke to Prof. Stodola's concern about cost raised at the last meeting, saying he believes the cost will be minor and well worth the investment.

E. Other reports

1. First Year Experience Course, Carol Thompson. (See attachment E.)

Peggy Scranton, reporting for Thompson, said they are in the process of gathering more information, and invited senators to contact her or any other member of the committee with ideas or concerns. Hopes to have a proposal for action by the Senate in April.

In response to a question about how much it's going to cost and where the money will come from, Scranton spoke of the possibility of overloads for faculty. She believes long-term financing of such a program may be anticipated from the increases in appropriation as retention goes up. Hoffpauir said a proposed budget has been submitted to the chancellor for this and other retention efforts.

Anson noted he is in a department that cannot now cover the number of classes at the class sizes optimal for students. Asked again where the money will come from.

Ramsey asked if, given the university's straitened resources, the committee has considered some sort of smaller bottom line than "all first-time entering freshman," such as perhaps requiring the course of all first-time entering freshmen with developmental needs. The answer was yes.

The chancellor believes the new allocation formula will go into effect in 2009, and so he wants new programming to begin in the fall. Scranton pointed out they are seeking the approval of Undergraduate Council this semester, and was reminded by Tschumi and Ford that the Undergraduate Council makes a recommendation to the Senate, and the Senate's approval is required for a new curriculum requirement affecting multiple departments, which means the proposal must come for action to the Senate in April.

2. *Campus Commitment to Universal Design, Susan Queller.*

Susan Quellar, director of the university's Disability Resource Center, introduced Freeland and Kuralt, the two faculty members on the Universal Design Campus Committee. Freeland and Kuralt explained what universal design means, and urged the Senate to read the proposed statement of commitment (see draft, attachment F) and vote to endorse it at the April meeting. Project Pace and the Disability Resource Center are available to faculty to enter into conversation about how we can incorporate universal design.

Several senators reacted to Kuralt's suggestion that lecture content might be posted on the Web. Lively discussion ensued, with the presenters' assurance that a campuswide commitment to universal design would not require posting lecture notes or videos on the Web, and that—as now—the specific methods of accommodating people with disabilities would be worked out individually. The commitment to universal design would, however, move us toward more seamlessly integrated resources, as in classroom technology, that would require less individualized planning and accommodation.

The following matters of old and new business, in the absence of a quorum, were continued to the next meeting of the Senate.

V. *Old Business*

A. MOTION. Senator Adjoa A. Aiyetoro (Second required; majority vote at one meeting)

Move to remove from the table the following motion: "The Faculty Senate, after further consideration of the five-year eligibility requirement to be nominated for a Faculty Excellence Award recommends to the Chancellor that he reinstate the prior one-year eligibility requirement."

VI. *New Business*

A. MOTION. Sen. Sarah Beth Estes (Resolution; second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

Resolved that the Faculty Senate support the Request for Extension of Employee Benefits as presented in Attachment F.

B. Motion. Sen. Pete Tschumi (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting.)

That the Faculty Senate approve the following motion.

Whereas the faculty as a whole are delegated responsibility for the curriculum by the Board of Trustees via the university's governance document, and

Whereas the Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock places primary responsibility for curriculum with the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the responsibility the Undergraduate Council has for issues that extend across multiple programs is restricted to reviewing and making recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the purpose of this legislative process is to create and foster transparency and to encourage broad, open debate of policy issues to ensure well-developed resolutions that balance and take into account the full range of interest and concerns of all stakeholders, and

Whereas the change of the Fine Arts core courses from two credit hours to three credit hours affects the core requirements of all baccalaureate students, and

Whereas the Undergraduate Council failed in its duty to bring the issue before the Faculty Senate, thus violating the University Constitution,

Therefore the Faculty Senate rescinds the approval of the change from two credit hours to three credit hours with the understanding that the Faculty Senate is not directly concerned with the number of credit hours in the course but is concerned with the effect on the two core curriculums and how the changes affect a variety of majors.

Furthermore, the Faculty Senate encourages the various parties interested in causing this change to bring the issue back to the Faculty Senate when the issues have been broadly discussed and vetted by the campus as a whole and all concerns have been resolved.

Commentary: Basically both the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council can approve policy issues that deal with a single program. However, any policy changes that effects multiple programs can only be approved by the Faculty Senate. As to the particular concern, this course change actually causes a core change for students in EIT majors and nursing majors.

VII. Open Forum

The clock having run out on access to the room, the meeting was adjourned at 4:57 p.m.

Judith Faust, Secretary