UALR FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Friday, May 1, 2015
1:00 PM until Adjournment
Legends Room

Present: CALS— Cheatham, LeGrand, Merrick, Seo, Maguire, Anson, Douglas, Kyong-McClain, McAbee *CB*— Funk, Mitchell, Henden, Farewell. *CEHP*—Benton, Layton, Vander Putten, Prince, Carmack, Evans, Faust, Hayn. *CSSC*— Rhodes, Hawkins (alt), Giese, Giammo, Craw, Scranton, Matson *CEIT*— Anderson, Bayrak, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, McMillan. *LIB*— Macheak. *LAW* – Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh. *EX OFFICIO*— Wright.

Absent: CALS—He, Street, Finzer (alt. for Amrhein), Ecke. *CB*–none. *CEHP*— Kuykendal, Thomas*. CSSC*— Golden, Jensen. *CEIT*— none*. LIB* – none. *LAW*–Boles. *EX OFFICIO*—Anderson, Toro, Ford, Morris, McNeaill.

I. Welcome and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 pm.

President Wright made some brief remarks, "Soonest begun. Soonest done."

Secretary McMillan called the roll.

II. Review of Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes as distributed was made by Cheatham and seconded by Tramel. The motion was approved.

III. Announcements

It was announced that several Senators are leaving after the end of the semester - Laura Amrhein, Moira Maguire and Johanna Thomas. President Wright and others thanked them for their long-term service to the Faculty Senate and UALR. The Senate concurred.

Pres. Wright announced a process change. We finally have the University Assembly email list up and ready. The constitution requires an appeal period for 10 days after senate actions are taken. When does that 10 day period start? Now that we can notify the Assembly – the President will prepare the legislative transmittal, then publish it to the email list – that action will start the appeals time (10 days).

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 min limit, no discussion)

Belinda Blevins-Knabe on behalf of Johanna Thomas brought up the need for breast pumping stations across campus. She noted that we do not have any and that they are a requirement of compliance with Title IX.

Denise LeGrand thanked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for showing her the ropes this year. Thanks were also expressed to Senator Ed Anson for his part in the initial formation of the Faculty Senate at UALR, and much appreciation was also bestowed in Past-past-past President Richard Ford for his lasting impact on the Faculty Senate, especially in establishing the "Introduction of New Topics" and the end of the academic year liquid refreshment tradition.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor's Report – Joel Anderson

No report, Chancellor Anderson was out of town.

B. Provost's Report – Zulma Toro

No report, Provost Toro was under the weather.

C. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies – Belinda Blevins-Knabe

The Core Council has been meeting regularly. They passed 2 policies:

1) on a test out option, which still needs review. If students wish to test out of a core course, they are able to. If you do not have an exam for each course offered, you are required to come up with something for each course;

The Core Council discovered that in the move from the previous core to the UALR Standard Core and College Core that there was ambiguity surrounding the test out policy. We have approved the following policy regarding the test-out policy for core courses:

Test out option for core courses: Every discipline that has a course in the core has to have an option to test out or a plan to develop a test if requested. If a core discipline has a test now it needs to be reviewed to make sure it meets the needs of the core.

2) core implementation – questions have arisen about when courses can be implemented. We are calling the core the 'UALR standard and college core implemented on Jan 2015". Courses approved after that implementation date can be offered for the next academic year after the course is approved.

The Core Council discovered that in the move from the previous core to the UALR Standard Core and College Core that there was ambiguity surrounding the date of implementation. We have approved the following policy regarding the implementation of the UALR Standard Core and College Core:

This policy applies to core courses for the UALR college core and standard core. The UALR college core and standard core went into effect on Jan. 2015.

Therefore only the courses approved for the UALR college core and standard core (implemented in January 2015) satisfy the core requirements. Courses approved after the implementation date of the UALR college core and standard core (January 2015) are approved for the next academic year following the semester of approval.

Cheatham – will a student understand the above statement? Can you clarify for the student?

Pres. Wright – you can contact the Core Council in the next academic year and ask for clarification.

The Executive Committee moved to suspend the rules and move to New Business to consider Motion FS_2015_22 before returning to committee reports. Counsel Faust presented the reason for suspending the rules was to stop punishing our students (the women's basketball team) when we intended to celebrate them. The motion to suspend the rules was approved by unanimous voice vote. (See new business for discussion of the motion.)

D. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

No additions to formal report posted on the Faculty Senate website

E. Graduate Council – Kent Layton

No additions to formal report posted on the Faculty Senate website

F. Ad Hoc On-line Committee – Lisa Sherwin

Denise LeGrand presented the report. The Ad Hoc Committee has been meeting once a week. We are proposing legislation relating to caps and best practices on online instruction. We have investigated orientation for students for online courses, looking at what other universities are doing and what work has already been done at UALR regarding orientation. The report is available on the Faculty Senate website.

VI. Old Business

A. Motion FS_2015_16. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at Two Meetings – second vote) Modify Membership of FGC (no second required)

Whereas the Faculty Governance Committee should include both continuity of experience in handling governance matters *and* representation extending through all parts of the university; and

Whereas the Faculty Senate Executive Committee already has many duties; and

Whereas the population of past presidents fluctuates and may not be large enough to carry the load required for good functioning of this committee;

Therefore be it resolved that the composition of the Faculty Governance Committee be changed in the following manner:

Faculty Governance Committee: This committee acts to facilitate faculty governance and to ~~insure~~ ensure that governance documents and policies are in accordance with all campus and University of Arkansas Board of Trustee policies. It monitors the Faculty Handbook ~~insuring~~ ensuring that approved changes are promptly and accurately incorporated into the Handbook. The committee shall establish cycles of review for the Handbook and all faculty governance documents from academic departments and schools and colleges. In the event a governance document does not reflect current campus policy(ies), the committee shall inform the unit(s) involved and assist the unit in developing needed modifications as feasible. The committee shall develop for approval by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor a generic college and a generic department governance document to be available for use by a newly created academic unit.

In the event such a new academic department or college is created, this committee shall assist the new unit(s) with the development of governance document(s). Until such new document(s) is/are created, the new unit shall operate within the framework of the generic governance document provided by the committee.

The committee shall consist of ~~the officers of the Faculty Senate and all past presidents of the University Assembly who do not hold administrative appointments above the level of department chair.~~ one member of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee selected by the Executive Committee; all past presidents of the University Assembly who do not hold an administrative appointment above the level of department chair and who are willing to serve; one member from each college/school represented in the Faculty Senate, elected by the faculty of the college/school, one member of the Ottenheimer Library elected by the Ottenheimer Library faculty, and one member of the Faculty Senate, elected by the Faculty Senate. Elected members will serve three year, staggered terms.

Commentary: There was some desire to make sure that a larger representation of past presidents was allowable, while retaining the flexibility so that election to president does not result in a life-time appointment to this committee. The word "insure" usually only applies to financial institutions, so the correct usage in this instance is "ensure."

Pres. Wright introduced the motion by reminding all of the rationale.

In addition to Pres. Wright's explanation, Vice President Matson pointed out that this new legislation does not require former Faculty Senate Presidents to stay on the committee.

The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

VII. New Business

   A. Motion FS_2015_20. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting) To approve 2015 Spring and Summer Graduates

   Those applicants completing all requirements for various degrees in the 2015 Spring and Summer Semester shall be approved for graduation. (see attachment 1 for a list of candidates for graduation, current as of 4/24/15).

   Tschumi – we need to add summer – "2015 Spring and Summer Semesters"

   Pres. Wright – will accept that as friendly amendment.

   The motion as amended was approved by unanimous voice vote

B. Motion FS_2015_21. Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting) To approve the AY17-18 Calendar

The AY17-18 calendar shown in attachment 2 shall be approved.

Douglas made the motion

Pres. Wright noted that the calendar committee and the registrar has reviewed the proposed schedule for this calendar.

Jovanovic – asked for a review of the fall recess process.

Douglas – there was never an action on behalf of the senate. This calendar does not have a fall break

Pres. Wright – if we do want a fall break, we ought to pass legislation

The motion was approved by voice vote

C. Motion FS_2015_22. Athletics Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. No Second Required.) Commend the Women's Basketball team

Whereas the Women's Basketball team achieved a difficult accomplishment by gaining a berth in the NCAA division I championship and

Whereas the team won the Sun Belt Conference Championship,

Therefore Be it Resolved that the Faculty Senate recognizes their hard work and commends their success.

Senator Prince introduced Motion FS_2015_22. She introduced the Women's Basketball Team and announced that we are very proud of them. Their record was 29-5 for the 2014-2015 season. They are the Sunbelt champions and made it to the 2nd round of the NCAA tournament. She also noted that every student athlete who works with Coach Joe Foley graduates. The Faculty Senate Assembly showed their appreciation of the UALR Women's Basketball team with sustained applause.

The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote

D. Motions FS_2015_25. Faculty Appeals Council, Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. No Second Required.) Judicial Appeals revisited

Motions FS_2015_12, FS_2015_13, and FS_2015_14 were jointly referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee and the Faculty Appeals Council. Both bodies recommend rejection of the motions.

Substitute Motion FS_2015_25. Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. No Second Required.) Judicial Appeals Revisited

Whereas the issue of Judicial Appeals requires attention, and

Whereas the existing policies are disorganized, and

Whereas the matter of Judicial Appeals cuts across two Standing Committees, and

Whereas these Standing Committees are too large to effectively consider the matter,

Therefore be it resolved that the organization of existing Faculty Senate legislative policies on judicial appeals into a single policy shall be referred to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, and

Be it further resolved that the revision of policies shall be referred to a committee of twelve members to be appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee,
1. one of whom must be a representative of each college or school represented in the faculty senate,
2. one of whom must be a representative of the library,
3. one of whom must be a member of the Faculty Appeals Council,
4. one of whom must be a member of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee,
5. one of whom must be an undergraduate student,
6. one of whom must be a graduate student,
7. one of whom must be a representative of each administrative unit that manages appeals (for instance, provost's office, human resources, dean of students).

Pres. Wright provided background information on this motion. In March, Sen. Tschumi brought a motion on Judicial Policy. At that meeting we referred it to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (AIGC) and the Faculty Appeals Council (FAC). The committee and council had two main options – they could recommend, or move to postpone indefinitely. A recommendation means the motion returns to the Faculty Senate, who would then have the responsibility to approve or not approve. Both committees came back and both recommended to reject the motion. The Chair of the AIGC indicated his committee liked the proposed policy, but there were parts they did not feel comfortable with. They felt amendments were needed. Both committees provided some review. The motion is back before the Senate. We can vote to approve, we can vote to reject. We can amend the motion. We are in a gray area regarding postponement because this is the last meeting of this Senate - we can't bind the Faculty Senate of the future, as that is a different body than this one.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has a substitute motion that would empanel an Ad

6

Hoc committee to allow for the process to continue. This motion was placed on the agenda so that the Senate could think about it before the meeting.

Pres. Wright opened the floor to debate on the motion –

Tschumi – I don't have problems with it going to committee

Aiyetoro – I think the motions are well meaning and warrant consideration. As written, they are very complicated, very dense. I would speak against it. I would want more time to be thoughtful about these motions.

Pres. Wright recognized Sen. Tschumi to introduce a substitute motion.

Senator Tschumi introduced a substitute motion (distributed it on paper and copied below and marked up as amended during the meeting).

Motion. Pete Tschumi (Legislation. Requires majority vote of the Faculty Senate) To establish an ad-hoc committee, chaired by Adjoa Aiyetoro, to review and report back to the Faculty Senate on the proposed Judicial Policy. The committee has the following charge:
1. Review the current policies
2. Determine any changes that need to be made
2a. Report to the Faculty Senate in the last meeting of Fall, 2015
3. Revise the proposed policy to incorporate the changes
4. Bring the revised proposal back to the Faculty Senate during the ~~Fall 2015~~ Spring 2016 semester

As has been done in the past on substantive issues and to ensure that both all of those with significant concerns on these matters and those with the necessary expertise can participate, the membership of the committee shall consist of anyone who wishes to participate.

The President of the UALR Assembly will invite the following constituencies:
1. each college or school represented in the faculty senate,
2. the library,
3. the Faculty Appeals Council,
4. the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee,
5. Student Government Association
6. Graduate Student Association
7. Each administrative unit that manages appeals (for instance, provost's office, human resources, dean of students).

Tschumi - My objection to the Faculty Senate substitute motion is that I would like the Ad Hoc committee to have different composition, and I would provide charges to the committee.

Scranton seconded the substitute motion

Pres. Wright declared a 5 minute recess to allow all to read the substitute motion.

Return from recess.

Tschumi – after a conversation with Sen Aiyetoro, I would like to add the following to the substitute motion - that Adjoa Aiyetoro will be the chairman of the ad hoc committee

Peggy Scranton – seconded the amendment - Senator Aiyetoro will chair this committee

On further discussion – Aiyetoro suggested to add that the committee would provide a report to the Senate by last meeting in the fall (add this statement after #2); to scratch #4, and to add that the Spring semester would be spent on #3. The big change is the way the committee is constituted.

Anderson – I don't have any problem about anyone who wants to be on the committee be allowed. But we need broad representation.

Tschumi – there is no restriction. All have the opportunity

Pres. Wright – and it is not restricted to faculty

Tschumi – we definitely need administrators

Aiyetoro – we disagree a bit on this. My recommendation would be to add the list that the Faculty Executive Committee came up with. Invitations should be sent to that group. We have to have invitations to a specific grouping of people asking that they appoint someone to the committee. Seems to me, the Faculty Executive Committee wanted to make sure that people who have interest or knowledge about this area are asked to be on this committee. We can open membership up to all, but we need to have specific invitations.

Tschumi – add as an amendment 'specific invitations to – and then include the list that was put together in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee's substitute motion.

Jovanovic – the chair can invite anyone she wants to

Pers. Wright – the Senate can direct the chair of the committee, as well

Matson – I think we need to make clear that these people are wanted to be on the committee

Hendon – I would caution on the number – the number of people in a group becomes unwieldy once beyond 12-15. I may make it impossible to be able to come to a conclusion.

Tschumi- if we run into problems we can go back to the Senate

Aiyetoro –Will the invitation come from the President of the Senate?

Pres. Wright – yes

The question was called. President Wright clarified that a vote would be on the substitute motion as amended – this will void the original motion. If the substitution is approved, debate would proceed on the substitute motion.

The motion to allow Sen. Tschumi's substitute motion as amended was passed on voice vote.

The motion passed by voice vote - majority ayes, a few nayes

E. Motion FS_2015_26. Ad Hoc Committee on On-Line Education (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. Second Required. Not on agenda one week before meeting. Requires 4/5 majority consent to consider) On-line Best Practices

Teaching online presents pedagogical and technological issues that are unique to the medium. Best practices indicate that class size for online teaching must correlate with pedagogical considerations (Orellana, 2006).

Student learning in online courses has been clearly linked to:

1. Course content which speaks to emerging trends in the discipline
2. High quality faculty-student interaction
3. Transparent goals and metrics for the course
4. Personalized feedback which comes with grading-intensive assignments
5. Building constructive opportunities for peers to learn from each other
6. Collaborative dialogue that is directly linked to increased skills in critical thinking and problem-solving.

The integration of these pedagogical elements is a function of faculty expertise and immersion in their professional field.

Faculty who teach online courses are challenged to integrate their discipline expertise with both knowledge of the web and technology suited for the online environment.

The literature clearly indicates that the ability of the faculty member to be present and responsive (as evidenced by faculty-initiated communication, timely response and personalized feedback) is inversely proportional to class size.

Therefore, online courses that seek to adopt pedagogic best practices and embody all of the above listed characteristics, should not exceed 25 students.

However, class size is ultimately a product of consultation with the full-time faculty member who is responsible for the course, the dominant educational framework, and the nature and purpose of the class.

Macheak made a motion to suspend the rules to consider the motion. Senator Tschumi seconded. Motion to suspend the rules passed by unanimous voice vote

Senator Macheak moved FS_2015_26. Senator Evans seconded the motion

Pres. Wright – this is regarding online courses specifically - 6 areas of best practices have been identified, and it states a course enrollment limit for best practices to be upheld

Anson – it goes on to say classes could be larger

Giammo – this makes it hard to have less than 25 people in a course

Layton – it says numbers should not be set. Caps range from 0-100. For online courses at UALR today, there is a mean cap of 29.6, mean enrollment of 24 students. If we set a cap at 25, what happens if we go over. It is additional money to hire additional people.

Blevins-Knabe – one issue is the fudgy language at the end, another issue is the question of who was consulted. The intent was to say these are the best practices. If there are 25 students or fewer, then these best practices could be followed. However in the cases of enrollments going over this level, then don't expect those best practices to be followed. What it is saying, we would expect to see these best practices if the limit is met or below. If you go over that, don't expect all of the best practices to be 'best'. We tried to set it with best practices in mind.

Aiyetoro – I have a problem with it. If you set it at 25 and say this is best practices, this leaves the impression that anything over 25 is not good. We are making a statement about best practices without knowing it. We need a much more thorough discussion about impact.

Maguire – this gets at the broader issue of class size. Who gets to decide? The people who get to decide the class size should be the people teaching the course.

Tschumi- maybe take a different approach. Can we advertise that we have the highest quality if you want good online, you go here. We need some mechanism to certify that we meet some standard. Some sections don't meet certification and would not be marketed as such.

Mitchell – the Workload Taskforce is getting ready to put in a report to the Provost. Process is each department in conjunction with the Dean and final approval of the Provost will set numbers.

Douglas – decisions of class size should be made by the faculty

Vander Putten – I am concerned that this takes an overly broad approach. It does not differentiate the nature of the level of courses. What about differences between graduate and undergraduate online numbers. This approach needs to be finely tuned.

Blevins-Knabe – we need to define what high quality would be. We were trying to do this. The distinction between grad and undergrad courses is important.

Anson – I like the idea of faculty and the chair making those decisions

Vander Putten – the other question that arises…why best practices for online? Will there be another policy for best practices for face to face?

Cheatham – should there be something that says online caps should not exceed face to face Enrollment caps?

Funk –from a business perspective – we are focused on best practices, but why not focus on better practices. Everyone is focused on best practices, let us do better. In addition we should encourage faculty to experiment – to seek out practices that work with very large courses.

Blevins-Knabe – what Sen. Funk said is exactly correct, we need resources for faculty to see what people are doing on campus for small and large enrollment courses

Giammo – there are people who teach using very different styles who are excellent at it. Setting up a standard cap might not allow for differences.

Aiyotoro made a motion to close debate. The motion passed

The motion FS_2015_26 failed to pass by voice vote (majority nayes, with some ayes).

> **F.** FS_2015_27. Senator Jovanovic (Recommendation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. Second Required. Not on agenda one week before meeting. Requires 4/5 majority consent to consider) Sign the eVersity MoU

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that UALR's Chief Academic Officer sign the eVersity Memorandum of Understanding, substantially "as is" but with all the typographical errors corrected, and

Be it further resolved that the President will formally communicate the Faculty Senate's concerns with the Memorandum of Understanding.

Cheatham – would like to empower the Faculty Executive Committee to suggest to the extent possible that these remain faculty concerns

Wright – yes, we can convey both the motion and the commentary to the Chief Academic Officer

Evans – can we make sure the MOU is not full of typos before we sign?

Wright – call the question

The motion to close debate passed with vocal ayes, a few nays.

The motion passed with vocal ayes and a few nayes.

VIII. Open Forum

Wright – Sen. Bayrak reminded me that the college assemblies will be meeting next week. I have compiled a list of open positions on the Senate site. You can see open positions that need to be filled.

Matson – don't forget to add the Faculty Governance committee (bottom of the 'vacancies' page)

Wright – on each heading, the committee is linked , you can see who is on the committee. We will call the committee on committees meeting after the college assembly meetings.

A. Discussion of Motion FS_2015_xx. Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. No Second Required.) eVersity Curricular Governance

Whereas the faculty of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock are supportive of the UofA System's efforts to start a fully on-line eVersity to reach students not currently able to access or afford the UofA's four year or two year campuses, and

Whereas the faculty of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock are willing to partner with eVersity as long as such partnership can be done consistent with the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation and the requirements of national accrediting bodies, and

Whereas HLC accreditation requires faculty review of both curriculum and credentials, and

Whereas a start-up such as eVersity and the relationship with partner institutions continues to evolve and requires an amendable process,

Therefore, Be it Resolved that eVersity curricula will follow the Curricular Governance Structure for eVersity Programs stated here:

Curricular Governance Structure for eVersity Programs

Program: The bundle of degrees and certificates and credentials offered by eVersity in an area, defined in the initial curriculum proposal and added to or subtracted from in subsequent Program Changes, will be governed as defined below.

Curriculum and Academic Policy Review Process: Curriculum and other policy decisions will be developed by the Back-stop Department (see below), reviewed by the eVersity Program Administrator (see below), and then passed on to the appropriate College curriculum Council. From the appropriate College curriculum Council, the matter will be passed on to the curriculum process as detailed in the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Back-stop Department: A UALR department will serve as the Back-stop for each Program (see ~~Program~~ above). Should the formal relationship between UALR and eVersity dissolve, this faculty will have the responsibility to "Teach Out" (the Higher Learning Commission [HLC] term for transitioning out programs) students who have started in the Program but not yet completed, as well as to wind down the curriculum.

Initial selection or replacement of the Back-stop department will follow the Curriculum and Academic Policy Review Process (see above) as a Program Change. The selection of the Back-stop department must be part of the initial Program Change for any new program.

The Back-stop Department will develop an assessment plan and submit it to the Curriculum and Academic Policy Review Process (see above).

The Back-stop Department Chair will serve as the conduit for information between the eVersity Program Administrator (see below) and the Program Assembly.

Program Assembly: The faculty supporting each separate eVersity Program shall constitute a Program Assembly. This Program Assembly will consist of all faculty members, whether from UALR or elsewhere, whose credentials have been validated by the Back-stop Department and who are participating in the program through teaching courses and advising students. Members of this Assembly may initiate Program and Curricular Changes.

eVersity Program Administrator: An administrator will be appointed, through a process in an associated Memorandum of Understanding, to serve as the eVersity point of contact, oversee resource allocation, course teaching assignment, and other administrative aspects of the Program

Minimum Program Faculty: If there are too few instructors to teach the courses in a Program, the Program will suspend without a Program Change, and the Back-stop Department faculty will teach out those students who have started the program. This suspension may be halted by curricular action of the Back-stop Department.

Credential Policy: Each eVersity Program must develop a policy detailing minimum credentials required to be eligible to teach in the Program. The original policy and modifications to the Credential Policy must be submitted to the Curriculum and Academic Policy Review Process as a Program Change. For faculty of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, distinguished professor, and university professor rank who are full-time faculty members at any University of Arkansas campus, the Credential Policy should review only appropriateness of degrees by subject and level to the Program. For any other credentials, the Credential Policy should be more detailed.

Validating Faculty to Participate in the Program: Any faculty member who wants to teach classes in the Program (including members of the Back-stop Department) will submit credentials to the Back-stop Department (once), which will decide by applying the Credential Policy.

Appeal of credential decision: The decisions of the Back-stop Department are final.

National Accreditation: For programs that may impact national accreditation in UALR programs, such as business or social work, the faculty of those accredited programs must write a letter indicating how program changes will impact their accreditation (if at all) to accompany any Program Change.

Advising students: Students will be advised by eVersity staff as detailed in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Equivalency of Courses: eVersity courses and UALR courses may be similar enough that courses may be automatically transferred between an eVersity program and a UALR program. The Back-stop Department who is over-seeing the eVersity course and the UALR department faculty offering the UALR course may establish or modify an equivalency between courses by submitting a joint curriculum change document to the curriculum process. The eVersity curriculum change will follow the Curriculum and Academic Policy Review Process. The UALR curriculum change will follow the curriculum process described in the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock. Once an equivalency has been established, it may be rescinded by curriculum change from UALR department faculty or the Back-stop Department.

Once eVersity becomes independently accredited by HLC or equivalent accrediting body, these equivalencies will be maintained.

Modification: This document can be modified as a piece of legislation through majority vote of the Faculty Senate (see Article III of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock).

B. Discussion of Motion FS_2015_xx. Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting. No Second Required.) eVersity MoU recommendation

Whereas administrative details involved with partnering with eVersity are handled in a Memorandum of Understanding, rather than through legislative action of the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas a Memorandum of Understanding does not abrogate the Faculty Senate's responsibilities under the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock or University of Arkansas Board Policies,

Therefore, Be it Resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the Chief Academic Officer sign the draft Memorandum of Understanding for all campuses (see attachment) with the following caveats,

Regarding **University of Arkansas System Colleges and Universities Obligations:** 2. Academic Polices, that UALR Academic Policies also apply to all UALR students, including those that are participating in a joint degree program between UALR and eVersity, and

Regarding **University of Arkansas System Colleges and Universities Obligations: item 2:**

Academic Polices, that the process of transferring eVersity courses will be handled through the Equivalencies process defined in eVersity Curricular Governance legislation (FS_2015_xx), and

Regarding **University of Arkansas System Colleges and Universities Obligations: item 2:**

Access to UA System College and University Facilities and Network, that the expense of maintaining these facilities, especially the library databases, may depend on the number of students served and any use of facilities that might incur additional costs to UALR will be managed through an Addendum to this MoU, along with appropriate fees, and

Regarding **University of Arkansas System *e*Versity and University of Arkansas System College or University Shared Obligations: 2.** *Degree Conferral*, and **University of Arkansas System Colleges and Universities Obligations: 1.** *Joint Degree Conferral*. And **University of Arkansas System Colleges and Universities Obligations: 2.** *University of Arkansas System College or University Students Enrollments in eVersity Courses that* any degrees conferred jointly between eVersity and UALR and any eVersity course UALR students enroll in through the UALR student information system (Banner) must be approved through the eVersity Curricular Governance legislation (FS_2015_xx), and

> Regarding eVersity Program Administrator defined in the Curricular Governance Structure for eVersity Programs, that a process for appointing an administrator serve as the eVersity point of contact, oversee resource allocation, course teaching assignment, and other administrative aspects of the Program must be developed as an Addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding.

Pres. Wright distributed paper copies of the eVersity Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and announced a 15 minute recess so that the Faculty Senate could read the document.

Resume session for discussion on eVersity –

Tschumi – under program assembly, this should say "shall' instead of 'will'. On the credentialing policy – 'for any other credentials' – should be some language that should mandate you have to use some minimal credentials. We don't want to leave a loophole.

Cheatham – I know you have been engaged on our behalf. I appreciate that. We are seen to be good partners in this process. When I look at some of the language in the open forum potential motion…. working in the concurrent program - we have very specific things that need to be included in those MOU's . This one does not come anywhere near the specificity. The UA system is not at least as concerned. A lot of the language is good language. If we can move this forward, it is collegial and in our best interest. Is it appropriate to pass this? Or to recommend that you be empowered to encourage the system officials to use this?

Wright –I would accept if this body wants to endorse the general direction we are going. I don't think we are ready to pass these motions.

Cheatham – I will put that on the floor – there is a need for sharing academic leadership between departments and eVersity. It is our belief that that sharing should be endorsed.

Jovanovic – they are admitting students in Oct?

Wright – yes, but will start courses in Jan

Jovanovic – so there is still time in the fall to work on this?

Wright -Yes

Matson – they want campuses to jointly offer the degree, to list in their catalogs the joint degrees. They want it jointly conferred and jointly listed. They want eVersity students to be able to register for eVersity courses through UALR. All of this MOU – is to say, 'if this is what you want, this is what we want'.

Douglas – why do we want to give away the farm?

Tschumi – it is one thing to allow them to offer courses using whatever mechanisms they plan on doing, and we backstop them until they get their accreditation. It is a totally different thing for us to advertise for them.

Robertson – all of the campuses have signed the MOU except UAF and us

Layton – our campus and UAF are the only place where the decision is made at the faculty level

Jovanovic – these are jointly conferred degrees. So we get degree production and SSCH.

Matson – the SSCH goes to the institution where the teacher is.

Mitchell – community college faculty have been told that if they have a Ph.D. they can teach at any level

Matson – we do not want to be seen as saying "NO". But at same time, we do not want to surrender control of degrees and faculty – we want quality education

Anderson – any joint degree we offer – eVersity policies will control?

Wright – our response is that that won't work. What we think are academic polices and what they think are academic policies may be different

Douglas – the other campuses have signed MOUs – have they given up control?

Layton – they have given control to the committee – the eVersity governing council

Matson – it is all faculty – but it is from many different disciplines, and from many different campuses – mostly 2 year campuses. Looking at the material in writing – it is confusing and poorly written

Bayrak – there is a section where they refer to open educational materials, but nothing about infrastructure

Wright –that is a second big caveat. Any use of our facilities would have to be addressed.

Layton – they have paid for their own Blackboard

Sandra Robertson – they have negotiated a system-wide deal with Blackboard – we are a part of that deal

Anson –are the departments backstopping degrees?

Pres. Wright – the 3rd big point is if eVersity dissolves, and students are left in limbo, who owns the student? We do – the department that is backstopping the degree will have to take the student. Taking on such an obligation for this large population of students is purely un-acceptable, if there are no new resources available to manage these students.

Giese – how are we sharing SSCH? If I teach for eVerstiy, we get the SSCH? That confers financial benefit to the department.

Layton – eVersity does not need SSCH. They are depending on tuition, and they do not have the 37 regulations that need to be met by the brick and mortar institutions.

Giese – what happens if that changes in the legislature?

Pres. Wright – they will charge the student tuition, that goes to eVersity. The SSCH is invisible to them, they don't have reporting requirements. If UALR wants to bill the state on those SSCH's, we can.

Jovanovic – they don't have a campus, we do, we need the funding to support the physical campus.

Layton – they will use the other campuses if we do not agree

Jovnovic – what will they do if we don't agree?

Layton – they will move on

Matson – originally, they were talking about one school to be the accreditation partner. We said ok, but this is what we would expect. All the other campuses agreed and signed with no expectations

Robertson – they are not getting UAF NOW, But a new Chancellor and a new Provost will be hired soon and they will hire someone who will sign the eVersity MOU.

McMillan – we are screwed

Mitchell – students will be taking their courses, individual faculty will be harmed. Departments will get SSCH, but at the expense of some programs/departments

Layton – Dr. Moore believes that the students they are targeting truly are different from our student population. It has its problems, eVersity is moving full steam ahead

Cheatham – under shared obligation, the process of choosing the home institution for the student will be put together by Chancellors. Is this all determined by the admissions?

Wright – if you are in the geographic radius, you would be associated within the radius. They may be getting a UALR degree, but if you live in the Batesville catchment area? Does Batesville get degree conferral?

Matson- his intention is to have all of the campuses to confer each degree – that is what he is talking about

Wright – the 2 yr campuses would get to confer a 4yr degrees?

Matson – I would presume they would keep the 4 yr and 2 yr degrees separate based on who already confers those degrees

Prince – if I voted for this…. eVerstiy and UALR would have the same program. If I don't vote for it, the competitiveness would hurt the program. If I keep fighting this, there may be damage.

Layton – if you pass your MOU, I don't think it will be accepted

Wright – you are correct

Layton – they have an entire team of lawyers working on most everything you are talking about

Wright – we need to ask, we have these concerns, how will this affect us?

Anson – how can two online programs appeal to different populations?

Layton – eVersity tuition is $500- $600 per course

Anson – what is the difference between the populations?

LeGrand – if you develop a course, you own the course. What prevents someone from taking the course at UALR?

Layton – on one level, it looks like they are breaking rules and policies that have stood for years. On the other hand, going after AR folks who have started their degrees but have not finished is seen as good for economic advancement in Arkansas.

Scranton – we have degrees in Criminal Justice, they have degrees in Criminal Justice… the course pattern is different. More of an applied niche. They are not going after a different person, they are offering a different product.

Matson – the SSCH goes to the faculty member's home institution. If some of our faculty decides to teach, we would get the SSCHs. For courses taught by other campuses, they would get SSCHs

Giammo – we would have students who would have UALR joint degree – but might have never taken a course from any UALR faculty?

Wright –it is unclear. That was our starting point. Not sure how that is working now.

Funk –on data sharing. If we share with them, do they share with us?

Wright – I don't know

Layton – they are paying for CIVITAS

Funk – we loaned them money to buy CIVITAS, and they shared the license with us; I think they will flame out in 5 years, I want to pick up the students

Wright – there are benefits, there are cautions. Somehow, we need to keep moving the process along. Little by little we are figuring out how to work together

Anson – if we keep correcting, it might actually work, we may come out with something that will work

Robertson – the longer we wait, the less they need us

Cheatham – there are some models that have worked. One of those is ACTS – seems to be a model that might work. Is there a way to offer a sense of the Senate based on (1) qualifications of faculty, (2) admissibility of students, and (3) accreditation. Can these be addressed later in an addendum.

Tschumi – on needing to act, on rare occasions, the Senate has met in the summer. If there comes a point late in May, or in June where we need to act, do not hesitate to call the Senate into session.

Jovanovic – we could vote on this today. We could give a recommendation that our Chief Academic Officer sign the MOU. The hazard of rejecting it is it will get into paper as we reject.

Robertson – the interim chancellor at UAF is one of the architects of eVersity

Douglas- whose accreditation are they using?

Layton – at an accreditation presentation at last meeting – it is still unclear. They are not going through HLC initially. They are using accreditation approved by the US Government for online universities.

Layton – invite Dr. Moore to come talk to us

Faust – the Faculty Senate Executive Committee did meet with him

Jovanovic – they will not change one word for us. If all of the other schools have already signed, it does not matter for us. If I thought the vote would be successful, I would move it.

Wright – we are in open forum, we can take a straw poll

Recommend to sign = 20

Opposed to signing = 9

Abstain = 2

Jovanovic made the motion to suspend the rules to return to new business and to add an item to the agenda, seconded by Anson. The motion passed with 4/5 majority ayes. (see New Business, Motion FS_2015_27).

Maguire – there are quite a few people leaving UALR. I am certain administrators are behaving with a lack of integrity. It is wrong – those leaving are having summer classes held over their heads.

Bayrak – will there be some rule put in place on expectations for those who volunteer to serve on committees. Is there some mechanisms to put in place to be more constructive for enforcing attendance and not just padding PARs/resumes?

Tschumi – people get on the appeals committee, but when appeals come up, they just say they can't do it. We have people who sign up for a committee and then don't do any work. Need to get some way to get them replaced.

Wright - I think we would need to amend the constitution; would be a workload issue

Jovanovic – there is a flip side – there are people who work hard on committees, then the committees work gets ignored. That is not a recipe for encouraging people to put time into committee work.

IX. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned 3:59 pm