



---

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 19, 2016

1:00 PM until adjournment

DSC B&C

I. Welcome and Roll Call

AWright convened the meeting at 1:04 pm

*Present:* **CALS**— Law, Anson, Cates, Ecke, LeGrand, Thibeault, Warner, Smith, Douglas, McAbee, Kyong-McClain. **CB**—Leonard, Hendon. **CEHP**— Rurup, Lowery, Prince, Evans, Clemmons, Oltmans, Vander Putten, Layton. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Jenson, Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Golden, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT**— Bayrak, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Ray. **LAW**—Boles, Foster. **LIBRARY**— Macheak. **EXOFFICIO**—Wright, Anderson.

*Absent:* **CALS**— Cheatham, Street. **CB**— Farewell. **CEHP**— Carmack, Crass. **CSSC**—**CEIT** —Anderson. **LAW**—Fitzhugh. **LIBRARY**—. **EXOFFICIO**—Hickman, Laan.

II. Review of Minutes

P Tschumi: Move to accept minutes of 1-29-2016; M Tramel seconds: Motion carries.

P Tschumi: Move to incorporate all council reports into minutes for previous semester. M Tramel seconds; Merge minute motion carries

III. Reports

A. Executive Committee Report – Andrew Wright

Concurrent Enrollment Interpretation of Legislation

A Wright: We have been asked to look at our admission requirements; need decision by May.

Chancellor's Disapproval of FS\_2015\_35

AW: Modifies annual review and P&T; [explains Chancellor's objections]; we have brought motions back to senate to amend and fulfill the original intent.

E Anson: Could you explain the objections?

AW: I just did.

EA: What about the second one?

AW: Off the top of my head, I don't remember.

P Tschumi: Did we not send out the Chancellor's memo?

A Wright: Here is the memo [on ppt screen]

**B. Chancellor's Report – Joel Anderson**

Reads message in response to FS-2015-35 if a responsibility is given how well you do that is subject to review and evaluation. Language should protect privacy and I understand that. An adjustment of wording is needed.

Mike Tramel congratulations for 2<sup>nd</sup> place award (missed 1<sup>st</sup> place by 1 point out of 200!) in heavy civil Associated Schools of Construction Region 5 competition.

Celebrate what has been going on of Trojan basketball teams! Let's sell out Thursday night for a grand game. We are drawing positive attention to UALR. Women have won 8 straight and moved into competitive position,

Enrollment: good news head count compared to FS last year up by 98 and makes good talking points. Bad news is the budget has not been positively affected because increase is from concurrent classes.

(1:17pm)

We will finish this year with balanced budget and are looking to the future. Trying to give raises and hire new positions – Alert: in the next few weeks AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities) will be coming to look at budget. Need fresh eyes for areas we can improve on in this on-going budget crunch. Head count is a good sign, but we must keep working on it.

I want to leave the budget in good shape for new chancellor. Thanks

**C. Provost's Report – Zulma Toro absent**

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

On website

**E. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel on website**

**F. Graduate Council – Brian Berry on website**

**G. Wellness Coordinator – Karl Lenser**

New wellness coordinator – been here since Thanksgiving. I like working on this campus and am excited to bring some new health initiatives to you. Bottom line is to help you get fitter. Watch for weekly wellness tips; classes on weight loss; one on cardiac fitness; does one on one consultations with faculty and staff; will present in departments.

From Wisconsin – has degree in business, grad degree in exercise science: cold pushed him to Arkansas via Seattle; spent 12 years as business manager for Conway Regional

Med Center; then Hendrix for 9 years as wellness director. I am happy to be here now.  
This is my first faculty senate meeting!

#### IV. Old Business

None

#### V. New Business

- A. Motion FS\_2016\_5.** Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting) Identification on Assessment Data

Related to FS 2015 35

J Matson moves and reads:

No information identifying a student may be recorded in student teaching evaluations or programmatic assessment data, unless the student waives this requirement in writing. No information identifying the course instructor, including section information, may be recorded in programmatic assessment data, unless the course instructor waives this requirement in writing.

**Commentary:** In order to improve the honesty of evaluation, it is important to protect the anonymity of an evaluator in areas where the evaluator might feel that retaliation could ensue, especially if the evaluation is negative. Further, data collected for program improvement should be constructed differently than data collected for teaching evaluation. Misapplying these data in other venues will result in skewing the data itself and making it meaningless for either purpose.

The principles of blind data analysis have long been established in the sciences, in particular particle physics, where confirmation biases can skew conclusions toward preferred theories. Robert McCoun and Nobel prize winning physicist Saul Perlmutter have argued that these principles be applied to other venues of data collection and analysis, including the social sciences (Nature, 10/8/2015, v 526, 187-189).

The consequences of skewed programmatic assessment data, with the likely bias being “we’re doing just fine,” can lead to disastrous results for the institution which fails to correct curriculum when outcomes are not being achieved.

A Wright: 1:23

P Scranton: How will that be managed when few students

A Wright: info is not easily

N Jovanovich: The chancellor seems to have misunderstood the intention of the legislation and this fix doesn’t fix the issue. Prevent people from being scared to report true results and not have it held against you. This does not go to that, the original purpose.

BBK There is a privacy issue which we were going to deal with that at the next core council. It is different and program eval can’t be done

E Anson: what he said is it can be used in evaluation. This allows wrong use of results. If we claim personal benefit then it can be used against you.

A Boles if you insert exactly what is meant by assessment, would that help?

J Matson: reads JA's letter about FS-2015-35: Then states that the specific wording in the legislation is 'the results of program assessment will not be used in P&T.'

A Wright: recognizes Senator Flinn.

J Flinn: there is a misunderstanding – I think we should write in that you do have to participate in program evaluation - .

[several people talking at once, then a comment by Flinn]

A Wright: then on the amendment

N Jovanich: Someone on the executive committee must have thought that a student or faculty member might waive the requirement. In the case of research, there might be a need for someone to sign a release. That language allows for research to be done through the IRB and have waivers possible.

E Anson: That would be a private decision made outside jurisdiction of the senate and the university. I believe this says the university cannot. 34:45

A Wright: You would have to collect the data separately.

E Anson: agrees

J Flinn: worried about pressure to sign a waiver. 35:41

A Wright: Any further discussion regarding the motion to strike the two statements waiving the protection?

Call for vote - motion carries

Back to the motion itself 36:26

A Wright: I remember there were concerns about the term programmatic assessment. So we want to amend this to clarify?

J Hendon: I thought we defined programmatic assessment

A Wright: At no point did definitions get added into the process.

BBlevins-Knabe: If evidence based changes from programmatic assessment...

A Wright: The term is programmatic assessment is the problem. The senate sent it to core council and asked what exactly that meant? [further observation that I cannot understand].

BBK: We [core council] did talk about it with the senate and they seemed to be happy about it. I believe that is why we put in the 'evidence based' changes and so on. We have attempted to address it – we did not ignore it.

AW: Yes the core council addressed it – I was addressing Senator Henson's comment.

P Scranton: Is the term 'program assessment' better? Is 'programmatic' the problem? 38:56

P Tschumi: What about 'student outcome based assessment' – would that be better?

J Hendon: I still think that definition of program assessment or programmatic is essential. We must make it clear what we are doing. We do not want to be a university that doesn't assess itself. 39:55

P Scranton: Program assessment is different from SLO assessment, so we could refer to both? 40:30

N Jovanovich: It is the student performance data that we do not want connected to faculty performance. SKIM is aimed at outcomes based assessment, which is what our accreditors require. Programmatic Student outcomes assessment or programmatic assessment of student performance or something like that to make it more clear.

AW: We need some work on wording of an amendment – can someone come up with some language?

K Leonard: Can we go with program and student outcome instead of programmatic -- there are two things, program assessment and student outcomes. 42:25

J Flinn: I like what you originally said – do you remember what you said?

J Matson: We want to delink student performance from faculty performance – but I am uncomfortable with trying to write this language in this manner. We must be cautious and practice careful deliberation in the writing of legislation. I am not clear on what wording we are working on – this motion or the original motion.

N Jovanovich: If we had language in original

JM: I suggest we withdraw and deal with it later.

B Blevins-Knabe: What might be a helpful step forward: bring back old legislation + privacy legislation which is also important, and do it all together. Is that possible?

P Tschumi: So send back to core council for wording?

BBK: can we do that?

AW: Right now it is an executive comm motion. If we were to refer it or postpone it, it would come back to the exec comm.

BBK: I believe both pieces of legislation are important. What is the best way to get it back out there?

J Hendon: would like to move it go back for negotiations with chancellor.

E Anson: I want to make sure is that what we did here is part of the these proposed negotiations. Let's don't lose the work we have done today.

AWright: J Hendon could make a motion to refer it to committee (core council) for re-introduction to senate If you refer 5 & 6 to core council to address these issues and bring back to the senate.

JMatson: Should contain that the core council should look at both versions and and the chancellor's veto and make sure objective is evaluation of faculty performance is decoupled from evaluation of student performance.

E Anson: Remove line that says programmatic assessment if you are going to try to get faculty assessed positively and tell others you can't -- if it is part of service requirement putting assessment in these other areas is dangerous. It could amount to annual assessment of faculty.

J Matson moves: refer 2016-5&6 as amended to core council to discuss in conjunction with the original legislation passed by the senate and vetoed by the chancellor, keeping in mind E Anson's objection and N Jovanovich wording of ultimate goal of disconnecting the assessment of faculty from the evaluation of students

PT: schumi seconds

AW: Motion carries

- B. Motion FS\_2016\_6.** Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required) Modify Annual Review to include programmatic assessment

**Whereas** the assessment of student learning outcomes begins with the educational goals of the core, and

**Whereas** assessment of the core is a faculty-led, faculty-driven process for the benefit of achieving UALR's educational mission, and

**Whereas** any single measure of student learning should be part of a larger holistic assessment plan, and

**Whereas** cooperation between administration, faculty, and staff is expected, and

**Whereas** participation in assessment is a critical component of university service,

**Therefore** be it resolved that section B. 1, second paragraph, of the Annual Review policy, passed on 4/20/1990, be modified as follows:

Teaching is defined in terms of providing for student learning in a variety of ways, including, **but not limited to**, classroom or clinical instruction; team teaching; supervision of independent study or research; thesis or dissertation supervision; multi-disciplinary teaching activities; student advisement; course preparation; curriculum design **and** development, **evidence-based changes from programmatic assessment, and** use of creative teaching strategies and technologies **etc.** Evidence used to evaluate teaching generally includes student evaluations, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and other materials.

**And be it further resolved that** section B.3 of the Annual Review policy, passed on 4/20/1990, be modified as follows:

Service shall be evaluated in terms of service to the public, the university, or the profession and may include activities such as discipline-related community service, work on college or university committees, department service, administrative service, recruitment, **programmatic**

**assessment**, in-service education, working with professional organizations, and participation in professional meetings. The University has identified public service as an important objective.

**Commentary:** Programmatic assessment has become an increasing load in many faculty members' work. Any part of a faculty member's work, any expectation or responsibility, should be subject to evaluation. If the faculty member performs creditably in these tasks, then it should be counted towards rewarding him/her.

- C. **Motion FS\_2016\_7.** Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires three-fifths vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required) To modify the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate to restrict eligibility on Faculty Senate committees

J Matson moves and reads:

**Be it resolved** that Article III: Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock be modified (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion),

**Faculty Eligibility for Service on Faculty Senate Councils and Committees:** Faculty service on elected and appointed standing councils and committees of the Faculty Senate shall be limited to those members of the faculty who are eligible to serve on the Faculty Senate. ~~have both voice and vote in the UALR Assembly.~~

**Commentary:** Under the current language, deans, directors, vice chancellors, and other 100% administrators may serve on Faculty Senate committees. The new language would restrict to administrators with 50% or less administrative appointment. This part of eligibility only applies to faculty representatives. Student, staff, and administrative (ex officio) positions on Faculty Senate committees are not affected.

A Wright: Discussion? No discussion: calls vote Motion carries

- D. **Motion FS\_2016\_8.** Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at two Faculty Senate meetings, first vote, no second required) Membership of the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee

JM moves and reads

**Be it resolved** that Article III: Appointed Committees (Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee) of the Faculty Senate of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock be modified (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion),

The committee shall consist of ~~ten~~ one full time faculty members from each college/school represented in the Faculty Senate, including the Ottenheimer Library and excluding the Bowen School of Law, to be appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly, two student members appointed by the Student Government Association, and, as ex officio without vote, the administrative officer in charge (or designee) of the Office of Transfer Student Services, University College/~~academic advising,~~ and the Office of Testing services, and, as ex officio with vote, the Director of Admissions (or designee) and the Registrar (or

designee). The Director of Admissions's designee shall coordinate the processing of materials for the committee. serve as Coordinator for the Admissions Committee proceedings. The ~~ten~~ faculty members shall serve two year staggered terms ~~and there shall be a minimum of one faculty member from each College, except the Bowen School of Law, and a maximum of three faculty members from any one College. All members of the Committee are voting members.~~ All other members shall serve a one year term.

**And Be it Resolved** that the committee will be reformed immediately and the terms of committee members will be staggered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

**And Be it Resolved** that the President of the Faculty Senate will call an organizational meeting for purpose of electing a chair before the end of the Spring 2016 semester.

**Commentary:** The committee is too large to function effectively. The faculty membership restrictions can make it difficult for the Committee on Committees to assign the committee in one meeting. Bringing the number of faculty members and their method of representation into line with the method used for most of the other appointed committees resolves this issue. Once the number of faculty members becomes smaller, the ex officio representation needs to be adjusted so that faculty maintain a majority of the committee.

Changing from Admissions's to Admissions' was necessitated by a review of current style. The President of Faculty Senate's style manual was deemed by a majority of the executive committee to be out-of-date.

The section about being "Coordinator of the Admissions Committee proceedings" was confusing. Does this mean the Director of Admissions is chairing the committee? Although practice has made it clear that this is not the case and the Senate by-laws require committees to be chaired by a faculty member, the ambiguity in the language in the committee description needed to be fixed.

Since the new committee needs to be empaneled to function for summer 2016 and since the faculty membership will reduce, it is important that these changes be instituted before adjourning for the academic year.

J Matson: We are trying to make it a more effective committee and clarify the roles of the administrators.

A Wright: Is there discussion? There being none [calls vote]. Motion carries: We will vote again next meeting.

[Go to minute 55:50 on the MP3]

E. Motion FS\_2016\_9. Joanne Matson on behalf of the Ad Hoc Skills in Major Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, second required) Implementation of Skills in Major legislation

AWright: introduces 9 &10; we can't pass 9&10 and therefore, we have to take some procedural actions.

J Matson moves

Whereas the Faculty Senate approved a Skills in the Major requirement for programs as part of the Baccalaureate Degree Requirement legislation passed March 15, 2013, and modified by Legislation FS 2014\_19 and FS 2014\_30; and

Whereas the Skills in the Major legislation, as modified, provided that,

Except in majors that must adhere to standards established by disciplinary accrediting agencies, major requirements must include courses or coursework either in or outside the department in

- Oral and written communication in the discipline
- Research methods, ethics, and critical thinking
- Technology;

And Whereas the Skills in the Major legislation must be implemented by Fall 2016 (FS 2014\_30); and

Whereas departments are the ones best suited to determine the specifics of their curricula; and

Whereas the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) (see <https://www.hlcommission.org/>), which will next review UALR during 2019-2020, states, "The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs" (Criterion for Accreditation 4.2.2);

Therefore be it resolved that the Skills in the Major (SKIM) portion of the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements legislation shall be implemented in the following manner:

1. The ad hoc Skills in the Major Committee (hereafter, the Committee) shall be re-sponsible for implementing the requirement.
  
2. The Committee shall consist of 12 members: 1 member each elected by the College of Business, the College of Education & Health Professions, and the College of Engineering & Information Technology; 2 members each elected by the College of Arts, Letters, & Sciences and the College of Social Science & Communications (the rationale for this being that 20 out of 25 of the affected programs lie within these two colleges); and 5 members appointed by the Faculty Senate President with expertise in the skills represented in the requirement. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs and Institutional Improvement shall serve ex officio without vote. Members shall serve a 2-year term starting Fall 2016.
  
3. The Committee shall function through May 2018, at which time its responsibilities shall be transferred to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies.
  
4. To implement the requirement, the Committee shall request information from the departments covered under the legislation (i.e., bachelor's programs that are not subject to a disciplinary accrediting agency), first, about the current state of instruction in the SKIM areas; then later about the evidence they're collecting regarding student learning in the areas as well as about curricular changes they are considering relevant to SKIM. (See Attachment for the programs that are covered as of January 2016.) Additionally the Committee shall develop a plan for including information about SKIM in the Undergraduate Catalog.
  
5. In reviewing these documents, the Committee's role shall be to determine whether departments are meeting the requirement, not to evaluate how they are doing so. The Committee shall also be asked to identify trends and to assist in providing resources for faculty through a centralized website or Blackboard shell, workshops, and/or meetings. The Committee shall report its findings to the Faculty Senate.
  
6. The Committee shall establish an implementation schedule. In order to eliminate duplication of effort and reduce faculty workload, every effort shall be made to co-ordinate this schedule with schedules set by Core Council, by any of the colleges, or by the university as a whole.

7. The Committee shall propose a long-term schedule so that by 2019-20, the year of the HLC accreditation report and visit, sufficient meaningful data will have been reported and analyzed so the University can identify where it stands with respect to its SKIM goals. The expectation is that by that time, all affected programs will have meaningful data to report regarding at least one of the SKIM areas.

A Wright: To be fair and effective, each senator will have a chance to speak, then will not be recognized again until everyone else who wants to speak has had a chance. Try to say everything you want to say because you may not get a chance to speak again. I recognize J Matson, who has comments to make on the motions and then will introduce them.

57:15

J Matson: I want to say 4 things. First. There has been a lot of discussion, which was done purposefully so that all may have a voice. As a result of the discussions, we've made changes in the legislation. Note for example Item 4 at the end: We added wording recommended by Senator Jovanovich about including information about SKIM in the undergraduate catalog.

Second, we have not, however, changed the underlying philosophy of the legislation. Currently departments are being asked to submit many reports. The underlying philosophy is to promote discussion about learning. We would like to hark back to a time of curriculum development and change that involved people and departments talking to each other about the curriculum and what it means. The underlying value in the implementation is to create opportunities for faculty to communicate with each other both within their departments and across the university.

That is why we have Item 5 written this way:

In reviewing these documents, the Committee's role shall be to determine whether departments are meeting the requirement, not to evaluate how they are doing so. The Committee shall also be asked to identify trends and to assist in providing resources for faculty through a centralized website or Blackboard shell, workshops, and/or meetings. The Committee shall report its findings to the Faculty Senate.

Third point. A major concern that has been expressed is that this committee is trying to tell the faculty what it is supposed to do. We need to make as clear as possible that what they decide to do in a department is up to the faculty.

The full statement of number 4 says that:

To implement the requirement, the Committee shall request information from the departments covered under the legislation (i.e., bachelor's programs that are not subject to a disciplinary accrediting agency), first, about the current state of instruction in the SKIM areas; then later about

the evidence they're collecting regarding student learning in the areas as well as about curricular changes they are considering relevant to SKIM.

There are schools all over the US who have writing across the curriculum or critical thinking or technology across the curriculum, and there is a committee that specifies exactly what must be in the course to meet this requirement. That is not what this committee will do: What we are saying is we want to facilitate communication among ourselves about what each of us is doing to meet these goals.

Fourth point. The other major objection people have had has to do with assessment. Earlier versions of this document had a stronger emphasis on assessment. This latest version has moved away from most of the assessment language.

Senator Anson has made a motion that we should implement SKIM by submitting assessment reports that address the SKIM requirements. Originally I was thinking that sort of recommendation should be included in the legislation. But in talking with faculty and administrators across campus I found that, in addition to a lot of anxiety about assessment, there was no clear assessment requirement going on at this moment, and we as an institution are in transition about our approach to assessment. Earlier versions of the legislation tied the development of the curriculum to college assessment committees or to university assessment committees. As a result of discussions, I determined this was not something the Faculty Senate had authority to do. That language was taken out and instead we have item 6:

The Committee shall establish an implementation schedule. In order to eliminate duplication of effort and reduce faculty workload, every effort shall be made to co-ordinate this schedule with schedules set by Core Council, by any of the colleges, or by the university as a whole.

We know that people are submitting many different reports and we are not trying to introduce another report. [1:06:15] This is why we have item 7, which requires the committee to phase in the implementation:

The Committee shall propose a long-term schedule so that by 2019-20, the year of the HLC accreditation report and visit, sufficient meaningful data will have been reported and analyzed so the University can identify where it stands with respect to its SKIM goals. The expectation is that by that time, all affected programs will have meaningful data to report regarding at least one of the SKIM areas.

The SKIM committee is proposing we have a long term process that starts by first doing an inventory of where we are and then gradually developing a more robust program.

So here are the 4 points:

1. We have made changes through the discussion process.
2. Our underlying value is to provide opportunities for faculty to communicate with each other
3. We are not telling individual departments what to do

4. We have pulled back from the assessment component and stretched the process out into reasonable plan that will meet HLC expectations without overburdening faculty.

J Flinn: Seconds

E Anson: If all of this is to be dependent upon the departments, [reads a phrase from the motion] I would never argue with that -- then why do you need a committee to do this? I trust faculty to do this part of the SKIM items [cites a Whereas in the motion]. Let the departments determine what they can do as far as assessment and trust them to do it. As to communicating the various ways it is being done or how it is being done, there must be a way without coercion. I find it strange that assessment is no longer part of this. There are many volunteer ways the faculty can communicate on assessment. I think the last thing we need is another assessment committee and that is what I see is happening here. Assessment is becoming more important than education. That is what killed the high schools – I don't want that to happen here. We should trust the departments to do their assessment and to report on it. My view is administration wants to be able to check boxes. This is in response to the argument that if we don't do it, they will do it for us.

G Jensen: I want to make a statement that is an expression of concern about preparing for our university-wide accreditation visit in 2019. I think this legislation probably relates to that. We have an assessment coming up in 2019, and it is my understanding that accreditation will require multiple years of data collection. We must get organized quickly. I'm not sure what the general expectations are going to be, but – my understanding is there is movement away from silos of departmental assessment toward more global assessment like assessment of the core and assessment of the entire undergraduate degree. We should be moving toward collection of assessment data.

N Jovanovich: I have read the HLC requirements. My understanding is that we must do assessment of gen ed and program level reviews that include program student outcomes based assessment also; those are the two things we need to do. If we do that, we should be good for HLC.

J Giammo: [cannot understand beginning] It is not going to be easy to do general assessment. It needs to be on department level looking at student outcomes. Leary of adding another process. This really *is* about assessment. We are trying to do too much...the problem is we are wearing ourselves thin and likely to get less quality--doing it as an exercise rather than meaningful assessment.

J Flinn: One of the things that struck me positively about going back to what we did in earlier years is the idea of setting up opportunities for sharing ideas. I was one of those during the earlier era in the 80s and 90s. From those experiences I realized that Yes, I can look at writing in my discipline, but I will get so much more by talking to faculty from other disciplines. What I like about this proposal is I see it as a mechanism for sharing ideas to gain new perspectives.

M Crow: Speaking on behalf of a program that is accredited, I can say that program assessment is evolving. I serve on assessment committees and see the variation in how assessment is done in different departments. I see this SKIM legislation as a plan to help us get ready for the accreditation in a

couple of years. We may not be ready if some departments are not keeping up with best practices. That's why I'm reluctant to go along with Ed's point. We will not be prepared for HLC accreditation if we do not provide some of these departments with more help in developing best practices in assessment.

J Matson: I want to reiterate that what the committee is being asked to do is to facilitate conversation and discussion about the requirements. At this point, the university-wide assessment plan is so unstable it is not possible to say within this legislation that the Skills in the Major should be part of ongoing assessment work. I am hoping that within a couple years there will be more clarity about the university's approach to assessment.

Why do we need a committee? Right now we have 25 programs covered under the legislation, and all of them could certainly do what faculty do—come up with a good way to teach and later assess writing, communication, technology, ethics, research. However, then we would have 25 different approaches with no common language, no common way of talking about it. either with our students or our stakeholders, which include the HLC. The purpose of a committee is to allow for shared understanding and communication.

J Hendon: I understand the reluctance to add a committee – unfortunately the alternate motion [by Senator Anson] is missing some things you are going to find necessary. Having been subject to some form of assessment for forty years, I've seen that some departments will not change without outside pressure. I think that's unfortunate. The issue with the [other] motion is that there is a lack of detail in it needed to carry forward to HLC and have them come away with a clear picture of how we assess our programs.

D Rurup: Are we looking for a universal data-collection template that could be tailored to each department? Have we looked at other universities? Perhaps an umbrella/template that departments could modify? Then we hold people accountable? Is that what we're looking for?

JM: No we are not looking for standardized assessment. 1:22:15

DR: There are ways to have a standard template or model so that all programs collect the required data, but do it in a way that is modified and tweak to your discipline. I've seen this in Nursing. Would this be helpful?

JM: I do think there needs to be a shared language.

M Douglas: We should be considering a compromise between these two motions. I'm one of the programs that is accredited. But our accrediting bodies require reports that document our assessment. Is it not appropriate for those departments who are not accredited to show how they are meeting SKIM requirements?

1:24:15 A Wright: It would have to be part of the program. In some sense these are general education requirements, and they will have to be part of the major.

MD: Then I think that is where it needs to be. We should include the assessment in our major assessment reports. The reports should add, “How is your program meeting the SKIM requirement?”

A Boles: Regarding Item 4: Is there anything in the legislation requiring departments to notify/inform students about SKIM requirements? I am concerned about making it easy for students to meet the SKIM requirements. 1:25:59

A Wright: There is nothing in the legislation that is that specific.

AB: So how is the student to know? How will undergraduates meet the requirement?

J Matson: the requirement is not on the student, it is on the major. Students do not have to make sure they have taken a writing course or a technology course. Rather the major has to make sure it's included. It is a different and creative way of an “across the curriculum” mandate, and it is very appropriate for us as a transfer-heavy institution since if it were a student requirement, then there would be this problem for transfer students of having to take all these different courses after transferring. This way, the department makes sure it's in the major for all students and that students have learned those things by the time they graduate.

A Boles: The last sentence in Item 4: what purpose is that? Just notification?

JM: [reads a section of the motion] Yes, it's part of us trying to be transparent as to what we, the university, have said (at least in our original legislation): that all our graduates will be able to write and speak and do research, think ethically, etc.

B Blevins-Knabe: SKIM says faculty looks at these things as a whole. What we are really saying is let's look at the student as a whole. What can the students in our majors do once they've graduated? I don't think this consideration should be relegated to assessment reports. Right now I'm not really sure what's going on with those reports. As a faculty member I don't even see them. I don't know if someone is looking at them. We're not at the point in our institution where we can start assessing these things [the SKIM goals]. There is a lot of preliminary work that needs to be done on the curriculum to lay the groundwork for assessment so we can move toward the accreditation visit, and that work needs to be done by faculty. We need to get on with it. This is a minor first step. But we need to do it.

C Law: In Music we are accredited and just went through visit. NASM has specific standards for degrees and these standards have to be met. We just went through this a few years ago. They have standards for each of the degrees. They came to campus and reviewed things minutely and compared other schools are we meeting guidelines? We look at our courses aligned with other universities. It allowed us to collect data that we can use. Are the classes helping? We can use data to develop programs, develop faculty, how can we use tools to do better? We can use this data to improve our programs.

J Ecke: At the risk of complicating this, I wanted to add some background on the work that came out of BDRC, the previous version of the SKIM committee: The language in the original legislation is “Coursework in or outside the department.” This is relevant because the requirement may not neces-

sarily be met by a course in the department. It could be met from another course in another discipline or an interdisciplinary course. There are interdisciplinary courses that could evolve and that SKIM could tap into across the curriculum with coordination and communication. This is an argument for having a committee that provides opportunities for cross-discussion.

E Anson: Neither of those proposals is precluded. If a department wants to go to an interdisciplinary course, that is their decision.

J E: With either legislation, I advise that we keep in mind what students may do.

N Jovanovich: Original legislation specifies [reads original legislation]. It seems to me that all that is needed is that for each of the programs in the list at the end of the agenda, that each program needs to provide a table listing SKIM skills and the courses are in the department that cover that. That is all that needs to be done here.

K Layton: It is not enough to say that a course exists: You have to show they have been effective and you have to show that with data. You also have to show you have made changes to your programs on the basis of data. And, you need a driver to be sure that happens. You don't want to just leave it up to everybody individually. I also don't want another committee, but it is important that there is a driver to make it happen. It's more than checking a box. After eight years of SACs accreditation in Georgia, I know there has to be a driver to make it happen.

NJ: I was not talking about accreditation or assessment at all. I was talking about the SKIM legislation as it exists. All that has been passed in the Senate is that the department must show it addresses the issues; majors have to have courses that address the SKIM. That is all the legislation does. A simple table is sufficient. Is that enough to get accreditation? Is that assessment? No. But we don't have to do assessment of SKIM skills for HLC. We have to assess core and programs for HLC – we don't have to add a third assessment of SKIM skills. But we are going to have to do some kind of evidence-based assessment of core and programs for HLC. To implement this legislation we just have to show what courses meet SKIM. Other than that we are going way beyond the legislation. Even Ed Anson's motion goes way beyond our original legislation.

E Anson: So we have a compromise!

A Wright: I have to say this: Senator Anson has found himself at the middle ground.

P Tschumi: It is true that we would meet the letter of the legislation by adding a table. The problem is that when HLC looks at our curriculum and at individual programs, they are expecting that programs do what we have said they need to do, which is basically the SKIM. Therefore we would have to assess SKIM in their program. The legislation leads us in the direction of accomplishing accreditation. It's backed off from assessment, but it gives us steps toward a common language so that we can talk with HLC in a way that communicates our programs have done what they needed to do.

J Ecke: Is there a way that programs that have responded more vigorously will make the other departments look worse in comparison? Unless there is some larger group that looks at how all departments are responding how will we look to HLC.

J Giammo: This discussion is much different than the language that is stated in the motion. The committee asks are you meeting requirements, not how we are doing it. If the goal is to have something more than that, I don't think the language is doing that. It makes it sound there is just a checking of the box. [difficult to understand.]

N Jovanovich: It would be helpful if we knew who was responsible for planning and preparing for the HLC visit. What faculty are involved in the planning and preparing for the visit? We could get some expert opinion for the Senate. What do we need to know? We need expert council to get ready. We have some expertise on campus that will tell us what HLC require. 1:44:30

J Matson: I want to pick up on what Pete said. No, of course HLC does not say we must evaluate SKIM skills. However, we have said that all majors will teach these skills – therefore, a major's assessment must include these things. The Senate could choose to eliminate the requirement. But unless it does, a major assessment will have to include it for HLC.

I want to respond to what Joe has said. We are not saying the committee will judge and tell departments what to do. We are strongly trying to say that the departments must develop their own way to teach and later assess these things. But like Kent said, there must be a driver. There needs to be someone who is going to say, "This is what we're going to talk about." There must be some way to hold people accountable. There is no way to get around that.

But there is the second component to the legislation, which is to facilitate discussion and allow for cross-fertilization such as what Jeremy suggested.

J Henson: [Reads HLC standards] -- "Courses are current, appropriate. . . 2. The university assesses its learning goals. 3. Learning goals are consistent across all elements of the university." This means HLC will check across all means and modes of delivery. We must be prepared to meet that standard. The entity that goes through the process will have to be able to show how we meet the standard, all of us. Without an entity to drive the process, that is going to be very difficult.

M Douglas: Is there a motion on the floor?

AWright: Yes we do – the first question is on the floor. We must vote between 2016-9 and 2016-10.

C Macheak: I would like to request that the library be included in the committee.

A W/JM: This is a friendly amendment and will be so.

B Blevins-Knabe: Calls question

Call carries

AW: calls vote. Motion carries

F. Motion FS\_2016\_10. Ed Anson, senator (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, second required) Implementation of Skills in Major legislation

Whereas the Faculty Senate wishes to remind those departments not subject to accrediting agencies that as part of the new core requirements passed by the Senate their programs must include the following skills: oral and written communication, research methods, ethics, critical thinking, and technology, appropriate to the discipline.

Therefore be it resolved that Departments not subject to accrediting agencies need to include assessment of these skills (oral and written communication, research methods, ethics, critical thinking, and technology) in their program assessment.

VI. Open Forum

VII. Adjourned 2:54

Attachment: Programs Covered Under the Legislation – as of January 2016

Arts, Letters, and Sciences

Biology	BS
English	BA
Environmental Health Sci.	BS
History	BA
Interdisciplinary St.	BA
Mathematics	BA
Mathematics	BS
Philosophy	BA
Physics	BA
Physics	BS

Business and Administration

Education and Health Professions

Communication Sciences & Disorders	BS	MS is accredited, but not BS
Health, Human Perf., and Sports Management	BS	

Engineering and Information Technology

E-commerce	BS	Benton program; through Info. Science Dept Information Assurance program in Computer Science
Professional Studies	BPS	
Web Design & Development	BA	Info. Science Dept.

Social Sciences and Communications

Anthropology	BA	
Applied Science	BAS	Deans Office completer, 2+2 program
Criminal Justice	BA	
International Studies	BA	
Mass Communication	BA	
Political Science	BA	
Prof. & Technical Writing	BA	
Psychology	BA	

Sociology  
Speech Communication

BA  
BA