



Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Friday, February 17, 2017

1:00 PM until adjournment

DSC B&C

I. Welcome and Roll Call

II. Review of Minutes

III. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

IV. Announcements

V. Reports

A. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson

B. Provost's Report – Deborah Baldwin

C. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

D. Graduate Council – Brian Berry

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

VI. Old Business

none

VII. New Business

A. Motion FS_2017_2. Executive Committee. (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Update to Class Schedule

Be it resolved to replace the class times legislation from 2/10/1971,
with the following policy,

In order to facilitate usage of class rooms and allow students to create meaningful schedules, all classes that use class rooms on the University of Arkansas at Little Rock main campus must adhere to the defined class blocks. Classes which do not use class rooms on the main campus may develop start times and class blocks that suit their clientele.

Classes must be scheduled to start at the start time, but may end any time before the end of the class block and may use any of the days in the class block. Any class in which a portion of the class will extend across multiple class blocks requires approval of the Registrar.

Class Blocks

The start times for MWF morning classes shall be 8:00, 9:00, 10:00, and 11:00. The class block shall be 50 minutes long.

The start times for MWF afternoon classes shall be 12:15, 1:40, 3:05, and 4:30. The class block shall be 75 minutes long.

The start times for MW evening classes and TR evening classes shall be 6, 7:25, 8:50. The class block shall be 75 minutes long.

The start times for TR classes shall be 8:00, 9:25, 10:50, 12:15, 1:40, 3:05, and 4:30. The class block shall be 75 minutes long.

The start times for M, W, T, R evening classes shall be 4:30, 6, 7:25. The class block shall be 160 minutes long.

And be it further resolved to implement these changes in the Spring 2018 semester.

Commentary: The campus has not followed the 2/10/1971 legislation for decades. This motion brings the legislation in line with current practice.

The MW and MWF afternoon classes have many overlaps, so that students who take a class in the MWF block may not be able to take a subsequent class in the MW block. By aligning start times with the MW and MWF classes, one available MWF period is lost, but the ability to make schedules is improved for the students.

This policy would not change the current practice of scheduling 50 minute MWF classes in the afternoon or scheduling 75 minute MW classes in the afternoon. So, a 3 hour lecture course could be scheduled MWF 1:40-2:30 into a 50 minute period within the 75 minute block or it could be scheduled MW 1:40-2:55 in a 75 minute period.

The MWF afternoon block has the added advantage that classes with more than 3 contact hours can be scheduled without interfering with other class blocks.

B. Motion FS_2017_3. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, no second required) Transfer of Authority over Core Student Outcomes

Be it resolved to change the method of modifying the learning outcomes defined in

- FS_2013_7 (mathematics curricular area),
- FS_2013_8 (communication – written curricular area),
- FS_2013_11 (social sciences curricular area),
- FS_2013_12 (fine arts curricular area),
- FS_2013_13 (communication – speech curricular area),
- FS_2013_16 (science curricular area),
- FS_2013_17 (humanities curricular area),
- FS_2013_18 (history of civilization curricular area),
- FS_2013_19 (US traditions curricular area), and
- FS_2015_1 (interdisciplinary studies curricular area)

from an item of business of the Faculty Senate to an item overseen by the Council of Core Curriculum and Policies.

Commentary: When the core was revised in 2013 the Faculty Senate approved the educational goals and learning outcomes for each curricular area listed in the motion. Now the assessment process is underway. In order to make the process more responsive to changes from the faculty the Core Council is requesting authority to make changes to learning outcomes. This would require that the Core Council have authority for all changes that occur below the level of educational goal.

C. Motion FS_2017_4. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, no second required) Program Assessment in Annual Review and P&T (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion)

Whereas program assessment serves to provide information about the quality of academic programs in order to guide curricular modifications and program innovation;

Whereas program assessment is not designed to judge individual students, courses or faculty;

Whereas program assessment data collected from any particular course reflects student outcomes of learning experiences from across courses, faculty, curricular and extra-curricular areas;

Whereas program assessment data collected from any particular course does not adequately reflect the student achievement of course learning outcomes;

Therefore Be it resolved to modify the Annual Review Policy (Faculty Senate legislation passed 4/20/1990)

Section B. 1. Annual evaluation of Teaching:

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, **and implementation, including pedagogical and curricular innovations motivated by formal programmatic assessment processes, and** use of creative teaching strategies and technologies, **etc.** Evidence used to evaluate teaching generally includes student evaluations, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, **program and curricular development**, and other materials.

The programmatic learning-outcomes data submitted by an individual faculty as part of programmatic assessment shall not be used in the annual reviews of teaching for an individual faculty.

And Be it further resolved to modify the Annual Review Policy (Faculty Senate legislation passed 4/20/1990)

Section B.3. Annual evaluation for Service

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

While faculty are required to participate in programmatic assessment when requested, the data collected from an individual faculty member shall not be used in the annual reviews of service for that person.

And Be it Further Resolved to modify the Tenure and Promotion Policy (403.15)
Section 1.c. Service

Examples of such service include, but are not limited to, membership and leadership of unit committees or task forces; advising student organizations; involvement in faculty governance; coordination of programs, labs, and technical support; **participation in and responsiveness to programmatic assessment**; and recruitment.

And Be it Further Resolved to modify the Tenure and Promotion Policy (403.15)
Section 2. Policies for Promotion and Tenure

Decisions on promotion and tenure shall not be based on lifestyle, political affiliations, or religious convictions.

The programmatic learning-outcomes data submitted by an individual faculty to support programmatic assessment shall not be used in promotion and tenure of that faculty; however, refusing to participate or respond to decisions based on programmatic assessment could be considered.

D. Motion FS_2016_34. Senator Barrio-Vilar. (Recommendation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, second required) Regarding House Bill 1249 Concerning the Possession of a Concealed Handgun in a Public University, Public College or Community College Building.

Whereas ample evidence shows that there is no public safety justification for forcing Arkansas colleges to allow guns;

Whereas concealed weapons on campus would place unnecessary burdens on campus police;

Whereas all Arkansas university boards of trustees, presidents, and chiefs of campus police oppose this legislation;

Whereas states that have passed similar legislation have faced lawsuits and difficulties with faculty retention;

Therefore, be it Resolved, that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock

1. urges the Governor and members of the Arkansas State Legislature to respect the public safety decisions of the colleges in the state; and
2. joins with colleges, campus police, and faculty across the state in rejecting proposals to force colleges to allow guns on campus.

Commentary: This recommendation has the same wording used for a recent recommendation passed at Henderson State University. UA Fayetteville faculty senate also approved a recommendation in 2015, which they affirmed in December 2016.

A brief bibliography with easily accessible research resources, prepared by Angela Hunter:

1. Webster, Daniel (et al). "Firearms on College Campuses: Research Evidence and Policy Implications." A Report for Johns Hopkins Center for Gun Policy and Research, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health (2015). Accessible here: http://www.jhsph.edu/research/centers-and-institutes/johns-hopkins-center-for-gun-policy-and-research/_pdfs/GunsOnCampus.pdf
2. CD Phillips (et al): "Concealed Handgun Licensing and Crime in Four States." Journal of Criminology. 2015. Open access here: <https://www.hindawi.com/archive/2015/803742/>
3. Vince, Joseph (et al): "Firearms Training and Self-Defense: Does the Quality and Frequency of Training Determine the Realistic Use of Firearms for Self Defense? Facts and Evidence for Public Policy Considerations." A Report Prepared for NGVAC. 2015. Accessible here: http://www.gunvictimsaction.org/downloads22/FirearmsTrainings%20_StudyDocument_F_062115.pdf
4. Alschuler, Albert W. "Two Guns, Four Guns, Six Guns, More Guns: Does Arming the Public Reduce Crime?" Valparaiso University Law Review, Vol. 31, No. 2 (1997). [a response to some commonly-cited research from the 90s]

A brief overview of some of the research regarding campus
ry: <https://www.thetrace.org/2015/11/campus-carry-self-defense-accidental-shootings-research/>

Testimony was given by chancellors/heads of state campuses and by Dr. Bobbit (UA system president) and UA Fayetteville Director of University Police Gahagans against HB 1249 at the House Judiciary Committee meeting on 1/31/17 as well as in the recent past on previous iterations of this bill (e.g., Chancellor Joel Anderson in 2015).

VIII. Open Forum

IX. Adjourn