UA LITTLE ROCK

FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Friday, February 17, 2017
1:00 PM until adjournment
DSC B&C

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Present: **CALS**— Cheatham, LeGrand, Douglas, Thibeault, Street, Smith, Barrio-Vilar, Warner, Cates, Kyong-McClain, Law. **CB**— Leonard. **CEHP**— Carmack, Vander Putten, Finley, Evans, Stieve, Otters, Grover. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Blevins-Knabe, Lopez, Matson, Craw, Golden**.** **CEIT**— Tramel, Jovanovic, Sandgren, Berleant, Deangelis. **LAW**—Entrikin. **LIBRARY**— Macheak. **EXOFFICIO** - Rogerson, Wright, Anson, Baldwin, Nolen, L McClellan.

Absent: **CALS**— **CB**—Hendon, Farewell. **CEHP**— Oltmans, Prince, Crass,. **CSSC**—Scranton. **CEIT** — McMillan,. **LAW**— Fitzhugh, Boles. **LIBRARY**—. **EXOFFICIO**— Donovan

II. Review of Minutes accepted January 20 2017
III. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

J Tramel: form a military support team to support veterans here at the university

N Jovanovich: multiple terms and parts of term which are resulting in uneven loads for some students. Do we need a student load policy?

J Flinn: students dropped may still attend their classes

P Tschumi: Re: judicial policy. the three parts were distributed separately for the work to be done so that by April 17 the final policy could be reviewed by faculty senate. The process has not moved forward and someone needs to take it up and move it forward.

IV. Announcements - none

V. Reports

A. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson

·   Fall 2017 enrollment numbers are ahead of 2016 numbers at the same time last year, for freshmen. We are currently looking at 1,351 that are accepted and 65 of those are from Dallas Texas. We are seeing an increase coming from this region and it is following the trend at UA Fayetteville. Same point last year we were at 900.

·   The VC of Student affairs posting has closed and we have 41 applications submitted.

·   UA Little Rock Benton campus. Will begin offering three degrees from this location in the next year I think, it may be a Fall 2018 start date, there was some confusion on my part regarding the date. First three will be Sociology, Business Admin, and Interprofessional Studies.

·   UA- Pulaski Tech is now officially part of the UA System. UA- Little Rock is actively working on a strategy to make them a feeder program.

·   Provost's Report – Deborah Baldwin

Announced that Dr. D. Rice will be joining the Provost office staff on an interim basis that will expire in June 2017.

T&P notices out about June 2017

    B. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel on website

    C. Graduate Council – Brian Berry on website

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

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 clienteles.

    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 department chair (or equivalent) or designee with notification to 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 with some accommodations.

This policy only affects class-rooms. It does not affect laboratories, studios, practica, or clinical practices.

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.

Stops the 1971 policy and replaces it with something similar to what is actually happening on campus. To gain flexibility is added by portions of a block or use multiple blocks with approval from department chair and exception by R&R.

Concerns about instructional minutes and meeting lecture minutes standards.

You may use M-W-F, or M-W or W-F

Many questions about exemptions

Why is this needed? M Douglas says it facilitates scheduling of classes for 1000s of students in hundreds of classes

J Flinn says we need some standardization to ensure students have a chance

A Wright: The scheduling of classes is delegated to the faculty senate's oversight via the Board of Trustees authority granted to the faculty. We as faculty have two options, rescind the 1971 legislation and be silent on the schedule or move to bring existing legislation in line with actual practice.

J Carmack: Can a program get an exemption?

N Jovanovich: Over 800 classes this year did not fall within the normal grid for class start times and meeting dates. If programs like Nursing, Theater and Dance, and a few others were eliminated from the equation, this number is still over 300.   Off grid courses cause issues with students that may be nearing graduation, yet they have not completed the college core.

Because programs that have their own dedicated space still have students that could be completing pre-reqs, no blanket exemptions were entertained at the global level (specifically Nursing and Theater). These programs should use the "Department Chair" approval process.
M Mathis: we have done a study comparing schedules to the proposed legislation

?? Lengthy debate on the process of a chair not only setting the schedule (as directed in the employee handbook), and the fact that they would be the same person granting the exceptions for off grid classes.
J Matson: moves dean have approval rather than chair - Second: Blevins-Knabe
A Wright: Calls vote   rejected

J Giammo: consider reporting exceptions for the sake of monitoring usage
D Stieve: what purpose does this serve?
J Giammo: recommended we look back at this in one year to see if the trends have reversed and if not, then further action may be needed.
E Anson: Scheduling serves many departments and allows tracking; Calls the question
S Farewell: asks about start/end time and scheduling blocks and break in between   can we do 15 min?
J Tramel: would like to add language in the commentary to address concerns about lecture/lab combo wherein lecture and lab are not separate
Clean up language to define locations?
K Leonard: called the question
 "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". There was wording offered to bring about clarity to the fact that this legislation was specifically aimed at classes that meet once a week.
A Wright: Calls vote and motion carries

> **B. Motion FS_2017_3**. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. (Legislation. 3/5 Majority Vote at two Meetings, no second required) Modify constitution to include learning outcomes
>
> **Be it resolved** to amend Article III (Councils and Committees of the Faculty Senate, Councils, Council on Core Curriculum and Policies) as follows (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion):
>
> **Council on Core Curriculum and Policies:** On behalf of the Faculty Senate, and subject to that body's authority, the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies shall maintain**, review, interpret, and recommend modifications to core student learning outcomes and to** policies and criteria governing general education requirements ~~and~~. **It** shall approve courses for inclusion and retention in the UALR Core Curriculum (Standard Core and College Cores) ~~The Council~~ **and** shall have responsibility for policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas.

The Council on Core Curriculum and Policies shall report all of its actions promptly to the faculty. In reviewing curriculum matters, the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies shall consider current policies and criteria of the U of A System and the Arkansas Board of Higher Education.

In academic units (programs, departments, schools, colleges) curricular proposals affecting the UALR Core, including but not limited to course inclusion in the core, modifications to existing core courses, and inclusion in the college core, will be routed through program, department, school, college curriculum committees and to the Undergraduate Council before being sent to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. In academic units not organized into departments, colleges, or schools, routing shall be according to an analogous process certified to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies by the executive vice chancellor and provost. **Revisions and modifications to student learning outcomes and to policies and criteria governing general education requirements may be proposed to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies by any faculty or academic unit. Recommendations by the Council on such matters shall be informed by written opinion of each academic unit directly impacted by the proposed change.**

Recommendations of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies are subject to review by the Faculty Senate upon decision of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate or upon petition signed by five or more senators and delivered to the president of the Faculty Senate within ten (10) calendar days of passage the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. Proposals not reviewed by the Faculty Senate or having passed Faculty Senate review shall be routed to the executive vice chancellor and provost and the chancellor.

Commentary: The learning outcomes for the UALR core were defined in the following legislation:
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)

Motion is made: A Wright calls first vote: Discussion? none   motion carries

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)

The motion as amended at the meeting reads:

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

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

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

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) by adding as the last statement in section B and before section B. 1.

> "Competency in teaching ... criteria for a specific review period.
>
> The programmatic learning outcomes data collected from an individual faculty member shall not be used in the annual reviews for that person.
>
> 1. Evaluation of Teaching or Professional Performance"

And 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.

And Be it 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.

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.

J Vander Putten: made a motion to commit to the Committee on Tenure (seconded by L Bario-Villar) A Wright calls vote Motion fails

E Anson: Asks if a condition could be stated once only: '[You cannot use this] in annual evaluation of teaching, research and service.'
Discussion ensues as to where such a comment be added. Structurally the message that repeats will be moved to the preamble for that section of legislation.
A Wright: Suggestions as to where this comment should be added?
R Cheatham: Put it in the preamble?
A Wright: Calls vote: Motion carries

   D. Motion FS_2017_5 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 carry: 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).

Motion made by L Bario-Villar:

Comments: explanation of the background

J Vander Putten: we are inclined to support a statement made by us professors in light of shootings -- reads statement

R Cheatham: discussion of local control and additional wording

L B-V: There is possibility the original bill may be amended in Ar State Legislature

A Wright: Calls vote: Motion carries

VIII.   Open Forum

A Wright: Regarding judicial policy to the Senate: We are working on having something ready for March or possibly April faculty senate meeting.

Introduces strategic plan: There is a survey including an opportunity to give written commentary. There will be focused townhall meetings to work on the plan, starting February 27, 2017.   Discussion will be recorded and forwarded to the task force. Planning and finance committee will bring materials and recommendations to the strategic planning task force.

R Cheatham: Goals inform budget?

A Rogerson: yes

K Leonard: How is Blackboard?

A Rogerson: just met with IT and we are quietly optimistic that we are out of the woods. Upper management understands. We hope to put out an announcement that the worst is past.

J Evans: Can we get a summary of the benefits we will enjoy from this rather painful and expensive upgrade?

K Leonard: Are we being compensated for all the expenses that Blackboard has cost us?

A Rogerson: the contract does not make it clear that we have much of a case for compensation

We have little recourse or leverage.

Thank you everyone in this room and protecting the students

Why us?

A R: The migration was far too fast and this resulted in all the problems.

RC: Would the system reimburse us?

BBK: There are people on campus who have wonderful skills - can they help us how to keep moving ahead no matter what. Can we develop an info exchange to share solutions and innovations.

JMatson: not necessarily as a work around but as complements. How can they all work with Blackboard.

A Rogerson: We are in contract with Blackboard via the System.

P Tschumi: the Board became interested in what we could do with consolidating contracts? What can we combine to get economies of scale and give access to all/more services? Now looking at Enterprise software license to meet more needs. When contracts are written we should put in contingencies.

    IX. Adjourn - 2:56pm