



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Friday, March 30, 2012, 1:00 p.m.

Faculty Senate Meeting

DSC Ledbetter B & C

MINUTES

Present: **CAHSS**— Amrhein, Anson, Bunch, Clausen, Deiser, English, Estes, Finzer, Giammo, Lopez-Ramirez, McAbee, Porter, Yoder. **CB**— Edison, Funk, Mitchell, Nickels, Watts. **CE**— Barrett, Burgin, Hayn, Nolen. **CEIT**— Babiceanu, Jovanovic, Tebbets, Tramel, Tschumi. **LAW**— Goldner. **LIBRARY**— Russ. **CPS**— Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Golden, Smith-Olinde, Thombre. **CSM**— Benton, Cui, Douglas, Grant-Scott, Guellich, McMillan, Prince, Yanoviak. **EX OFFICIO**— Anderson, Senate Counsel: Faust.

Guests Present: Daryl Rice, Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Success; Christina Drale, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – Faculty Development and Administration; Joyce Hail, Registrar.

Absent: **CAHSS**—Kleine. **CB** –. **CE**— McAdams. **CEIT**—Anderson. **LAW** -- Fitzhugh. **CPS** – Rhodes. **CSM**— Sims, Tarasenko. **EX OFFICIO**— Robertson, Ford, Lewis, Patterson.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Smith-Olinde welcomed the senators, declared it to be 1:00 p.m., called the meeting to order and invited the secretary to call the roll.

II. Review of minutes

Senators were invited to comment on the minutes of the February 17, 2012, meeting of the Senate as distributed and posted on the web site. Clausen noted that she would correct mistakes she had noticed in the roman numerals. It was moved (Anson) and seconded (Prince) that the minutes be accepted with those corrections. Motion passed on a voice vote.

III. Announcements

President Smith-Olinde. First I want to announce an open meeting for faculty, staff and students with John Hicks of the firm Academic Search. This firm has been retained to generate a

candidate pool for the Provost search. The open meeting is on April 4 at 2pm in the EIT auditorium.

Second, I remind you that elections will take place at the Assembly on Thursday, April 26 at 2:00pm in Dickinson auditorium. Please be there.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit; no discussion)

President Smith-Olinde invited senators to address topics of interest to the body.

Yoder: I first want to acknowledge that I missed the first two Senate meetings this semester – once because of illness, the second time due to departmental business – so if this was already discussed I apologize for bringing it up again. I was the chair of the Humanities subcommittee for Undergraduate Curriculum Review, so I read with interest the final reports of the other subcommittees. I have nothing to say about most of them, but I did find the Values report distressing and, actually, downright alarming in its recommendation that we should actually be teaching particular values. Now, I'm a child of the 1960s and have not forsaken the liberal values of my youth. Indeed, if anything I embrace them more strongly and more radically than I did then. Nonetheless, I do not believe it is my job to indoctrinate students into that or *any* value system. The only values I teach are the importance of skepticism and critical thinking. I believe that if I teach my students to question and think critically they will make better decisions. But it is not my job to make those decisions for them, and I do not think it is the university's place to endorse a liberal agenda any more than I think it is the university's place to endorse a conservative agenda. Moreover, as a past winner of the university teaching award, I think it is especially dangerous to include the teaching of particular values as part of the criteria for that award – as the Values subcommittee recommends. If we can implicitly penalize faculty for not teaching values that I admit I agree with, what is to stop the university from penalizing faculty for refusing to teach other values, should the political or philosophical climate change? Again, it is not that I disagree with the values outlined in the Values subcommittee's report. Rather it is that I disagree with the suggestion that faculty should be coerced into teaching *any* particular values. Thank you.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Joel Anderson.

President Smith-Olinde invited Chancellor Anderson to the podium.

Chancellor Anderson: Thank you, President Smith-Olinde. I actually have a number of things to report and will try to be expeditious.

The Board of Trustees met yesterday afternoon and again this morning –it was an unusual Board meeting, with much time devoted to the changing relationship of UAMS to CARTI [Central Arkansas Radiation Therapy Institute]. UAMS wishes to part ways with CARTI, but taking that step could be very expensive.

We presented UALR's request to the Board to purchase Coleman Place – we've had problems because of the management of that property; when problems arose there, UALR was always associated with those reports. We had a hard time getting together on price. The Board of Visitors

worked with us, our offer was finally accepted, and the Board approved. In the absence of that agreement, we would probably have started looking at our next on-campus residence hall, but with this purchase we will probably push new on-campus residences farther to the future. This purchase has the advantage of giving us all the land associated with the new sports complex. And the reality is: Residence Halls are auxiliary enterprises; we don't enter into them unless we know it will work. So this is a significant development that has been cooking for a long time.

Today after spirited discussion the Board acquiesced in our offering an E-Commerce major at the Benton campus. They also approved changing the name of the Department of Construction Management to Department of Construction Management and Civil and Construction Engineering, and the name of Construction Engineering to Civil and Construction Engineering. In addition, the Board approved requests for increases in tuition and fees that all the campuses had proposed; that was preceded by a report from the system president, Dr. Bobbitt. His main point was that online education is one way to address the increasing costs of delivering education. He told the Board that he had given the chancellors two priorities: faculty and staff compensation, and student success/graduation. He noted that Arkansas is the lowest in the SREB [Southern Regional Education Board] in terms of compensation. Now that we have settled numbers on tuition and fees (the UALR increase is 4.3%) we will be able to move ahead and finalize the budget. To give you a sense of what we're looking at: major expense items include technology, utilities (opening new buildings adds new costs in these categories, and the trolley is an expense that we need to get into our regular budget); also the student success initiatives and the health insurance increase. The latter will cost approximately \$1 million more this coming year – a big chunk that we have to address. I want very much for the institution to absorb the entire increase for employees on the Classic Plan; among my reasons are that we won't be able to give raises to classified employees, so if they have to pick up the health insurance increase, that's going to hurt them. Concerning funding: when we made our Strategic Plan, we realized very clearly that if we continued to rely on tuition and fees, we would come up short, so we made a commitment to go after all sources – Washington, grants that faculty bring in (\$25 to \$30 million); you're familiar with our \$100 million private campaign – what that means, is, you didn't see that exact money but you probably got some of your budget in the normal course of things because of the campaign.

This is the first year that the amount funded by students is greater than the amount funded by the state (46% versus 41%). As we move into performance funding, we have to look closely at what we do to bring in and retain students. Marginal enrollment increases – for example, larger lecture sections or a couple more people per section in smaller classes can make a dramatic difference overall. We can take advantage of ways to leverage the expertise of faculty by using other folks (e.g., graduate assistants) to support large classes; we also need to be sensitive to scheduling – not what works for us but what works for students – it's the new reality.

One other thing I want to mention is Construction Projects on campus. We are coming to an end; there is one more after the student services one-stop building is opened and we can vacate Admin South for the Nursing Program. We have been able to accomplish the building projects with minimum impact on our budget; we were fortunate to get a lot of it donated (Jack Stephens, Bailey); student housing is self-supporting, as I already mentioned. We'll always have unmet needs – at University Plaza, that building's got to come down one of these days – here's the dilemma; in order to move people out you've got to have some place to move them into. That's a challenge for another day. That reminds me, the Trail of Tears Park, almost all of the money for that was donated. What I'm a little bit worried about politically – Fayetteville and Jonesboro

have had enrollment increases, whereas we're going to get \$83,000 to spread across out entire budget. They've got the added tuition revenue – so this is on top of an already major operation. Our enrollment has been flat the past few years so we must make the best use of tuition and fees, reallocation, etc. We have no interest in laying off people but there are some things we can't do.

President Smith-Olinde: Do you foresee a possibility that the UA system will treat employees as members of one insurance pool, rather than by campus?

Chancellor Anderson: Here is the story. A few years back, all employees in the system were regarded as part of the same university. Then, some years ago, a change was made: costs were reallocated based on the principle that the campuses that were using the health insurance more should pay more. There may be logic to this but I don't like it. I remember when I got here, there was no maternity benefit in the health plan, and there was opposition to adding it in Fayetteville because the benefit would go more to us than to them because they were an older campus. We're having a bigger hit than some other campuses because it's trying to match cost to utilization.

Yoder: Can you give us some insight into the difficulty with CARTI?

Chancellor Anderson – It's been, as I understand it, a partnership to be sharing costs. Sometime within the past year one of the partners said we want out, which from the standpoint of UAMS was problematic. That's why yesterday's board meeting was somewhat contentious; there was a lot of strong feeling and it was left somewhat unresolved. I'll tell you, I had a perverse thought. Because of the Coleman place issue and the campus master plan; I was so tempted to say: This is where we're going to start our unit of CARTI. [laughter] Fortunately that is one that problem that doesn't really affect this campus.

There were no further questions. The Chancellor concluded his remarks by commenting that yesterday was the investiture of David Belcher as President at Western Carolina University.

B: Provost Robertson:

President Smith-Olinde informed the body that the provost was unable to be present.

C. Graduate Council: Chair: Amanda Nolen

Nolen was happy to report that she had no report.

D. Undergraduate Council: Chair: Jeanette Clausen

Clausen: The UGC has experienced an onslaught of CCFs since the last Senate meeting, as departments scurry to get course and program changes to us in time for the 2012-13 catalog and the fall 2012 Schedule of Classes. Many if not most are routine types of changes – departments are cleaning up discrepancies in catalog descriptions, scrutinizing prerequisites and either adding or removing to ensure that students are prepared for the next level of coursework but not required to endure courses that they won't need in subsequent courses, and so on. Some departments are paring down the number of credits required for a major, in anticipation of the 120 hour requirement. Departments that made these kinds of course and/or program changes are Mass

Com, Information Science, Astronomy, Chemistry, Math and Statistics, and Audiology and Speech Pathology. Changes that may be of interest to Senators in Math and Statistics are the redesign of the pre-core mathematics courses in a modular format that is not lecture-based. The intent and hope is to get students through developmental math courses more quickly; students will be able to move through the sequences at their own pace to some extent. Math has also developed a new course, MATH 1321, Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning, which will replace Math 1315 College Mathematics; the new course is not algebra-intensive but will focus on process, conceptual understanding, communication and problem solving in areas such as personal, state, and national finance; statistics and probability, mathematical modeling, and quantities and measurement. The math department communicated with the URC committee on Quantitative Reasoning about this course, and that committee agrees that the new course is a great choice for the UALR core. The UGC approved a new E-Commerce major to be offered at the Benton campus, as Chancellor Anderson already mentioned, and finally, the UGC approved a number of changes in Construction Engineering, which will now be called Civil and Construction Engineering, also noted earlier by the chancellor. The changes in this program include the ADHE State Minimum Core as the Core for students in this program. The changes were made in anticipation of an upcoming ABET review that will take place in fall 2013.

UGC also spent some time discussing Senator McMillan's proposal for changing the course drop date and associated policy changes that are on the agenda for today. The UGC endorses the motion on the course drop date. We were unable to get our heads around the other motion. This concludes my report. The CCFs and UGC meeting minutes are on the web site if you need more information.

Anson: Isn't it jumping the gun to approve a new core [for this major] before the Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee has finished its work? We are getting ready to give our report.

Jovanovic: The ADHE allows the state minimum core for this program, and regardless of what the UCR decides for the core university-wide, I was going to ask for the state minimum core for engineering students anyway. I had to get the curriculum into the fall 2012 catalog to be ready for the ABET visit a year from fall.

Anson: How did it change the EIT core? I have the EIT core before me.

Jovanovic: My core has nothing to do with the EIT core. The state minimum core for Engineering students requires 3 hours of math, 8 hours of science, that's 11, which leaves 24 hours of arts, humanities, and social sciences; and the state minimum core for Engineering students allows them to substitute 6 additional hours of math and science for arts, humanities, and social sciences, so that brings it to 18 hours of arts, humanities, and social sciences – Comp I and II, American Government or US History – and the other three are just fine arts, humanities, and social sciences electives, which I have defined to include foreign languages (French, German, or Spanish) and the UGC recommended that I broaden that to include American Sign Language and Mandarin Chinese. – I've got it right here if you want to take a look.

Anson: Yes, can I see it afterwards.

VI. New Business

- A. **LEGISLATION. FS # 2011-12_14.** Undergraduate Council. (No second required, majority vote at one meeting)

Motion: That the baccalaureate degree requirements be modified as indicated with strikeout font removed and underlined text added.

Baccalaureate Degree Requirements

To receive a baccalaureate degree, a student must complete the following requirements:

[NOTE: Academic majors and colleges may specify additional and/or more restrictive requirements.]

1. ~~*A minimum of 124*~~ *120* *hours of which 30 hours must be in residence and 45 must be upper-level (3000 level or above). A baccalaureate degree program may require more than 120 semester hours of college credit if prior approval has been granted by the Board of Trustees or it is a requirement of an independent licensing or accrediting body.*

These required hours must include:

- *A minimum of a 2.0 cumulative grade point on all work attempted at the University.*
- *A minimum of a 2.0 cumulative grade point on all work attempted in the academic major and a minimum of a 2.0 cumulative grade point on all work attempted in the academic minor.*
- *A core curriculum which must include a 3 hour course in U. S. history or U. S. government and a 3 hour course in College Algebra, College Math or higher level math course.*
- *A major and a minor, a combined major-minor, a double major or a major and an associate degree transferred from another institution in a program not offered at UALR.*
- ~~*Completion of the “Rising Junior Exam: between 45 and 59 college-level hours except for those students who qualify for exemptions.*~~
- *Completion of the appropriate second language requirement for students seeking a B.A., B.S.E., or B.S.W. degree.*

Commentary: The main purpose of the motion is to make UALR’s degree requirements consistent with the new state law.

The language concerning the “Rising Junior Exam” is also being removed because the motion that originally removed it cannot be found and we want to be certain that it has been removed.

Clausen moved the motion on behalf of Undergraduate Council and noted that Pete Tschumi had drafted the motion, so questions should be addressed to him.

McMillan – Why are these math courses singled out?

Tschumi – The reason this is singled out that way, that language is actually from an earlier document.

McMillan – The state requirement is College Math or an equally rigorous course.

Tschumi – That could be replaced. The state requirement is why things got separated. We had this listed in old legislation; the core is separate legislation. This legislation only is focused on these specific items. All other legislation is still intact.

Faust – Is this discussion germane to the motion on the floor?

Tschumi – This is just excerpting part of one policy.

Daryl Rice – I was always told that it's state law. The legislation tells ADHE to develop a state minimum core; I don't think they specify courses except math and history.

Tschumi – Our own policy has evolved since then.

Jovanovic – If there are additional changes that need to be made you can propose them. I also have a question about the cumulative GPA – does that include repeated courses?

Clausen – I did look that up but I don't remember.

Jovanovic – Looking through the catalog, I couldn't see . . .

Faust – Point of order. The question is interesting, but not germane to the motion.

Watts – I just have a procedural question. Does this need more than a majority vote at one meeting? It's changing legislation.

Smith-Olinde – It is changing legislation, but not amending the constitution; those sorts of changes are the ones that require a vote at two meetings.

President Smith-Olinde called for a vote. The motion passed unanimously.

B. LEGISLATION. FS # 2011-12_15. Senator McMillan. (Second required; majority vote at one meeting)

Motion: Policy for Dropping Individual Courses.

That the following policy on page 5 of the 2011-2012 UALR Undergraduate Catalog,

Changes in Enrollment

The academic calendar lists deadlines for dropping or adding a class or section. This schedule is binding for all students. Adding or dropping a course, including transferring from one section to another or changing credit status in a course may

be accomplished through the computer registration system (BOSS) within the published time limits. Classes may be dropped in the Office of Records and Registration until the drop deadline; see the “Academic Calendar” on page ix.

be replaced with

Changes in Enrollment

A student can drop a course up to the 5th day of classes through the schedule change process. Dropping a course in this time period will not result in a record of the drop on the student’s transcript. ~~If a student drops a course between from the 6th day and through the 41st day of classes, the course drop will be recorded on the transcript as a “WP” (withdraw passing) or “WF” (withdraw failing), as determined by the instructor. A~~ a student wishing to drop a class obtains from the course instructor a signed acknowledgement of the drop and completes the course drop process by submitting the form, ~~with the grade of “WP” or “WF” as recorded by the instructor,~~ to the Office of Records and Registration. Courses cannot be dropped after the 41st day of classes. The cut-off dates in this paragraph refer to the day of classes in a 15-week semester (five days=one week). In shorter semesters the cut-off dates will be adjusted proportionately. See the “Academic Calendar” for course drop dates. ~~The grades “WP” and “WF” do not affect the calculated GPA.~~

McMillan moved the above motion, and Anson seconded. President Smith-Olinde invited discussion.

Barrett – I am concerned that there is no provision for online students – how would they get a signed form to the registrar?

Rice: - As soon as the Undergraduate Council started talking about the idea, I brought up that issue. I got together with Tammy Harrison, Mark Burris, and others to discuss what could we do to be sure that online students are able to comply with this requirement. The answer we got from Information Technology Services is that for online students, it should all be done (password protected) in Blackboard itself.

Hail – I have a question about students who withdraw from the entire semester – what about students who do that?

McMillan – This motion only deals with dropping individual courses; it doesn’t apply to withdrawing from the semester.

English – I thought this policy seemed rather punitive. Having a lot of WFs on your record seems pretty harsh to me, and not in keeping with what we’re trying to do at UALR.

Anson – I like the idea of having a student make a commitment to a course as early as possible; what I see a lot is students who show up the first day and then I don’t see them; I think we should get students to commit to the course early on in the semester.

Bunch – But then we become the police – what if students didn't come to class because they had a genuine emergency, they were hospitalized or one of their family members died?

Jovanovic – Will a WP or WF be subject to grade appeal process?

McMillan: That's a good question.

Christy Drale – The question is, how will students react? The WP or WF doesn't affect their GPA but that won't stop students from complaining about it and asking me for an appeal and I would have to make a decision as to whether to bring it to a formal appeal – I would want guidance as to how to respond to them.

Guellich – I don't see why a student is dropping is material to my allowing them to drop. I don't think this [proposal] actually gives me the right to refuse to let students drop – I see it as an opportunity to inform students but not prevent them from dropping.

Bunch – But what if they have a valid reason? That's why we have a W right now. Students are going to view this as punitive.

Guellich – Then they should make the effort to complete the course. We can try to convince them to try to finish the class rather than giving up. We need the opportunity to tell the student not to give up.

Jovanovic – In response to Associate Vice Chancellor Drale's concern about the WP or WF – students are getting a penalty by forfeiting their tuition dollars, and the WF is an additional Black Mark on their transcript. I can support part of this motion but am not convinced of the value of WP and WF

Tramel – Can students appeal a grade of NC? I agree with Nick, I don't support WP and WF.

Amrhein – There will be grade appeals based on this.

Yoder – Students will not want to finish the course when they could retake it and get an A.

McMillian – I am not wedded to the WF.

Tschumi – I propose a friendly amendment to just use a WP or W, and remove WF.

Goldner – Our experiences at the Law School might be helpful. If the main thing is to make sure the student needs to talk with the faculty member, just the W does that, so I don't think adding the WP / WF distinction is needed. As to whether it makes a difference on their transcript: Faculty members on the admissions committee see a WF and it has a negative impact, there's no question. Also, this is a very wide-open discretionary decision on the part of the faculty member. You are asking for challenges. At the Law School, we have required attendance at classes and most of us started out our career saying OK, you have X number of absences, but then you have X number of excused absences. You quickly move away from that and you say: I don't care why you're not here, if you're not here for 80% of the classes, you are dropped from this course.

Giammo – I like the idea of moving the date and of having the faculty member sign off; I would propose removing the language about WP and WF – and remove all language related to WP and WF – a friendly amendment [reads his proposed language].

Smith-Olinde: Do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

McMillan – Let's vote on it.

Giammo moved his suggestion above, and Jovanovic seconded. Giammo was asked to read his amendment again and did so, pointing out that he hadn't changed any language, just removed all references to WP and WF.

President Smith-Olinde asked for a vote on Giammo's motion. The motion passed on a voice vote.

McMillan clarified that the language specifying when courses can be dropped should read: from the 6th day through the 41st day.

President Smith-Olinde called for a vote on the motion as amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Jovanovic – Now do we have to change the language on when midterm grades will be due?

Smith-Olinde – I think that legislation [about midterm grades for 1000- and 2000-level courses] has the same date as this drop date. I'll go back and check to be sure.

C. LEGISLATION. FS # 2011-12_16. Senator McMillan. (Second required; majority vote at one meeting)

Motion: Policy Governing Repeating Courses.

That the following policy on page 7 of the 2011-2012 UALR Undergraduate Catalog,

Repeated Courses

If an undergraduate student repeats a course for credit, only the last grade will be computed into the cumulative grade point average. (The earlier grade will remain on the transcript with an "E" indicating exclusion from the grade point average.)

If there have been any changes in course numbers or titles, the student must first obtain the approval of the chairperson of the department offering the course to be assured it is an identical course.

All grades for repeated courses are included in calculations for graduation honors. Once a degree has been awarded, repeated courses will not be accepted.

be replaced with

Repeated Courses

An earned grade is a grade of “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, “F”, “Credit”, “NC”, recorded on a student’s UALR transcript.

A course is said to be a repeat if a student takes it after having received an earned grade for the course and if only the latest grade earned for the course will be used in the calculation of the grade point average.

A course is said to be a retake if a student takes it after having received an earned grade for the course and under the condition (specified below) that both the previous grade and the grade earned for the retaken course will be used in the calculation of the grade point average.

In all coursework at UALR, a student can have a total of at most four repeats. If a student has accumulated four repeats, then any future attempt to take a course for which an earned grade has been received will be counted as a retake. *i.e.* Both the earlier grade(s) and the grade earned in the retake will be used in the calculation of the grade point average.

Grades that are not included in the calculation of the grade point average will remain on the transcript with an “E” indicating exclusion from the grade point average.

All earned grades are included in calculations for graduation with honors. A course cannot be repeated after a degree has been awarded.

McMillan moved the motion on repeating courses. Guellich seconded it.

Tschumi – Does the proposed policy mean that a student can have only 4 repeats in their entire academic experience?

McMillan – Basically what this says to a student is, you can have 4 E’s in your undergraduate experience. [E=excluded from the Grade Point Average]

Tschumi – But it can be read both ways. It could be ambiguous.

McMillan – Let me give a little bit of motivation on my part – I know that when a student applies to graduate schools, professional schools, law schools and some medical schools, those schools recalculate the GPA based on all grades on the student’s transcript. So students may have a high GPA as calculated by the university and it turns out to be relatively low when calculated by directors of admission.

Goldner – And they [students] are always surprised. [laughter]

Smith-Olinde – UAMS has this policy.

Anson – What’s pushing this? We get a lot of students who mess up their first two years and then grow up, come back ready to take it seriously. Why are we penalizing them?

McMillan – they can take advantage of the clemency policy.

Anson: But still, what’s driving this?

McMillan – This is a policy that encourages students to make a commitment to the course. In another institution that I was at, this policy helped shorten the time to graduation. I think, given that we want to improve our graduation rates, this is a policy that could help . . .

Hail – I understand this from the academic side, but from a practical standpoint, it would be very difficult for us to implement. Repeat processing in Banner is a manual process; we can't do repeat processing until the last day (because of withdrawals from the semester). It could slow down our graduation processing as well. I just wanted to say that.

Collier-Tenison – I have a concern too about students who come in initially and struggle, then come back after a period of time ready to start fresh. For some of those students, repeating classes is the only way they have to get their GPA up high enough to meet current standards. Academic clemency is an option, but you get one chance at it, and it erases everything, including classes that you may have passed that semester.

Mitchell – This policy would treat our native students differently than transfer students.

Faust – In the current system, how do students get that E? How is it decided?

McMillan – Right now, if a student repeats a course, the latest grade earned counts in the GPA, and the previous grade remains on the transcript marked by an E.

Tramel – I've seen students who take a class, get a C and repeat the class but get a D – so they have to take it a third time.

[Senator whose name the secretary did not get]: when that happens, the student has the right to appeal to keep the C.

Douglas – There has to be something better than what we're currently doing. I don't know how many of you teach beginning freshmen students. A lot of them have very little commitment to their academics. I don't know what their reason is, but when I have a student take the same course 12 times and they still haven't passed it – there's a problem. They are using someone's money to do this . . .

Rice – First of all, I'm pleased as punch that the first motion passed. I don't shy away from the word punitive; maybe it's old-school, but I do think, sometimes structure motivates people, penalties do motivate people. I agree with Marian [Douglas], we have to think of something to discourage drops and repeats. I just sat through a series of meetings with chairs and their deans to talk about the status of all their majors – when we have students who have dropped 48 courses! Now we can't legislate for those, that's on the far end. But there are lots who have dropped 9, 10, 12 courses – and do the math, that is a lot of credit hours. And I do think there is something to the idea that, well, if it doesn't work I can do it again, and again, and again. I know that in Accounting, there's three tries and that's it, can't try any more. I used to advise students who thought they were going to Law School and they'd drop courses because they were getting B's, and they think if they drop Con Law 7 times and the 8th time they get their A, they think Chuck Goldner is going to say . . . [laughter drowns out the rest of the sentence]. Also, there's another side to this – it's a case of filling up seats, sucking up space so that somebody else can't take the class. So if not this policy, I'd really encourage us to get a group of people together, to really drill into this issue and figure it out.

Jovanovic – If I'm reading this correctly – when you get to your 4 repeats, you're done.

McMillan – What it says is, once you get your 4 E's, from then on all grades count [in the GPA].

Drale – I just offer this as something to consider: At some institutions, you get one free repeat per course but from there on out, everything counts and gets included in the GPA – so if students need to repeat in order to get a certain grade to qualify for their program, they can do it, but it does discourage multiple repeats because those D's and F's will continue to be factored in.

Lynch – This also leads to grade inflation. I had the opportunity as associate Dean in CSAM to look at repeats and we had a student with a 3.5 GPA but 20 W's on his transcript.

Goldner – I want to thank you for educating me today – I mean this, I'm always surprised when students want to retake a class to get a better grade. And we look at them and say: What?! Another way to think about it is, at the Law School, in your first year, you may not drop a class, but you can withdraw from Law School. And you know what? A few people drop out of Law School, but pretty much everyone else hangs in there to finish their classes.

Burgin – How much of this is people trying to get a better grade and how much is financial aid fraud? Can anybody answer that question?

Tramel – It used to be but there's been a decline in that; now financial aid stops them. What I see with my students is they withdraw from the whole semester because of work.

Funk – I'm very concerned – I would rather see if it handled at the departmental level. Also, as an economist, I suggest that we attach a fee for every W – start at \$50 per drop.

Watts – We have a compulsory 3 strikes and out at the upper level, for majors, and a W counts as an attempt; so far we've allowed two students to appeal. Also, those people who are repeating those courses, we're getting an awful lot of money from them. I just think that this needs more study, so I move to postpone. (seconded by a senator whose name the secretary did not get)

Clausen – But the students are also incurring more debt, and where are they getting that money from – from our tax dollars, so there are two ways to look at that; we are getting money, but we're not getting graduates, and we are moving toward performance funding.

Smith-Olinde – There is a motion on the floor to postpone; if that is approved, this same motion will come back to us at the next Senate meeting. Another option, and Senator McMillan is open to this idea, is to refer this to committee.

Watts – I withdraw my motion.

Smith-Olinde: The matter will be referred to committee.

D. LEGISLATION. FS # 2011-12_17. Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee. (No second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

Motion: The Grievances and Appeals section of the *Faculty Handbook* shall be updated and revised to accommodate graduate student representation on the AIGC, modified procedures for distance education students and delegated chair responsibilities for grade appeal hearing panels.

Proposed Revisions

Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (9-1)

The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee hears specific grade appeals and hears, on appeal and referral, cases involving certain alleged academic offenses. The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee comprises 15 faculty and 3 faculty alternates to be appointed annually in the spring by the Committee on Committees and ~~17~~ 15 students and 3 alternates to be appointed no later than the beginning of the fall semester. 12 voting and 2 alternate undergraduate students will be appointed by the Student Government Association and 5 ~~3~~ voting and 1 alternate graduate student(s) will be appointed by the Graduate Student Association. The term of office begins with the fall semester and continues for twelve months.

General Operating Policies of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (9-2, 9-3, 9-4)

1. The Committee shall meet as soon as possible after it is formed and elect a chairperson from among the 15 faculty members. The chairperson shall serve as the chairperson of all grade appeals hearing panels. The chairperson may designate a provisional hearing panel chair in those instances when the committee chairperson is not available, and a scheduling delay would be a detriment to the parties involved.

2. Quorum:

a. A quorum to hear alleged academic offenses consists of the chairperson and three members; of this number, one must be a faculty member and one must be a voting student member.

b. A quorum to hear grade appeals consists of the chairperson (or designated provisional chairperson), ~~an ex-officio member~~, two faculty members, and two students; on all grade appeals involving graduate or professional degree curricular matters, at least one graduate faculty member and one graduate student shall be included on the hearing panel. Of this number, all must be present.

...

6. Committee Membership

...

d. Should any member of the committee be unable, for any reason, to complete a term for which he or she has been appointed, one of the alternates shall fill the balance of the term. Resignations shall be submitted in writing to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and the chairperson of the committee. The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs shall then immediately inform the

president of the Faculty Senate/Assembly in the case of the faculty member resignation, or the Student Government Association president or the Graduate Student Association president in the case of a student resignation or a vacancy, request the appointment of one of the alternates to fill the position, and request the appointment of a second alternate to fill the vacant alternate position until the next term.

...

8. The Faculty Senate/Assembly president and the Student Government Association president or the Graduate Student Association president may appoint temporary committee members during the summer months to hear cases in an emergency and only after the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs has made all attempts to contact committee members and alternates.

...

Grade Appeals (9-9, 9-10)

Steps Toward Redress for Grade Appeals

1. The student must approach the faculty member in question to discuss the grade and attempt to resolve any differences. This must be done within 20 class days after a final course grade is awarded.

There are certain professional courses within the University for which the final grade is awarded upon completion of a designated number of weeks. The student will need to review the time frame for awarding the grade with the department chairperson. No faculty member shall be allowed to delay the resolution of a grievance by failing to hold a consultation with a student within the designated time, unless bona fide reasons such as illness, personal emergency, or campus absences for professional reasons make this time limit unreasonable. If the student is appealing a grade for an online course and does not live within a reasonable driving distance of the main campus, he or she may conduct the required conferences via telephone or other voice transmission technologies. The student's grade may be changed in Step 1 of this procedure by the written consent of the instructor. The student may confer with the Student Government Association president/designee regarding the complaint at any time during the Steps Toward Redress for Grade Appeal. The Student Government Association president/designee will listen to the complaint, counsel the student as to the merits of the case, review the steps as outlined in the formal procedures for grade appeal, assist the student in writing the appeal, and may attend the hearing upon the request of the student as a nonparticipating party.

2. If unable to resolve the difference with the faculty member, the student shall take the grievance within five class days of this discussion to the department chairperson (or dean, if the faculty member involved is the department chairperson). The chairperson shall attempt to resolve the dispute within 10 class days by meeting with the student and faculty member. The student's grade may be changed at Step 2 of this procedure by the written consent of the faculty member. At this meeting the chairperson will have the student and the faculty member complete and sign the Grade Appeal **Complaint** Form and give a copy to the

student. The department chairperson maintains the original. If the student took the course online and does not live within a reasonable driving distance of the main campus, the grade appeal form may be sent electronically, but it must include scanned or electronic signatures.

3. As a last resort and only after Steps 1 and 2 have been carried out, the student may file a formal appeal complaint in writing within three class days to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. If the student decides to file a formal appeal, he or she must meet with the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and bring to the meeting the written appeal which must include a written statement which clearly explains the basis of the appeal and the Grade Appeal **Complaint** Form. Following the conference, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will immediately consult with the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson. The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will notify the student in writing that the grade appeal will be referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee for a hearing or to the vice chancellor/provost if the case does not fall within the purview of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

Procedures for Grade Appeals Handled by the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (9-10)

The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee shall promulgate rules governing its proceedings which shall be consistent with the following hearing procedures set forth in the 1967 Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. The rules shall be distributed to all members of the committee by the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs.

1. The student and the faculty member will be notified in writing, at least 10 class days before the date set for the hearing, of the nature of the appeal complaint and of the date, time, and place the case is to be heard. They shall also be notified that, should either party choose not to appear, the hearing will proceed as scheduled. For the purposes of this section, the day after the date of mailing of the letter of notification shall be the first day of the 10-day delay period. ~~The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs shall also send and/or give a copy of the preliminary data sheet, time frame report, and the release of academic records form to the student.*~~ The committee must hear the case within 15 class days of the time the appeal was filed. The determination of the date, time, and place of the hearing will include consideration of the student's and the faculty member's schedules and of their convenience, but in the interest of fairness, reasonable speed shall be the watchword.

2. The student and faculty member will be notified that each can bring witnesses in his or her behalf, that each will have a reasonable opportunity for confronting witnesses appearing against him or her, that each has the right to be present during all phases of the hearing, and that each may bring to the hearing two non-participating representatives.

3. At least five class days before the committee is convened, the student and the faculty member must submit to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs all the information that each feels is pertinent to the appeal; this information must be in writing and supported in detail, and it should specify what additional evidence and witnesses the student or faculty member will bring to the scheduled meeting. Copies of this information will be distributed to all involved parties. Students appealing grades are reminded that the burden of proof is on the student; i.e., the student must be able to support his or her assertion.
4. The committee will not make any decision on a specific appeal until it has been determined that all pertinent written documents, oral testimony from the student and the faculty member, and official records from the student's college or school dean and from the Office of Admissions and Records have been submitted and reviewed.
5. The only persons present at meetings of this committee shall be committee members, an ex-officio member, Student Government Association president/designee upon request by the student, parties to the action being considered by the committee and their non-participating representatives, and witnesses actually testifying before the committee. In the case of a student appealing an online course who does not live within a reasonable driving distance of the main campus, he or she may participate via conference telephone or some other voice transmission technology.
6. Written statements by witnesses in lieu of personal appearances should not be allowed except in rare instances.
7. During the process of making a decision on a case, the committee shall consider only that information which (a) has been presented during the hearing and (b) is relevant to the charge.
8. Upon conclusion of the appeals hearing, the committee will make a decision in writing and sign appropriate appeal documents. The chairperson of the committee will return the master file and the tape of the hearing, and prepare a summary of the findings, decision, and recommendations for the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs within three class days of the hearing. A letter explaining the findings and the decision will be sent to the student, faculty member, department head, college dean, and ~~director of admissions and records~~ the registrar the Office of Records and Registration in case of a grade change within 10 class days of such decision. Either party may appeal the panel's decision in writing to the vice chancellor/provost with a copy to the chairperson and the non-appealing party, within 10 class days upon receipt of the decision.
9. The vice chancellor/provost shall review the appeal and render a decision in writing to all interested parties that includes the reasons for the decision, no later than five class days upon receipt of the appeal. Reasonable deviations from the time frame or procedures will not invalidate a decision unless the deviations cause significant prejudice to the student.

*These items have been incorporated into the Grade Appeal Form and no longer need to be sent separately.

Commentary: As the AIGC is encountering more grievances from graduate students and online students it finds the current policy insufficient to serve these students adequately. The current policy on grievances and appeals stipulates that a hearing panel that hears an appeal involving a graduate student must include at least one graduate student as a member of the panel. However, the policy also stipulates that the Student Government Association president appoints the student members and consequently all student members are undergraduates. A mechanism is needed for appointing graduate student members of the committee. In the case of distance learners, there is no language at all in the current policy that addresses the circumstances of an online student who lives outside of Central Arkansas. Finally, the current policy states that the chair of the committee must be present at all hearings in order for the quorum to be met. As our student population grows, this becomes an impractical requirement at the end of each term when grade appeals pile up. A mechanism is needed for the committee chair to assign temporary chair responsibilities for hearings that he or she cannot attend.

Amrhein moved the motion on behalf of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee. President Smith-Olinde invited discussion.

Barrett – Are 3 graduate student reps and one alternate sufficient? Should a larger number of graduate students be recruited? Are appeals by graduate students increasing?

Amrhein – We have a pool of students to pull from. Graduate appeals that we hear are fewer in number.

Drale – I think the point here is that the graduate student population is growing and we are seeing more of those appeals. If someone wanted to suggest that we have a larger pool of graduate students that would certainly be a friendly suggestion.

Amrhein – Give us a number.

Barrett – Five [other voices chime in also in favor of five).

Anson: Should we then reduce the number of undergraduates by two? This will give us 15 faculty and 17 students.

Drale – We still need to maintain a large pool of undergrads because it is challenging to find students who are willing to serve and able to attend meetings. I would personally suggest that we just make the pie bigger.

Tschumi – On page 8, it specifies the persons who can be present at the meetings. Who is the ex officio member?

Drale – Let me just address that – it was in another part of the faculty handbook and we inserted that just to make it parallel, and the ex officio member is the Associate Vice Chancellor, but if you want to take that out of both of them, I don't need to be there.

Tschumi – We have had major problems in the past whereby faculty members were being intimidated into going along with a grade change. There was also a statement made earlier about you evaluating whether an appeal would go forward and that was not the intent of that legislation. The intent was that the chair of the committee keeps moving around the campus and students cannot easily identify who the chair is, in order to hand in their materials. So they turn them in to the AVC. The only job of the AVC is to receive those appeals . . . The ex officio

member should not be in any meetings in which a decision is being made. They should not be in the room.

[Several voices] The ex officio member attends the meeting but does not vote; the situations you are referring to were happening outside of the meetings.

Faust – Just to be clear, when this is printed out, is it the pale parts that are being changed. So you added that about the ex officio person being there.

Smith-Olinde – But as Christy was saying, she took that from another part of the same policy

Goldner – It already says, for a quorum, you need an ex officio member, so what you say in one section to have to say throughout.

Drale – That’s why I put it in

Smith-Olinde [to Tschumi] – So do you offer that as a friendly amendment? Senator Amrhein, do you accept that as a friendly amendment?

Amrhein – The ex officio member doesn’t have a role in the outcome; the student meets with you prior to the meeting, right? The AVC connects the student to the procedure. I don’t know that there’s an influence there. We haven’t had a problem.

Tschumi – There have been enormous problems in the past where faculty have felt enormous pressure from the provost’s office to change grades.

Amrhein – As [committee] chair, I like seeing that person in the room. But I can take that out. I’ll take that as a friendly amendment (section 2.B, and page 8 section 5)

Laura – I noticed one thing, on page 8, the Office of Admission and Records should be changed to the Office of Records and Registration.

Goldner – On page 5, new language, “the chairperson may. . . detriment to the parties involved” It doesn’t say anything about who decides whether it would be a detriment. You just need to say who it is. [Smith-Olinde – Or you could just omit . . .] Goldner – Yes, just say the chairperson may designate . . . [consensus]: delete “. . . and a scheduling delay would be a detriment to the parties involved.”

Laura – And I received an email from Senator Tudor who cannot be here today, concerning the same page, number 2, part B: “Of this number, all must be present to have a quorum.” He is interested in putting forth the idea that fewer people be required for a quorum.

Tschumi – The reason is you have to have faculty and students present.

Drale – It only takes one not being there and you don’t get a quorum so lowering the quorum is not going to solve your problem.

Smith-Olinde – So, just to be sure: that concern is not sustained; this is no change on this: the chair, two faculty, and two students.

Anson – For clarification: back to page 4 where we added two grad students, are we also adding two faculty? To increase faculty to 17? I would propose that.

[here there followed some overlapping discussion of how the committee functions]

Drale – I think there may be some confusion about how the committee operates. The committee itself did meet once at the beginning of the year, but it doesn’t meet very often and it doesn’t make routine decisions about who’s going to be on the panel. It operates however more as a pool, and in the provost office we go down the list and pick who’s available to meet the quorum

requirements, so if the committee chair is going to be out of town, if this passes, she can designate someone else to be the hearing panel chair.

[further conversation about populating Senate committees, who serves, etc.]

Goldner – I have one last change, on page 7, item 1 change complaint to appeal. [Amrhein agrees].

Smith-Olinde: Anything else? Then let's vote. All those in favor say "aye." The motion passes unanimously.

Amrhein – I have one more question for you to think about and we'll come back to this: what to do if there is an absent faculty member – if they are retired, ill, or have passed away – what do we do? Right now we have no policy for that. We would appreciate input.

VII. Old Business

There was no old business.

VIII. Open Forum

President Smith-Olinde invited comments for open forum.

Guellich – The motions we have passed today, in particular Tom's motion on the drop date – when will that go into effect?

Answer: We're hoping for fall. We'll let you know.

IX. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:11 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Clausen, Secretary

