



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, September 19, 2008, 1:00 p.m.

Donaghey Student Center A & B

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Anson, Chadwick, Clausen, Eshleman, Estes, Giammo, Martin, Ramsey, Vinikas, Webb, Yoder. CB— Brice, , Edison, Nickels, Watts. CE— Garner, Handre, Hayn, Lindsay. CEIT— Chan, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh. LIBRARY— Pine. CPS— Collier-Tenison, Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Kosmatov, McMillan, Prince, Sims, Tarasenko, Wiscaver. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Belcher, Ford, Williams, Davis, Lyn-Cook.

Absent: CAHSS— Bunch, Levernier. CB— Holland. CE— Pack. CEIT — Jovanovich, Patangia. LAW— Foster. CPS— Robinson. CSM—Perkins, Yanoviak.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Ford declared it to be 1:00 p.m. and called the meeting to order. He welcomed the Senate, and particularly newly elected senators, to the first meeting of academic year 2008-09. In lieu of the usual roll call by the secretary, Ford asked that each senator introduce himself or herself, name the college represented, and say how long she or he has served in the body.

II. Orientation

Past Assembly President Fred Williams gave a very brief history of the University Assembly and the Faculty Senate.

Williams reviewed the Senate's rules of order, and suggested that members take a look at the Faculty Handbook, since most of these procedural matters are set out there. Acknowledging the size of the body and the number of new members, Williams asked that we observe the tradition of standing and giving your name when you address the body. Williams spoke of how motions and information items get on the agenda: by submitting them to the executive committee in sufficient time for the committee to send a completed agenda out seven days in advance of a Senate meeting. He clarified the matter of elected alternates: they cannot simply stand in for a senator who must miss a meeting, but rather are there to step in should a senator be unable to serve. He described the difference between "move the question," a motion, requiring a second, to end debate that is itself not debatable, and "call the

question,” an indication a member thinks debate has proceeded long enough, that may be recognized informally by the chair’s asking the body if it is ready to vote.

Williams also named the Faculty’s areas of primary responsibility, reminding the Senate that any action initiated elsewhere in regard to these areas must be approved here, as well. He also reminded the body that the University Assembly remains the final authority on these questions.

III. Election of Senate officers

President Ford, before beginning the election, called the Senate’s attention to “The List” of committees and councils of the Assembly and Senate available. He asked senators to review it, and to see if there are any empty slots either designated for their colleges or for which there is someone in the senator college who would like to serve, please be in touch with Ford.

Ford reminded the Senate of the composition of the executive committee: president of the Assembly and the Senate (elected by the Assembly); immediate past president of the Assembly and Senate; vice-president, secretary, and parliamentarian (elected by the Senate from among their number); documents officer (appointed by the executive committee to its service); and the provost (ex officio). He underscored the amount of work required of the executives committee, who have for the past several years met weekly to tend to the Senate’s business and make sure it’s moving along between meetings.

Lindsay nominated Early Ramsey for the office of vice president. **Moved Watts, seconded Tschumi, to close nominations and elect by acclamation. Motion carried unanimously.**

Robertson nominated Laura Smith-Olinde for the office of parliamentarian. **Moved Watts, seconded Tschumi, to close nominations and elect by acclamation. Motion carried unanimously.**

Rhodes nominated Judith Faust for the office of secretary. **Aiyetoro moved, Tschumi seconded, to close nominations and elect by acclamation. Motion carried unanimously.**

IV. Review of minutes

Ford explained that he will, in the absence of objection from the body, postpone consideration of the minutes of the last meeting until we later take up the matter of the motion from the Tenure Committee. The extensive coverage in the minutes of line-by-line formal and friendly amendments to and failed efforts to amend that motion suggests that it would be wise to consider the minutes in close proximity to our consideration of the old business of tenure-and-promotions policy. There was no objection from the body.

V. Announcements

Ford reminded the Senate that the public phase of the comprehensive campaign has begun, and that members of the campaign committee will be coming around to the colleges soliciting participation. He encouraged senators to promote such participation, since our own giving is an important factor in being successful with other prospective donors.

Ford also brought up the motion passed in the spring in regard to midterm grades. He distributed a copy of the motion as passed. He said there have been misinterpretations of the content, and he encouraged senators to read it with care. He said that if there are differing interpretations, the Senate—as always—has the right to interpret its own legislation.

Anson said he had heard many different accounts of what was passed, and asked the chair for his interpretation of the sentence. Some present believed we had not passed a requirement for midterm grades at all. Robertson, Tschumi, and others said their memories matched the account in the minutes. The president suggested we hold this discussion until the postponed review and approval of the minutes.

VI. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor greeted the Senate in its first meeting of the academic year.

He began with a comment on the T & P document, praising the work so far in the committee and in this body. He hopes we'll get done today, and reminded us that it doesn't stop here: it comes to him, and ultimately must pass muster with the president of the System.

He had a meeting recently with the Senate's executive committee to talk about a number of things, including his request that the Senate move forward with developing a simple and straightforward statement on civility in the classroom.

He gave big thanks to everyone who participated in the kick-off of the Campus Campaign. We are, he said, approaching \$51M on a \$75M campaign. His announcement that 47% of the people who work here have already contributed drew great applause, and he seconded the president's assertion that the level of faculty and staff participation is an important factor in our ability to raise money from others in the community.

The chancellor stressed once again the value and importance of the *Access to Success* report. The more of us there are on campus who understand the state perspective on these issues, the better position we're in to accomplish what we want to accomplish. He read the paragraph about reaching the SREB average of citizens holding bachelor's degrees. Each of the next six years, we'd need significant increases in our production of graduates with bachelor's degrees to reach that benchmark. He thinks the efforts we're currently putting into retention and the pilot project on transfer of credit will be strategies that pay off well for us. Some of the recommendations in the report will be strong medicine for us and other schools in the state, but he believes they will be good medicine.

On the budget front, there is bad news and good news. He feels no need to comment on the turmoil and challenges of the national economy. At the state level, we started \$2M down from what we thought we'd have because of a take-back directed by the governor. The governor has also asked that all state agencies develop three budget proposals: one with a modest increase, one level, and one reflecting a seven percent reduction.

The outcome is not clear; there are a number of things in play out there, and most merit a conflicted reaction. A grocery tax reduction is a case in point. There are three cents remaining, and we don't know what the governor will do, but imagine he will do something. We'd all like to see that tax fall to zero, but with it will go significant state revenue in uncertain times.

Enrollment is down 146 students, though it is still over the 12,000 mark. With our new enrollment standards, we deferred more than 300 students, which means we're down about \$400K in tuition for the fall, but the loss is acceptable. Health insurance, however, is a bleaker picture. We have an \$8M deficit in the System, and there will most certainly be increases in premiums, copays, deductibles, some of the above, or all of the above. He will be surprised if dealing with this were postponed until July. January is more likely.

The good news is that state revenues are holding up better than expected. One possible explanation is that the Fayetteville shale activity is paying off, and if it is, we can expect it to persist for some while. Another factor frequently cited

is the historic experience of Arkansas lagging the nation in economic downturns: we go in later and we come out later.

The chancellor concluded with what he hopes are appropriately encouraging words: we're not going to progress in some areas as fast as we'd like to—might not be able to buy some things we want, could face a hiring freeze—but none of these are things we haven't dealt with before, and we're moving on toward our goals. He urged us to remember UALR is here for the long haul, doing the good work that is both our place and our pleasure to do.

Q from Ramsey: Will there be any chance for this body to deliberate what might happen in connection with insurance? *A:* Don't know, given that this is a Systemwide issue. He hopes it would be the case, and did observe that we have good representation on the System fringe benefits committee in the person of Professor Emeritus Doug Buffalo.

B. Provost Belcher

The provost congratulated the new officers, especially the "wise president."

He saluted the work of the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Senate as a whole. He underscored the process of approval, and wanted to be sure senators understand there's virtually no likelihood that this document could become policy this academic year.

He observed that all our plates were full to overflowing before we even looked outside our own borders, yet there are two issues of real concern to us in *Access to Success: The Final Report of the Arkansas Task Force on Higher Education*. One is the standards for degree production. Current standards are three graduates per year averaged over five years in bachelor's degree programs, two in master's programs, and one in doctoral programs. The task force's proposed standards are an average of six undergraduate, four graduate, and two doctoral degrees' over three, not five, years. Belcher pointed out that it's tough to apply such a policy to the idiosyncratic range of degree programs we offer. Cognate programs are an example; a proposal might be something like defining cognate as sharing seventy percent of content. It looks like we could count embedded certificates and degrees both as completions as long as we don't count the same graduate twice. There are also issues about consortial doctoral programs, and new degree programs. The task force recommendations will be voted on in mid-October. If they pass, all schools will have about two years to get their houses in order. Those who don't meet the standards by June 2010 will have another two years of "probationary" period. The hidden stick is that as of 2010, ADHE will withhold SSCH credit from programs that don't meet the standard when the schools forward information for funding allocations.

How are we currently doing? The provost has asked Jim Lynch to study our performance. Our programs not already meeting the proposed standards seem to fall into three categories: brand new programs, a second set of programs extremely close to meeting the standards, and a small list of programs that will be challenged to meet the productivity standards. This may spark some new and creative work, and that's his hope. He will report to the Senate on this matter again in October.

A second issue in the *Access to Success* report is a provision regarding program review. If it passes, there will be a new pattern. Those with national external accreditation will continue to use it as program review, but every nonaccredited program must have a self-study every seven to ten years (our

choice), and employ at least two out-of-state reviewers who will prepare and send a report to ADHE a report. We don't yet know how we'll fund these external reviewers, but the process looks basically healthy to us.

Q from Eshleman: Will there be designated delays for new programs before the number-of-graduates standard kicks in? *A:* Yes, there will be grace periods set, but we don't know what they'll be.

Q from Ramsey: Any possibility of linking these two initiatives together, so that we could use the program review process to help support programs that might not meet the degree-productivity standards? *A:* There has been a suggestion of an appeal process, about which Dr. Purcell is not excited, so it might be possible.

Q from Robertson: About interdisciplinary degree programs, which often are administered very cost-effectively, he's concerned that the new numbers might cost us valuable programs. *A:* Our colleagues at Fayetteville have raised this issue, and we all realize how complex the discussion really is, and ultimately, the devil's in the details, and the details still need work .

C. Reports of Standing Committees

Ford noted that there will be reports from the Councils at each Senate meeting until we have worked out effective, timely, and consistent ways to communicate their work to the faculty.

1. Graduate Council, Anne Lindsay, Chair

Lindsay summarized the Graduate Council's charge for the Senate. She asked for communication from senators about what they'd like to hear the Council report to the Senate.

The council has received three charges from Ford: to propose communication procedures between the Council and the Senate and communication to the faculty as a whole, to review jurisdiction in general, and to review working processes to streamline them where possible and to be able to communicate those procedures clearly to newcomers, for example.

She again invited communication: aclindsay@ualr.edu.

2. Undergraduate Council. Jeanette Clausen, Chair

Clausen said Lindsay just gave her report: Ford brought Undergraduate Council basically the same three charges. She added they're pretty clear they'd like to be able to do good work with fewer meetings. They're already about the business of considering these issues of communication, jurisdiction, and procedural streamlining.

Clausen invited the same feedback from senators to her about what they'd like to have regularly reported on: jxclausen@ualr.edu.

3. Academic Calendar and Scheduling Committee, Amy Oliver Barnes, Chair.

Barnes noted that all the slots on the committee weren't filled until just this week, so she apologized for springing this on them before a first meeting. She said the executive committee has asked the committee to bring forward templates for the scheduling of final exams, in the hope that administrative staff can set up the schedules easily and accurately every semester. She

thanked Rosalie Cheatham for her work in putting the templates together, and said she hoped they'd be presented to this body for approval next month.

The committee's also been asked to consider how online courses might affect and be affected by our policies about finals.

Late registration is an issue on their agenda for discussion, and they've been asked to consider general scheduling of time blocks for classes, examining for example the possibility of classes being scheduled for only four weekdays.

Q: Does your committee control the way the finals schedule is presented online? A: No. Records and Registration handles that. Eshleman observed that the current format is very difficult for students to read. Barnes agreed, and said perhaps the committee could communicate.

Nickels noted changes in the final schedule between the draft and the version on the web. Barnes said there had been an error, apparently, in the transfer of information about the final schedule, and the wrong information was posted. We caught it, she said, and got it corrected. Ford spoke to trying not to make a major campus to-do about it; the errors only affected about fifty classes, and those professors will get personal notification of the change.

IV. Review of minutes (previously postponed)

Moved Nickels, seconded Tschumi, to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2008. Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

V. Old Business

- A. MOTION. The Tenure and Promotion Committee's motion, beginning with Section 2.

President Ford, in remarks preliminary to discussion of the motion, reminded the Senate that in our extended meeting of April 18 (and April 25, May 2, and May 9), 2008, the Senate went line by line through Section 1 of the Tenure Committee's motion, and passed it with the amendments noted in the minutes. Because of the important of the topic and the sheer volume of discussion and amendments, formal, friendly, and failed, Ford asked the secretary over the summer to incorporate the amendments captured in the minutes into the original document, so we could have a pulled-together draft amended version (pending the approval of the minutes, of course). He then appointed an ad hoc "Purple Bow Panel" (thereby avoiding the stuffiness of a "Blue Ribbon Panel" to vet the draft against the minute record, and spot any errors, contradictions, or other matters that might need attention.

The Purple Bow Panel was comprised of Ed Anson, Charlie Bolton, Jane Brown, Rosalie Cheatham, Andrew Eshleman, Judith Faust, Gary Geissler, Linda Holzer, Earl Ramsey, Pete Tschumi, Fred Williams, and Andrew Wright. Ford thanked them heartily for their help.

Ford asked Holzer and Brown to come forward and sit at the Senate table for the discussion.

There was considerable discussion of whether the document before the Senate had incorporated changes recommended by members of the Purple Bow Panel. The secretary, who had been the recipient of all comments and who

developed the draft with amendments incorporated, said the Panel had found errors in the secretary's transcription of the content of the minutes to the new draft, such as the repetition of a subsection, and mistakes in numbering. She did incorporate those editorial corrections. Members of the panel had also recognized an unresolved issue, and noted what might be internal inconsistencies, but no such changes were made in the document—the comments are merely noted in the draft.

Fitzhugh said the law school wishes the phrase "law reviews and journals" to be added on p. 19, and to the fifth line of the first full paragraph on p. 20, since the current language might otherwise be construed as ruling out those publications as acceptable. **The Tenure Committee accepted the amendment as friendly.**

Robertson moved, Ramsey seconded, the approval of Section 2, as amended, to include the changes requested by law faculty.

In discussion, Clausen asked about the reference to "applicant" in the first paragraph in section VII, and clarification was offered that the committee had agreed that the term "applicant" should be used consistently throughout the document.

Robertson moved, Vinikas seconded, the question. Motion carried. The main motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

Ford requested from the secretary a clean version of the motion as passed

Chin asked if a clean copy could also be sent to department chairs, since so many are revisiting their governance documents. Ford explained that while a clean copy will certainly be available on the Senate web site, the document does not represent policy; it is a recommendation to the chancellor, who must approve it, and will ultimately require approval at the University System level as well.

Robertson, concerned that such a process might turn into a long one, asserted that we need to move with speed rather than extended deliberation. He asked that we urge the administration to move quickly. He said his college has structures that need to change in order to follow the direction set out by this policy, and that waiting years is unacceptable.

Ramsey expressed some concern at yet another example of agreeing with Robertson, but he too believes administration needs to move this matter expeditiously.

Ford says he will transmit the approved motion to the chancellor ten working days from now, and hopes we'll have response from the chancellor this semester.

Ramsey asked that Ford commend as strongly as possible to the chancellor that he acknowledge their concern about moving forward with improvements to the University's policies on tenure and promotion.

Watts expressed some concern about how rapidly we moved through the remainder of the T & P motion. He admitted to not having read section 2 of the document with care, and said he's missing Sen. Jovanovich's presence and careful attention to detail. Bennie Prince, a member of the committee, noted that Jovanovich was here in spirit, since he reviewed every word of the document and sent his detailed comments to the committee.

Anson raised a point he believes remains essentially unclear in the document we approved. Ford asked that if senators have such concerns, they write them out and bring them to the attention of the chancellor and/or provost.

VII. Open Forum

Tschumi asked that the Senate recognize the good work of the secretary, saying very kindly that recruiting her to the executive committee sometimes seems like the most useful thing he did during his term as president. The secretary was abashed and pleased by the vigorous round of applause given her by her colleagues.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

Judith Faust, Secretary