



## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, September 25, 2015

1:00 PM until Adjournment

DSC B&C

### I. Welcome and Roll Call

*Present:* **CALS**—Cheatham, LeGrand, Thilbeault, Warner, Street, Smith, Douglas, Kyong-McClain. **CB**—Leonard, Hendon, Farewell. **CEHP**—Prince, Evans, Layton, Rurup, Clemmons, Lowery. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Blevins-Knabe, Scranton, Craw, Jensen, Matson. **CEIT**—Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Bayrak. **LAW**—Foster. **LIBRARY**—Macheak. **EXOFFICIO**—Anderson, Toro, Wright, Laan.

*Absent:* **CALS**—Cates, Law, McAbee. **CB**—. **CEHP**—Oltmans, Crass, Vander Putten, Carmack. **CSSC**—. **CEIT**—Anderson. **LAW**—. **LIBRARY**—. **EXOFFICIO**—Hickman.

### II. Review of Minutes from 8-28-2015

Motion by Senator Tschumi to approve the minutes from Aug 28, 2015. Seconded by Senator Cheatham. Motion carries.

### III. Announcements - none

### IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 min limit, no discussion)

Senator Macheak: Stated that she had been told one must be out for a month before being eligible for catastrophic leave.

Chancellor Anderson responded: That is accurate. Please refer said faculty member to contact him. There are policies in place that have worked well in past years and are in compliance with state and federal regulations.

Senator LeGrand: Just moved into ETAS and gives a shout out to IT – quick response, thorough. She is grateful to everyone in IT services.

### V. Reports

#### A. Chancellor's Report – Joel Anderson

- Catastrophic leave – encourage faculty member to contact me; answer was a good one; policies and processes are in place consistent with existing law and regulations.

- Glad to report improved enrolment – 1.8% increase, better than initial report of 1.2%. Freshman enrollment up in a significant way. Was proud of representation at significant Hot Springs event by enrollment management; faculty, staff, parents, students there, all colleges represented. Well-organized and looked sharp; thanks to Dean Kahler.
- Questions about new branding of athletics as Little Rock Trojans – references Little Rock’s name recognition, recognition greatly due to the 1957 desegregation crisis and President Clinton, including the Clinton Library. Also, in the world of athletics the senior university (flagship) in any state owns the State name. Another reason is the difficulties the acronym UALR! Little Rock may be more effective in calling us to mind. Reception has been overwhelmingly positive. Little Rock is a unique and highly recognizable name. Our athletics department has enjoyed recent successes, including women’s basketball and soccer teams, and has a bright future.
- President Bobbitt and others discussing student retention and graduation –state master plan initiative kicked off and provoked this discussion. The legislators and Governor are asking why do we remain at 49<sup>th</sup>? A lot could be said about this, but there is no benefit in getting defensive about it. We simply must work on improvement. Every part of the institution needs to be concerned about retention and graduation. One good thing that has developed is an increased appreciation for other credentials and certifications in addition to AAS and bachelor degrees. We have made progress and appreciate the Provost’s work on this. Recommends we accept this as a happy challenge – we must work on recruitment and retention, one student at a time.
- The environment continues to get more complicated and challenges keep coming. We must keep our minds open to new ideas and new ways of doing things, and not become defensive. Need to involve more autonomy to colleges in curriculum to improve their ability to move more quickly, for example. Change as you can to deal with challenges successfully because the issues just keep coming. As he ponders retirement, a note he would leave behind might be “I am sorry, but I didn’t get it finished.” There is always something and more coming in – not quite enough time in the 24 hour day to get it done. We must adapt, use resources to our advantage. Respond thoughtfully to challenges and suggestions to learn what will position us best in the future. Thank you.

**B. Provost's Report – Zulma Toro**

Dr. Toro’s speech is attached.

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

**D. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel**

**E. Graduate Council – Brian Berry (new chair of grad council)**

**F. Academic Success Program Success Stories – Kimberly Bright (ppt attached)**

P Tschumi asks: What would it take to increase the capacity of ACS?

K Bright says: At least 3 more GAs.

PT - How many are on probation that do not get the help?

KB: It varies by semester. Based on our statistics we have the potential to save approximately 25% of that pool who do not participate, if they would participate. Financially, that is a lot.

L Smith: What suggestions do you have for us when we spot students who are at risk, before they are on probation? Where do we refer them for help?

KB: We would like to expand and allow faculty to refer. Right now we can't. We can take a few more, but right now we can't take them all. We have been able to take about 5 additional students who were recommended by faculty.

It is more promising to help students hovering in the 2 – 2.25 GPA range. One semester can wipe them out. We should help them avoid that.

N Jovanovich: It seems there is big large group of students who should be in these programs – but it is a relatively small, self-selected group who volunteer for the service. Is there evidence that the program could help those who don't voluntarily come?

KB says: We currently have no way to measure that or any way to compel students to participate. Any time you 'force' a student to do something that could compromise the chance for success. We probably would see some affect from compulsory attendance, but those who want help are more likely to succeed.

P Tschumi: Athletics is a group required to participate. What is their success rate? What rate of success do we need to achieve to increase capacity?

Z Toro: If financial analysis supports that more GAs would improve retention by enough tuition to pay for the GAs then we would hire more GAs. Yes, that can be done.

S Farewell: What if there were incentives?

KB: Anything we can do to motivate and help them understand and want to participate is useful.

S F: The students who lose their scholarships and financial aid, so now they are only taking one class because that is all they can pay for and they still haven't bought books.

KB: We do need to ask, is it the loss of the scholarship that keeps them from coming back when they may be at 1.99 but still be on probation. Perhaps in the next semester they could recover, but they can't come back because they have no funding.

B Prince: Can you recommend a semester of academic forgiveness?

KB: You can, but it must be used with caution. A student gets only one chance at academic forgiveness. We also encourage them to talk to their advisor. We are careful about staying within our boundaries as coaches.

A Wright: Existing legislation requires that students who are on academic probation attend ACS. Therefore, we need to organize the resources to make that possible. Also, it would be wise to allow students to continue to use ASC even after probation to ensure they continue to be successful.

## VI. Old Business

- A. Motion FS\_2015\_28. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at Two Meetings, Second vote, verbatim) Merge Faculty Research Committee and Faculty Teaching and Service Development Committees into Faculty Professional Development Committee

Be it resolved that the Faculty Research Committee shall be deleted

~~**Faculty Research Committee:** This committee shall make recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning research policies of a general nature and methods of encouraging research activity. Under the authority of the vice chancellor and provost, it shall award the faculty research grants. The committee shall consist of one full-time faculty member from each college and school represented in the Faculty Senate to be appointed by the Committee on Committees. Each member shall serve a two-year term, with the terms to be staggered to insure experienced representation.~~

And, Be it further resolved that the Faculty Teaching and Service Development Committee shall be renamed to the Faculty Professional Development Committee and changed as follows:

~~**Faculty Teaching and Service Professional Development Committee:** The purpose of this committee is to review and make recommendations concerning policies and procedures involving the enhancement of the research, teaching, and service functions of the University. ~~More specifically,~~ The committee is concerned with faculty improvement workshops and other activities and conditions designed to recruit, improve, and retain a highly productive faculty. This committee shall make recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning research policies of a general nature and methods of encouraging research activity. Under the authority of the executive vice chancellor and provost, it shall award the faculty research grants.~~

~~The committee shall consist of one member from the Ottenheimer Library faculty, two full-time faculty members from each college or school represented in the Faculty Senate to be named by the Committee on Committees to staggered terms of two years each and as ex-officio member, the designee appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost. ~~the Associate Vice Chancellor for Technology and Instructional Support, the campus director of American Humanities, and the Director of Campus and Community Partnerships.~~~~

**Commentary:** Neither the Faculty Research Committee nor the Faculty Teaching and Service Development Committee has been active in recent years, so neither committee has so much work to do that two committees are justified. By focusing the charge of the committee to Faculty Professional Development, it is envisioned that the committee might recommend and maintain a comprehensive professional development plan for the university that is responsive to faculty needs.

Motion carried unanimously.

- B.** Motion FS\_2015\_29. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at Two Meetings, Second vote, verbatim) Delete Planning and Finance Committee chair as Academic Calendar and Schedules chair.

Whereas the practice of the university has been for the ACSC committee to elect a chair from its membership,

Be it resolved that the Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee be modified to delete the chair of Planning and Finance Committee as the chair of the Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee, so that the committee shall read:

**Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee:** This committee shall recommend to the Faculty Senate the academic calendar, schedules, and schedule policy, and shall present academic schedules to the Senate. Normally, these calendars and schedules, in draft form, originate in the Registrar's Office, and are forwarded to the committee for its approval before being submitted to the Faculty Senate. When questions arise, the committee shall, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, interpret the calendar and schedules.

The committee shall consist of one full-time faculty member from each college/school represented in the Faculty Senate to be appointed by the Committee on Committees, the vice president of the Faculty Senate, the chair of the Undergraduate Council or that person's designee, the registrar or that person's designee, the vice chancellor and provost or that person's designee. In addition, two students appointed by the Student Government Association shall serve as members. Appointed faculty members shall serve two-year staggered terms and students shall serve one-year terms.

~~The chairperson of the Planning and Finance Committee shall serve as chairperson of this committee.~~

Motion carried unanimously.

## VII. New Business

- A.** Motion FS\_2015\_30. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Tweak Drop Date Legislation

Whereas the Drop Date and the Late Add Date need to be separated in time so that students can make schedule adjustments more easily, and

Whereas the Drop Date can be postponed a few days without consequences,

Therefore be it Resolved that the drop date legislation be changed to:

Withdrawing from an Individual Course (Drop Date)

A student can drop a course up to the 5<sup>th</sup> 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. From the 6<sup>th</sup> day through the 41<sup>st</sup> day of classes, a student wishing to drop a class ~~obtains acknowledgement from the course instructor and completes the course drop process by submitting the acknowledged~~ submits a request to the Office of Records and Registration who notifies the person responsible for the class. From the 11<sup>th</sup> day to the 41<sup>st</sup> day, the student may cancel the request within 5 calendar days by no-

tifying the Office of Records and Registration. Should the student fail to cancel the request within 5 calendar days, the drop becomes final. A student cannot withdraw from a course 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.

**Commentary:** It should be noted that the 5 calendar days to cancel a request is NOT a cut-off date. After reviewing the process in the Fall 2015 semester, it was determined that the Late Add process was interfering with the Drop Process, when students needed to drop a class before they could add a class. By extending the Drop Date until after students have completed adding, a student who ends up dropping a class isn't blocking another student who wants to add that class. It was also determined that students were having a difficult time contacting instructors, especially adjuncts and especially in on-line classes. By giving the students five days after they have started the Drop Request for the instructor in the class to be notified and to discuss the student's possible success in the class, any students who might be convinced to continue in the class can be reached.

J Matson: We are adjusting the drop date so that the drop date and late add date work together better.

AW: basically extends through the 10<sup>th</sup> day of classes. Does not need advisor/faculty member to acknowledge. Provides the student a 5 day grace period to cancel the drop. By doing that it accomplishes the intent of the legislation, that is, to give the student and faculty a chance to discuss dropping the class.

J Flinn: Concerned about the probability of conversations happening between student and faculty – I want to reach out to the student, but chances are they are not going to respond to my email – they will not come to class. Will this really encourage those conversations?

BBlevins-Knabe Implications of timeliness to degree- recommends student speak to the academic advisor first. Once the student has dropped the decision has been made and the student is unlikely to respond to the faculty's request to talk about it.

A Wright: The current legislation does not empower the instructor to block the drop.

J Flinn: Right, but at least we have the opportunity to have the conversation, the way it is written now.

AW: You have a valid point, I am not sure the conversations are taking place right now.

J Flinn: Maybe we need to work a little harder on the process as it is – not all faculty are aware that they have an obligation. It may be too early to tweak.

P Tschumi: What does the language actually say?

AW: From the 6<sup>th</sup> – 41<sup>st</sup> they can cancel the class, and the instructor is notified. From the 6<sup>th</sup> through the 11<sup>th</sup> day there is a grace period during which the student can rescind the drop.

N Jovanovich: No grace if dropping before the 6<sup>th</sup> day. From the 6<sup>th</sup> through 11<sup>th</sup>, grace and notification to the instructor. From the 11<sup>th</sup> – 41<sup>st</sup>, no grace but instructor is notified.

M Douglas: Why would a student rescind?

P Tschumi: if they went and talked to the faculty member and faculty member says they can pass if they do x, y, and z...

N Jovanovich: Or your degree will be delayed by a year...

M Douglas: But if they are not forced to come talk to me, how can that every happen?

AW: I appreciate your point of view – this legislation would have to be the thing that would incentivize them to come talk to you.

M Douglas: ...I don't understand why they would rescind without the conversation happening.

AW: The intent of the legislation is to get that conversation to happen.

R Cheatham: Should be discuss/tweak more later? We all seem to be in the same spot, there is some agreement here. But the language is not getting us where we want to be. We have time to tweak in October perhaps, prior to the next drop date time. Would the movers consider postponing this?

AW: You are moving towards a motion to refer to committee. Before we get to that point – it would be nice if some solutions were put out there.

R Cheatham: It is hard to change the peculiarities of the language in a way that gets us where we need to be.

P Tschumi: Do they still require the department chair? Because that was one of the big complaints.

R Cheatham: No.

AW: Let's make a motion to send it back to the executive committee.

R Cheatham: Moves to refer to committee. Seconded by Sen. Douglas.

AW: A number of questions need to be answered. Is there any discussion on the referral?

J Matson: If we all go home and nothing happens until October 17 or whatever and we just have the same thing, that seems useless.

AW: I have an idea how to resolve it... from the 11<sup>th</sup> to the 41<sup>st</sup> day continue with the signed acknowledgement- given the 5 days to rescind... part of the issue is who gets notified who is responsible for processing the drop? Do we keep that with the registrar?

J Matson: Can we have an opportunity to give suggestions?

AW: yes, on the list serve.

Motion to refer to executive committee carries unanimously.

- B.** Motion FS\_2015\_31. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Modify Prerequisite Test Legislation

Whereas the prerequisite test legislation has enabled some departments to administer tests after the semester began, it should be clarified that such a test can be administered before registration for the class which might assist students in selecting a more appropriate class before classes have filled up, and

Whereas it is poor form to administer a test without notifying the student about what might be tested, and

Therefore be it Resolved that the legislation which authorized departments to administer prerequisite tests be modified as follows (strike-through indicates deletion, underline indicates addition):

Individual academic units/departments may choose to develop and administer a "prerequisite-test" to all students in a course prior to registering for the class and no later than the end of the first week of classes to verify that those enrolled have the skills necessary to successfully complete the class. Students may be administratively withdrawn from the course if they do not demonstrate their grasp of the prerequisite skills. Departments who choose to initiate a prerequisite test shall follow the normal curriculum approval process using the appropriate curriculum change forms. The prerequisite test must be accompanied by a syllabus of topics covered on the test and recommended study materials to prepare for the test.

#### Citation and Modification

This policy must be cited in curricular documents that excerpt it (such as the Undergraduate Catalog) and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (or their designee) should review those documents before they are finalized. Wherever there is a substantive conflict between the document which quotes this policy and this policy, this policy shall be followed.

The policy can be modified through legislative action of the Faculty Senate (see Article III of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock).

J Matson: To allow prerequisite tests -- we are trying to make sure students are informed about the tests that they are trying to take.

N Jovanovich: What is the motivation for this? Is there a problem?

AW: A number of faculty members in EIT have commented on a specific prerequisite test.

D Legrand: Math lab -- we tutor on everything, but when students come in we cannot help them because we have no idea what they are being tested on.

R Cheatham: What about the current language? Pre-requisite means it would have been required prior to getting into the class. Does it mean that prerequisites are not being enforced in BANNER?

AW says: We may be talking about classes where the student has come to UALR and has a test score that got them into the class, but might not actually be material to the course.



R Cheatham: Are selecting from particular student population? We all know that a student may have just passed the class but not retain the requisite knowledge.

N Jovanovich: This is not prerequisite checking – this is giving them a test.

R Cheatham: Which implies they have met the prerequisite for being in the class, or else we are not enforcing the prerequisite.

N Jovanovich: There is a prerequisite course to get in the class and there is a prerequisite test score to get into the class, regardless of whether you took the class.

R Cheatham: Isn't that what is happening? Like this math...you have to have this ACT or something to get into the class?

AW: There is the concept of the technical and the concept of the knowledge. Legislation has already authorized faculty to drop the student if they give them the test and they fail.

R Cheatham: When the word prerequisite was added it gave me a question – I understood the concept of knowledge, but then pre-requisite came up as opposed to just the requisite knowledge.

S Farewell: In Econ, before we let them go on into the Intermediate, we want to know if they have retained the requisite knowledge from previous coursework (which could be from years back, or from who knows where) to be successful in Intermediate. So we give them that prerequisite test.

R Cheatham: Yes, we encounter the situation where a student wants to come in a foreign language class 15 years after they had French I...

S Thibeault: We have handled it by putting it in the course description, consent of the instructor. This gives us the leeway to decide why we are going to give permission.

AW: You don't have to write it into the course – the Senate had already given you the authority to administer that test, you just need to inform the student. What we are adding is that you would have to convey to the student what you are testing him on.

L Smith: Call it testing for requisite knowledge.

AW: We could do that.

M Douglas: We give a placement exam to put the student in a position to be most successful and reduce failures. We are doing a great job of predicting failure. You can't predict success – there are way too many variables. If you come to our Chem I class without X amount of knowledge in math and chem you are not going to make it. It is not a prerequisite test; it is a prerequisite test to get into the course. Calling it a prerequisite test confuses the issue. I don't want them to study for it. If they don't have the knowledge at their fingertips, they are not ready for the course.

J Matson: There are some problems with terminology and we can talk about that. The point of the legislation is the last line – if you are doing some kind of placement or test, the student should know what it is and what's on it. That is your basic principle. Is that the issue?

S Thibeault: I think it is the prerequisite. You can satisfy the prerequisite with Accounting II for example. But you have added the word ‘pre’ to the requisite knowledge.

AW: You are right. There are several ways to deal with that and that could definitely be handled through a motion to amend.

D Legrand: When you give any test you tell them what is the goal or focus.

J Giammo: If they know what is expected they may be able to decide that the class is or isn’t for them before it is too late to make a change.

AW: The amending says up to the first week of class but doesn’t speak to giving the test before the semester starts. The addition of ‘prior to registering for the class’ is intended to clarify the authority.

P Tschumi: We are worried about the student knowing what is on the test, and going out and studying it and passing the test – either they already knew it and only needed to brush up or were so smart they were able to pick it up quickly. Either way, they are ready for the class. A student who is not ready for the class is not going to be able to finesse the test. I believe the concern is without merit.

Nick: If a student is given a syllabus that covers the content of the test, and told this is what you need to study for the test, would that be adequate?

AW: That would be sufficient. That is all we ask.

AW: I will ask Senator Cheatham for an amendment to drop the ‘pre.’ Is that something you would like to do?

R Cheatham: I’d love to.

AW: The amendment was accepted without objection. The language returns to the language of the current policy. Wherever you see ‘pre’ underlined in the amendment, that will be stricken. Is there further discussion?

Motion carried as amended

## VIII. Open Forum

### A. Core Assessment: What will be distinctive about UALR graduates?

AW: Right now we are starting to assess the core curriculum. Back when we started the general education revision, we intended to have outcomes where our graduates would exhibit some common, unique characteristics. I wanted to re-engage the Senate in the discussion – How will our graduates be distinctive?

B Blevins-Knabe That concept is too vague for us to get our head’s around. Could you give us a more concrete task to discuss.

AW: we are beginning to put flesh around the baccalaureate degree requirements

J Matson: reminds us that we are trying to implement wording that majors that aren’t subject to accreditation will have to demonstrate skills in communications, technology, ethics and research methods.

AW: This may involve content creation or curriculum changes.

N Jovanovich: It's too late to make curriculum changes effective Spring 2016 since the registration deadline was moved up. As representative of UGC, the deadline for Spring 16 is Oct 1. These changes would have to take effect in Fall '16.

P Tschumi: It could be that departments make changes that do not have to go through UGC.

B Blevins-Knabe: The Council on Core Curriculum and Policies would like to know whether or not the Senate would be receptive to moving the science curricular area into the UALR Standard Core. Since all college cores require the same science core courses, this might make the core more understandable to students and more effective to assess.

N Jovanovich: Right now, it looks like UALR doesn't care about science and math, since they're in the college core. If we bring science into the UALR standard core, we should also bring math into the standard core.

S Farewell: On behalf of the College of Business ... [I could not discern what was said].

AW: all colleges except the College of Business have selected the same set of math courses.

B Street: The only deviation that CoB has is that they don't accept QMR.

K Leonard: we are the only ones who require college algebra or higher

P Tschumi: All EIT programs require calculus. We don't specify which math a student should take to satisfy the math curricular area, because we know they are going to need calculus

G Jensen: If we incorporate the science and math into the UALR standard core then the only hours left are the flex hours. Why would we continue to have college cores?

AW: Standard core and college core makes advising a little bit more difficult. There is a cost in documentation. There are benefits to colleges having some uniqueness and being able to try different things in their core. The college core is also not limited to just State Minimum Core. So far, no college has added to what the Senate required them to put into the college core. That doesn't mean they can't do so in the future.

Nick: If you list the standard core, there are no math or science courses in the core. We would be broadcasting to the world that UALR requires no math or science...it makes the discussion cumbersome.

AW: Any further discussion on this or any other topic? Then, if not, we are adjourned.

## IX. Adjourn