



Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, January 29, 2016

12:30 PM until 2:45 PM

EIT Auditorium

I. Welcome and Roll Call

AWright convened the meeting at 12:35 pm

Present: **CALS**— Cates, Cheatham, Ecke, LeGrand, Thibeault, Warner, Smith, Douglas, McAbee, Kyong-McClain. **CB**—Leonard, Farewell, Hendon. **CEHP**—Lowery, Prince, Evans, Clemmons, Oltmans, Carmack, Vander Putten, Layton. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Jenson, Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Golden, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT**— Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Ray. **LAW**—Fitzhugh, Foster. **LIBRARY**— Macheak. **EXOFFICIO**—Wright, Anderson.

Absent: **CALS**— Anson, Street, Law, **CB**—. **CEHP**—Rurup, Crass. **CSSC**—**CEIT**—Ray, Bayrak. **LAW**—Boles. **LIBRARY**—. **EXOFFICIO**—Hickman, Laan.

II. Review of 12-11-15 Minutes

S Thibeault offered correction, ‘Current enrollment’ should be ‘concurrent enrollment.’ Thibault.
Moved by R Cheatham, second by J Tramel. Approved as amended.

III. Reports

A. Chancellor’s Report – Joel Anderson

JEA before Bobbitt. Running late. Past official 11th day headcount. Been submitted to ADHE. Down 1.3% this semester. UG – 1.8%. Grad up 2.2%. First time entering doctoral students up 182%. Increase of 31 students. 10939 final number. Includes concurrent. Concurrent during spring is 1300 students. They don’t pay tuition. \$50/course. Tuition fees down \$400,000 plus. One of things making a strong headwind across the state is what’s going on with 2-year. 15.5% for 2-year headcount. We have declined 7.7% since 2012. PT since 2012 declined 36.3%. Two year enrollment decline affects our transfer rate, which has dropped xx percent. State funding has lagged. Number of things operating against us. Another challenge is that the competition for students is FIERCE. You can spell fierce in all caps. We are making some advances in terms of retention. We are making some strides there. It is less expensive to keep a student than bring a new one. Whereas SSCH used to be the language of higher ed, now retention and graduation rates are the language. Encouraging results in freshmen re-

cruitment in last two falls. Discouraging because these things take awhile. Estem partnership will help some, but that's a few years away.

Provost has been working on a plan for student success, which will help. Touchstone project is "US" focused. How to help all of us do a better job. Encourage Faculty Senate to be alert and ready to take actions when opportunities arise to help efforts. Example: homeschool students. We have opportunity to get more of them involved in homeschool/concurrent. Homeschool students are good students generally.

Chancellor search: I am glad the search is about to pick up steam. I think the search itself will be good for the spirit of the campus. Although there are many clouds on the horizon, there are some promising signs: national economy seems to be picking up some steam (post 2008). Maybe fall election will help higher education. Certainly signs out there and on campus that are encouraging. Although things moving slowly, things can change dramatically in a short time. Like our basketball team. Like the change a new coach can make. See the obvious analogy to a new chancellor. I think a new chancellor will make a significant change. I'm quite aware that most people like to come here to work. That's going to continue because they know they work in a place that elevates people. But I know there is a feeling across campus, particularly among people who have been here a long time, need a change. I would encourage you to be a participant in the search process. If you know people, nominate them. Participate in campus visits.

B. Chancellor Search Committee – Donald Bobbitt 12:57

Thanks for having me; this is to be a conversation not lecture.

[New chancellor coming on anecdote]

Thanks to Chancellor Anderson for his service.

You work with the hand you are dealt. Since announcement I have met with constituencies including the board of visitors, mayor. There is lots of appreciation out there for the job to be done. There is a desire for national search, but that does not preclude local, but casts wide net.

Challenges: highly publicized examples of people who were damaged simply by being included in the search; there are several reasons not to identify; interview could imperil current work

I offer that because the newspaper would out all persons of interest; if you nominate someone to the search committee it could get fo'i'd and put the nominee at risk.

The process then, is first avoid inhibiting anyone who might be a good candidate

Monticello – was ambushed by fo'i - we lost virtually all candidates we have regrouped from there. If we use an external search firm that will yield a range of candidates. There will be some who don't require confidentiality, but some will. The external search firm can lay groundwork. The search firm will serve as a safety for those who need confidentiality.

Advantage: There are a number of attractive things about LR and UALR. Therefore, I am not concerned that we will have difficulty finding candidates.

RFP for search firm and got 6-7 responses yielded 2 outstanding firms.

1:08 After interviews Greenwood and Asher floated to the top - they are considered most ethical - and we have a contract in place.

Membership of search committee; got names from several sources including faculty.

Search committee and consultants to meet

Greenwood and Asher will be overseeing our search

Division of labor; confidentiality will require that updates be in general terms

1:13 Search firm is buffer; can reach lots of candidates who are qualified and suited.

Will stimulate interest in broad and deep roster of candidates

We need the opportunity to share our wonderful state, city and university.

Then meeting wherein formal applicants will be pared down to a few compelling candidates. Should have some on campus interviews; Bobbitt will make final recommendation.

All structured to protect us and them

Ultimately 3-4 candidates

Will bring them in during most propitious time; delay until Fall if we can't get them here by May

1:18 Prospectus being prepared on the job

Q&A

Q: Found it interesting there is not much representation from the Arts, ie Ar Rep, arts council, etc.

D Bobbitt: Committee is broad and representative.

Q: Given the delicacy etc if someone has a name, should they contact the search firm?

D Bobbitt: Yes, give name to Greenwood Asher and they will contact. You should feel free to give them all info.

Q: Speak about your goals and hopes for the new Chancellor?

D Bobbitt: our business has been stable; some recognize that the future of University is important to community etc 1:23 We should be embracing challenges and opportunities of the university.

Q: What sort of process for faculty input?

D Bobbitt: Get with members of the committee; or directly with Bobbitt, or Bob Denman.

Q: Tell us about the 6-7 candidates for search firms.

D Bobbitt: We took a large group id'd by search firm; chose Dallas for pre-interviews which are essential to balanced view of candidates; ask campus for feedback on what is important; the face to face initial meetings will sort out more.

Q: April doesn't seem likely, so when?

D Bobbitt: too early to say; I would not put someone who is interested in being a candidate in the interim role if interim becomes necessary.

Q: Are there particular challenges to our search?

D Bobbitt: always going to be a challenge to bring people to Arkansas; finances and issue;

I will come back any time you summon and give you what I can. Andrew stays in touch; ask me or ask Andrew.

1:32

IV. Old Business

None

V. New Business

Should facilitate admissions/ transfer committee; to comply we must amend by laws to allow eVote.

J Matson moves on behalf of the executive committee:

- A. Motion FS_2016_1.** Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires three-fifths vote at one Faculty Senate meeting) To add to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate the following language to allow limited eVoting by Faculty Senate Committees.

Be it resolved that the following be added to Article III: Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, **eVoting:** Committees of the Faculty Senate may render decisions on matters of routine business through asynchronous electronic means such as email (hereafter referred to as eVoting) provided that the committee follows the approved operating procedures by which it will conduct eVoting. Operating procedures for eVoting must be approved by the Faculty Senate.

The deliberative process is the foundation of sound democratic governance. It is critically important that the use of eVoting is done in such a way that it does not undermine this process.

1:35 A Wright introduces motion –calls for vote discussion

R Cheatham: The first motion enables, next implements it
Motion carries

J Matson moves on behalf of the executive committee:

B. Motion FS_2016_2. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting) General Operating Procedures for eVoting

Be it resolved that the following policy be created,
General Operating Procedures for eVoting

In accordance with the Bylaws of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, each committee wishing to use eVoting shall submit a proposal describing what matters may be decided by eVoting and the procedures that will be used to implement eVoting.

A Faculty Senate committee may render a decision on a “matter of routine business” through asynchronous electronic means such as email (hereafter referred to as eVoting) provided that it follows the rules outlined in this policy.

A “matter of routine business” is a matter that the committee encounters frequently in its operation and which the committee typically acts on with limited or no discussion. A policy decision or election cannot be considered as a routine matter of business.

Only members of the committee may propose an item to be decided by eVoting. The committee must specify the minimum number of members that must propose the item for it to be considered.

Any member of the committee may require a meeting and that the voting be done at the meeting by notifying the chair of the committee in writing after an item to be decided by eVoting has been communicated to the committee and before the end of the voting period. If there is a need to amend the item, then a meeting must be held.

The proposal must contain the following:

- all routine matters of business that the committee may consider through eVoting.
- the means by which an item to be decided by eVoting shall be communicated to the members of the committee. All members of the committee, including non-voting members, must be included in the communication of an item.
- how eVoting will be conducted (e.g., by email).
- the time period from the communication of the item by which the eVoting will be concluded.
- the required percentage of those voting that will be used to determine if an item is approved (majority) and the minimum number of the committee that must vote in order for an item to be approved (quorum).
- whether or not votes may be viewed by committee members during the voting
- how the result will be communicated to the committee

Introduced; discussion

Q? Who approves the process?

A Wright: Faculty Senate

This is a discussion of value of having it come before the executive committee.

Each committee must act on its own.

“In accordance with the bylaws” as friendly amendment

Q: Need more detail such as how far in advance?

A Wright: Committee bylaws should address this.

Q: Record keeping?

A: Met by ‘how the result will be communicated to the committee’

Q: What is a matter of routine business?

P Tschumi: The big concern is a deliberative process in which people have the opportunity for give and take. eMails may inhibit the exchange or devalue the deliberative process. Example: Admissions: A student appeal. What we are voting on only affects faculty senate; intention is to allow faculty senate eVoting. Amend bylaws of University Assembly to allow there.

AW: Calls vote

Motion carries

J Matson moves on behalf of the executive committee:

C. Motion FS_2016_3. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting) Admission and Transfer Credit Committee eVoting Operating Procedures

Matters of Routine Business that may be considered by ATCC: individual student admission appeals

One member of the committee may request resolution of an item by eVoting by emailing the motion to the chair of the committee and the desire to resolve it through eVoting.

The chair of the committee will send the motion to all members of the committee by email, and members of the committee may issue a vote through email to all members of the committee within two business days from notification of the item by the chair.

Approval of items requires a majority of those responding, provided that no fewer than 2/3 of the committee have responded.

At the completion of the voting, the chair will notify the committee of the result, the number of respondents, and the tally.

Discussion:

Q: Do we want to use the word email? Perhaps another term?

AWright: Committees may specify; Consider using generic language.

Any member of a committee may call for live meeting.

N Jovanovich: How does this motion consider individual admission appeals: How could that happen without discussion?

S Thibeault: There is discussion. We did this on the admission transfer committee; discussion still happened:

N Jovanovich: bylaws preclude discussion by email. If discussion is needed, then face to face can be called.

A Wright: Vote called:

Motion carries with one nay.

D. Motion FS_2016_4. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Admission and Transfer Credit Committee) (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting) Administrator Title Change for ATCC

J Matson moves on behalf of the executive committee:

Under Article III. Admission and Transfer Credit Committee, change

“...and the administrative officer in charge (or designee) of the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid, the Officer of Records and Registration, the Office of Transfer Student Services, university college/academic advising, and the Office of Testing services. An Admissions Office designee shall serve as Coordinator for the Admissions Committee proceedings.”

(underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion)

“...and the administrative officer in charge (or designee) of ~~the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid, the Officer of Records and Registration,~~ the Office of Transfer Student Services, university college/academic advising, and the Office of Testing Services, and the Director of Admissions (or designee) and the Registrar (or designee). ~~An Admissions Office designee~~ The Director of Admissions’s designee shall serve as Coordinator for the Admissions Committee proceedings.”

R. Cheatham: It is on the record that non faculty member are not to be head of a committee

J Carmack: Do we need to change the name of the committee?

AWright: core council has been charged with this

2:01 Vote called Motion carries

VI. Committee Reports

A. Judicial Policy Review –Adjoa Aiyetoro

2:02

Handout

We have almost completed the review of existing policies; we have done and have one more to do; we have outlined issues and needs; P Tschumi has proposed two things and we have addressed; we are aiming at revised policy to A Wright by March 4. Intention is to get it done by this semester.

See written report

Q: Will we be looking at bringing modifications or will what has been proposed stand?

2:07 AA says: We have not made a decision. We invite A Wright's recommendation. In what form will it make the process easier?

A Wright: Policy to amend judicial processes; that is the motion we are looking at.

See March 15 agenda for policy that is being proposed.

- B. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies – Belinda Blevins-Knabe
- C. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel
- D. Graduate Council – Brian Berry
- E. Faculty Governance Committee – Pete Tschumi

In addition to the committee report, Tschumi reported on recent actions by the Board of Trustees. The Patent and Copyright Policy has been modified. Due to concerns about its impact on teaching, he is working with the system to clarify some parts of the policy. Board approved a brand new policy that affects the pay of all administrators who hold faculty rank. Salary will be combination of faculty position pay + administrative salary. This change will affect their pay if they move back to full time faculty.

A Wright: Be vigilant.

P Tschumi: Most of you don't know it but I want emeritus status in May. You need to find a way to ensure that you have a faculty member attending Board of Trustee meetings at least in central Arkansas.

VII. Open Forum

Discussion: Skills in Major motion

J MATSON says we adopted this and it was to be implemented when we implemented core. Now implementation is for Fall 2016. This is what is to be implemented:

Whereas the Faculty Senate approved a Skills in the Major requirement for programs as part of the Baccalaureate Degree Requirement legislation passed March 15, 2013, and modified by Legislation FS 2014_19 and FS 2014_30; and

Whereas the Skills in the Major legislation, as modified, provided that,

Except in majors that must adhere to standards established by disciplinary accrediting agencies, major requirements must include courses or coursework either in or outside the department in

Oral and written communication in the discipline

- *Research methods, ethics, and critical thinking*
- *Technology; and*

Whereas the Skills in the Major legislation must be implemented by Fall 2016 (FS 2014_30); and

Whereas departments are the ones best suited to determine the specifics of their curricula; and

Whereas the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) (see <https://www.hlcommission.org/>), which will next review UALR during 2019-2020, states, “The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs” (Criterion for Accreditation 4.2.2);

Therefore be it resolved that the Skills in the Major (SKIM) portion of the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements legislation shall be implemented in the following manner:

1. The *ad hoc* Skills in the Major Committee (hereafter, the Committee) shall be responsible for implementing the requirement.
2. The Committee shall consist of 12 members: 1 member each elected by the College of Business, the College of Education & Health Professions, and the College of Engineering & Information Technology; 2 members each elected by the College of Arts, Letters, & Sciences and the College of Social Science & Communications (the rationale for this being that 20 out of 25 of the affected programs lie within these two colleges); and 5 members with expertise in the skills represented in the requirement who shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate President. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs and Institutional Improvement shall serve *ex officio* without vote. Members shall serve 2-year terms starting Fall 2016.
3. The Committee shall function through May 2018, at which time the Senate shall determine whether the Committee should continue *ad hoc*, should be converted to a standing committee, or should have its responsibilities transferred to the Core Council, creating a single body responsible for General Education at all levels at the University.
4. To implement the requirement, departments covered under the legislation (i.e., bachelor’s programs that are **not** subject to a disciplinary accrediting agency) shall be asked to report to the Committee about the current state of instruction in the SKIM areas, about the evidence they’re collecting regarding student outcomes in the areas, and about curricular changes they are considering relevant to SKIM. (See Attachment for the programs that are covered as of January 2016.) In reviewing these reports, the Committee’s role shall be to determine whether departments

are meeting the requirement, *not* to evaluate how they are doing so. The Committee shall also be asked to identify trends and to assist in providing resources for faculty through a centralized website or Blackboard shell, workshops, and/or meetings. The Committee shall report its findings to the Faculty Senate.

5. The Committee shall establish an implementation schedule. In order to eliminate duplication of effort and reduce faculty workload, every effort shall be made to coordinate this schedule with schedules regarding curricular review set by Core Council, by any of the colleges, or by the university as a whole.

6. The Committee shall propose a long-term schedule so that by 2019-20, the year of the HLC accreditation report and visit, sufficient meaningful data will have been reported and analyzed so the University can identify where it stands with respect to its SKIM goals. The expectation is that by that time, all affected programs will have meaningful data to report regarding at least one of the SKIM areas.

E Anson: It states the departments are suited to determine the skills within their disciplines... why don't we ditch the committee and add this requirement to the assessment component.

J Matson: There is no University wide assessment requirement. Every college is doing something different.

E Anson: Why is that wrong? Why is an overall committee needed?

JM: There is value in having consistency in approach and terminology so we can talk about what is going on at the university. If we have 25 individual reports, there is no way to make generalizations about University students as a whole.

E Anson: Don't understand. We vary and differ by department. How can one assessment apply to all?

JM: We are not suggesting there be one assessment. We are saying there should be common language, like the accrediting bodies, everyone should answer the same questions. Questions like, what are the outcomes in your discipline with respect to the SKIM goals?

EA: I think History should join a national organization so we can bypass all of this.

JM: We are doing the same things as the accreditation bodies.

NJ: We did implement the SKIM requirements. We now have three choices:

1. Leave it as it is. It's already implemented by saying these departments teach this.
2. Go beyond it and require assessment of SKIM skills.

3. Eliminate SKIM and assessment requirements.

Recognize that all of these requirements may not be appropriate for all disciplines. It is not clear how or if any standards can be applied across the board. [Gives an example]

P. Scranton: What I think I'm hearing is "Can you translate what you do in your discipline into categories so that we can inventory what is being done?" The committee is not trying to change what departments do. It's just asking for an inventory.

JM: The role of the committee is to collect information and find out what we are doing. The role is not to evaluate.

K Layton: will there be a common assessment across those four areas?

JM: There may be elements that are common, but we don't know at this point; first we must find out what's going on. Even if there are common elements, there will never be the same assessment tool. For example, there might be a similar rubric for writing, but each major has different expectations for writing. So there can never be an identical instrument to assess writing in every major. The starting point is to think about these questions: what are your outcomes? What course do you teach them in? How do you know students have achieved the outcomes?

B. Blevins-Knabe: I'm encouraged by this legislation because I value the faculty doing this. We should step up as faculty. We could then have an overview of what we are doing. It's important for faculty to be the ones to do this. It gives departments a way to show strengths and weaknesses. We (the University) are a whole also - if we don't all join together we won't know what is going on at the university as a whole.

NJ: If you are involved with a program that you consider natural or applied science, you might seek accreditation with ABET. Our Earth Science department is getting Geology program accredited. It will be the first accredited geology program in the world.

JM: This policy is modeled after accrediting bodies' techniques.

AW: [The shuffling of papers disturbed about 20 seconds of recording]. Does anyone have an opinion about the specifics of this legislation? One thing, think about the committee and committee structure. We don't have a concrete sense of people's opinion other than to delete the motion. If you have some issues on specifics, talk to members of the Executive Committee.

E Anson: Wants no motion; no committee, no assessment of assessments.

R Cheatham: Perhaps we should add a phrase that explains that program assessment is not student assessment.

Andrew Wright -- Adjourn 2:34 pm

VIII. Attachment: Programs Covered Under the Legislation – as of January 2016

Arts, Letters, and Sciences

Biology	BS
English	BA
Environmental Health Sci.	BS
History	BA
Interdisciplinary St.	BA
Mathematics	BA
Mathematics	BS
Philosophy	BA
Physics	BA
Physics	BS

Business and Administration

Education and Health Professions

Communication Sciences & Disorders	BS	MS is accredited, but not BS
Health, Human Perf., and Sports Management	BS	

Engineering and Information Technology

E-commerce	BS	Benton program; through Info. Science Dept Information Assurance program in Computer Science
Professional Studies	BPS	
Web Design & Development	BA	Info. Science Dept.

Social Sciences and Communications

Anthropology	BA	
Applied Science	BAS	Deans Office completer, 2+2 program
Criminal Justice	BA	
International Studies	BA	
Mass Communication	BA	
Political Science	BA	
Prof. & Technical Writing	BA	
Psychology	BA	
Sociology	BA	
Speech Communication	BA	