



Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 23, 2015

1:00 PM until Adjournment

DSC B&C

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Present: **CALS**—Cheatham, LeGrand, Thibeault, Warner, Street, Smith, Ecke, McAbee, Kyong-McClain. **CB**—Hendon, Farewell. **CEHP**—Prince, Evans, Clemmons, Oltmans, Vander Putten, Carmack. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Golden, Jensen, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT**— Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi. **LAW**—Foster, Boles.
LIBRARY— Macheak. **EXOFFICIO**—Anderson, Toro, Wright, Laan.

Absent: **CALS**— Cates, Law, Douglas, Anson. **CB**— Leonard. **CEHP**—Crass, Lowry, Layton, Rurup. **CSSC**— none **CEIT**—Bayrak, Ray. **LAW**—Fitzhugh. **LIBRARY**—none. **EXOFFICIO**—Hickman, Laan.

II. Review of Minutes from September 23, 2015

Motion to approve as corrected: P Tschumi 2nd: J Tramel

Motion carries

III. Announcements

none

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

V. Reports

A. Executive Committee Report – Andrew Wright

Transfer Credit Memorandum (FSM-2015-3) see end of minutes

A Wright: The Executive Committee has reviewed all legislation regarding effects of new core. We found one gap where the authority was not delegated. This is being addressed in the motion to amend the Core Council.

1. Right now, for transfer courses from outside the ACTS, we don't have a mechanism whereby individual transfer decisions can be made.

2. Articulation vs articulation agreement – It is clear from the minutes that these terms mean a formal agreement between UALR and one or more external parties: These agreements have to go through curricular process.

3. If a department makes a substitution of a transfer course for a UALR course in that department's program, the department can communicate with OTSS to allow the same substitution to be made automatically for subsequent students for a specified length of time. This will speed up the process of transfer from another institution.

Memo point of order on electronic meetings (FSM-2015-5), see end of minutes.

A Wright: A member of the Committee on Tenure raised a point of order regarding holding election of the chair via email. RRONR do not allow electronic meetings unless specified in bylaws, and then simultaneous aural communication is necessary. Email does not meet these standards. **I am upholding the point of order for the Faculty Senate and its committees.** From now on, the Faculty Senate and its committees may only conduct deliberative discussion through face-to-face meetings.

I will be issuing a memo upholding this point of order for the Assembly. Once that memo is issued, the Assembly, its committees and other subsidiary bodies will have to conduct their meetings face-to-face. The next meeting of the Assembly, where this ruling can be appealed, will be in April. A sooner meeting can be called by the Assembly if it deems this ruling to be incorrect.

J Ecke: Will this also pertain to an alternate method of meeting, whereby question is posted and members come by and read and vote?

A Wright: RRONR allows a polling place.

R Cheatham: It is possible for units to create a deliberative mechanism under RRO as colleges are working on an issue.....and submit them in a process that will allow e meetings to move forward.

A Wright: Assembly has to permit it.

D Legrand: Reports minimum requirements.

P Tschumi: All parties have to be able to participate.

A Wright: Governance process is lengthy.

P Tschumi: ...allows you do it if you put it in the Constitution

N Jovanovic: Not all departments are part of the assembly.

P Tschumi: Each department creates its own governance structure...

A Wright: That authority derives from the campus governance structure, defined in the UALR Constitution, making colleges and departments subsidiary to it.

P Tschumi: They can put the rules for their own stuff in their own governance documents.

A Wright: Not if those rules conflict with the university rules or board policies.

N Jovanoic: Proactive question: On occasions when rules not followed, that is, if a committee were to violate, what are the risks?

A Wright: That should be resolved by the committee itself as a point of order at the time of the violation. The member raising the point of order can point to this ruling to resolve the problem.

B. Chancellor's Report – Joel Anderson

Limited to campus safety: Annual meeting on safety, R Carter met downtown with others to talk about safety issues on campus national event community college campus.

Recount what we have done over the last year and a half:

Specific measures: Trojan transport; 5 additional Police officers + 3 security guards with plans for more which increases visibility for crime prevention

Moving to point Trojan trollies driven by PD

Cleared brush and foliage to create sightlines along 28th near Jack Stephens

Increased lighting; always an issue to which we are attentive

Surveillance cameras increasing and will continue to increase and improve systems

Electronic

Shots Fired video posted –

we may offer the training on self defense

...and have completed training on Title IX

Green dot program especially useful everywhere on campus, but may be really useful in dorms

Added police substations to enhance visibility and increase resources; in addition to main office, added DSG, Stabler Hall and East Hall; soon opening a 24/7 gate at village of student housing where it has been harder to control

That's all important stuff... I encourage each of you to approach with common sense attitude for example car items theft – such as locking your car, at night time don't walk alone or do get the taxi versions of Trojan Trolley.

If you look at the safety record it is very good here and across the country. *Ar Democrat/Gazette* released a report that did not mention UALR because year after year our statistics are as good as or better than others. We fight perception because we are campus in the city.

Crime in LR is down 9% but if happened to you that is meaningless - If something happens tomorrow, that is what people remember. We need to be knowledgeable about things. If you have suggestions, mention them to Carter or me. Provost's Report –

Zulma Toro Good afternoon – highlighting bright spots setting stage for future; editions of student news papers; alumni of the year; Susan Komen race health services flu prevention; UALR Works student success employment; counseling services; graduation

As you may remember Degree Works potential time to degree; advisors faculty long list of areas; will take 10 month to a year new tool very useful.

Student success veterans conference – armed forces in attendance 7 colleges challenges vets face

Career internship and extravaganza Oct 21 400 students participated 50 companies were part recognize to students and staff make it possible

Acknowledge start of registration is around the corner we must get them advised and registered before finals; Intern? Recommends explore passions

Message to update workload process (see memo) we need additional feedback on the draft of the policy preparatory to release campus Q? K Drale

High impact learning seed grant – coming!

Finally – UALR concurrent program distributing \$\$\$ see your chair

Thank you

C. Arkansas State Legislative Update – Joni Lee

We are always available during interim. There has been much activity lately as info about realignment task force Act 554 of 2015 sponsored by J Gilliam - passed easily Dept of Higher Education gave input, number of legislators who participated in that and some of the info brought back and was discussed – looking at initiatives. Thus the task force was formed.

First meeting: Gilliam mentioned bad legislation that came about because of lack of communication. Proposed have more dialogue to cut off bad legislation. J Lee says, we took heart in that but we also know that other initiatives have been proposed that are not in everyone's best interest. We need a national dialogue on the value of college degree, accountability, productivity, and retention, among other things.

Last session, the group talked about a \$10,000 degree – a compact around this and smaller government and streamlining agencies.

Doing now: realignment task force has asked ASU and UA to present testimony

These types of task forces are looking at national data, and we are striving to bring the debate back to Arkansas.

Highway funding task force is another one -- higher education subcommittee and education committees are hearing interim studies proposals.

Discussion in ADHE task force around funding formula and institutional finance. Director Powell is looking at funding and equity. What changes are needed? It is important that all campuses are treated fairly.

J Giammo: Students and parents are vocal but others not so much - it would be helpful to us if we connected with all groups that have interest in higher education.

J Lee: We need all input, need to see all sides some of the discussions include how the focus gets back on 2 year institutions, then 4 year can get lost in debate. Economic development and research would benefit from more of that type of dialogue.

J G: Focus groups need broad education represented.

P Tschumi: Hathaway set up a task force on what skills are wanted: Soft skills. We have some documentation but we don't communicate that.

JL Let me know when you have such discussions -- we have worked with companies who want to know these things.

PT Any discussion with the chamber of commerce?

JL Yes, we do.

N Jovanovic: Legislation of 120 credit hours because accreditors specify 120. Is there any lobbying going to lower minimum?

JL Several natl reports on this...we are looking for best info on this. What are the best resources and most effective standards? Ongoing battle -- the point well made of dangers of fallout from natl debates. We are working hard to convince legislators that our work is important, and we must be aware of history and not repeating mistakes.

NJ Are we campaigning proactively? What work is being done?

JL I am not sure.

A Wright: We need to articulate what we value and what we need so that J Lee has the best arguments to help her to advocate for UALR.

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

Report attached

E. Undergraduate Council – J Tramel:

Report attached

A Wright: You did some things with developmental math courses? They suspended some courses?

J Tramel: [Reported number of course and the actions]

A Wright: Developmental courses are mentioned in the College Success legislation – did you consider these changes are going to be affect that program?

J T Math deleted one sequence of courses but they are replacing them with a different set of courses

R Street: It has been taking too long to get through pre core, or worse, students just dropped. Therefore, we have refined and streamlined and added concurrent courses to make it more effective.

N Jovanovic: There are one hour labs that will be taken in conjunction with developmental that facilitate the path.

J Matson: ask Math to bring senate up to date on these changes

Z Toro: Thanks to math department for this. I encourage faculty senate to change whatever needed to give this opportunity to students that is exactly what ADHE is asking us for. If the Faculty Senate creates obstacles to math dept, we will be behind. Let go of some things -- let this change go forward.

A W: If we had been aware the changes, we would already be dealing with it.

F. Graduate Council – Brian Berry

No report

G. Faculty Governance Committee – Pete Tschumi

Article IV specifies the order of review of governance documents: dept/college, dean, provost/FGC, chancellor - once it goes to chancellor he has approval and has said if provost not happy he will not be happy. procedure allows for waiting period of 30 days because we had a problem with Deans sitting on documents. Dept/college should send document to Faculty Gov Comm to make sure that someone outside college knows about it. We will be sure things go steadily.

Last Spring we got through

Accounting has taken our recommendations provost reviewed

CALS approved

EIT found some recs they took it back and is now with Chancellor

significant delays with upper level adm because of all going on we need discussions to take place but those have not but finally did and now others have moved through few stragglers that need to be cleaned up

will meet on Nov 12 to get through math and info science and that will finish up what we know about

please let us know if we have others want to move everything through this year law and library? Finish up all others that have not come up yet college should not have more than one document at a time – Colleges should coordinate to submit sequentially once we have finished review then we will accept another nothing from Law CEHP CALS EIT do not need to submit anything until we finish what we have Social science has a window

Keep in mind that we create comments and send it to the department or college. The dept or college has the right to send the document to the chancellor even if the reviews do not recommend approval. look at our feedback and see what you can do we will work with you to help resolve issues we want to move through with Joel because new Chancellor could delay the process.

Senator (sec. didn't catch the name): rumor has it that the chancellor is no longer signing governance documents. would you comment?

P Tschumi: sounds like false rumor, but I'll check into it. (NOTE: The President of the Faculty Senate checked into this with the Chancellor, and the rumor is unsubstantiated. The Chancellor is still reviewing and acting on the governance documents that reach his desk.)

J Matson: reminder faculty governance comm changed this year- now requires a rep from every college

PT we are training everyone what to look for to smooth the process

H. Skills in Major – Joanne Matson report in-line

Skills in Major – Joanne Matson

I'm reporting on where we are with the Skills in the Major legislation. As a reminder, for the last 2 years this committee was called the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements Committee (BDRC), and it was chaired by Jeremy Ecke. The legislation this was a part of contained a whole lot of things, and this year the focus is on the part pertaining to the skills in the major. Thus the committee has been renamed to SKIM.

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*

Committee is tasked with coming up with an implementation plan and with working with the Core Council since both committees are working on General Education throughout the curriculum.

This table shows how the SKIM and Core goals parallel each other.

CORE Goals	SKIM Goals
[Content 1: Science, math, & social sciences]	
[Content 2: Arts & Humanities]	
Skills 1: Communication	Oral and written communication
Skills 2: Critical thinking	Critical Thinking
Skills 3: Information Technology	Technology; Research Methods
Values 1, 2, 3	Ethics

As we move forward we will probably tinker with language so as to have consistent terminology.

Here are the members of the committee:

Jeff Connelly, Earth Science
Susie Cox, Management
Paul Crutcher, English
Marian Douglas, Chemistry
Julie Flinn, Anthropology
Rolf Groesbeck, Music
Nancy Hamilton, Educational Foundations/CARE
Jamie Jones, Nursing
Karen Kuralt, Rhetoric and Writing (on OCDA Fall 2015)
Joanne Liebman Matson, Rhetoric and Writing, VP Senate, Chair of SKIM
Carol Thompson, Speech

Committee was designed to have representatives across the university from departments who will be affected by the legislation and from departments who deal with the same thing but through disciplinary accrediting bodies. If there are others who want to be involved or should be involved, let me know.

We've had 3 meetings so far, so we are moving along. We hope to come to Senate by the December meeting with a plan for implementation.

Please review and communicate with everyone so that there are no surprises. Questions?

N Jovanovic: I attended the meeting on Thursday and am trying to understand what the purpose is. The only implementation I think is necessary is that the programs need to do it. I don't know what legislation is necessary.

J M: The implementation that is necessary is to have a process to facilitate discussions about what each of these "skills" means in the major: For example, what is it in terms of ethics or communication or critical thinking or information technology that it is important to learn for a particular department? Then the plan will set up a process for asking departments to know how you will know students can do that. That's the assessment question.

J Ecke: In the original committee the charge was to implement the legislation—to come up with a way to implement the legislation to maintain some kind of control so the Senate knows those skills are being met. The original committee came to the Senate with legislation last year implementing other parts of the legislation such as the 45 hours. The legislation as written was not seen as the final step. The charge of the committee was to figure out the work-through legislation to assure this overall goal is being met.

NJ: I'm not talking about the charge. I'm talking about the original legislation. So how will we know it's being met?

J. Ecke: Exactly.

NJ There is no implementation needed -- they just need to do it.

G Jensen: At the risk of sounding like I am against assessment, I want to express a concern. We don't need levels of assessment on top of assessment. Let's use what we have. The assessment of skills in the major could be embedded into program assessment.

B Prince: My interpretation of this legislation is that it is invasive. You are telling us what to do.

J Matson: The legislation *does* tell the affected programs what to do in the sense of saying you need to address these four goals of critical thinking, communication, ethics, and information technology. It does not tell the programs *how* they are supposed to do that.

BP: The message we hear is ‘ My area does not have the expertise to know what students need.’ I hear you telling me what I *have* to teach.

JM: That message is exactly what we are trying to avoid. The plan we present will most definitely not say, “this is the kind of communication, ethics, critical thinking, and information technology you must put in your departments.” Instead it will say that departments are the ones to determine what students need in terms of these skills, and departments are the ones who should determine whether students have met the outcomes.

P Tschumi: I see this as no different from what our disciplinary accreditation bodies ask us for. We have to do things in communication, we have to do things in critical thinking, we have to do things in writing. What ABET asks is we demonstrate how we’re meeting them.

Z Toro: If we follow the model of accreditation bodies they state the learning outcomes. The LOS that the senate has approved you have to meet these learning outcomes. Approach, process and implement these learning outcomes. The legislation already tells us the outcomes. We don’t want it to tell us how we are to do it. All ABET wants is for departments to explain how they meet ABET requirements.

JMatson: That is exactly what the SKIM plan will do.

N Jovanovic: Let us take a step back. I think you are not talking about implementing the legislation but expanding it. ABET tells me 2 different kinds of requirements: curriculum requirements and learning outcomes. Curriculum requirements do not have to be assessed. Learning outcomes have to be assessed. On curriculum It is the role of undergraduate council to know what each course does. Each program should have a table showing how it is satisfying the requirements.

PT Are you saying Undergraduate Council would be charged with holding departments accountable?

NJ: They could.

VI. Old Business

- A.** Motion FS_2015_30. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required, returned from referral, motion to substitute and approve) 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, and

Whereas the signed acknowledgement from the Instructor is difficult to obtain in classes managed by adjunct instructors who do not have offices, who do not always answer emails in a timely manner and when the 41st day deadline approaches,

Therefore be it Resolved that the drop date legislation be changed to (strikethrough indicates deletion, underline indicates addition):

Withdrawing from an Individual Course (Drop Date)

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. From the 6th day through the 41st day of classes, a student wishing to drop a class ~~obtains acknowledgement from the course instructor and com-~~

~~pletes the course drop process by submitting the acknowledged~~ submits a request to the Office of Records and Registration. From the 6th day through the 11th day, the drop becomes final when the request is made. From the 12th day to the 41st day, the drop becomes final either when the person responsible for the class acknowledges the request or when seven days after the last day to drop arrives, and the date of the drop is the date when the request was made. The student may cancel the request by notifying the Office of Records and Registration at any time before the request 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: 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 on-line instructors. By managing the drop process in the Office of Records rather than putting the full responsibility on the student to obtain an onerous list of signatures, the date of the drop can be recorded at the time of the request rather than the time of completion (similar to the postmark on your taxes being the satisfaction of the deadline rather than the receipt of your tax documents at the IRS).

By allowing a grace period after the student initiates the drop, the person responsible for the class can be notified to discuss the student's possible success in the class. Students who might be convinced to continue in the class can be reached and can cancel the drop request.

If the conversation between the person responsible for the class and the student does not take place, the question remains, "Do you record a 'W' or do you record an 'F'?" This legislation changes the current practice of failing students who do not communicate with the instructor to a finalization of the drop. This will reduce the detrimental effect to the student's GPA and therefore ability to continue in the university.

The intention of changing the language from "instructor" to "person responsible for the class" is to allow departments to decide how to manage the communication. For instance, if a department chooses to manage the conversation through the instructor, it can. On the other hand, in classes where the instructor may be difficult to contact (for instance, a industry professional teaching a course as an adjunct), the department can assign another person responsible for the class, such as the department chair.

Dates:

1st through 5th day ... drop is done through boss by the student.

6th through 11th day ... drop is done through Records immediately and without instructor notification

12th through 41st day ... drop is done through Records and requires instructor acknowledgement

42nd day through end of term ... no new drops can be initiated

A Wright: This motion had been referred to executive committee. The executive committee recommends approval, so the motion is now reintroduced; however, the executive committee is offering a substitute motion.

J Matson (vice president on behalf of executive committee): moves the substitution proposed in the revised minutes (no second required)

A Wright: Hearing no objection, the substitution has taken place, and now the substitute motion is on the floor.

We wanted a no fault drop. The implementation of the requirement for instructor acknowledgement creates a delay in getting the notice of the drop to records, which in many cases meant the student could not drop the class by the deadline. That has resulted in students failing a class they wanted to drop.

We are saying here that after 7 days the drop becomes final, but can happen sooner if acknowledged.

NJ What happens if drop happens on 35th day?

AW: Window extends 7 days no matter what day of drop

S Farewell: Confusion about day to drop and day to notify instructor; It is possible the instructor may not be notified?

AW yes

S F But we just said they need to...

AW In the new process, submits the form to records and notifies the instructor. If no further action is taken the drop occurs on time and the student gets W instead of F.

J Hendon Can chair acknowledge as well as instructor?

AW Up to the Dept.

G Jensen: Simple drop date and students get confused; This is not simple, it is very complex -- how are we going to educate on it?

A Wright: It is a simpler process. The student must fill out the form and get it to records.

B Prince: our program deals with volume – each student has his own interpretation – it is too hard too confusing. We need a drop process for dummies.

J Ecke Burden is on student to drop course and it goes through R&R verbiage just outlines consequences process to get instructor acknowledgement too complicated don't recommend this language be given to student

N Jovanovic: legislation doesn't make it clear how instructor is to respond

A Wright: R&R does not have all info on who is teaching what classes. The student does know the instructor, therefore it is left to student.

K W an effort to promote retention – increase discussion to many interpretation confusion among faculty and students 200 students are still waiting adjunct instructors don't know anything is this the way to fx it? Massive confusion – does the proposed legislation go far enough?

J Hendon: Did the discussion occur? Are there any implied claims that if a student fails...

L Foster: would it be simpler to have an electronic drop date? Is the interaction helpful? Does the legislation proceed from that assumption?

P Tschumi: some senators think if faculty have a chance to talk to student they might be saved and retention improved; some want a simple process, that is, the student takes form to R&R. This puts onus on instructor to follow through -- we don't know if it works.

J Hendon: This was the first time I ever had to sign off on drop –it is not student friendly .

A Wright: This process was introduced four years ago but not implemented until now.

P Tschumi: We are getting rid of old process. The legislation is looking for compromise.

J H: There is danger there.

AW yes

N Jovanovic: Historical debate was, students that stopped coming to class are getting F because they didn't drop. We wanted to reduce Ws by getting students to not drop but

to finish course. In the proposed legislation no instructor will be informed unless student informs instructor.

L Smith: What is the incentive to talk? It is that sort of motivated student who ties ups ends.

A Wright: Incentive or lack of ...the incentive now is if you don't get this form signed you are going to get an F.

J Flinn: I want a chance to talk to the students and the proposed legislation would give me time to do that -- I like the compromise.

J Giammo I like the idea...let's go back to simplest way. Why not have the student drop in boss?

AW I have been told that boss is programmed to disallow student changes after the end of the late registration period (day 6). Is this correct (to the interim registrar)?

M Mathis: That's correct.

AW This also ties into financial aid, when a record needs to be placed onto the student's transcript to indicate that s/he was in a class after the student has been billed. Boss doesn't automatically put a W on the transcript. That has to be manually entered by Records.

J Giammo: There is no benefit to make it more complicated.

N Jovanovic: There is no mechanism for instructor notification -- we should notify instructor or we get rid of the whole thing.

G Jensen: A complicated process puts burden on student -- if no clear benefit, keep it simple.

P Tschumi: Is there a way to do this in a batch job?

JG might be a lot of work for R&R

R Cheatham: Move to amend striking all underlined after "Office of Records and Registration" J Tramel 2nd

AWright: Discussion?...

Amendment carries.

Motion carries.

VII. New Business

- A. Motion FS_2015_32. Faculty Senate *Executive Committee* (Legislation. Majority Vote at Two Meetings, first vote, no second required) Assign Core Transfer Responsibility

Whereas the review of legislation revealed that the creation of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies along with some ambiguity in the language of the Admission and Transfer of Credit Committee left the authority over transfer of core credit undelegated and therefore reserved back to the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the routing language in the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies does not match similar language in the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council,

Therefore be it Resolved that the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies be modified as follows (strikethrough indicates deletion, underline indicates addition):

Council on Core Curriculum and Policies: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, and subject to that body's authority, the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies shall maintain policies and criteria governing general education requirements, ~~criteria~~ and shall approve courses for inclusion and retention in the UALR Core Curriculum (Standard Core and College Cores). The Council shall maintain policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas, including individual course transfer decisions.

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

In academic units (programs, departments, schools, colleges) curricular proposals affecting the UALR Core, including but not limited to course inclusion in the core, modifications to existing core courses, and inclusion in the college core, will be routed through program, department, school, college curriculum committees and to the Undergraduate Council before being sent to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. In academic units not organized into departments, colleges, or schools, routing shall be according to analogous process certified to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies by the executive vice chancellor and provost. Recommendations of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies are subject to review by the Faculty Senate upon decision of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate or upon petition signed by five or more senators and delivered to the president of the Faculty Senate within ten (10) calendar days of passage by ~~following an unsuccessful resubmission and appeal by the authors within 10 business days of the notification of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies's decision to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.~~ Proposals not reviewed by the Faculty Senate or having passed Faculty Senate review shall be routed to the executive vice chancellor and provost and the chancellor.

The Council on Core Curriculum and Policies shall be composed of two voting representatives from each College with undergraduate program(s). Council on Core Curriculum and Policies terms will be for three (3) years. Members may serve two consecutive terms. Individuals may be re-elected to serve after not serving for at least two (2) years. Two (2) students shall serve as voting members of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies on policy matters, but will not vote on course decisions. Elected representatives in the Student Senate are eligible to serve as student members of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies and will have 1-year terms.

Found an open area of problems. No mechanism/authority to govern how transfer courses satisfy the core. Authority originally delegated to admission and transfer committee – when the core council came in, that changed things. This legislation does two things:

1. Adds authority to the council on core curriculum;
- 2 Clarifies and simplifies routing language.

JM (vice president) moved on behalf of executive committee.

1. Amendment. Executive Committee (no second required) Modify the sentence “The Council shall maintain policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas, including individual course transfer decisions.”

To

“The Council shall ~~maintain~~ have responsibility for policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas, including individual course transfer decisions.”

Commentary: This change captures the transfer of authority to both develop and modify policies. Since “development” is a one-time act, it was not deemed to be appropriate for a standing committee definition in a constitution. “Maintain” does not necessarily capture the generative function.

JM (vice president) moved on behalf of executive committee. No second required. Motion accepted without objection.

2. Amendment. Executive Committee (no second required) Modify the sentence “The Council shall maintain policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas, including individual course transfer decisions.”

“The Council shall (maintain/have responsibility for) policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas, ~~including individual course transfer decisions.~~”

Commentary: A number of members of the Faculty Senate contacted the executive committee after the agenda was published and expressed concern that “including individual course transfer decisions” was too prescriptive and was already covered in the authority to “maintain policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas.” It is possible that this line could be misinterpreted to mean that the Faculty Senate intended that the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies would be making decisions on individual course transfer (which was not the intent of the majority of the executive committee in writing the original motion). The intent of the original motion was to authorize the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (rather than the Faculty Senate) to develop a policy and bring it to the Faculty Senate resolving how core transfer decisions would be made.

J Matson (vice president): Move on behalf of executive committee. No second required.

A Wright: Is there discussion?

P Tschumi: variety of problems; all those decisions made out there in their departments thought the process is would substitute -- for one, in terms of the structure of their own major is not the same as did the student resolve core course moved it transfer and credit committee coming from instate schools transfers facilitated but not so much with other Admission trans-

fer comm asks why thus simplifying process agreement that dept chairs have been pulled back in there and yet they have no responsibility could be problems you get a strong chair and things go smoothly all are in favor of going over to core council because they are invested and knowledgeable; but we need to be very careful that authority stays where it needs to be someone needs to be responsible for when a new course pops up we could find ourselves with it wandering off

J Matson: What are the core council's responsibilities? The issue might be -- is it appropriate it to be so specific?

J Tramel: What is the impact on Transflex?

A Wright: Does anyone still use it?

N Jovanovic: all that was left was on core requirements

J M: That is for a particular student doing relevant to something else. This is for out of state students.

P T: Transflex is still there.

J Tramel: I use it a lot . When core says no then I go to Transflex.

A Wright: Transflex will not be changed

J Matson: The core council has other responsibilities.

R Cheatham: Deleting clause does not delete the authority. I suggest that if the minutes reflect that the language being deleted is considered unnecessary – it is redundant in that its intent was made clear earlier in the language – not that the deletion is intending to remove the authority, then there should be no future issues.

PT: I objected to get to this discussion going and in the minutes.

B Prince: How is this in relationship to our office of transfer? Complementary or interfering?

AW Keep doing things as we are: The senate has the authority to delegate to the council.

BP This change captures the transfers of authority to both develop and modify

PT It is our responsibility to give it to the core how does that

Karen Nelson on behalf of OTSS: We don't have authority over policy. We use rubrics to make the determinations on individual courses.

PT The departments don't have the rubrics...

AW OTSS is using the criteria that were developed by core council and approved by the senate. The VP of FS, the chair of Core Council, and I have been working with OTSS to make sure they are using the approved language for the new core.

PT That is fine.

AW This has been going on for a year in terms of figuring this out – that how decisions are being made now...

K Nelson: Now we are going by the amendment.

AW: [Calls for vote on amendment]

Amendment carries

AW Explains this is the 1st vote on a constitutional amendment. We will have to vote on this again, verbatim.

[Calls for vote on the motion as amended.]

Motion carries.

- B.** Motion FS_2015_33. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Move Science Curricular Area from College Core to Standard Core

Whereas all of the college cores allow students to choose any science course approved for the science curricular area to meet the requirement for the core,

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Science Curricular Area be moved from the UALR College Core to the UALR Standard Core beginning in Fall 2016.

Moved by Belinda Blevins-Knabe on behalf of Core Council, no second required.

A Wright: Call for vote

Motion carries

VIII. Open Forum

No further comments.

IX. Adjourn