



---

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, November 20, 2015

1:00 PM until Adjournment

DSC B&C

I. Welcome and Roll Call

*Present:* **CALS**—LeGrand, Thibeault, Warner, Street, Smith, Anson, Douglas, McAbee, Kyong-McClain. **CB**—Hendon, Farewell. Leonard. **CEHP**—Prince, Evans, Oltmans, Carmack. Layton, Rurup, Lowry. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Golden, Jensen, Matson. **CEIT**— Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi,. **LAW**—Fitzhughes, Boles.  
**LIBRARY**— Macheak. **EXOFFICIO**—Wright, Laan.

*Absent:* **CALS**— Cheatham, Cates, Law, Ecke, **CB**— **CEHP**— Clemmons, Vander Putten, Crass. **CSSC**—Scranton. **CEIT**—Bayrak. **LAW**—Foster. **LIBRARY**—. **EXOFFICIO**— Anderson, Toro, Hickman.

II. Review of Minutes

Motion to accept October 23, 2015 minutes with corrections-B Blevins-Knabe 2 T Warner

Motion carries

III. Announcements

A. Faculty Staff Appreciation Basketball Game on Nov. 27 and Dec. 20 (reduced ticket prices)

B. Women's Volleyball Team starts defending their crown at Sunbelt Tourney today

C. As we dug through the constitution we learned faculty senate committees do allow proxies; tell who your proxy is and they will be eligible for the committee.

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

A. None

V. Reports – all reports have been submitted and are available along with these minutes on the Faculty Senate website.

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

B. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

C. Graduate Council – Brian Berry

D. Faculty Governance Committee – Pete Tschumi

E. Workload Task Force – Christy Drale

1. Update on the work of the task force (see report)

C Drale: Provost opened the work with a memo describing the Workload Task Force charge. The task force has been meeting for a year and a half and are now on draft #9. Three focus groups, made up of faculty members and facilitated by task force members, have met with the task force to collect input on the draft workload policies. This is a reiterative process of refinement of the policies preparatory to bringing a draft to full faculty. We are on draft #10 which we will present to faculty at large, along with FAQs. There will be opportunities for feedback which will go into draft #11 which will go to Faculty Senate.

The provost has given some feedback but has not been involved in the process. We have avoided the influence of interest groups. Our intent was that the process be faculty led. Once we have a final draft, it will then go to the provost and the chancellor.

2. Questions:

B Blevins-Knabe?: How were the focus groups selected?

C Drale: What we wanted to with the focus groups is reproduce the interdisciplinary nary experience that we had on the task force so that all departments could be involved. We had input from a dynamic, multi-focused, diverse input. We wanted online people, labs, arts -- a variety reflective of the university.

BBK: Why is the report being distributed to a limited number of faculty, the focus groups, and not to the faculty at large? Why were some faculty privy to it and others not?

CD: So that we could work out some of the issues before we present a draft. We were depending on the focus group approach to build a generally acceptable draft. We hope there will be a fairly short period between the focus groups and general distribution.

J Matson: I understand your intention but the result of that process it was some faculty had it and some faculty did not. It was unclear who had it and who didn't. It was not clear how faculty was selected. It promulgated rumors of distrust and disinformation.

F. College Success Program (Math) – Annie Childers

A Childress: Currently the pre-corp program is used to address math prep. We have 4 pre-core course which can mean that a student goes through 4 semesters before ready to progress. We wanted to make the process more effective and efficient and improve matriculation.

See New Math Remediation handout.

We have modeled the new pathway to target students appropriately. It adds continuity and enables instructor to give students the attention they need.

[explanation of the new process with rationale]

Vetted process used by others successfully.

We will evaluate every semester and adapt as needed.

?: what happens to student who fails twice?

C D: We track students closely-- students who fail repeatedly and are looking at other ways to reach the repeaters. Not allowed to repeat repeatedly.

A Wright: [Explains that senate legislation was passed about the two repeats. Senate could address it if desired.]

## VI. Old Business

- A. Motion FS\_2015\_32. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. 3/5 Majority Vote at Two Meetings, second vote, verbatim first vote, no second required) Assign Core Transfer Responsibility

J Matson moves

**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 have responsibility for policies governing how transfer courses satisfy core curricular areas.

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.

**Commentary:** In discussion on 10/23/15, the Faculty Senate made it clear that the authority over policies regarding core transfer included the ability to develop a practice whereby core transfer decisions for a specific student could be made.

A Wright: Invites discussion; seeing no discussion, takes vote.

Motion carries

## VII. New Business

- A. Motion FS\_2015\_34. Executive Committee (Legislation. 3/5 Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Improve authority over off-season committee appointments

J Matson: moves and reads:

**Whereas** all appointments on Faculty Senate Committees are done at the end of the Spring term for the upcoming academic year by the Committee on Committees, and

**Whereas** the pending ruling on electronic meetings requires this large committee to meet in person, and

**Whereas** the current language requires vacancies to be filled by a college assembly meeting in the event of a college appointment, and

**Whereas** many appointments, such as staff members or at-large faculty members (e.g., AIGC) or Alumni cannot be filled by special election in the unit involved since there is no unit involved,

**Therefore be it Resolved** to amend Article III of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (bylaws of the Faculty Senate) from

"Faculty vacancies on appointed Faculty Senate Committees shall be filled by special election in the unit involved."

To (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion)

"~~Faculty~~ Vacancies on appointed Faculty Senate Committees shall be filled by the Faculty Senate President in consultation with ~~special election in the unit involved the college assembly, department faculty, staff senate, or whatever appropriate body is represented by the position.~~"

**Commentary:** The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate can only apply to Faculty Senate committees. This amendment does not apply to the University Assembly committees, which will have to be handled through modification of those bylaws at an Assembly meeting.

A Wright: asks for discussion.

K Fitzhugh: A couple of us have had short notice on tenure committee. For example one of us missed the vote on the chair of the committee. Meeting notice was too short and but we really needed to be present. This happened last year and has happened again. The process seems to be informal, unstructured and unpredictable. It creates rumors and distrust as well.

P Tschumi: I don't see how this is germane – the motion relates to how we fill vacancies. The committee on committees and makes nominations and puts people in place, then chairs go out and fill vacancies. It has nothing to do with the function of the committees themselves, but how we get the committee positions filled. I am in favor of the motion.

A Boles: I oppose because: while it appears on its face to be a matter of administrative function but the lack of vote by email means that we want representation in person. Now we are handing it to the president. It can be any vacancy and the language is vague; 'in consultation with' is vague and may lead to faculty president appointing without input from committee or faculty. The committees must maintain autonomy. It may say that if a member does not do what president wants, then they can be removed. There has to be another way to fill the positions without putting the responsibility in the hands of one person.

A Wright: There was never a right to vote by email: it was out of order

This motion specifically talks about appointments to committees when it fails to make the appointment by end of term

There is a separate mechanism for committees electing chairs.

N Jovanovic: I have been on committees and this is an issue every year. It is not specified who makes appointments beyond the committee on committees. We deal with filling vacancies frequently and do need another way to do it.

P Tschumi: The arguments here are comingling two different things. The constitution divides up various things and specifies all appointed committees [unintelligible] this is odd language. There never is an election; it is the committee on committees and they do the appointing. The chair of COC is elected by the committee. Some departments have not got enough members to get the job done that has nothing to do with how chair is selected.

Regarding taking away electronic voting. That is the issue we were asked to investigate, thereby discovering that it is not allowed by the constitution.

A Boles: I completely support that. But here you really not describing a different process. So the language leaves the ultimate authority to the Senate president and that is not acceptable.

A Wright: What committee are you referring to?

A B: I am just looking at the language...trying to fill the vacancy...leaving that to the chair of the committee -- filling vacancies on senate committees leaving that with chair or shifting it to the senate president.

PT: Current language is consistent with the constitution – these are not elected positions. Then there is language about elections – it becomes confusing.

JM It is confusing because there has been an issue with the tenure committee related to the chair. I suspect it is a little confusing. This legislation appointing someone to serve on an appointed committee and who is not elected. 80% may be filled but by Fall. The people making appointments is the CoC. Here we are just saying the president in consultation with whomever should be involved will make the appointment. We probably do need to address tenure committee issues but this does not have anything to do with that. I urge you to vote for this.

J Hendon – Would Boles and Fitzhugh be satisfied by making this an interim appointment which must be ratified by the senate? Is that reasonable or not?

AWright: This is a philosophical issue about the senate may want to express some oversight, which it certainly can.

JH: [...]that's why I asked that question.

A Boles: I understand that it may seem that the two are disconnected but I worry about the implications...I can see how this could be a slippery slope argument. As an alternative, can the CoC meet in the summer?

AW: It is the vacancies that crop up during the semester. We tried to use e voting but now we can't but cannot see trying to get 30 member committee together every month to fill vacancies. The problem with the awards committee is a good example. Very small committees end up doing a lot of work. What is better? You have a committee with five vacancies which leaves five people to do the work. If you do an interim apt do you put somebody on a committee then they come off ...

Inaudible exchange

JH: Concerns about it this being a permanent appointment. Is there is a mechanism to stop?

N Jovanovic: On the issue of ratification – we don't want to go there. There are a lot of committee and vacancies. If CoC does its job there will be no vacancies except for a sudden change as happened with the chair of the honors committee. We are talking about a remainder of term. As chairs and members of committees there are deadlines we have to meet. I, as a committee chair, shouldn't be recruiting – that could appear coercive. So I want the president or some other external entity to make an appointment so I don't appear to be stacking my committee. Because we are only talking about vacancies that arise – I think this does a fine job of solving the problem.

G Jensen: Aren't we talking about committees where we struggle to find members to serve on? What the president is doing is only to help this.

### **56:33**

K McAbee: I don't know the background all these problems, but it seems to go back to the committee on committees: They don't meet often enough, etc. Are we trying to fix a problem that originates there?

E Anson calls the question.

A Wright: Alright – all in favor of suspending the debate say aye...those opposed say nay. We have suspended debate

Calls the vote on the motion: Motion carries with some dissent

## VIII. Open Forum

### A. Discussion of Modifications to Annual Review and P&T Policies

Motion FS\_2015\_35. (recommended by the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies and brought by the Executive Committee) majority vote at one meeting, no second required.

**Whereas** the assessment of student learning outcomes begins with the educational goals of the core, and

**Whereas** assessment of the core is a faculty-led, faculty-driven process for the benefit of achieving UALR's educational mission, and

**Whereas** any single measure of student learning should be part of a larger holistic assessment plan, and

**Whereas** cooperation between administration, faculty, and staff is expected, and

**Whereas** participation in assessment is a critical component of university service,

**Therefore** be it resolved that section B. 1, second paragraph, of the Annual Review policy, passed on 4/20/1990, be modified as follows:

Teaching is defined in terms of providing for student learning in a variety of ways, including, **but not limited to**, classroom or clinical instruction; team teaching; supervision of independent study or research; thesis or dissertation supervision; multi-disciplinary teaching activities; student advisement; course preparation; curriculum design, ~~and~~ development, **and assessment, and** use of creative teaching strategies and technologies, ~~etc.~~ Evidence used to evaluate teaching generally includes student evaluations, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and other materials. **The results of assessment shall not used in annual reviews of teaching.**

**And be it further resolved that** section B.3 of the Annual Review policy, passed on 4/20/1990, be modified as follows:

Service shall be evaluated in terms of service to the public, the university, or the profession and may include activities such as discipline-related community service, work on college or university committees, department service, administrative service, recruitment, **assessment**, in-service education, working with professional organizations, and participation in professional meetings. The University has identified public service as an important objective.

**And be it further resolved that** 1.C in the Promotion and Tenure guidelines be modified as follows:

Examples of such service include, but are not limited to, membership and leadership of unit committees or task forces; advising student organizations; involvement in faculty governance; coordination of programs, labs, and technical support; **assessment**; and recruitment.

**And be it further resolved that** "2. Policies for Promotion and Tenure," 5<sup>th</sup> paragraph in the Promotion and Tenure guidelines be modified as follows:

Decisions on promotion and tenure shall not be based on lifestyle, political affiliations, or

religious convictions. **The results of assessment shall not be used in promotion and tenure.**

**Commentary:** “Results of assessment” refers to data collected for purposes of curriculum development and evaluation. As such, this data is not appropriate to use in annual review or promotion and tenure evaluation. That data should be stripped of section or instructor identification in order to avoid biases; however, even if it isn’t, the purpose of the data collection is different from the purpose of data collection to evaluate an individual’s teaching.

On the other hand, the activities associated with performing assessment ... analyzing data, developing plans, rubrics, outcomes, objectives, and other activities ... may be relevant parts of teaching or service. Credit should be given for original work in those areas.

A Wright introduces: A motion was made by the council core curriculum to the executive committee that touched on annual review and tenure policy and on assessment. This made it necessary to get a tenure committee chair elected. The core council would like to have the motion addressed as they move into their assessment plan, before they get too deep into their assessment plan. Therefore, we bring it to the Senate to see how the Senate would like to proceed before moving on this motion.

E Anson: My only objection is that assessment shows up in two categories and one is teaching where I do not believe it belongs.

B Blevins-Knabe: In the core council we asked; Does it belong in service or teaching? Can be argued both ways I do see how it fits in teaching but could be in service. We were comfortable with it being in teaching, but we can see it both ways.

E Anson: I just have problems with it as teaching. Assessment of something – I am not entirely sure what that is. I don’t see it as teaching in any way, shape, or form. I see it as service activity in which you are assessing reports which are about teaching.

BBK: I may have a philosophical difference. I see assessment as about how to teach, learning how to teach, pondering teaching, etc. To me, that all falls under the heading of teaching with includes the assessment process. I could also argue that being a good department citizen you will participate in the process developed for assessment.

J Giammo: [In teaching]...looking at results of assessment and what that means in course prep and curriculum design. Whereas, when I think about assessment I think about serving on a committee or working to gather data for assessment.

P Tschumi: The word assessment in here is a little ambiguous. If what you are talking about is evaluate data, then that falls on the service side. But if I am trying to systematically evaluate teaching that too is assessment. The key is the faculty member needs to decide, in relation to tenure, where it goes. It has got to make sense in terms of the distinctions that have been made here.

J Hendon: I understand that the commentary does not go into the documentation, yet the commentary is where it says assessment results will be used for curriculum purposes only. It is in the body of the document that it says assessment will not be used in annual evaluation of teaching or in promotion and tenure. Both should be in the body of the document. It reads poorly now: It could look like UALR does not assess their teaching.

M Douglas: All the assessment activity I have been involved in has been either assessing a program or assessing a course. But a faculty member, never. Assessment activities are not pertinent to an individual person.

BBK: What if we said something like ‘the results of assessment of student learning outcomes?’

J Hendon: Say the results of assessment data collection for the purposes of curriculum evaluation and development. Assessment in academia means something different to us than in other disciplines. I would not be in favor of putting this in front of the world as it is.

BBK: So you want something long and elaborate...

JH: No nothing long and elaborate – that definition...

E Anson: Basically, what it states in the commentary is what we know as assessment we use things for course development, course design, it is all in there in the commentary.

JM: Many faculty are involved in assessment when teaching. We have goals and we decide if we are going to address those goals and how students are achieving those goals. It is a complex and time consuming process. It goes a step beyond teaching, calls on other abilities. We are saying is, in annual reviews when you talk about your teaching it's not just SSCHs but what have students achieved? Have the goals been met? The core council is saying the annual review may include that. The second point is not using the fact that students may not learn something to attack a faculty member. Sometimes students do not learn what they are supposed to be learning – it is not the purpose of assessment to say it is the teacher's fault that the students are not learning, as is happening in K-12.

G Jenson: I second what Joann is saying. I do a lot of assessment. I call it reflective practice in my classroom and have students involved in assessment and they are to assess what they are learning. Maybe add some wording parenthetically.

J Hendon: I would prefer to define assessment in the motion itself.

J Flinn: I believe assessment should be part and parcel of teaching.

A Boles: I defined all methods of assessment in portfolio as part of teaching.

E Anson: They are two different things. Assessing a program is different from assessing teaching. We should distinguish between the two. Program assessment is not teaching, it is service.

N Jovanovic: Program assessment could inform one's teaching. That could give you insight and lead you in new directions that you might not have discovered on your own. As member of core council we had this discussion too. We recognized that some are going to see it as teaching and some as service.

E Anson: Then why include the caveat?

J Flinn: I don't like to make the distinction between myself and the program.

PT wonder if we could resolve by because of the ambiguity could we narrowly define to apply to service all these other things categorize for clarity

E Anson: then you can't used in annual review but conflicts

P Tschumi: Then don't evaluate the quality of service vs teaching

A Wright: links to policies

N Jovanovic: Everything you do could be used except the results if my students didn't learn

E Anson: ??

J Giammo: 2 things one committee does assessment the act of which may influence my teaching we could say same about curriculum comm

J Matson: term assessment means a lot of things which cannot be solved by narrow definition no matter what we come up with the rest of the world will negate I agree with NJ there are many ways that assessment affects us the language is not restrictive it is permissive but that last line results may not be used - that is another issue 1. Differences in assessment 2 we should make clear that people should not be punished

NJ: I agree with JM and I agree with Anson intent was that results wouldn't be use against it

won't be used to deny you tenure

BBK: for assessment to work it has to be transparent and teaching separate issues so participation is valued and encouraged but not punitive we are committed to get that in our doc

PT: if you want to honestly use assessment you have to do it honestly

G Jensen: We are hung up on definitions...a few well placed adjectives...

E Anson: We were saying if in teaching you prove you are a lousy teacher; if you put it in service it this one thing that cannot be used against you -- but might seem counter productive.

PT: protection sentence can lead to misunderstanding so we should explain if you want honest results that won't penalize

J Laan: Self assessment? Might be acceptable.

BBK: Needs to be clear-- results of assessment not used in review, there are so many variables. If the assessment process says this person is a good teacher/bad teacher will stall us.

JM: We always use assessment of student learning. This is not performance assessment.

A Wright: Obviously it was clear that we all need to wade in. The question is how do we want to proceed?

Agenda is due out Dec 4 so we need to have something if we send this back it won't get to Council. We will look at what we have done today and bring something to executive committee.

Further discussion? none

I. Adjourn 2:39