



Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, March 11, 2016

1:00 PM until adjournment

DSC B&C

Welcome and Roll Call

AWright convened the meeting at 1:02 pm

Present: **CALS**—Anson, Cates, Ecke, LeGrand, Thibeault, Warner, Douglas, McAbee, Kyong-McClain. **CB**— Farewell, Hendon. **CEHP**— Carmack, Prince, Evans, Oltmans, Vander Putten, Layton. **CSSC**—Flinn, Jenson, Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Golden, Matson. **CEIT**— Tramel, Tschumi, Ray. **LAW**— Fitzhugh. **LIBRARY**— Macheak. **EXOFFICIO**—Wright, Toro.

Absent: **CALS**— Cheatham, Street, Law, Thibeault, Smith, Law. **CB**— Leonard. **CEHP**— Rurup, Crass, Clemmons, Lowery. **CSSC**— Giammo, Scranton. **CEIT** —Anderson, Jovanovich, Byrak, Ray. **LAW**— Boles, Foster. **LIBRARY**—. **EXOFFICIO**—Hickman, Laan.

Review of Minutes deferred to April Faculty Senate Meeting

Reports

A. eVersity Update – Michael Moore

Greetings. About two years now since inception – 1 year or so of planning; began receiving applications in Sept 2015. To date we have had 479 applicants and admitted 405 -- rejected only out of state applicants. We had 459 inquire and we record those as prospects.

Started two courses in Jan developed by Denise Le Grand and others – took in 23 students Now have 3 classes running bio, computer sciences, pol sci

Lumina Foundation stats show Arkansas 49th in degree completion behind everyone but Virginia. 70% of jobs in Arkansas do not pay a livable wage.

Average age of our applicants is 35. 74% counties in Arkansas are represented.

We facilitate the application and can get their transcripts for free if students wish – except home-schoolers, of course.

66% 1st generation college. skewed female AA 15% 66 credit hours

Seeking to be 100% electronic – no textbooks saving students about \$100 students are pleased

We have over 140 courses built. We pay up to \$7000 for course dev more if use OER (electronic textbook)

Team based courses that may pay more co remediation models in math and English on the fly

Go into eVersity engaged - there is free, online, self-paced orientation course which helps to sort students effectively

Search for scholarship we assess their level of grit and hope, persistence

Trying to be lean operation – about 18 people, with 1 IT guy hosted offsite by Banner

UAM partner for financial aid, evaluation, library services, mental health services

Working outreach two fronts: On the ground by addressing clubs and professional organizations and careful Digital marketing via Stone Ward -- we know most effective ads we can count clicks and know how to tailor ads effectively.

Trying to be a resource for the system John Rogers has helped us with Blackboard.

OER symposium -- if you are interested in working with oer. Text books are becoming cost prohibitive. Publisher said 1/3 of students do not acquire texts because of costs.

OER results related to better performance; controls costs, too

Q: How many students in eVersity now?

MM: 34 in current courses. 194 in orientation course (can get faculty assistance).

Q: How many have directly transferred from another campus?

MM: None: some home schooled

Q: How are you assessing?

MM: One thing we are doing with all our course critical thinking, cultural competence, creativity eg areas in history, social sciences to cover the concepts and competencies of career and we can show that on the transcript 15 hours of critical thinking etc

Exams, discussions, work from SLOs mapped back to program SLOs and eVersity goals etc

Pre-post test in all courses to assess knowledge of subject matter before and after to allow us to evaluate students and faculty we can identify weak areas (faculty)

If you are interested in [lists areas] we are interested in you -- only 3 from UALR so far. More participation from other campuses. If you create the course you and we own the course. Thank you -

B. Executive Committee Report – Andrew Wright

C. Chancellor’s Report – Joel Anderson

D. Provost’s Report – Zulma Toro 26:56

Greetings – happy to report on important things

Recognition of bright spots: March 1 recognition event to id last semester and January and Feb those who are making a difference Certificate awarded you can see bright spot page on provost webpage

Please nominate for a bright spot.

Faculty mentoring program identify mentors and mentee please contact Dr Miller aimed at assisting junior faculty to establish careers -- good for both.

Regarding the online programs 14 fully online UALR programs planning to have 19 by January 17 -- online enrollment has increased by 21.5% average age 36 years 82% are Female BSN most popular BBA gen mgmt Learning technology?

New opportunities for faculty to teach online we will that product ready this summer if you are interested

Online design certificate and another looking at STAR information certificate

33:05

State level: Addressed ADHE on non-funding formula funds we receive. There are five units at UALR funded this way.

Institute for economic advancement \$4m to support these units

Request for increase to \$6.5 mil next year before legislature.

Somebody from ADHE made a presentation reaction of elected officials was interesting there seems to be some misinformation about what we do in higher ed there is trend to encouraging tech degree - it is up to us to emphasize college degree.

Additional 2.1% \$ from DHE to maintain cover inflation

Request for 4 year institutions to be better funded based on thing SSCHs additional \$ for programs not funded by level based on SSCHs We are funded at 66%

Let me talk about High Impact learning experiences launched this program and the program is aimed at selecting proposals from faculty. Seven proposals were selected for funding multiple departments participating.

UALR selected by American Association of Colleges and Universities to work on a Gates project to study the first two years of college, reimaging whole undergraduate experience. Will be asking for time to present before end of semester.

Finally, progress on HLC identified items to go -- task force working on it expecting report by Mar 25 2016. Will we be participating in the HLC assessment in September 2017. Please send your feedback as to where we should go with assessment or initiative and questions.

We are making good progress toward excellence. There is a positive net change.

- E.** Council on Core Curriculum and Policies – Belinda Blevins-Knabe on website
- F.** Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel on website
- G.** Graduate Council – Brian Berry on website
- H.** Faculty Governance Committee – Pete Tschumi None now --planning to meet with Provost and then will present.
- I.** Chief Information Officer – John Rathje

45:50

Greetings – Let's talk about info tech services -- who is ITS? We want ITS to be perceived positively and how can you be more effective and efficient.

ITS 2.0 is a new start for all of us to become more engaged with the mission. How do we be a trusted partner?

Communication -- we must listen better and identify focus points:

It Delivery - stay on plan, be consistent, training and access, image and perception do we understand and listen it is the action behind the verbal communication? Addressing actual needs -- what you need and access.

Innovation -- we want to cultivate culture of can -- why not? How do we become the UALR we want to be – we must be data driven.

Modernize the environment

Prepared team celebrate successes empowerment -- are we aligned with the mission?

Thomas Bunton new director IT from Univ Wisconsin

Bryan Couch form Computer Sciences.

Improve support services – how can we be prepared to help you?

Right balance of understanding, why do we do what we do? Aiming for being successful, being good at what we do based on your feedback.

Updates: network modernization starting with residence halls to meet students' needs complete

Working to improve registration devices on the network. Guests will be able to register on the network students will be able to register their devices. And stay registered,

Greater band width now with greater default tolerance.

Banner Lucien -- developing an action plan to improve our use.

Intrusion detection – malware

Our telecommunications are antiquated we are working with the whole system.

Payment processing in bookstore to be improved.

Improved desktop management Office 365 is available via ITS for no charge. Supports many devices including Apple. We will help you with that.

Q: Getting access to particular screens can be difficult.

J R: We should address those things -- our on-boarding process is something that we could improve on. We are looking for all areas where we need to be more efficient and effective.

Q: IT sometimes takes one size fits all attitude.

JR: We need to be agile to problem solve specifically. We want to look global but act local.

D Legrand: Thank you -- IT guys are always supportive and helpful; responses are timely.

JR: Thank you. We want to hear good and where the gaps are -- how can we help you?

Old Business

J. Motion FS_2016_8. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at two Faculty Senate meetings, second vote, no second required) Membership of the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee

A Wright: introduces

J Matson: moves

Be it resolved that Article III: Appointed Committees (Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee) of the Faculty Senate of the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock be modified (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion),

The committee shall consist of ~~ten~~ one full time faculty members from each college/school represented in the Faculty Senate, including the Ottenheimer Library and excluding the Bowen School of Law, to be appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly, two student members appointed by the Student Government Association, and, as ex officio without vote, the administrative officer in charge (or designee) of the Office of Transfer Student Services, University College/~~academic advising,~~ and the Office of Testing services, and, as ex officio with vote, the Director of Admissions (or designee) and the Registrar (or designee). The Director of Admissions's designee shall coordinate the processing of materials for the committee. ~~serve as Coordinator for the Admissions Committee proceedings.~~ The ~~ten~~ faculty members shall serve two year staggered terms ~~and there shall be a minimum of one faculty member from each College, except the Bowen School of Law, and a maximum of three faculty members from any one College. All members of the Committee are voting members. All other members shall serve a one year term.~~

And Be it Resolved that the committee will be reformed immediately and the terms of committee members will be staggered by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

And Be it Resolved that the President of the Faculty Senate will call an organizational meeting for purpose of electing a chair before the end of the Spring 2016 semester.

Commentary: The committee is too large to function effectively. The faculty membership restrictions can make it difficult for the Committee on Committees to assign the committee in one meeting. Bringing the number of faculty members and their method of representation into line with the method used for most of the other appointed committees resolves this issue. Once the number of faculty members becomes smaller, the ex officio representation needs to be adjusted so that faculty maintain a majority of the committee.

Changing from Admissions's to Admissions' was necessitated by a review of current style. The President of Faculty Senate's style manual was deemed by a majority of the executive committee to be out-of-date.

The section about being "Coordinator of the Admissions Committee proceedings" was confusing. Does this mean the Director of Admissions is chairing the committee? Although practice has made it clear that this is not the case and the Senate by-laws require committees to be chaired by a faculty member, the ambiguity in the language in the committee description needed to be fixed.

Since the new committee needs to be empaneled to function for summer 2016 and since the faculty membership will reduce, it is important that these changes be instituted before adjourning for the academic year.

A Wright: Is there discussion?

There being none, calls vote. Motion carries.

New Business

K. Motion FS_2016_10. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required) Place a constitutional amendment on the assembly agenda (enable eVoting for Assembly committees)

A Wright: We have adopted a process for eVoting at faculty senate committees and now need a motion to add it to the Assembly. I ask the vice president to introduce.

P Tschumi moves: A Wright reads:

Be it resolved that the following be added to Article I: The bylaws of the Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock:

eVoting: Committees of the Assembly may render decisions on matters of routine business through asynchronous electronic means such as email (hereafter referred to as eVoting) provided 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.

AW Calls for vote -- motion carries. The Assembly will vote on this in April.

L. Motion FS_2016_5. Faculty Senate Executive Committee, referred to Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required)

1:04 A Wright: Recommend to adopt with changes.

Be it resolved that the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies recommends approval of Motion FS_2016_5 with the following change (strikethrough indicates deletion, underline indicates addition):

No information identifying a student may be recorded in student ~~teaching~~ evaluations of teaching or programmatic assessment data.

No information identifying the course instructor, including section information, may be recorded in programmatic assessment data.

Commentary: In order to improve the honesty of evaluation, it is important to protect the anonymity of an evaluator in areas where the evaluator might feel that retaliation could ensue, especially if the evaluation is negative. Further, data collected for program

improvement should be constructed differently than data collected for teaching evaluation. Misapplying these data in other venues will result in skewing the data itself and making it meaningless for either purpose.

The principles of blind data analysis have long been established in the sciences, in particular particle physics, where confirmation biases can skew conclusions toward preferred theories. Robert McCoun and Nobel prize winning physicist Saul Perlmutter have argued that these principles be applied to other venues of data collection and analysis, including the social sciences (Nature, 10/8/2015, v 526, 187-189).

The consequences of skewed programmatic assessment data, with the likely bias being “we’re doing just fine,” can lead to disastrous results for the institution which fails to correct curriculum when outcomes are not being achieved.

AW: Calls vote motion carries.

A. Motion FS_2016_11. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required) Modify operating procedures of Council on Core Curriculum and Policies

1:05:25 A Wright: When the Faculty senate was passing the gen ed provisions from the Undergraduate Curriculum Revision Task force which led to SKIM and the gen ed curriculum, we passed the operating procedures for what would become the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies. The Council had not yet been approved, so some things were placed in the operating procedures with the idea that they may need to be removed later, when the Council came into existence. In particular, there is both a chair term limit and a member term limit. These are redundant, so the chair term limit in the operating procedures is being removed today. The council is also removing some implementation language, much of which has now been completed.

A Wright: I recognize the chair of the Council on Core Curriculum to make the motion of behalf of the Council.

B Blevins-Knabe: So moved.

Be it Resolved to modify the operating procedures of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (legislation FS#2012-13_11) as follows (strikethrough indicates deletion, underline indicates addition)

Operating Procedures for the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies

A. The UALR Council on Core Curriculum and Policies (henceforth 'Council') a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, will be responsible for:

~~1. Adapting the Ad Hoc Criteria Committee's report to accommodate the curricular areas of~~

~~the UALR Standard Core and the College Cores:~~

- ~~• English/Communication Written;~~
- ~~• Fine Arts;~~
- ~~• Humanities;~~
- ~~• Social Sciences;~~
- ~~• Mathematics;~~
- ~~• Science;~~

~~English/Communication Spoken~~

- ~~1. 2.~~ Maintaining the criteria for determining whether a course is appropriate to satisfy a curricular area in the UALR Standard Core;
- ~~2. 3.~~ ~~Developing and~~ Maintaining a submission and approval process for UALR Standard Core course inclusion;
- ~~3. 4.~~ Developing and maintaining a re-approval process, including a timeline, for UALR Standard Core course continuation;
- ~~4. 5.~~ ~~Developing and~~ Maintaining a plan to assess educational outcomes of the UALR Standard Core;
- ~~5. 6.~~ Overseeing college/program course inclusion beyond the UALR Standard Core to ensure the coursework meets the State Minimum Core;
- ~~6. 7.~~ Providing a detailed, written review to submitters for all decisions;
- ~~7. 8.~~ Granting exemptions to the UALR Standard Core requirements to programs, where appropriate, as outlined in part C.
- ~~8. 9.~~ Developing application and exemption forms reflecting these guidelines.

B. Operating procedures of the UALR Council on Core Curriculum and Policies

1. Any course already approved by UGC is eligible to be considered for inclusion in core. Any new or modified courses must first be approved by UGC before being considered for inclusion in core.
2. No ~~chair~~, assistant dean, associate dean, dean, vice provost or vice chancellor shall serve as a voting member of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies.
- ~~3. Given the 3-year terms for faculty, one-third of the initial faculty members will serve for one (1) year, one-third for two (2) years and one-third for three (3) years, to be determined by lot.~~
4. The members of the Council will annually elect the chair from among its members, with the term of chair being one (1) year. A Chair-elect will also be elected annually. ~~Chairs may succeed themselves for a total of three (3) terms.~~
5. The Office of the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs shall provide staff support to the committee, scheduling meetings, preparing agendas and minutes, and providing such other support as may be required.
6. Student input is valuable for developing and maintaining the UALR Standard Core. If the numbers of elected undergraduate students willing to serve are less than the number of positions to be filled, then nominations for these positions will be solicited from the university community.
7. The Council will report regularly to the Faculty Senate and university community, with the actions taken at each meeting disseminated through the provost's office within five business days of each meeting.

8. If the Council rejects an application, the committee must provide a detailed, written explanation to the author(s) explaining why the proposal was not accepted. The author(s) may address the Council's concerns and resubmit the proposal within the same semester to the Council; said course will not need to be resubmitted to the Undergraduate Council. If the resubmission is not accepted, the author(s) may appeal the decision of the Council to the Faculty Senate. The author(s) will apply in writing to the Executive Committee within 10 business days of the notification of the Council's decision. The final decision on course inclusion resides with the Faculty Senate.
9. This document may be amended by a $\frac{2}{3}$ ~~affirmative majority~~ vote of those members of the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies present and voting, provided a quorum is present, and ratification of those changes by the UALR Faculty Senate.

C. Appeals for Exemptions to the UALR Standard Core

1. Individual programs or departments may appeal to the Standard Core Curriculum Council to be exempted from all or part of the UALR Standard Core requirements when implementing the UALR Standard Core would:

- a. conflict with accreditation requirements;
- b. increase program requirements to more than 120 hours for graduation or further increase the total number of hours for graduation for programs which have received approval from the Arkansas Department of Higher Education to require more than 120 hours;
- c. otherwise bring the program into conflict with state law, Board policy, or University policy.

2. Exemption request must include relevant documentation demonstrating how the UALR Standard Core conflicts with any of the above (1.a.-1.c.) including but not limited to: detailed accreditation requirements, ADHE/Board/University policies, state law, etc.

3. The Council may choose by a majority vote to grant exemptions for one to four years or an unlimited exemption. During the final year of the exemption, the department or program may reapply for an exemption, at which point the Council may grant them one additional temporary exemption of no more than two years or make the exemption permanent or deny them any further exemption. Permanent exemptions should be granted only in cases where it would not be possible to bring the program's or department's requirements in line with the UALR Standard Core without creating problems with accreditation, total hours, state law, or relevant policy, as outlined above. Exemptions would be permanent so long as there are no significant changes to the program curriculum.

4. If the Council rejects an application for an exemption, the committee must provide a detailed, written explanation to the author(s) explaining why the application was not approved. The author(s) may address

the Council's concerns and resubmit the proposal within the same semester. If the resubmission is not accepted, the author(s) may appeal the decision of the Council to the Faculty Senate. The author(s) will apply in writing to the Executive Committee within 10 business days of the notification of the Council's decision. The final decision on exemptions resides with the Faculty Senate.

5. In the case of persistent exemptions of groups of programs, the Council will examine the UALR Standard Core and may recommend changes to the UALR Standard Core which may resolve these persistent exemptions.

Commentary: The start-up provisions in the operating procedures need to be removed, since they have been completed. The modification clause needs to be fixed, since the language requires 2/3 of the entire Core Council, which is impractical. The term limit on the chair can be removed, since the Constitution defines a two term limit on the members. The Operating procedures were passed before the constitution was modified to include this Council, so the chair term limit is redundant.

AW: No discussion – calls vote. Motion carries.

-Break-

II. Report from Workload Task Force – Christy Drale

Workload Policy Proposal

2 handouts – list of changes between drafts 10 & 11 and a comparison chart by B Berry

Recap the process and talk about a few of the things that have changed

Last time we had focus groups to prepare draft 10 then college meetings and open feedback we drafted 11 which is what is posted along with the changes

(2:42) Mainly editorial changes or additions -- elaboration on Library faculty

-clarified the essential difference going from (Bryan's comparison) 1994 which was an instruction centered model that assumed that fulltime load was defined by a certain amount of instruction – anything else you do is reassigned from that instruction Disadvantage: presents scholarship and service as other things you do 'instead of' instruction (your fulltime job).

Distribution model that distributes all activities across the functions – all equally valid

Eliminated baseline IUs more important to have the baseline (typical assignment)

Considerable discussion around weights – instructional weights table; what ifs? how will that work? we have a table to allow you to figure exceptions out discussions about more weight for certain things? No work is any more or less important than other unless there is broad consensus for heavier to one area we left it alone

Individualized instruction was adjusted still hearing debate about it seeking compromise for limit actually two kinds of individualized instruction: straight dissertation hours and doctoral/research dissertation hours.

In this version we adjusted to 3 levels to accommodate.

This is probably the least popular provision with provost and will probably result in further discussion.

Moved example workload distributions to Appendix A 9, 10 month tenure tracks and 9 month non-tenure tracks moved to the appendix to cut down on confusion to make it clear that these are examples

Summary of changes to date done

First read so to speak Will return next time to ask for the senate to formally respond to the proposal.

G Jensen: I understand why you eliminated banking hours. In the area of thesis or dissertation credit: How can you get credit for diss hours? How can we project hours? How do we know how many students we might have?

CD: Difficult situation – Can we have a usable banking system Try to deal with it by adding short term limits.

G Jensen: Here we have ways to evaluate faculty workload and other metrics to evaluate programs - other places we have other ways they must be aligned

CD: how do we do it now?

G Jensen: In my department we are getting releases to help University but not department. But that is not calculated in the metrics. Will work in the distribution model, but not necessarily in every program.

CD: May have to negotiate bringing back people from other assignments, university assignments

G Jensen: That is my answer - but it means we might appear we do not want people to serve.

CD: This seems like a separate issue - maybe a priorities issue?

G Jensen: All must align to avoid mixed messages.

B Blevins-Knabe: Concerned that there is no differentiation between grad and undergrad courses. This does not speak well for the institution, for the quality of our grad courses.

M Crow: Address BBK's concern What impact on faculty recruitment? ...on University ranking and institutional standing? Got greater share of for grad students – if all same why should grad students get more funding?

CD: The formula for funding is system wide. I don't think that UALR would be singled out for different funding formula. As to recruitment, it is open for discussion -- we have people on both sides of the argument -- considering possible implications for deleterious effects?

B Berry: We looked at many organizations: Only two institutions gave differentiation for grad vs undergrad. precluded distinction between there are not distinctions in our system check out other workload policies for comparison I am concerned if this will hurt grad ed but could not find evidence. If you have data to the contrary then share with me.

P Tschumi: planning and finance looking at proposal we are looking at impact have you applied it in theory as a test? What is the financial impact?

CD: Yes a dean and a chair tested it and I will send copies thereof.

A Wright: is this going to be a change or not a change? If no change, then what is the point?

CD: It will be a more equitable system. We did not set out to save millions of dollars. We were looking for an equitable, efficient system. Banked hours, for example, were discounting other functions This may bring us together - start fresh with an equitable workloads. It can be seen and inspire confidence across the board.

AW: The document cites Roles and Rewards wherein we said we were going to do more scholarly activities. However, this policy isn't really moving us towards a load that is consistent with the provisions in R&R.

CD: We are saying the typical workload is going to be 9 hours. There may be costs savings depending upon evening out workloads.

E Anson: I like it better than earlier but don't like to see department chairs moving out of teaching and into administration only.

J Vander Putten: Has anyone on the task force chaired a social science dissertation? I ask because doctorates achieved at different times of life need to differentiate between men/women. Women have been at a disadvantage.

2:58

Open forum none

III. Adjourned at 2:59