

FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Friday, October 21, 2016

1:00 PM until adjournment

DSC B&C

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Present: **CALS**—Anson, Cheatham, LeGrand, Street, Smith, Kyong-McClain, Barrio-Vilar, Woolbright. **CB**—Hendon. **CEHP**—Oltmans, Prince, Carmack, Evans, Vander Putten, Stieve, Grover, Otters. **CSSC**—Giammo, Flinn, Golden, Blevins-Knabe, Scranton, Lopez, Matson. **CEIT**—Jovanovic, Deangelis. **LAW**—Fitzhugh, Entrikin. **LIBRARY**—Macheak. **ExOFFICIO**—Rogerson, Wright, Anson, Donovan, McClellan.

Absent: **CALS**—Cates, Thibeault, Warner, Douglas, Law. **CB**—Farewell, Leonard. **CEHP**—Finley, Crass. **CSSC**—Craw **CEIT**—Sandgren, Tramel, McMillan, Berleant. **LAW**—Boles. **LIBRARY**—. **ExOFFICIO**—Toro

II. Review of Minutes September 23 2016 Minutes approved with correction

III. Announcements and Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

?: working on Open Educational Resources

B Blevins-Knabe: Wants a report from Planning and Finance on budgetary issues.

N Jovanovic: Midterm grades for levels 0-2000 are required, but no process for delivering them was specified -- was left up to the individual instructors.

IV. President's Report – Andrew Wright

A. Ad Hoc Committee on Admissions Requirements Review

B. Ad Hoc Committee on Paperless Curriculum Process

C. Ad Hoc Committees on Judicial Policy Review

D. Counsel Appointment - Exec Comm appointed Amanda Nolen

A Wright: Admissions requirement committee has been established with J Carmack as chair.

Appointed an ad hoc committee on the paperless curriculum process. Met with chair of core curr committee to define what is the curriculum process? We will have a document explaining by next meeting.

Judicial policy review Three ad hoc committees for processes on how this will work out.

AIGC self nominations have been made.

We have asked previous members on the judicial policy review to serve on one of the ad hocs to help.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson

Reminds us that Toro is moving on at the end of December. Search company for provost will begin quickly. Will be a national search. Looking for vice chancellor of student affairs to replace Kahler. Will be local for now.

My biggest challenge is dealing with enrollment. We really have to turn around student enrollment. We have to do something fast to affect the Fall 17 class. Focused recruitment and reaching out to regions we haven't addressed. Concerned about customer service. That will discourage people. It would be useful to have a one stop shop - one number anyone can call and get a response immediately. Therefore, we are implementing such a program wherein the caller will be answered by a live person and the phone call will be immediately routed. This process will happen within a week.

E Anson: Do you mean they will get live person on phone?

AR: Yes, I guarantee it.

AR: Also, working with Jacksonville school district to help students there - we are extending to middle and senior high school the Trojan Promise contract. Agreement that that if student satisfies admission requirements, they will be admitted. This is not new, but the reaching out with a plan to school districts is. Shows students that there is a pathway to this school. We will make sure students are taken care of, mentoring etc. We will make a way for them, make students conscious of affordability, work on financial aid. We will concentrate on maximizing financial aid with close work. It is a great thing for the city - this is what we do. I would like for my legacy to be increase the education of the people of this community.

EA: Is it Jacksonville or more?

AR: Just JVille now. But will entertain others. Met with Poore in Little Rock who endorsed the idea. There are a lot of students who don't see a pathway to higher ed: We may start them at community college. Get them on a path.

I have been working closely with the community and now it is time to get with the campus and will be conducting a town hall meeting soon.

Budget questions?

E Anson: Why do we need a search firm at all? In this electronic age, can't we do it ourselves?

AR: A search firm gives us a bigger pool but it is expensive - does it warrant the cost? I am working with the firm that attracted me, and hope to get a good deal. I am open to considering other ideas, but am anxious to proceed. It can be costly to be missing a provost.

J Matson: Are we going to reorg?

AR: All academics affairs will go back to new vice chancellor.

N Jovanovic: Search firms have a conflict of interest because they steer candidates for the benefit of the firm rather than the University.

AR: We want UALR to be up to par. Search firms are aggressive. They do a pretty good job sorting and vetting producing best candidates and give us a look at all candidates. May go with the firm that got AR.

R Cheatham: How what?

AR: We don't have a policy on the makeup of the committee. We are making it inclusive. Need faculty reps to be selected by fac senate. the provost can make things happen on the campus.

L McClellan: Will students still have to live on campus?

AR: Not changing for now - you must live on campus if outside 25 miles.

N Jovanovich: We have waivers? It is not friendly policy. Scholarships requires freshmen to live on campus.

AR: Get rid of waiver -- get rid of scholarship policy. The way scholarships are given is inequitable. We are going to track them better with software package.

E Anson: Can we do this by Spring 17?

AR: Will try.

J Vanderputten: Research has shown 18-24 yo Hispanics they don't live on campus for cultural reasons. Our pop is fast growing and we need to accomodate.

AR: ASU is putting a campus in Mexico City. We need to catch up. The urban metro univ is a good model and we need to get back to it.

J Matson: What about moratorium on online programs?

AR: eVersity is growing. Is it a competition? Doesn't think so - eVersity is addressing a different population , mostly those who have never been or are finishing a degree. Not addressing higher ed at this time.

N Jovanovich: Of the 600 reportedly enrolled students, story is only small portion (60?) of eVersity students are in actually in class.

AR: Doesn't know for sure. Holds party line.

Will be holding a Town hall meeting to review details of issues -- reaching out to faculty.

B. Provost's Report - Zulma Toro Absent

C. Assessment Academy Report – Erin Finzer, Cody Decker

Complete report on website

E Finzer: The next thing is the annual conference.

The senate has not had the chance to read and digest the report. How is the interface with committees? Because we were not able reach consensus, but have not made recommendation. Encourages faculty to read the report and give feedback.

D. Faculty Governance Committee – Rosalie Cheatham

We are still challenged with getting items through the process. Some things are getting stuck. There are no time limits. Until the document is signed by the chancellor it is not official. Need to get documents to us, but can move only one at a time. We have to move the documents forward. Very serious issues at question. The provost and I met with the chancellor and reviewed the process.

Once the department has received feedback, the department is free to make their own document as long as it is not at odds with policy or regulations.

Please work with other departments in your college and keep things moving.

The handbook is from 2000 - working on getting it updated. Will facilitate everyone being on the same place. Please bring issues to the attention of the committee.

N Jovanovich: The flow should be uninterrupted, not stopped at any level or returned to department before going through the process.

M Deangelis: Why has the dean been left out?

RC: We are trying to facilitate the flow. There are lots of representatives to help the process.

E. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel on website

F. Graduate Council – Brian Berry on website

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

A Wright: Is it the intention of the CC that the recommendations become legislation?

BBK: That is my question to you. In Fall of 1X, this policy was introduced. What do we need to do to implement? When does what have to go to legislation.

In the case of the test out specifically - the exec comm was thaling aabout course transfer and were told that core is already legislation. In the blue ribbon it was legislation; in that instance it was determined it was passed legislation. Regarding core council: relative to implementation policy that is in the commentary, and needs to be brought before the Faculty Senate in November and let the senate decide.

The previous report came at a crowded time and it got missed.

BBK: We just need to come back and pust.

R Cheatham: Hard to know when it becomes senate business - we have test out from blue ribbon, but we have policies that did not die with the new core. Am concerned that we are setting the precedent of dealing with things that we have already been dealt with. Which vestigial policies are still alive?

AW: When we passed the gen ed, I am not sure that was a real clean process. Was the legislation clearly to replace old? What parts? We have been operating on this line since 2014

RC: let's eliminate ambiguity. Some are interpreting things differently.

AW: We have a mechanism to clear this up.

RC: But not all are dealt with b

AW: We have taken care of specific issues. YOU can see what we have done on the website; every piece of legislation relative to gen ed.

RC: You don't know what you don't know.

AW: Senate can make that determination. the core council has brought a motion.

J Hendon: That seems to be a poor process. Can someone specific to make a determination.

RC: Historically, it went to exec comm and the fac senate can ask questions and acts on by vote.

E Anson: is this policy separate from Core?

BBL: when we approve a course in Fall 16 it will not be in place until Fall 17. But we are working with people to avoid holding people up.

P Scranton: Who knows the most about a piece of legislation? It is the originating committee not us.

AW: If something is legislation the process is that it goes on the agenda.

NJ: The committees and councils don't have all the background - so we are trying to forestall the appeals and equip them to move ahead.

J Matson: I really think that policy is to go in effect - this came up because it hasn't. The senate has said we have a new core and has delegated responsibility to the committee or council, then the senate needs to step back.

NJ: Says policies need to be documented

RC: What happens in the future when things have been forgotten? What about transition periods?

BBK: We do have a way to make things known. Have committees put policies on the web for all to see.

VI. Old Business

- A. Motion FS_2016_26.** Executive Committee. (Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Place a constitutional amendment on the April 2017 University Assembly meeting to add authority to designate committee organizer to Officers of the Assembly.

AW: Re-introduces the motion that was set aside for further consideration.

L Entrikin: I move to withdraw the current motion which is to be replaced with a new one. P Scranton

My concern was 'president or designee' is too broad. [Reads new motion.]

Amendment carries

Motion carries

Be it resolved that Article I of the Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Officers of the Assembly be modified to read:

The president shall preside at meetings of the Assembly and of the Executive Committee of the Assembly. The president of the Assembly or designee shall have the responsibility for convening the initial meetings of the committees and councils of the Assembly and Faculty Senate in the fall semester.

Commentary: This was withdrawn from the Assembly agenda due to a question concerning amending the constitution. The motion has been changed to accommodate input received after it was passed by the Faculty Senate.

Amendment on the Floor (Senator Entrikin): add “from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee” after “or designee” so that the additional duty reads:

The president of the Assembly or designee from the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall have the responsibility for convening the initial meetings of the committees and councils of the Assembly and Faculty Senate in the fall semester.

- B. Motion FS_2016_27.** Executive Committee. (Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Place a constitutional amendment on the April 2017 University Assembly meeting to delete authority over committee calling from Committee on Committees

Be it resolved that Article I of the Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, Committee on Committees be modified to read:

The president of the Assembly and Faculty Senate shall serve as the chairperson of the Committee and shall have the responsibility for convening the initial meetings of the committees and councils of the Assembly and Faculty Senate in the fall semester.

Motion is live.

Entrikin proposes an amendment as shown. R Cheatham seconds

Amendment carries

Committees are listed on website and who calls on the committee.

Motion carries

VII. New Business

- A. Motion FS_2016_30.** Executive Committee. (Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) eVoting for agenda items

eVoting for Executive Committee

Matters of routine business that may be resolved through eVoting include

- Approving agendas for distribution

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

If no one disapproves of eVoting on the matter within two business days of the request, the motion will be considered for a vote.

Approval of items requires a majority of those responding, provided that no fewer than 2/3 of the committee have responded by the time of the next Executive Committee

meeting or the time an agenda is due for distribution to the assembly.

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

Motion is live and requires no second.

JMatson reads.

A Wright explains.

Motion carries

B. Motion FS_2016_31. Executive Committee. (Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Test out option for core courses

Whereas the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies presented a policy at the 5/1/2015 faculty senate meeting,

Test out option for core courses:

Every discipline that has a course in the core has to have an option to test out or a plan to develop a test if requested. If a core discipline has a test now it needs to be reviewed to make sure it meets the needs of the core.

And whereas this policy needs to be included in the general education policy by the Faculty Senate,

Therefore be it Resolved to modify Policy 503.3 to add (underline indicates addition, strike-through indicates deletion):

General Education

The UALR Core Curriculum is 35 semester credits. These 35 credits will be divided in the following way: 29 credits in the Standard Core and 6 credits in College Cores. The Standard and College cores together satisfy the Arkansas State Minimum Core. Some colleges, departments or programs may have additional requirements.

Every course in the UALR Core Curriculum must have a test-out option. The test must be reviewed by the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies to ensure that it meets the needs of the UALR Core Curriculum.

J Matson reads.

B Blevins Knabe: Why do the tests have to be reviewed by the council ?

Proposes amendment that the test must be reviewed by 'the appropriate program.'

R Cheatham makes suggestion

N Jovanovic: there could be artifacts from the courses - this has not been discussed.

J Matson: proposes it goes back to core council for amendment.

E Anson: Why can't we just revise it now?

JM: The core council has been may need to review it again considering N J's comment.

J Giammo: isn't this equivalent to transfer?

AWright calls amendment for vote. Amendment carries.
Calls motion for vote. Motion carries.

VIII. Open Forum

A. Discussion: Faculty Excellence Awards

A Wright: There is much discussion that could be had about the recent disruption of the awards.

1. Faculty excellence policy has been on record since 1988 and may be out of date.
2. The awards themselves may not be as appropriate because we have passed the new roles and rewards and they may not fit.
3. We would like to engage our donors to see if they would fund the awards.

The biggest issue is that the Colleges have taken on the college level faculty awards. Also, the external body doesn't have the nuances between various categories of Sch, teaching, service.

Pro: honors committee would be a good review before the nominees go

Con: does the honors committee actually have the expertise to set

A Rogerson: We are spending about \$85,000 and only \$20,000. How can we update this to make it more manageable?

E Anson: questions about the total award amount.

A Rogerson: I am not comfortable using more than \$20,000 state funds.

J Matson: Conversations with people have been good. Whatever we do this year, the colleges were told that we were going forward with the process as was. Then about a month later it was cancelled. Whatever we do make it minimal change - we have already invested in current process. All that wasted will be another insult.

L Barrios: We need to act quickly to preserve actions and avoid further confusion. There will be little time to review.

AW: Changing the process will have to go through the faculty senate.

AR: Agrees we have a policy and we must adhere from it.

NJ: Joanne asks what is the senate's role in this? Proposes empowering the chancellor to alter the legislation for this year.

Suspend rules and add this motion to agenda: The senate will authorize the chancellor to make minimal changes to the policy, for this year only, for expeditious handling of the process for the faculty excellence awards.

Rules suspended: Discussion

M Deangelis: What changes?

E Anson: Okay with it.

R Cheatham: We need to expedite things to support morale. Has concerns about the budget. Where does the money go?

N Jovanovich: The priority is to get the job done without delay but for only this year.

J Matson: I don't see it as a senate defined process.

Calls vote on motion

Motion carries

N Jovanovich: Concerned about honorary degrees but doesn't know history.

R Cheatham: There were some politics involved.

J Matson: Purview of the senate...heard from the assessment academy team. Assessment is one of the purviews of the faculty what are the roles; what should be the future of a process established by provost who is leaving. Should we look at a new process?

IX. Adjourned at 3:40 pm