



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

February 23, 2018

1:00 PM until adjournment

DSC B/C

I. Called to order at 1:13 pm and Roll Call

Present: **CALS**— Nguyen, Stone, R Street, LeGrand, Smith, Law, Kyong-McClain, S Thibeault. **CB**—Wooldridge, Hendon. **CEHP**— Evans, Otters, Grover, Vander Putten, Nolen, Stieve, Franklin, K Cates. **CSSC**— Flinn, Blevins-Knabe, Lopez, Matson, Scranton, Craw, Golden, Giammo. **CEIT**— Tramel, DeAngelis, McMillan. **LAW**— Boles. **LIBRARY**—Schmidtbauer. **EXOFFICIO** - Rogerson, Wright, Anson, Burton, Harper.

Absent: **CALS**— Barrio-Villar, S Woolbright, Cheatham, M Douglas, Al-Shukri. **CB**—Vibhakar, Leonard. **CEHP**— Fletcher, Atcherson. **CSSC**— **CEIT** — McMillan, Jovanovic, Berleant. **LAW** ---Foster, Fitzhugh. **LIBRARY**— Macheak **EXOFFICIO**— Gregory, Harper

II. Review of Minutes from January 19, 2018

III. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)

BBK: Chairs are being referred to as administrators, though they are

Chancellor and provost agree chairs are faculty members

M DeAngelis: What is quorum for the faculty senate?

A Wright: About 25

BBK: Where is the judicial policy?

AW: We have postponed the judicial policy because of work we are doing on the other issues of governance.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit) none

V. Announcements

A. Suicide Prevention Walk - Mike Kirk

M Kirk: Reviews counseling services; social workers, counselors and APRN. We are committed to help students and want to promote help seeking behavior. Call us. We are collaborating on suicide prevention with Arkansas Suicide Prevention. We are sponsoring a suicide prevention walk April 7 2018, on campus from 12-3pm. Posters available - encouraged us to create teams.

We are directing students to resources on campus, holding a two day conference and asking you for participation.

VI. Reports

A. Executive Committee - Andrew Wright

Introduces our report on Changes to Board Policies 405.1, 405.4, 470.1

Motion made, discussion opens:

AW: reviews document

?: Calls 405. into question - does not believe it has been mostly satisfied.

PTschumi: warns against language

AW: - Language re: appointments to department head or chair

- changes to post tenure review
- Josh concerns over adequacy of our amendments
- concerns about number of years to remediate
- Josh says now that once the process is triggered you have two years after being notified
- We still need to continue to ask for more information
- Moves to to drop the word and primary - motions fails
- suggestion to go back to the drawing board
- AW
- move made to add a paragraph about the problem of including all these things in the same item (redraft) motion carries
- V. b. No objections
- VI. Concern over Impact...No comments
- VII. Concern over lack of faculty input....no comments
- Return to IV - see mark ups on the item - it is recommended that IV be fully reviewed and possibly more fully revised.
- Exec comm will move to tenure committee
- motion made that everything we do gets addressed to the trustees with cc to others - motion carries
- motion to change 'mostly' in **II. Concern Over the Expansion of the Scope of "Cause" - Mostly Satisfied** to 'partially' satisfied.
- does anyone want to put anything in about XII?
- All in favor of adopting the document as modified? Motion carries

B. Faculty Governance Committee - Rosalie Cheatham

E Anson: Rosalie sends regards. We have several proposals in progress awaiting input from others. Most recently working on 405.1

C. Committee on Tenure - Jim Vander Putten, Rob Steinbuch

Report on file. (Recommendations to Board Policy Revision)

Motion made to receive. Motion carries

Motion made to accept: Motion carries

Discussion on whether or not to send both documents to BOT. Concerns that executive comm document does not address enough of the concerns

3:14 pm Motion to amend executive comm document with three things: limitation on search language strike language about salary change r/t funding sources

D. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson

- REMIND US OF eSTEM report form on BOSS and quick links - please give your comments, positive and problems as well; retro feasibility study will be conducted and they will need our input
- E Anson: will things be delayed until then
- A R : Yes, there is time for the study to be done before further serious developments
- Continues to remind powers that be of our identity and mission

E. Provost's Report – Velmer Burton

Reports on UALR internal viability study update (report attached)

F. Graduate Council – Brian Berry

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

H. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

VII. Old Business

- A. Motion FS_2017_26 .** Executive Committee (Legislation. 3/5 Majority Vote at two Meeting, no second required, second vote) Create a Buildings and Grounds Committee

Buildings and Grounds Committee: The purpose of this committee shall be to insure protection of the natural and aesthetic environment of the UA Little Rock campus consistent with reasonable growth and development of the campus. The committee shall promote beautification of the campus through a continuous review of landscaping, building and signage appearance, and campus roads and paths. The committee shall recommend on plans for new campus construction, and shall recommend to the chancellor steps that should be taken to preserve the natural environment and beauty of the campus. The committee shall periodically review the campus master plan.

The committee shall consist of one member from each college or school represented in the faculty senate, including collections and archives, appointed to two year, staggered terms by the Committee on Committees; two members of the staff senate, selected by the staff senate to two year, staggered terms; two students appointed by the Student Government Association to one-year terms. The administrator in charge of planning buildings and grounds shall serve as an ex-officio member without vote.

Motion carried.

VIII. New Business

- A. Motion FS_2018_2.** Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Grades and Grading System changes

Be it resolved to adopt the following Policy on Grades (404.13) and supercede all prior legislation on grades (1968 LRU bulletin; repeated grades: 12/8/1983, 5/8/1975, 5/2/1973; credit/no credit: 5/2/1973; incomplete: 2/26/1987):

Grades

Permanent letter-grades are here indicated, together with the grade-point value of each grade:

- A -- superior work 4 grade points
- B -- good work, above average 3 grade points
- C -- average work 2 grade points
- D -- passing work, below average 1 grade point
- F -- failing work 0 grade points

Other grading symbols:

Credit (CR) or No Credit (NC) may be given in certain courses instead of the usual letter grades.

A student may elect to take no more than one course each semester on a CR/NC basis if the course instructor concurs provided this agreement is established at the start of the course. This course may not be used to meet the general education requirements, major requirements, or minor requirements. Courses in which a department requires CR/NC grading are not included in this limitation. (5/2/1973)

W -- withdrawal during the early period of a course (see Attendance and Withdrawal Policy, 404.4).

I -- incomplete course work

The designation, *I*, or incomplete, is appropriate where the instructor deems that circumstances beyond the student's control prevented timely completion of course requirements. The designation is given by the instructor only after consultation with the student and after the student has been informed in writing of the work to be completed and the date by which the work must be completed; additionally, a copy of the written notice must be filed with the department chairperson.

The work must be completed and the I converted by the instructor to the appropriate grade by the date grades are due during the next academic semester (fall or spring) for undergraduate courses, and within one year from the date grades were due for graduate courses. The I will expire and be administratively changed to an F on the first business day following the above periods if the instructor does not convert the incomplete grade or submit an extension request within the allowable timeframes. A request to extend the deadline to complete an I must be completed by the instructor and forwarded to the Office of Records and Registration prior to the expiration date.

The extension request must include a specific date by which all course work will be completed.

Regardless of any extensions that may have been granted, an unconverted I grade will expire and be administratively changed to an *F* on the first business day following the date grades are due in the term immediately prior to graduation.

In Progress (IP) Grade - graduate only

An In Progress grade (IP) is used for thesis, dissertation, or other similar classes that have a time obligation that is longer than the traditional semester or session. IP indicates that the student is making satisfactory progress in that class. Students who do not make satisfactory progress will be granted no credit (NC). The instructor assigning the IP grade will replace it with a letter grade that reflects the quality of the finished work. In unusual circumstances, such as a student not finishing the obligation in a length of time deemed reasonable by the professor or the professor assigning the grade being unable to change the grade, the graduate coordinator, after consulting with the Graduate School dean, may change the grade to CR in the CR/NC scheme or A-C in the A-F scheme. The IP grade is distinct and different from the Incomplete (I) grade. The IP grade is not calculated into the grade point average. IP grades will be administratively converted to CR/NC or A-F, as described above, after six years have elapsed.

Repeated Grades

If a student repeats a course for credit, only the last occurrence of the course shall be counted toward credit hours or cumulative grade points, except in circumstances of academic integrity.

Changing Grades

The course instructor has the responsibility for assigning grades. In the event that an instructor cannot issue a grade, the chair of the department offering the course may issue the grade.

Grades must be submitted to the Registrar by the date assigned in the academic calendar (see Calendar and Schedules Policy, 404.11). If the grade has not been entered by this deadline, the symbol MG (missing grade) shall be entered. Missing grades should be changed to a final grade no later than five business days after grades were due.

Grades may be changed through the Grade Appeal process, through the conversion of an Incomplete to a grade, through the conversion of an IP to a grade, through the replacement of a repeated course, and through the Grade Change Process.

Grade Change Process: Under some circumstances not covered by an Incomplete or In Progress, a grade may be changed by the course instructor through submission of a grade change request. The request must be reviewed by the chair of the department offering the course. A grade may not be changed on the basis of a second final

examination or additional course work undertaken or completed after the grade was issued.

Reporting Grades

The schedule and method of reporting grades to the student are determined by the Registrar's Office.

Commentary: Many changes have occurred in the Grades and Grading System since the last time the faculty reviewed them (LRU, 1968). Some of these changes can be seen in Faculty Senate legislation (e.g., the incomplete legislation, 2/26/1987), but many changes cannot be found in Faculty Senate legislation.

This legislation is intended to reconcile current practices and fix a few issues, such as Spring incomplete grades being resolved in the summer when faculty are off contract and issues related to resolving situations where grades have not been issued.

A Wright introduces and explains the motion.

Malissa Mathis offers some explanations and definitions regarding grades

J Matson: Move to postpone until March 2018 meeting. A Nolen seconds;

AW calls vote. Motion carries

- B. **Motion FS_2018_3.** Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting, no second required) Adopt a variation on the Chicago Statement for Academic freedom

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock hereby adopts the following operating principles:

STATEMENT ARTICULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK'S OVERARCHING COMMITMENT TO FREE, ROBUST, AND UNINHIBITED DEBATE AND DELIBERATION AMONG ALL MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY'S COMMUNITY

Our students and faculty have the right to discuss any problem that presents itself. This right is grounded in long-standing principles of academic freedom and is reflected in university accreditation standards. The "cure" for ideas we oppose lies through open discussion rather than through inhibition. Free inquiry is indispensable to the good life, universities exist for the sake of such inquiry, and without it they cease to be universities. This is the essence of critical thinking that provides society and individuals with progress.

Education is not intended to make people comfortable; it is meant to make them think. Universities are expected to provide the conditions within which hard thought, and

therefore strong disagreement, independent judgment, and the questioning of stubborn assumptions, can flourish in an environment of the greatest freedom.

The ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is inappropriate for the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University community greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can *never* be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. But the University may legally restrict the substance of expression only when it explicitly violates the law, i.e., when speech falsely defames a specific individual, constitutes a genuine threat or actual harassment, or invades legally recognized privacy interests. In addition, reasonable time, place, and manner regulations are recognized as legal. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions *never* be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University's commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

The University's fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community or society at large to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. The individual members of the University community—not the University as an institution, its administration, nor any external constituency—are entitled to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University's educational mission.

As a corollary to the University's commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

Commentary: Higher Learning Commission expects some statement regarding Academic Freedom on campus as part of Criterion 2.D “The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.” The Committee on Tenure has prepared this statement as an adaptation of the 2014 University of Chicago’s Committee on Freedom of Expression [“Report on Freedom of Expression.”](#)

IX. Open Forum

X. Adjourn