



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Friday, November 16, 2012, 1:00 p.m.

Faculty Senate Meeting

Donaghey Student Center A/B Auditorium

Article I. MINUTES

Present: **CAHSS**—Jo Anne Matson, George Jensen, Sarah Beth Estes, Paul Yoder, Julie Steel, Brad Minnick, Robert Corwyn, Laura Amrhein, Adiana Lopez-Ramirez, Ed Anson, Kris McAbee, Erin Finzer. **CB**— Steve Edison, Mark Funk, Jim Nickels. **CE**—Gail Hughes, Amanda Nolen, Greg Barrett. **CEIT**— Pete Tschumi, Andrew Wright, Gary Anderson, Nick Jovanovic, Mike Tramel. **LAW**—none. **LIBRARY**—Karen Russ. **CPS**—Jim Golden, Amy Barnes, Sonny Rhodes, Avinash Thombre. **COS**—Bryan Benton, Marian Douglas, Tom McMillan, Bennie Prince, Jay Sims, Denise Legrand. **EX OFFICIO**—President Smith-Olinde.

Absent: **CAHSS**— Clea Bunch, Jess Porter. **CB** –Robert Mitchell, Lars Powell. **CE**— Judy Hayn, John Burgin. **CEIT**—Chia-Chu Chiang. **LAW** – June Stewart, Kathryn Fitzhugh, Chuck Goldner. **LIBRARY**—none. **CPS** – Lillie Wichinsky, Judith Faust. **COS**—Olga Tarasenko, Elizabeth Sloan Davidson, Qingfang He. **EX OFFICIO**—Chancellor Anderson, Provost Robertson, Past President Ford, Staff Senate President Turner, SGA President Mohsin.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Smith-Olinde welcomed the senators, called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm and invited Secretary Wright to call the roll.

II. Review of minutes

The minutes from 11/02/12 meeting were moved by Senator Steel, seconded by Senator Douglas, and approved unanimously on voice vote.

III. Announcements

Thanksgiving Break is next week.

IV. New Topics

Senator Barrett read the following statement:

“First, I want to wish everybody a Happy Holiday Season!

Second, I want to thank Chancellor Anderson, Interim Provost Robertson, and Extended Programs Dean Stevenson for making the Accelerated Online Course Creation and Ownership Agreement available to the faculty for discussion. I hope the Faculty Senate will take action so we can temporarily suspend our ongoing work and hold a discussion of the provisions of the Agreement today regarding the implications that those provisions hold for faculty members and the University.

I also hope this is the appropriate venue to make a request for an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee to be established that will investigate the future of online higher education at UALR. I would hope the committee would investigate pros and cons, positives and negatives, long- and short-term implications for faculty, staff, and students, and perhaps most importantly the alignment of online higher education with Fast Forward 2 or whatever strategic plan the University decides it wants to follow or to create.

I believe it is essential to the long-term health of UALR that critical and strategic thinking be applied to how we can maximize our strengths, overcome our weaknesses, capitalize on our opportunities, and surmount any threats to the University within the context of online higher education. In the spirit of shared governance, I believe the Faculty Senate should take the lead in this initiative and the committee should include the full participation of UALR's administration and student leaders to help steer a course that will benefit all parties in this important endeavor.

Thank you.“

V. Reports

UGC Report (Mike Tramel)

ugc approved a few course changes and a program change and there were about 50 new items introduced this week for the first read.

GC Report (Amanda Nolen)

The last meeting of the semester will be Dec. 5, so all curriculum changes must be submitted by Nov. 28

The “Proposal for Changes to Graduate Faculty Status and Appointment Process” was presented to the Faculty Senate.

The main change is that approval is only granted for six years and faculty need to reapply to continue working with graduate programs. The Graduate School will implement a new record keeping system to keep track of the various statuses and expiration dates.

Some discussion took place following the announcement, the gist of which was, why are faculty being removed from graduate faculty status?

Angela Hunter (who chaired Graduate Council when this process started) indicated that there were “a number of instances” where faculty members complained that their colleagues had not been active in their field and may not be qualified to mentor doctoral students. This process gives Graduate Council a mechanism to prevent those faculty members from participating in doctoral programs.

Ad Hoc Committee on Criteria (Steve Edison)

Senator Edison (chair of the Ad Hoc Committee) presented the committee's plan of action regarding organizing the criteria for courses to be included in a distribution and assessed. The Committee presented a template for one of seven areas mapped out in Motion FS_2012_13_2. The Committee adapted the look from documents at other schools.

The Committee requested the Senate to approve the format as a means of proceeding so that they can complete by the Dec. 7 meeting. Senator Sims seconded.

In Favor: This approach maps the distributions to the bullet list of values and skills in Section 0.

Against: If a course is offered in the UA system as a core course, UALR should accept it as a core course in the closest possible substitution.

This approach doesn't include the distribution skill sets anywhere in the outcomes. For instance, a student who takes a course in English Language Communication does not have an outcome (under the sample) of being able to communicate in the English language.

The motion was approved on voice vote with Senator Jovanovic voting against.

VI. Insertion of Discussion on Accelerated Programs Contract

Senator Barrett moved to suspend the rules to allow the Senate to discuss the accelerated on-line programs contract. Senator Nolen seconded. The suspension of the rules carried unanimously on a voice vote.

Concerns raised about the contract included:

1. Although the University and Faculty member are considered “joint owners” of the copyright, the University has all of the rights and the faculty member has all of the responsibilities. The language in the contract may be misleading.
2. It is not clear how the faculty member who authored the work can develop the pedagogical material into publishable material.
3. How can the author incorporate previously published material into the work?

4. The contract puts the onus and expense onto the faculty member author to obtain consents for other copyrighted material. This can get very expensive (more than the \$5000 fee that the university is paying for the work).

5. The contract seems to take any subsidiary rights (e.g., movie rights, digital print rights, paper print rights).

6. The contract requires the author to be revised if asked within a year of the contract and can charge the author for costs if s/he doesn't comply.

7. The College of Business is doing the work that would be covered under this contract without this contract, since its accelerated program is "going live" in January. The current partnership is pushing faculty to develop materials that are pedagogically unsound (no specifics).

8. The University is supposed to provide resources to support faculty in their normal activities; however, the contract doesn't specify what resources the faculty can use in developing the work.

9. Is it possible to participate in the accelerated on-line program, but not sign the contract?

10. Is there a contradiction between existing university IP policies and the accelerated on-line contract?

11. It appears that the contract only applies to a one-time development of course materials between the University (who provides a \$5000 check and some residuals) and the faculty member author (who provides the work and assumes most of the liability). Faculty members can sell their IP if they choose, so this does not appear to have any implications on the campus IP policy.

Most of the concerns raised so far seem to be related to the contract being an undesirable deal ... too little money for the liabilities. However, if a faculty member does not want to take this deal, there are materials available that can be used to deliver these courses.

12. If the University can license the work anywhere with the faculty author assuming the liabilities, could this contract subject the faculty author (without his/her knowledge or consent) to other country's laws? treaties? export controls?

VI. Old Business

Resumption of FS 2012_13_2 ... Motion was postponed until the December 7.

X. Open Forum

None

XI. Adjourn

At 2:30, the meeting was adjourned.