



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Friday, January 24, 2014

1:00 PM until Adjournment

Ledbetter A & B

Present: **CAHSS**— Estes, Anson, Giammo, Hawkins, Jensen, Maguire, Matson, Merrick, Kris McAbee (for Minnick), Porter, Yoder. **CB**— Funk, Mitchell, Watts. **CE**— Hayn, Barrett, Kuykendall. **CEIT**— Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Wright. **LAW**—Aiyetoro. **LIBRARY**— Macheak. **CPS**— Collier-Tenison, Giese, Rhodes, Golden. **COS**— Benton, Chen, Douglas, LeGrand, He, B. McMillan, T. McMillan, Zheng . **EX OFFICIO**— Toro, Ford, Wright.

Absent: **CAHSS**— Corwyn, Minnick, Amrhein, Drummond. **CB**— Nickels. **CE**— Vander Putten. **CEIT**— Chiang. **LAW**— Fitzhugh, Foster. **LIB**— none. **CPS**— Franklin, Faust. **COS**— Prince, Davidson, Zheng. **EX OFFICIO**— Anderson, Bishop, McNeaill.

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Pres. Wright called meeting to order 1:06 pm. Sec. B. McMillan called the roll.

II. Review of Minutes

The minutes of the Dec. 6, 2013 meeting of the Senate were reviewed. The following changes/corrections were made. Sen. Anson pointed out that Fred Williams was Associate Vice Chancellor of UALR (not Vice President). Sen. Barrett –Requested on behalf of the the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Higher Education to incorporate the SWOT report into the minutes document (not just as a link). Anson made a motion to approve the minutes with corrections. Tramel seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

III. Announcements

Pres. Wright announced that everything Faculty Senate- related is being migrated to a new Faculty Senate site on the UALR webpage.

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

Sen. Tramel asked what is going on with the Pocket Guide? It has been eliminated in paper form. We use it as an advising guide. Can we still produce it?

Pres. Wright asked -Who publishes it?

Karen Wheeler answered – Registration and Records

Tramel – An electronic version would be fine. We would like it to be updated.

Karen Wheeler – We will update it and make it available electronically.

Sen. Tschumi publicly thanked Andrew Drummond for his work on the Generic College Governance document.

Sen. Watts asked why we are not getting enrollment number updates via email like we have in the past. We need to get them. If not, rumors start. I am assuming enrollments are down. It does not do any good to postpone bad news. We need to let people react to the numbers. These should be provided on a timely basis. Pres. Wright state that some committees do get these numbers, but these updates should go to the whole faculty. Sen. Tramel reported that Chairs get 4 categories almost every other day. Past-past-past Pres. Ford asked why can't the date still be sent to FACFOCUS? Pres. Wright said he will talk to someone to make it happen.

Past-past-past Pres. Ford reported on an incident affecting an undergraduate student over the December-January break. The student was applying for graduate school which required electronic transcripts as a part of the application. The student was told by someone in Registration and Records that UALR cannot sent electronic transcripts out of state. This occurred right at Christmas when no one else who could help the student was around. This was an opportunity lost for the student. Ford asked – whose head should have rolled for this? It is unconscionable that this happened. I want you to be aware that this has happened.

Sen. Jovanovic had an additional comment on the need for a reporting enrollment and the distribution of enrollment numbers. He remarked that every now and then I see one and see mistakes. Wider dissemination would help alleviate mistakes.

Sen. Tramel thanked everyone for responding to his email request on where to find the late registration card.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor: Zulma Toro-Ramos (acting)

Pres. Wright informed the Senate that Chancellor Anderson is out – recovering from surgery. Provost Toro is the Acting Chancellor. She will be late because she is attending a Board of Trustees meeting in her role as Acting Chancellor.

[the report that follows was given at the end of the meeting]

Provost Toro apologized for being late. The Board of Trustees meeting took longer than anticipated. She began her report with thoughts and facts on how to strengthen the financial

position of our University in light of an expected large drop in enrollment for the Spring semester. She will present an action plan to turn around the financial and enrollment situation.

Our enrollment trend in headcount since 2004 with and without concurrent enrollment reveals the only upturn is in concurrent enrollment. Otherwise, enrollment has been going down. On enrollment in spring terms – the concurrent enrollment for this spring is not in it yet. But, if we look at the last data point (last two springs) there has been a huge drop in enrollment, the trend is REALLY down. Why? – There are many, many reasons. Enrollment in two year institutions around us is down, as well. This is the reality we have to deal with.

There are two aspects to enrollment – new students and retention. Our new students are 1st time incoming students – from high schools and transfer students. We rely heavily on transfer students. This is the nature of our institution. We must embrace that and use it to our advantage. For Spring 2014 the projection is for a huge drop in 1st time transfers. The two year college trends are now impacting us. Our total SSCH shows the same trend as enrollment. Concurrent enrollment SSCH's are the only ones that are up.

We need to turn around this situation.

On the retention component – we look at the cohort that comes in each year and within each cohort, the % of students who come back the 2nd year up to the 6th year (we have to report to the Federal Government based on 6 years). Based on our % of students who come back the 2nd year – there is hope – this trend is going in the right direction. Beyond the 2nd year, the % returning in the 4th year to 5th year is not good. In fact, 98 % of all students have not graduated. We have a retention problem – they do not graduate. We need to focus on retention programs beyond the first year students if we are really going to make a difference. We as faculty members can make a big impact.

On Budgetary Impacts we are facing some unknowns for the next year budget. The level of state appropriations depends on what the Legislature does with health care Private Option. If that is not extended, many millions of \$\$ will be removed from the state budget. To make up the difference for other needs, money will be taken from higher education. Also, UALR has been very generous in covering health care. Will that cost go up? This is a big unknown. Can there be a tuition increase? Big unknown.

On Budgetary Impacts we do know something about – as the economy improves, enrollment in higher education goes down. Recent changes to financial aid mean students are running out of financial aid sooner than before. The Arkansas Lottery Scholarship has changed. Students now get the same amount of money to go to a 2 year college as they get to attend a 4 year institution, and our largest transfer feeder, Pulaski Technical College has experienced a big drop in enrollment.

We have lost revenue due to enrollment declines since (FY 2012). The projected SSCH lost in 2014 is -6.5%. This equates to a cumulative effect of \$5,000,000+. In other words, 5 million less to spend on faculty students, facilities, etc. If numbers hold, the projection for next year will be a cumulative effect of 10 million + lost.

We have what it takes to turn it around – we have the will.

Strategies to turn this situation around.

Student Success is everyone's job. If each faculty member commits to retain one more student (we have over 500 faculty members), the retention of 500 more students equates to \$3.7 million. I am not suggesting lowering academic standards. I am suggesting things that we can do to help students to succeed. For example, to identify to a transfer student another major, to not lose the student, but to put them on a path where they will be able to excel.

We need to increase the yield of the undergraduate and graduate application pool. We have a bigger pool of those who apply, we need a bigger yield.

We need to seek additional sources of revenue. These may come from degree completion programs, a BS in Applied Science, a BA in liberal studies and increased offerings online.

We are now able to recruit our first UALR AR Research Alliance Scholar. This will improve external grants and contracts.

We need to contain costs. This will come with the implementation of the new organizational structure to support academic offerings, to build student centric processes, and to analyze and re-engineer our processes. We will streamline academic course and program offerings, and strategically manage positions vacated due to early retirement – not by eliminating them, but by looking at where those positions are needed.

We will build partnerships - with 2 year colleges - Pulaski Technical College, the College of the Ouachitas and others; with the Little Rock Air Force Base and Camp Robinson.

This is a call to action. I invite you to be a part of the efforts to strengthen the financial situation of UALR.

Questions?

Pres. Wright – on the strategic partnerships. We need articulation agreements for transfer courses. The more we could automate that, the better

Provost Toro - Faculty involvement in partnerships will be key. We will have to consider common admissions. We may need to go so far as offering our courses at 2 year institutions.

Douglas –What of enrollment at our sister campuses?

Provost Toro – except for Fayetteville, most are having problems.

B. Provost: Restructuring Liaisons

Pres. Wright - The Restructuring Liaisons will give the Provost's report.

George Jenson introduced the report and provided a handout with the goals for Phase 2. The transition team of each new college has had number of meetings – approximately 200. These meetings have included departments, chairs, faculty and staff....each liaison will report on the progress in each of the college. He also reported that Kathryn Lowry will serve for EIT in similar liaison capacity.

George Jensen reported on progress for the College of Education and Health Professions. They have drafted a job announcement for the Dean position and forwarded it to the Provost. Next, the search committee will be formed. Proposals for structure of the college have been submitted to the transition committee. Two town hall meetings are scheduled for Jan 29, and Jan 30. They will attempt to have rough draft of structure in the next 3-4 weeks.

Sonya Premeaux reported on the progress for the College of Arts, Letters, and Science. The Dean profile is completed and the Search Committee members have been identified. The Provost will announce the committee in the next few days. We will meet with the search firm on Monday. We have received numerous proposals from CALS faculty and staff. Proposals were related to Department changes mentioned in the Phase 2 restructuring document. Comments and recommendations were received in confidence. It became apparent that Department mergers must be dealt with before the college structure could be addressed. The Faculty representatives needed to come out with initial recommendations to settle as best as possible. The recommendations are: for the dissolution of the Applied Science Department. Applied Science faculty will be reassigned to other departments based on education and research interests. The Applied Science graduate degrees will be administered at the college level; against the merger of English and International and Second Language Studies (DISLS), instead those departments should remain independent; Recommends that Intensive English Language Program (IELP) be pulled out of the International and Second Language Studies department, but no suggestion as to where it should go. The IELP mission is very different than the academic mission of the DISLS; Recommends the Department of Philosophy and Interdisciplinary Studies be combined with the Department of English. The Dept. of Philosophy is a small/young faculty with no department chair. They are doing great things but as a part of a larger faculty, they can do more. The merger will diminish their service load. These recommendations have been sent on to Provost.

We are now working on the structure of the college. The Blackboard site is up. Town hall meetings are to be scheduled to comment on example structures for college and to offer suggestions.

Shannon Collier-Tenison reported on the College of Social Sciences and Communication. They have developed a couple of specific recommendations: they recommend that Political Science and Public Administration combine. They have drafted the job announcement for their Dean. The search committee will be constituted soon. This search will be handled in house. Faculty and staff submitted 7 proposals. Some were on structure in college, some were specific to departments. The proposals are posted on Blackboard, comments are being posted, online discourse is occurring. They will close discussion on the original proposals on Jan. 29. They will draft a report and request feedback on Blackboard or to the faculty representatives. A town hall is scheduled for feedback on Feb. 21.

C. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies: Belinda Blevins-Knabe

Belinda Blevins-Knabe reported that they have had 2 meetings this semester. They will have a form finalized by next week. They will offer drop-in sessions for folks to look at the forms, discuss concerns and for clarification.

Pres. Wright asked if the form will be a printed form or if it will be online.

Blevins-Knabe - online

D. Undergraduate Council: Mike Tramel

Tramel reported that a number of changes moved through the Undergraduate Council. These are changes to the Civil Engineering program resulting from their recent ABET report. They needed to change all math pre-requisites. The committee also discussed a motion about repeating courses.

E. Graduate Council: Mark Seigar

Seigar reported they had two curriculum change forms approved. They approved 3 persons for full graduate faculty status and 5 persons for affiliated graduate faculty status

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

A. Motion FS_2014_1. (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting) To adopt transition governance and election procedure. (no second required) Requires 2/3 majority to suspend the rules to consider at this meeting.

To facilitate the transition of faculty governance to the new college structure and to manage elections of representatives to university committees the following process will be implemented per attachment 1.

Pres. Wright, remarked that as President of the Faculty Senate, he is charged with creating a census. This adds a bit of bureaucracy, but allows for a rational way of making decisions instead of relying on an ad hococracy.

Sen. Tschumi made a motion to suspend the rules, and Sen. Douglas seconded the motion

There was no discussion

The motion passed on voice vote with no dissention.

Sen. Tschumi – made the motion to adopt the transition governance and election procedure.

Discussion -

Jovanovic – asked if this only applies to the 3 new colleges?

Tschumi – there are some impacts on the old colleges (e.g. Earth Sciences moves to EIT).

Ford – By the end of the spring semester, each committee shall provide elected officials. The Committee on committees meets before the end of semester. We may need to say this must occur before the end of the semester

Tschumi – we know of that issue. Last Wednesday is when we got this together. As we worked through this we discovered new issues, but we had to stop to put this forward. We know issues will come up, we will address them.

Ford – I applaud your efforts. We just need to push groups to get this done on time.

Questions?

none

Pres. Wright called for a vote and the motion passed on voice vote.

B. Motion FS_2014_2. Undergraduate Council (Legislation. Majority Vote at One Meeting) delete out-of-major hours (no second required)

The recommendation of the UGC concerning the FS_2013_10 Clarify what is meant by “must come from the departments” in baccalaureate degree requirements is that this is a barrier to student success and should be removed as a graduation requirement.

Pres. Wright - Last semester, the Senate charged the UGC with looking at the added graduation requirement from previous academic year’s end. The Senate sent this to the UGC to see if they could fix it. The UGC brought it back to the Senate with a recommendation that the requirement should be removed.

Pres. Wright - Was that an act of legislation?

Tramel – it was a recommendation.

Pres. Wright - the Faculty Senate Executive Committee understood it as a motion.

Tramel – based on conversations in UGC – it is motion. When asked to clarify what is meant by “must come from the departments” in baccalaureate degree requirements, discussion by the UGC is that this is a barrier to student success and it should be removed as a graduation requirement.

Anson – what does this mean?

Tramel – the statement says 12 upper level hours chosen by the student must come from outside of the department. Several new degrees will be housed in a college, not in a department. What do you do? We could not find a solution that did not impact student success.

Ford – this is a requirement that provides broader perspective in a student's education. If you remove this requirement, you remove the underlying idea of making a student get broad education. Students will narrow in if this is removed. I would like a solution to solve the department issue, but keep the broadening requirement.

Tramel – we could grant waivers.

Jensen – would changing 'department' to 'program' work?

Pres. Wright – this is in the current catalog and so is the requirement for a minor. Problem is in the catalog. Will changing to 'program' fix the problem?

Yoder – we have minor in linguistics. Students have an English major and Linguistics minor. They won't be able to take our minors. I am in favor of as much diversity in education as possible, but this is restrictive.

Tschumi – a degree is 120 hours total, 35 hours of core, 36 hours in the major.... students still have 20 hours not attached to anything. Ford's argument is related to critical thinking criteria. Students develop critical thinking in a discipline. The idea is if you have students take upper level hours different from their major, it broadens their ability think critically. There are some programs that may have problems. Removing this requirement weakens education for the whole campus. We should not do that.

Tramel – there may be problems with getting prerequisites for upper level hours outside the major

Tschumi – we need an in-depth analysis

Tramel – the student picks the hours

Tschumi – this gives them flexibility

Tramel – we were looking at scenarios that could hamper student success.

Tschumi – hamper student success... I am all for it if it contributes to education

Giammo – the 12 upper level hours could be applied to a different major.

Tramel- one of our programs is interdisciplinary – what do with that one.

Tschumi – there are a variety of possible solutions. I move to postpone indefinitely

Ford – second that motion

Maguire – what do we mean by student success? Just getting a student out the door at the end is not success

Aiyetoro – There needs to be a requirement for courses outside of a major. Problem today is that many people are getting narrow and narrower in their perspective. We need broad perspective. I do not think it should be removed.

Matson – we should vote down the recommendation. We need some ad hoc group to look at this. This originally was part of a larger provision, which was passed by the Senate. It was a mistake that it go into the catalog. We did not create the step to implement it. Part of this was the 12 hours, but that was only a part of the original intent. UGC has too much to do to add this. I recommend we vote on the motion from UGC, then ask a separate group to look at this.

Tschumi – we delayed the implementation of all of the undergraduate curriculum changes to 2015– there is time to deal with this

Jovanovic – in some programs, this is impossible even without the exemption

Pres. Wright called for a vote. The noes have it, the motion did not pass.

C. Election of Faculty Appeals Council Administrators (2014-15 rep & replacement for 2013-2014 rep)

Pres. Wright noted a missed election last spring for a term-ending position on the Faculty Appeals Council. In addition, when Ann Bain was named Interim Dean of COS – this created the need for a mid-term replacement. We need 2 elected folks - one in the missed position, one to fill Bain's position. Propose to elect one person to the regular 3 semester term, then combine the mid-term position with a regular term for a 5 semester term. Sonya Premeaux is at the end of her term, but willing to serve again.

Anson - nominated Sonya Premeaux for the 5 semester position

Pres. Wright - Nominations for the 3 semester term?

[crickets chirping.....]

Pres. Wright nominated Gary Anderson for the 3 semester position

Pres. Wright - Nominations closed;

Ford -move to accept nominations by acclimation

Motion passed by voice vote

D. Discussion. Graduate Faculty Status Proposal (attachment 2)

Marc Seiger (GC chairman), Angela Hunter, and Kent Layton from Graduate Council were in attendance. Seigar presented the proposal. Four years ago, the Dean of the Graduate School wanted GC to look into changing the Graduate Faculty Status policy. At the time he (Graduate Dean) was thinking of being the final level of approval. The Chancellor was not comfortable

with that. The issue came to faculty senate last year. A similar document was introduced in the last session of the Faculty Senate.

The big changes were related to Affiliate Status. There are some legalities about who gets Affiliate Status – issues with UALR property rights. International Affiliates might take intellectual property. Background checks might need to be added. Kent Layton and Angela Hunter made most of the changes to Affiliate Status.

Anson – why is Graduate Council better equipped than those in that particular field to assess/approve status?

Seigar – The policy puts most of that at the level of the program or department. It is up to the programs and departments as to how they handle the process. It requires a review every 6 years.

Hunter – It does not change what has been done. The GC approves all. It is not a new power.

Anson – GS has been a rubber stamp in the past

Hunter – GC is only verifying that folks had a terminal degree; Senate could decide to take GC out of it. The goal was to find a way to make sure that someone who once got Graduate Faculty Status does not end up chairing a Ph.D. committee long after they are research active. No one was checking.

Seigar – the departments and programs will establish a process. GC will check that it has been followed.

Jovanovic - I am against this more than any other issue. If you read faculty handbook, there is not one word about GC approving graduate faculty status for teaching/advising students. Where did GC get this authority? It is not in the Constitution. There is no explicit mention of authority over personnel. When we hire a faculty member, they are being hired with credentials to oversee graduate students and teach graduate classes. Why do we have this additional layer? For UGC, it also says nothing about personnel and there is no such thing as undergraduate faculty status. If GC does graduate status, UGC could decide to do it for undergraduate teaching. The way it has been done is fairly innocuous. This proposal from the GC is quite different. It will reduce graduate participation across campus. Fewer faculty members will participate. It will put obstacles in front of faculty instead of incentives.

Seigar – Someone has to be doing it. If Faculty Senate takes this away from the GC – then ok. But it takes a bit more rigor to be graduate faculty.

Pres. Wright - You need more credentials to teach graduate courses?

Seigar – more rigor, not credentials, you must be up to date. The initial Graduate Faculty Status is not hard to get. But then it must be checked.

Pres. Wright – this is making two distinctions – One is fit to teach graduate classes, but not some graduate classes.

Seigar – it leaves it up to programs to make decision to say who is fit.

Aiyetoro – The fundamental question is... Who has the authority to make the Graduate Faculty status? What do we want to do about it as a Senate?

Layton – The Consitution says GC has personnel priority. This represents the voice of the council. We tried to deal with input, and our vote was unanimous on this issue.

Hunter – We do not know when this authority was given to GC. There is a need for some oversight mechanism. If GC has oversight, then it should do something about it.

Anderson – I have carefully read the document and its predecessors. There are some good things: it outlines who can advise Ph.D. students. We do need a list of who is supervising Ph.D. students, who is participating in these programs. But there are bad parts: This is bureaucracy without benefit – doctoral program quality is determined by having an elite faculty. Quality is determined by the Ph.D. committee. We want faculty participating in the program. If someone wants to get involved in research, what better way to get involved than to work with Ph.D. students. We don't want barriers to this. The philosophy of 6 years of previous work to maintain status creates work that takes away from the program.

Tschumi – I don't see a relevant statement from the Constitution. Before the Senate was formed at UALR, GC and UCG were formed. Early in UALR history there was an overall curriculum council, then later the GC and UGC were formed. These councils were created decades ago. We need to put in place a policy where each Ph.D. program specifies the policy of how they will deal with Graduate Faculty status. GC will look at the policy, but will not actually decide who is qualified. GC would be in the place of checking the policy for each.

Yoder – I think this is an answer to a problem that I am not convinced exists. There may be a few cases, but there is nothing here to support that folks have rested on their laurels. This is a solution to a problem that I am not convinced exists.

Aiyetoro- We should develop criteria asking for each program to have criteria. As oversight – report that they are doing it. GC will have oversight to assure that it has been carried out on the department or program level.

Bayrak – As EIT Assembly Pres. we discussed this with EIT colleagues. The major milestones for promotion, tenure, professional development are in department. This adds another classification outside of those evaluations processes.

Jovanovic – this does a bad job of dealing with the arc of a career, which can take lots of different paths. This could remove Graduate Faculty status in a rude way. Why would we want to discourage someone from going into research?

Jensen – if we feel it is necessary, one way to streamline this process will be to combine it with the annual review process. We have post-tenure review, it might streamline the process.

Hunter – special circumstances are considered in the document

Pres. Wright – how are we to move forward as a Senate on this issue? We need an implementation date. The process will need to go through committees. Regarding the question about Affiliate Status related to intellectual property, does this mean that UAMS faculty working with Ph.D. will assign their rights to UALR?

Layton – Keith Hudson wanted it in there

Pres. Wright – this reads that the Affiliate persons rights will be assigned to UALR

Aiyetoro – where are we on this? Should it be sent back to the GC to consult with the Law school.

Tschumi – the language is attached at end. We need to keep the intellectual policy statements only associated with actual policy documents. In this policy, we need to refer to the appropriate policy that those that want this status need to be aware of.

Jovanovic- who (Senators) is in favor of this?

Aiyetoro – there needs to be oversight, but not necessarily according to this document. Consider what has been said here, consult with corporate lawyers.

Pres. Wright – graduate council has passed this document – what shall we do on this?

Matson – go with the current plan

Tschumi – if you withdraw the motion, you will still have control

Pres. Wright – if something is not done, it will come up in the next Faculty Senate meeting and will likely be voted down.

Seigar – I will talk to the Graduate Council

VIII. Open Forum

None

IX. Adjourn

Sen. Yoder made a motion to adjourn, was seconded. Motion passed by unanimous voting with feet.

Attachment 1. Process to transition faculty governance and elections in the new colleges.

To facilitate the transition of faculty governance to the new college structure and recognizing that all faculty have a right to be represented in the collegiate structure for the purposes of faculty governance, the following will be implemented:

1. In the interim before the new colleges become official on July 1, 2014, each new college shall form an ad-hoc faculty assembly, which shall operate under the Generic Constitution For a College Assembly, for the purpose of making decisions that cannot be postponed until after the college structure becomes official.

Procedures:

To determine the voting membership of each college and the distribution of senators once the composition of the colleges has been finalized, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee shall conduct a census to assure that all eligible faculty are included accurately as members of a college.

Once the census is complete, the President of the University Assembly or his designee from the Faculty Governance Committee shall begin the process of having each new college assembly elect a college executive committee as specified in the Generic Constitution For a College Assembly to serve during the transition period.

Officers elected through this process shall serve through the opening assembly meeting in Fall 2014 at which time each new assembly shall elect officers. For existing colleges, the President of the Assembly shall inform the college assemblies of the results of the census in order to assure adequate and appropriate representation on the Faculty Senate, councils and committees. For decisions affecting the 2014-1015 academic year faculty in the Department of Earth Science shall participate in the EIT Assembly during spring 2014.

By the end of the Spring 2014 semester, the executive committee of each college assembly (both ad hoc and official) shall call a meeting of the college assembly for the purpose of electing the various university level positions. For those positions requiring the staggering of terms, lots shall be drawn to determine the length of each person's term.

Should decisions be required from college committees, such as recommending a college core, then the appropriate college committee shall be formed by the ad hoc college assembly according to the rules of the Generic Constitution for a College Assembly, using, where possible, the departmental representatives who have already been elected or appointed to college level committees. If such representatives do not exist or otherwise are not able to serve then the affected department shall select a representative according to procedures in its departmental governance document.

2. Per the UALR Constitution, the three new colleges (Arts, Letters, and Sciences; Education and Health Professions; Social Sciences and Communications) shall operate under the Generic Constitution For a College Assembly until the official assembly decides for itself whether or not to write its own constitution or to adopt the generic constitution as the official constitution of the newly formed college.

Attachment 2. Graduate Faculty Status Proposal

Proposed: Graduate Faculty Status Policy

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

November 20, 2013

Overview:

1. There will be three categories of graduate faculty status: Affiliate, Full, and Doctoral (See definitions beginning on Page 5.).
2. Faculty members who are full-time non-tenure-track at UALR have the choice of applying for Affiliate status or for Full status (Details below.).
3. Graduate faculty statuses be appointed on a 6-year term, and the faculty member must re-apply every sixth year after tenure (or initial appointment for Affiliate) to receive renewal of graduate faculty status.
4. A new record-keeping and operational process be created and maintained by the Graduate Council (Details below.).
5. The new review process will be phased in commensurate with restructuring of the colleges and a schedule will be set and administered by the Graduate School.

Process for Initial Appointment to Graduate Faculty:

The process for initial appointment remains the same as currently practiced with the change in terminology from “**nomination**” to “**application**.” The faculty member fills out an application form, checking the box for the appropriate status sought and including all requested information, including a current curriculum vitae (CV). The chair of the department or appropriate program head signs the application form for approval, the dean of the college signs for approval, and the Graduate Council votes for approval of faculty member at appropriate status level. The application then goes to the Graduate Dean for review.

I. Process for Renewal Appointment for Full Status:

In year 6 of the initial appointment and every sixth year thereafter, the faculty member applies to the Graduate Council for renewal of graduate faculty status. The application consists of

- a completed application for renewal,
- a current CV with brief narrative description of accomplishments during this review period,
- an accompanying statement from the appropriate authority in the department/program (e.g., chair of personnel committee, chair of department, etc.) evaluating the faculty **member's** performance during review period relative to the criteria in his/her department/program and a recommendation on renewal.

The above documents constitute the renewal dossier. The renewal dossier includes the information relevant to the **applicant's** scholarly activity, graduate teaching, graduate student mentoring roles (if applicable), and professional and graduate service (if applicable). The

accompanying statement from the department/program should confirm that the applicant for renewal has sufficient accomplishments to continue his/her Affiliate, Full or Doctoral status and recommend continuation. *The faculty member's record will be measured by the department/program using the standards set by the department/program.* The Graduate Council Personnel committee makes a final recommendation based upon the renewal dossier.

If the accompanying statement does not recommend renewal at the current status, it should explain clearly what is lacking in the **applicant's** record during the recent 6-year term. The applicant must receive a copy of the accompanying statement at the same time the Graduate Council does (if not before). The applicant may submit a written appeal to the Graduate Council if s/he disagrees with the assessment. The Graduate Council will consider both documents. If the Graduate Council, based upon recommendation of the departmental/program official, votes not to renew a status level, the faculty person has the opportunity to appeal through the normal appeals process available to faculty undergoing Annual Review (see Faculty Handbook). If the accompanying letter recommends renewal and the Graduate Council disagrees with this assessment based on materials provided, a request for further documentation or for clarification will be made (copies of request will go to department/program official, chair of department/program, and applicant). A faculty member may request an extension of his/her review period for up to two academic years with support from the department/program official in charge of evaluating performance. Current status privileges apply during the extension period.

During the time of the appeal process, the faculty member is allowed to continue with the same privileges of the prior status, except that s/he will not be given any new graduate assignments that were not already part of his/her duties, including supervision of new student research. The person may continue with supervising current students and teaching already slated courses. This continuance can last no more than two academic semesters (summer not included). If, after appeal, the final determination is that the faculty member cannot continue to hold the current faculty status, s/he will be stripped of that status until a re-application can be made that demonstrates remedy of deficiencies. The re-application process is the same as the review process, and the faculty member must initiate it.

Each semester, the Graduate School will send notices to faculty when their renewal period is the following semester. If the faculty member does not provide review materials to the Graduate Council during the semester of his/her renewal, the status continues for a one-semester time period during which the review must take place or the faculty member loses graduate faculty status and can no longer perform the duties granted by such status until renewal is granted.

II. Process for Renewal for Doctoral Status

The Graduate Council requests that all doctoral programs have an internal review procedure for doctoral faculty appointments within the program. The reviews should be thorough and should occur typically every 6 years (a shorter review period may be required for program

standards, and a longer review period may be requested based on program needs). The review process used by each doctoral program should be sent to the Graduate Council, and the Graduate Council should be kept abreast of any changes to the review process. If programs prefer not to create their own internal review process, they can request to follow the Graduate Council procedures outlined earlier for Full status, adding in any materials that may be relevant to the program regarding doctoral teaching, doctoral student supervising, or research expectations.

In the faculty **member's** sixth year, the review committee for the doctoral program will forward to the Graduate Council an evaluation report of the faculty, including any reports of reviews conducted in the prior 5 years (for those programs with shorter review periods) along with the review **committee's** recommendation (renewal, continuing, denial, other, etc). The documentation provided to the Graduate Council for Doctoral renewal should be similar to that of Full renewal (See above for Full renewal requirements).

If at any point a faculty **member's** doctoral status changes in a specific program during the 6-year period, the Graduate Council should receive notice and explanation of the change. The appeal process for Doctoral status must be made clear by each doctoral program in its internal review process. At the 6-year renewal point where Graduate Council votes on renewal, the appeal process will be the same as for Full status (see above).

III. Process for Renewal for Affiliate Status

Full-time non-tenure track faculty at UALR qualified for Affiliate status will follow the same process as Full status for renewal, although the expectations for scholarship and service will be adjusted based on individual faculty appointment and department/ program expectations. All others on Affiliate status (non-UALR employees or adjunct employees) will submit only an updated CV and an application for renewal with *no need for brief narrative descriptions or accompanying statement*. At any time that an Affiliate member outside the university is no longer affiliated with the program that appointed the person to Affiliate status, the chair who approved the **person's** original appointment should notify the Graduate Council immediately in an effort to keep an up-to-date database of graduate faculty members.

Statement of Integrity:

Faculty members elected to Graduate Council agree to complete their term of service with a **commitment of conduct that is professional and ethical. In the event a faculty member's** graduate faculty status review occurs during a term of service on Graduate Council, said faculty member shall not participate in her/his individual review process or voting.

IV. Criteria for Renewal Review

The details provided in a renewal dossier (CV with brief description, accompanying statement) will fit the specific vocabulary of the discipline or field and should follow general **standards of the field. In addition to the faculty member's own scholarly activity, the criteria** should encapsulate all of the ways in which a faculty member may contribute to the graduate

education, such as teaching, advising, and mentoring as well as contributions to student productivity (i.e., articles/presentations/competitions).

The renewal dossier should specify the type(s) of minimum requirements necessary for Affiliate, Full and Doctoral status (in programs where doctoral programs exist) in scholarly, teaching, and service activities. These standards are decided on at the local (department/program) level and should be recorded at that level.

The criteria of the department/program should cover the following areas:

- *Scholarly activity*: This includes various forms of research, presentation, exhibition, workshop, etc, as deemed appropriate by those in the field designing the criteria and in keeping with the Promotion and Tenure document of UALR (section I.B. Scholarship). The accompanying statement should provide guidance regarding the types or numbers of products/activities that are minimally expected in the given discipline.
- *Graduate teaching*: This includes any special criteria needed to be met in order to teach doctoral courses and/or any restrictions placed on teaching a set of specified courses at **various status levels. All of a faculty member's contributions to graduate teaching should be considered during review.**
- *Participating on and/or chairing thesis/portfolio/project/dissertation committees*: For programs that require thesis/project/portfolio/dissertation, stipulations may be specified for serving as chair at the certificate, master or doctoral levels. Programs may determine a maximum or minimum number of theses, projects, portfolios, capstones, comprehensive exams, and/or dissertation committees that are generally expected of faculty members. Faculty should receive credit during review for participation and chairing of such committees in their own and in other programs.
- *Graduate service*: This includes serving as graduate coordinator, a graduate-level committee in the college or program, or on Graduate Council; creating new graduate level courses; organizing adjuncts or instructors teaching in a graduate degree; coaching and/or accompanying students to present their activity at professional meetings; serving as advisor to graduate student groups; creating student workshops or other mentoring roles; overseeing internships or other activities (if not already counted un teaching duties); participating on external professional committees or governing bodies; reviewing graduate programs at other institutions, and the like.
- *Consideration for those in full-time or part-time administrative positions or in other special circumstances*: Departments/programs will need to take into consideration the review criteria that fit their own departments/programs when those holding administrative roles or in other special circumstances come up for review. Examples include but are not limited to: department chairs; program coordinators (graduate or

undergraduate); deans; associate deans; those who have been on FMLA leave during the review period; those who have shouldered heavy burdens for undergraduate administration during the review period; those who have served in major faculty governance roles during the review period. Each department/program should develop an understanding of expectations in the above regularly anticipated circumstances, and be willing to discuss options for such unexpected circumstances.

Graduate Faculty Status at UALR

Due to the diverse nature of graduate programs, faculty teaching in the programs may possess different qualifications. Three categories of faculty status are recognized by the Graduate Council: Full, Doctoral, and Affiliate. Each college may add special types of status as required.

Full Status:

Full status is offered to persons tenured or in tenure track positions at UALR and persons in full-time non-tenure-track positions who seek Full status and meet the criteria. They hold an appropriate terminal degree in their field and are active in scholarship. Persons holding the titles of Research or Clinical Assistant Professor, Research or Clinical Associate Professor, or Research or Clinical Full Professor, as distinguished by UA Board Policy 405.1 also qualify.

Full members can:

- **Teach graduate courses**
- **Serve as graduate advisor**
- **Serve as master's thesis/project committee chair**
- **Serve on thesis/project committee**
- **Evaluate comprehensive exams or portfolios (with appropriate program approval)**
- **Serve on a dissertation committee (with appropriate program approval)**
- **Supervise master's level graduate research (with appropriate program approval)**
- **Supervise graduate assistants (GAs, TAs)**
- **Serve as graduate program coordinator (with Graduate School approval)**
- **Serve on Graduate Council (Tenured and tenure-track faculty only)**

Doctoral Faculty Status:

Doctoral status is offered to persons tenured or in tenure positions at UALR. They must hold an appropriate doctoral degree in their field of practice and must be active in scholarship as determined by practitioners in their field. In addition to all of the privileges listed in the full status category, Doctoral Faculty can:

- **Teach doctoral courses (in programs where such courses are designated);**
- **Serve as a Chair of dissertations;**
- **Serve as Chair of the doctoral comprehensive examining committee or other doctoral-level exam committee; and**
- **Supervise doctoral level graduate research**

Affiliate Faculty Status:

This status is available to full-time non-tenure track faculty at UALR who do not meet the criteria listed above for Full status. This status is available to:

- (1) all adjunct instructors or others employed by UALR, and
- (2) all persons not employed by UALR.

Candidates must possess a minimum of a master's degree appropriate in their field of practice and are given all privileges and responsibilities of Full status except:

- (1) they can only serve as chairs of graduate dissertation/thesis/project/
portfolio committees for degrees no higher than they hold
and
- (2) when all other members of the committee hold Full or Doctoral status
and
- (3) with the approval of the department/program chair.

Appointment to Affiliate Faculty Status for persons not employed at UALR must be determined in accordance with all Federal Government regulations, especially persons not classified as citizens or permanent residents of the United States of America. As a result, all persons not employed at UALR must be vetted through the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, Innovation, & Commercialization prior to consideration of the Graduate Council.

In addition, all non-employees of UALR must abide by the following definitions of intellectual property rights when serving as chair or member of a committee for a graduate dissertations, theses, projects, or portfolios:

- (1) *All property rights and intellectual property rights associated with work or research created or developed at UALR or on behalf of UALR by a graduate student under the supervision of the chair belong expressly to UALR.*
- (2) *The faculty member serving as chair or member of a committee has an obligation to declare both his/her and graduate student's respective roles concerning the intent to replicate, extend, or further explore the student's research.*
- (3) *The faculty member may not professionally or commercially exploit the research questions, research methodology or research findings of a graduate student as a result of having served as chair or member of a committee without the express written agreement of both the student and UALR (Office of the Vice Provost for Research, Innovation, & Commercialization).*