



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK
Friday, August 26, 2011, 1:00 p.m.
Faculty Senate Meeting

Ledbetter B & C

MINUTES

Present: **CAHSS**— Amrhein, Anson, Bailey, Bunch, Clausen, Deiser, English, Estes, Garnett, Giammo, Kleine, McAbee, Porter. **CB**—Edison, Funk, Mitchell, Nickels, Watts. **CE**—Barrett, Burgin, Hayn, McAdams, Nolen. **CEIT**— Anderson, Babiceanu, Jovanovic, Tebbets, Tramel, Tschumi. **LAW**—, Fitzhugh. **LIBRARY**— Russ. **CPS**—Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Golden, Rhodes, Smith-Olinde. Thombre. **CSM**— Benton, Cui, Douglas, Grant-Scott, Guellich, McMillan, Prince, Sims, Tarasenko, Yanoviak. **EX OFFICIO**— Anderson, Robertson, Ford; Senate Counsel: Faust.

Guests Present: Felicia Epps, Daryl Rice

Absent: **CAHSS**— Finzer, Kleine, Yoder . **CB** —. **CE**—. **CEIT**—. **LAW** --. Goldner; **CPS** – **CSM** —.**EX OFFICIO**—. Lewis, Patterson.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Smith-Olinde welcomed the senators and called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. and invited the secretary to call the roll.

II. Review of minutes

Senators were invited to comment on the minutes of the May, 2011, meeting of the Senate as posted on the Senate web site. Anson moved and Barnes seconded that the minutes be accepted as amended. Motion passed on a voice vote.

III. Remarks on the Senate's Role and Conduct: Richard Ford

President Smith-Olinde introduced Past President Ford, who welcomed the new senators and those returning (in some cases, many many times). He reminded the senators of the Faculty Senate's authority, as defined in Article III of the Constitution of the University Assembly:

The areas of the Faculty Senate's legislative authority shall include but are not limited to the following:

1. Admission requirements
2. Curriculum and courses
3. Degrees and requirements for degrees
4. Calendar and schedules
5. Awards, honors and honorary degrees
6. Interpretation of its own legislation

In addition to its legislative authority and all actions taken under this authority, the Faculty Senate shall make comments and recommendations on matters of UALR concern and multi-campus concern.

Concerning the agenda, he noted that a two-minute comment section was added a couple of years ago, to give senators an opportunity to alert the body to items of interest – not for a vote, but something you think other senators should be aware of. The President will enforce the two-minute time limit. Ford asked all senators to sit at the table, not the periphery of the room. It is appropriate to stand when you introduce something. He pointed out that the top of the agenda reads “1:00 pm until Adjournment.” Robert’s Rules discourage people from monopolizing the floor, so don’t speak a second time about a topic until others who want to speak have had a chance. Finally, he reminded everyone that civility and respect are appropriate and should be followed.

IV. Announcements

President Smith-Olinde announced that she was in the process of sending emails to the committees, designating someone to convene the first meeting and review the committee’s charge. This is part of the planned review of committees to be undertaken this year.

Second, Smith-Olinde noted that it’s difficult to find all the senate actions that have been approved over the years. The Provost’s office is working on scanning them and will create a web site that can be easily searched and is available to everyone.

Third, Smith-Olinde pointed out that Dr. Alan Sugg is retiring on November 1. A resolution will be brought to the Senate to honor him, perhaps in September. Stay tuned.

V. Election of Vice President (one-year, to fill vacancy created by Smith-Olinde’s election to fill Eshleman’s term as President).

President Smith-Olinde invited nominations. English nominated Anson, who respectfully declined. Collier-Tenison nominated Sarah Beth Estes. Smith-Olinde asked if there were additional nominations. Watts moved, and Sims seconded that nominations cease and that Estes be elected by acclamation. Motion passed on a voice vote.

VI. Introduction of New Topics (two minute time limit, no discussion)

Anson reported that he is one of the faculty members who have worked with former Provost Belcher and now with Interim Provost Robertson on a statement about disability to be included on course syllabi. [He distributed the draft to those present.] Last spring, Provost Belcher had

decided to form a faculty committee and a staff committee. Each developed a statement, then the two groups met together and came up with the draft that Anson distributed.

Edison suggested that, to escape the health hazards of eating alone in your office, faculty should bring their lunches to the Faculty Lounge (DSC-G). This meeting room is now open as a faculty dining area from 10am to 2pm Monday through Friday, sponsored by ATLE (Academy for Teaching and Learning Excellence). Edison and the other ATLE co-directors will be present, and there will be guests – Associate VC Christy Drale, Lisa Sherwin on IRB, and others you might want to talk with.

VII. Reports

A. Provost's Report: Interim Provost Robertson

Robertson was attending the Clinton School's orientation of their new class. She arrived before the Senate meeting was over.

B. Chancellor's Report: Joel Anderson

Chancellor Anderson congratulated those who have been newly elected to the Senate. It's an important role, one I hope you will find rewarding. Welcome and congratulations.

I won't repeat what I said at the Assembly last week but will just make a few comments here. Our enrollment, on the eleventh day, will be 13,000, give or take. One thing that has really affected our enrollment has been the rise of Pulaski Tech; without them, we would probably have about 15,000 students. There was a need for a two-year institution in this part of the state, that's incontrovertible. Having it put us in a position finally to be comfortable with putting admission standards in place and we've done that; we now defer students whom we previously would have admitted. There is a process of appeal, for students who think they do have what it takes to be successful at UALR. We might have 750 more students if we hadn't made that change. Another new thing is the requirement for students to confirm their registration and put money down up front. This requirement also has some very positive benefits – as I've told the Policy Advisory Committee, some years ago the chancellor had a risk assessment meeting, and it showed that we looked good in our financial numbers but not so good in accounts receivable. This was debt we were writing off. We had more accounts receivable dollars out there than were really appropriate, so that's one motivation for developing this confirmation process. It also has the effect of depressing our numbers somewhat – by eliminating students in our eleventh day count who weren't really here.

Sandra will brief us more thoroughly at some point on performance funding, which is evolving in a way that's much more satisfactory than I would have thought. The horse is not yet in the barn, but it's at least in the corral and there's a good chance that the gate will remain closed. Sandra and I have both been pretty loud throughout that process, so that it's understood what kind of students we serve. There's nothing in terms of recent developments that I have to add. The chancellor then invited questions.

Jovanovic asked about financial aid policy, citing the example of a Donaghey scholar who was also an Arkansas Governor's Distinguished Scholar and a National Merit Scholar, an excellent

student whose scholarships appear to have been reduced by three to four thousand dollars per year. Chancellor Anderson said he thought it was the state's stacking policy kicking in, but will check.

Watts: I have a question, and perhaps a follow-up, about the Sodexo exclusive contract. "We had a guest on campus and were told we had to go through Sodexo."

Chancellor Anderson: It's a good question. It's correct, for an event on campus you have to have food service through Sodexo, with a couple of possible exceptions for events in Bailey and Stephens. "Exceptions can be granted; they usually come to me and I'm not quick to grant them." The reason is that having food service on a relatively small commuter campus is a challenge. When I became chancellor, we bid it out and we had Chartwell. They were actually making the numbers work – the only food service since then which has done that. Then we went to Aramark, again after a bidding process, and after two years, maybe three – long before their term was up – they left, because they couldn't make it work. So then we went to Sodexo, and they too haven't really been able to make it work. That may change this year. When we hired them, we didn't have but two bidders. On every residential campus, the food service has a meal plan which provides a basis of solid predictable income for the company. The meal plan is doing some other positive things, bringing students to DSC, creating community. Catering is what most folks react to. I've been generally satisfied with the catering and they [caterers] tend to pay attention to the chancellor. The problem is they could not make a profit. More often than not the problems that you've suffered have been a result of insufficient staff. So you get back to the challenge of operating an effective food service. I think better times are ahead. One thing that will not work is "every unit for itself" in terms of catering. I would ask you to be patient, see if I'm right that things are better this year. I can't promise that but I'm hopeful. I ask you to work with them.

Watts: Now the follow-up. First let me compliment you for getting Sodexo to give me an unredacted copy of the contract. The problem is, I don't think it gives them an exclusive contract on the premises. Unless you define "premises" as the entire campus, they can't prevent us from bringing in, for example, box lunches for events. I also don't think it's a good idea to give food service an exclusive contract, and I respectfully ask you to reconsider.

Chancellor Anderson: I appreciate the comments. It's understood between the two parties that it be an exclusive contract. That's not necessarily my preference but we have found that a competitive situation just doesn't work.

Jovanovic: To follow up on what Watts just said, there's a perverse incentive in the new contract. The incentive is there for them to maximize their profits by offering the least food possible, for example without making allowances for vegans or for those with food intolerances.

Chancellor Anderson: You're asking for some different performance funding measures.

There being no further questions, the Chancellor closed with the comment that he is looking forward to another good year.

C. Report from the Task Force on Undergraduate Curriculum: Felecia Epps

Epps commented that she was happy to be here to talk about something other than the West Memphis Three. The Task Force has senators among its members, Senators Anson and McMillan, who are good sources of information for you; also Dean Brenton and AVC Daryl Rice can help answer questions. What's being circulated is a memo [document distributed to those present] describing our process and what we perceive as happening in the future. We use the terms "general education" and "educational outcomes." These items [on the handout] have been around for a few weeks and were circulated to the unit heads. The Task Force will meet again this coming Wednesday. Why the term general education as opposed to core curriculum: there are lots of cores within the university. General education is used at our peer institutions. Similarly, rather than core competencies, we are trying to get at educational outcomes (again, there are cores in various colleges). We developed these items in numerous discussions in the Task Force; we also collected information online and from focus groups (alums, employers). We found a consistent theme: All groups valued effective communication, critical thinking and problem solving, and the ability to work well with others; also employment skills – skill in seeking the job and knowing what to do when they get there. Some comments on the proposed document: Some things are just issues that need a separate group to focus on and define them (second language is one; professional self-presentation is another). Educational outcomes cannot be achieved just by taking one class; rather, they need to be incorporated throughout the curriculum and even in the co-curriculum. We envision groups of faculty across disciplines to discuss these. The Task Force is putting together charges for these groups. We spent much time discussing ethical behavior – how do you teach that? At the Law School, we do teach a class on that, but it's also my responsibility to incorporate it into my classes. Perhaps we will come back at the next meeting with a document for a vote. Comments?

Ford: I want to talk about the last page of your handout (knowledge, skills, and values), but before I address that, let me say, I think your Task Force wants to come to the Senate with a document we can vote on and have some guidance for the group to go forward with the task. However it's presented to us, it should have the wording that provides that guidance. What got my attention—I have no problem with the values, but to me, these values are diminished if there is nothing about personal responsibility. It's important to us that it be something basic we should recognize. How we put it in the curriculum I don't know but it's something that should be there for the goals of responsible individuals.

Epps: We [the Task Force] thought these would be the basis for what comes next, but if this isn't what we want . . .

Jovanovic: First, it was my understanding that each college would have an opportunity to comment and we [EIT] haven't had that. Second, I'd like everyone to imagine a world without clean drinking water, vehicles that work, highways, bridges, air conditioning [and many other items the secretary didn't get into her notes]. None of the competencies address that. My challenge to your committee would be how to incorporate engineering and technology into general education. A lot of debates today address not just science but also engineering and technology. I see this as a big hole.

Epps: At the beginning of the year, you might have gotten an email mentioning department meetings. The members of the Task Force [as representatives of their colleges] were to initiate those meetings but it didn't happen.

Jovanovic: I asked that person, who said yes we should have a meeting but it never happened.

Epps: I'm not a scientist but I do need clean water and air conditioning, so I agree this is something we should follow up on.

Douglas: Which colleges did have input?

McMillan: CSAM did.

President Smith-Olinde noted that the Provost had arrived and invited her to report. She had no report.

VIII. New Business

There was no new business.

IX. Open Forum

President Smith-Olinde asked if there were issues to be brought up in open forum.

Jovanovic: I have a question about the new policy that was issued over the summer concerning how certain kinds of credits would be added to the student's transcript. What I saw is that military credit and technical credit will no longer be automatically applied to the transcript. I have a number of concerns. I recall a case of a PTC student who came to UALR with a 4.0 in technical credits and because those credits didn't transfer, he was not eligible for a transfer scholarship. Whether we transcribe the hours or not does not change the fact that the student took the hours. If the goal is to make students eligible for financial aid – do we want to commit fraud to do that? To me, that change in policy over the summer was something that administrators did, but it should have come to this body. What are you doing about it? You said you would talk to the Executive Committee?

Smith-Olinde: I did talk with them, and as a first step we are referring it to the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee.

Rice: The memo [outlining the policy] was from me and I'm willing to say a few words if that's allowed.

Ford: If you stand up.

Rice: First, some history. For many years we didn't see credit from two-year technical colleges. That changed over night when those two-year technical colleges became community colleges. We had not been transcribing technical credit until then. The memo issued this summer is not a real change: We will transcribe any credits that the student insists be on his or her transcript. We have students, for example from the military, who come in with 100, 120, 150 hours. Our concern is: They need to know the consequences of putting all that credit on the transcript and whether it counts. That depends on the college and the program too. If the Art Department wants to count Inert Gas welding, that's fine. I assumed that the intent of the policy [on military credit, passed by the Faculty Senate in December 2008] was to be student-friendly.

Smith-Olinde: Does the clock start again when they [transfer students] get here?

Rice: We are talking about what's reported to the federal government. It's not a common practice to put on the transcript every course that the student ever took. We are not expected to transcript the entire academic history of each student. If the student wants it, we'll do it.

Tschumi: One policy is very old: Technical credit from any regionally accredited college. I looked at some of what we are transferring in as military credit. I'm not sure we want to give credit for, e.g., basic training. We need to look at the military credit [policy]; we wanted to be helpful but we went too far. Concerning technical credits: we were accepting technical credit long before there were technical colleges. [Here the speaker summarized more history than the secretary was able to record.] Katie Young has verified that, when she was in the admissions office, she did in fact transfer all of those technical credits. When Sandra Dannaway became the registrar, she didn't transfer all of it. We complained. There were problems because those credits were hidden out there somewhere. Eventually what we did is, we went to David Belcher, who wrote a memo to Sandra Dannaway saying: "You will accept these credits." From that point on, the problems went away. We may have some issues that we need to look at here. What's the distribution? We need to look carefully. Most of it is probably on the military side. The other point is: Under Board Policy, we [faculty] have authority. What the administration is trying to do is usurp authority from the faculty to make or change policy. It's not procedure, it is policy. The administration has no basis for making that distinction.

Jovanovic: Let me be very direct here. What defines whether a course is technical or not? Embedded in this change is some definition of technical that I don't think we have ever discussed. There are business classes that may be classified as technical. One could even say that all classes from Pulaski Tech are technical.

Barrett: I have a question about the legislation that limits the number of hours that can be transferred from a two-year college. [Someone answered the question, explaining that this legislation was not part of the issue here.]

Ford: We are a Senate, but we do have committees. I highly recommend that we send this to the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee with urgency.

Jovanovic: But we have the problem that the policy has already been changed over the summer, so what are we going to do? Let it stand?

Sandra Robertson: We had some issues this summer related to federal financial aid. The federal government does not want to pay for more than 150% of the hours required to complete a baccalaureate degree. With the military credits, the federal government has not paid for those credits from a financial aid perspective. I apologize for stepping on your toes. I agree that this discussion should go to the committee.

Smith-Olinde: The intent was to be student-friendly and I think the Senate recognizes that.

Tschumi: Will that data be given to the ATC Committee on the front end?

Robertson: Of course, we'll give them whatever data they want.

Smith-Olinde: I've copied the pages out of the catalog that discuss transfer credit and it's very confusing. In one place it says that credit will be evaluated [to determine if it will transfer], elsewhere it says that only courses with a grade of C or higher will transfer . . . It is appropriate for the committee to review these issues.

Someone moved adjournment.

X. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:31 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Clausen, Secretary