UALR FACULTY SENATE

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK
Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, April 16, 2010, 1:00 p.m.
Ledbetter Rooms A & B, Donaghey Student Center

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS—Bailey, Clausen, Eshleman, Garnett, Giammo, Groesbeck, Ramsey, Vinikas, Yoder. CB—Edison, Holland, Nickels, Watts. CE— Bandre, Hayn, Hughes, Kuykendall. CEIT—Chan, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Fitzhugh, Goldner. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS—Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Driskill, Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM—Guellich, McMillan, Sims, Tarasenko, Yanoviak., EX OFFICIO—Belcher, Davis, Ford.

Absent: CAHSS— Amrhein, Anson, Chapman, English, Webb. CE— Pack. CEIT— Anderson. LAW— Aiyetoro. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Kosmatov, Perkins, Prince, Seigar, Thompson, Wright. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Smith, Williams.

I. Welcome & Roll Call

President Ford declared it to be 1:00 and convened the meeting. The secretary called the roll.

II. Review of Minutes

The minutes of the March 12, 2010, meeting of the Senate were reviewed and approved on unanimous voice vote.

III. Announcements

Ford announced that Thursday of next week is the Assembly Meeting. He observed that it's an important one since we will elect a new president of the University Assembly and Faculty Senate.

He thanked the Senate and the faculty as a whole for the good slate of nominees for the task force on revising the baccalaureate degree. The task force will be appointed before the end of the year.

Ford took some pride in getting all the attachments actually sent with the e-mailed minutes this month. He noted that he is celebrating his penultimate Senate meeting as president, which made it about time.

IV. Introduction of new topics

Ford opened the floor for senators to bring up items that need to come to the Senate's attention.

Holland alerted senators that the Planning and Finance Committee did send its report to the chancellor, and that it's posted on the Faculty Senate web site under "working documents." It's fourteen pages, he said, and an important read in these times.

Holland thanked Ortega, Barrett, Dearman, Smith-Olinde, Chan, Parker, Cheatham, Parins, and perhaps more that the secretary didn't catch, for their work gathering data and considering recommendations to the administration.

Vice President Ramsey asked senators for their best guesses about what percentage of instruction at UALR is done by full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty. The answer, he said, is that of all the student-semester credit hours in 2008-2009, fifty-one percent were. He thinks this is a disgrace, and wants senators to be thinking about it, and about substantive action we might take.

Jovanovic brought up the new registration-confirmation process. He is concerned that the July 19 to August 12 window during which registration for classes must be confirmed might not work for students.

Ford recognized Steve Jennings, chair of Graduate Council. Jennings wished to assure the Senate "that we work under your policies." He said the Council plans to capture all policies in a central location, where they will be more easily and widely accessible. The Council been asked to examine eight current policies, some of which are obviously out of date, and they will come forward with recommendations for action. He said they're not thinking of significant changes in intent with regard to these policies.

Angela Hunter spoke to the recognition of graduate faculty. They're researching now, and hope to have a new proposal early next spring. In general, they're thinking about moving the question closer to departmental faculties. There should be, she said, a regular review, and explicit criteria.

Gail Hughes raised an issue that came to her attention in the College of Education through a student whose dissertation she was advising: the practice, apparently widespread on the campus, of permitting students to participate in graduation ceremonies before they've completed the requirements for graduation. Faculty in the College of Education believe this practice is particularly inappropriate for doctoral candidates before they've successfully defended their dissertations.

V. A short debate on a topic related to "Rethinking the Bachelor's Degree

> Resolved: **Students must satisfy the requirements of a 35-hour general education core in order to graduate from UALR (as opposed to the 44-hour current core).**
>
> *Speaking in support of the proposition: Sen. Paul Yoder.*
> *Speaking in opposition to the proposition: Sen. Chris Lloyd*

Yoder began the debate with the pro position. This a paraphrase of his remarks:
> Do happen to believe this. English department doesn't have a dog in this hunt, in that we don't have courses in the core.
> Remember, though: it isn't about which specific courses are in the core, nor is it about reducing the overall number of hours
> Two reasons to support this proposition: one philosophical—having to do with students determining their own education—and the other practical—it will get students into their majors more quickly. Such a change would allow them a little more time for their majors and more freedom in their electives. Remember having taken a number of courses because of needing credit hours for graduation that I would otherwise never have taken.
> It will, of course, increase the need for good advising, but would as soon have students thinking a little more about their own educations and making a few more choices.
> On the practical side, will make transfer a little easier and more attractive. Looked at Fayetteville, Pulaski Tech, UCA, and the University of Houston, Fayetteville is the only one that has the 35-hour core requirement, but programs can impose their

own requirements, and they do: 47, 47, 42, and 41 hours, for example, and students have to demonstrate computer literacy and oral competency. Making this change will put us in better company, and will be good for us.

Sims followed with the con position:

Had to resist several inclinations for this discussion. Did go out to the national forums, and saw many questions people seem to have developed different responses to. A key one: are we producing workers or citizens?

Don't have real data. People out in the community have said they used to be able to count on UALR grads to be able to think and to be "trainable" in almost any circumstances, but they're not seeing that so consistently now.

Has some doubts about the ability of entering students to make good choices in planning their own curricula. Students do need guidance. Would also suggest that some of these upper-level courses are not so simple that students can enter them without the preparation of targeted undergraduate work.

Comment from Ramsey: Students who begin here have to do 44 hours. Many students who transfer don't. Seems fundamentally unjust to have different requirements for different groups of students, and particularly unwise to disadvantage our native students.

Comment from Jovanovic: The idea that we have a 44-hour core isn't quite right because we have a second language requirement. There's really a 55-hour core. Of the core, 11 hours are science and math. Our students have to take thirty-plus hours in arts, humanities, and social sciences, while arts, humanities, and social sciences majors only take 11 hours in science and math. Thus, the core seems to entirely unbalanced. Until we balance it, I'd have to support reductions in the core requirement.

Comment from Groesbeck: Suggest that Jovanovic is really arguing for a 60-hour core if we hope to achieve that balance he spoke of. Can't imagine that we could allow students to graduate with one course in algebra.

Comment from Giammo: Counseled caution in eliminating hours. Want things to be convenient for students but we also want them to get an education of good quality. The legislature seems already to be tugging us in the direction of reduced hours, and we should resist adding our own tugging to that trend.

VI. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor, just retuned from the Board of Trustees meeting, had information to share: the Board approved the tuition and fee increases we institution had requested. The practical consequences for us in terms of building the budget for next year are that we'll go ahead with the second half of the classified-employee pay plan. We'll have a two-percent merit increase pool for faculty and staff. In addition, the University will pay employees' share of health insurance premium increases. The budgetary future is not going to be without pain, but he is much relieved. Meeting before last, he told us about the three scenarios he'd given the associate chancellors and deans for budget planning; barring the unexpected, it looks like we'll be able to plan around the $1.5M cut for the new budget year, which was the most favorable of the three scenarios.

The revenue picture at the state level as of January is just an eyelash above where it was a year ago, which isn't much but is in the right direction..

He gave a big thank-you to the vice chancellors and the deans for all the hard work they've done in preparing to respond to whatever budget circumstances come to us.

He suggested we should already have noticed the recently opened window for early retirement of faculty and staff. It won't help us a lot in the short run, but it will help. We've felt compelled to do everything we can to protect revenue, and to avoid digging the hole any deeper. We'll continue with the hiring freeze but will make exceptions from time to time where the vice chancellors recommend it.

The chancellor thanked Holland and the Planning and Finance Committee for their timely completed and very interesting report on how other universities are coping with budget cuts. He hopes we'll look at it. Presents you with an interesting encyclopedia of responses. They interviewed personnel at peer institutions and included some of their comments in the report.

Beyond that, the chancellor said, we're roaring toward the end of the semester. He always finds it to be a stressful and hectic time of year, but also a fun time, as the achievements of our students are recognized, and as we salute excellence among staff and faculty. It's in many ways been a difficult year, with lots coming at us, but by and large, our students have been protected from that and have been able to pursue their educations with the faculty's work and help. He sees it as another successful year.

Indicated his openness to recommendation to use the salary money otherwise.

B. *Provost Belcher*

The provost spoke about new programs coming before the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Both went through the trustees this morning: construction engineering and the Shepherd Project, a consortial program in poverty studies.

He noted we have survived in fine style two more accreditation site visits. The reviews in theatre arts and law were really quite strong. Having done nine this year, including the two big ones, NCATE and North Central, has been a challenge, certainly. But it's important periodically to have outside eyes coming in to look at what we're doing. These processes help us get better.

Proud of and grateful to the people who shepherded all those self-studies and site visits.

The provost talked about the plan for updating the university's strategic plan. The survey got a respectable 550 responses. He has asked Jim Lynch to put together a summary for both internal and external audiences. The next phase, now, is looking forward. He is going to send out two initial solicitations for comments in the next few weeks: Of the goals in *UALR Fast Forward*, which should be kept in the next iteration? And for the next phase: Where to now? Where do you see the University going and what steps do we most need to take to get there? He's eager to hear from the campus community, especially given the kids of things that have been emerging as issues… technology, diversity, resources to do what we need to do.

He said there might be some e-mail during the summer, but reassured us we won't come back to a finished plan.

C. *Vice Chancellor for Finance Adams*

The vice chancellor said he was asked by Dr. Ford to come and talk about the changes recently announced about confirmation of registration.

Adams offered some perspective on why we're doing what we're doing. We have a problem with accounts receivable. When he interviewed, the chancellor

said the institution is in pretty good financial shape except in one area: as of June 30, 2009, we had $7M in receivables after writing off nearly $900K every semester.

This January we turned over to collection agencies 544 students with over $900K unpaid tuition. We will get some of that back from collection agencies; a lot, we won't get.

With the new confirmation system, the requirement for a $100 deposit ends. Implementation will unfold in two stages: First semester, this fall, will get students oriented to doing something—they'll have a window of time in which to confirm their registration for classes, or to pay their entire bill, or to pay 25 percent of the total and execute a deferred payment agreement. Those who choose the latter two will confirm their attendance. When they confirm, there will be things on the screen that serve to insure they're acknowledging their obligation. On August 13, we'll delete from registration all those students who have not confirmed. August 14, registration opens up again. Up through the last day of late registration, they will have to have done one of those things—confirm or pay.

January 2011 will be a bit different. Must pay at least 25% of tuition and execute differed payment plan or pay in full. Scholarship and student loan dependence will require confirmation. Adams distributed charts comparing the processes last fall, this coming fall, and subsequent to next fall.

Having followed the recent discussions on FacFocus, Adams said that if there are students who are to be gone during the entire confirmation period or are otherwise unable to get to the Internet, we'll work with the faculty and them to solve problems. This is pretty normal policy for universities in the state and around the country.

Q and comment from Robertson: What about students who've applied for financial aid but haven't gotten it yet. We see students a day or two before classes begin still having their student aid processed. *A from Adams:* Going to do everything we can to work with students about when things need to be done.

Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students Donaldson said things are working much more effectively with some new systems now in place in Financial Aid, especially in the spring semester.

Q from Jovanovic: Why can't the confirmation be done right now? Why can't students accept responsibility right now if they've registered right now. *A from Adams:* Concerned about everything that could happen between now and fall. Need a window of time closer to school starting. This year, for example, we won't even have tuition rates loaded until July, so we couldn't tell them exactly what their tuition liability would be.

Comment from Eshleman. Struck by difference of timeline between the fall and spring. The window seems to close some three weeks before classes begin. *A from Adams:* May need to look at the dates for spring more closely. Were really focused on the fall dates.

Q from Tramel: How are bills sent to students? *A from Adams:* Sent by e-mail. We send a 30-day demand letter when it's about to be sent to collection. Tramel observed that he is the one who gets the irate parents. Talked about how students are required to use their UALR e-mail accounts and many don't even check them. This has been a major issue for him. Adams noted that they're required to acknowledge their understanding that the UALR e-mail address is the official mode of communication for university business.

D. *Faculty Senate Executive Committee, Andrew Eshleman*

Eshleman redistributed the handout that was sent with the agenda and handed out at the last meeting, and which is Appendix A of these minutes.

The issue concerns the third step of the grade appeal process and how it is to be interpreted. It's on the agenda now, he said, to get some comment from senators about which way you think we should go on this issue.

Comment from Jovanovic: Favors clarifying the existing language. *Comment from Clausen:* Believes the meaning and intent of the process should not hinge on whether a committee's workload might get too big.

Eshleman added that by the time a grade appeal gets to the committee, it becomes a formal complaint. It is at this point that a record is kept.

Comment from Robertson: Spoke in favor of the current practice. The point of our informal administrative processes is to get things solved where possible. Robertson suggested that an alternative to an ombudsman might be to rotate through members of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee, and see if a committee member could work through it before moving to the formal appeal.

Comment from Tschumi: Robertson is underestimating what can happen in terms of pressure from administration on faculty members. Alluded to a recent case in which a long-time tenured professor was intimidated. The results of that incident, he said, have resonated and influenced the actions of other faculty.. Said the idea of having committee members make an informal try at resolution may have real merit.

Comment from Jovanovic: Added that in the incident alluded to , the appeal process dragged on for a full six months, which was damaging to the faculty member and wasn't good for the students either. Maybe the ten-day limit in here would be useful.

Q from Watts: How many have we had arriving at the AVC's office? *A from Eshleman:* Forty in two years. About twenty to the Committee?

Q from Tudoreanu: What substantively can happen at this AVC level? Could it be anything other than pressuring either faculty member of student to give in? *A from Eshleman:* It has been reported to us that most of the informal resolutions that occur at that level involve the students dropping their appeals.

Comment from Robertson: And the opposite circumstance does occur, when at the last informal effort, faculty are reminded that they did or failed to do something that affects the merits of the appeal.

Comment from Vinikas: Shouldn't use one bad case to drive policy. The current practice seems to have been effective if it's resolving a third to half of the appeals before they get to the committee.

Q from Jovanovic: The language is vague about the ten days. Is the intent for the AVC to have ten days? *A from Eshleman:* It was meant to be a ten-day limit, and he will revise the language.

VII. Old Business

A. MOTION, *Executive Committee*, presented by Andrew Eshleman. (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at two meetings required.)

The *Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves to amend the policy on "Academic Dishonesty Procedures for Students Enrolled in a Course" so that the last paragraph of that section reads as shown below:*

The student has the right to attend classes until the appeal is resolved. ~~In the event the case has not been resolve before final grades are due, the faculty member will withhold the grade until the appeal is resolved.~~ *The student may not withdraw from a course while an allegation of academic dishonesty in that course is being adjudicated. If the student withdraws from a course after receiving notification of an allegation of academic dishonesty, the student will be reinstated, pending final adjudication of the allegation.*

At the conclusion of the adjudication process:

> *• If academic dishonesty is found, and a grade of "F" in the course is assigned, then the failing grade will be recorded and remain on the student's transcript.*

> *• If academic dishonesty is found, and a penalty less than a grade of "F" for the course was assigned, then the student may continue in the course or withdraw from the course at that time.*

> *• If academic dishonesty is not found, the student may continue in the course or withdraw from the course at that time.*

If the adjudication process is not completed before the end of a semester, a temporary grade not affecting the student's GPA will be submitted until the adjudication process is completed.

The student may re-take a course in which a grade of "F" is assigned as a penalty for academic dishonesty. However, in such cases, the original grade of "F" will not be replaced but instead be included in the calculation of the student's cumulative GPA along with the subsequent grade received.

Eshleman presented the motion for a second vote. There was no discussion. **Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.**

VIII. New Business

A. Resolution. Executive Committee, presented by Earl Ramsey, vice president. (Resolution; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

Students who have met all graduation requirements at the conclusion of the 2010 spring semester shall be approved for the appropriate degree for which they have applied.

Ramsey read the motion. There was no discussion. **Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.**

B. Resolution. Tenure Committee, Paula Casey, chair. (No second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

The Faculty Senate accepts the changes to the Promotion and Tenure document as presented in Attachment 1.

Commentary may be found in Appendix B of these minutes.

Casey spoke to the motion, recapping the history of the development of the promotion and tenure policy for the university. The committee concluded that not only did the last revisions from the chancellor not change substantively the policy but that they have for the most part improved it.

Ramsey commented that we have fully and carefully vetted the proposed policy, and he hopes it will move forward expeditiously.

Tschumi pointed out a couple of small errors on p. 11: it is the Faculty Appeals *Council*, not *Committee*. The chair ruled we will make a silent correction of this name.

Comment from Tschumi: Language at the top of p. 11, "appeal or rebuttal or both," seems to him ambiguous. *A from Jensen:* The intent was that applicants cannot have two appeals going at one time. You can appeal after the chair's or after the dean's decision or you can do a rebuttal after either; you just can't have both a rebuttal of and an appeal of those decisions going on at once.

Several faculty said the language appeared to them quite clear. Tschumi said he's fine with it as long as this discussion describing the intent of the policy is reflected in the minutes. The secretary assured him she was doing her best to record it.

Motion carried on unanimous voice.

Q from Jovanovic: When will this go into effect? *A from Ford:* Can't be entirely sure, but his best guess is that the Chancellor will sign it some time over the summer.

C. Resolution. Athletics Committee, presented by Mike Watts. (Resolution; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

WHEREAS, *for the 17 regular academic semesters from Spring 2001 through Spring 2009, UALR student-athletes have maintained an average cumulative GPA of 3.0 or above for each semester, and*

WHEREAS, *for the Fall 2009 semester, UALR student-athletes had an average GPA of 3.15 for that semester and an average cumulative GPA of 3.22, and*

WHEREAS, *for the Fall 2009 semester, 67% of UALR's student-athletes had a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher, and*

WHEREAS, *the members of the UALR women's tennis team had a 3.91 average GPA for the Fall 2009 semester and an average cumulative GPA of 3.86 at that time, and*

WHEREAS, *29 of UALR's student-athletes will be graduating in May,*

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED *that the UALR Faculty Senate recognizes and congratulates the outstanding academic achievement of UALR's student-athletes and, further, recognizes and congratulates the UALR Department of Athletics and its coaching staff for its recruitment, retention, and support of student-athletes who perform so impressively in their academic efforts.*

Watts presented the motion, noting that the copy distributed to the Senate had omitted the phrase "and its coaching staff" from the final paragraph of the resolution. The secretary had already made the correction to the copy posted on the Senate's web site.

Comment from Jovanovic: He has no objection at all to singling out student athletes and the Athletic Department for recognition, but also knows there are many other students on campus who might be similarly praised.

Ford added that one reason to do this in particular is because of how the performance of UALR's student athletes compares to that of their peers at other schools.
Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

D. Motion. Calendar and Scheduling Committee, Eric Elder, chair. (Legislation. No second required; requires majority vote at one meeting)

The Faculty Senate accepts the 2013- 2014 academic calendar as presented in Attachment 2.

Amy Oliver Barnes made the presentation for committee chair Erick Elder. One note: This calendar does contain the information that the university closes officially at 4:30 pm on the Thursday before Thanksgiving. Indeed, they supported it with sufficient intensity to include the notice twice.

A couple of small errors were pointed out and accepted by the Committee as friendly amendments. Summer one grades are due on August 7.

Watts congratulated the calendar committee on getting in two full fifteen-week semesters, with one exception: Wednesday night classes. With the pre-Thanksgiving closure, these will be short a class session.

Comment from Groesbeck: Is there consensus in this body that not having a fall break is a good idea?

In reply, many comments followed about why it isn't possible and about how it might be accomplished. Unsurprisingly, no resolution was apparent.
Motion carried on voice vote.

E. Motion. Sen. McMillan, on behalf of the Roles and Rewards Task Force II. (Resolution. Second required; majority vote at one meeting)

The Faculty Senate adopts the report as presented in Attachment 3.

McMillan moved, Clausen seconded the motion.

Q from Robertson: Page 4, last sentence before criteria for advancement. Not clear. *A:* At the last meeting a comment was made that there was no process for appeals. The Committee took it, and Cheatham suggested use of the Faculty Appeals Council. Robertson questioned exactly what the Faculty Appeals Council is to deal with in connection with this, what decisions they would be empowered to make.

Q from Robertson: On next to last line of page three, is a reference to "policy document." Is the reference to "governance document"? *A:* Yes.

Comment from Robertson: In the section dealing with service, it's important to remember we have non-tenure-track full-time faculty engaged in activities beyond teaching.

Comment from Ramsey: Described himself as really torn about this document. Most instructors we have now, he said, are overworked and underpaid, but in the best of worlds, we would not have all these instructors. In that sense, he objects to the "canonization" of the instructor role.

Ramsey also noted that it appears only teaching will enable one to be promoted. *A:* We were told that legally, instructors are hired only to teach, and that if we included other requirements, this policy would not pass muster with those who must sign off on it. We can encourage professional development and

service to university and community, but we can't require it because we don't always support it.

Comment from Eshleman: Wonders if the references to voting privileges are consistent with promotion-and-tenure policy as we just passed it.

Comment from Nickels: Objects in principle. Reminded the Senate that UA-Fort Smith has a system of employment of faculty without tenure, and they required state law to permit them to do it. Believes it is inadvisable to take on this two-track system of recognizing faculty because it serves to weaken the academic freedom of the academy. He will oppose it unequivocally.

Ramsey moved, Giammo seconded, to amend the motion by striking the three references to full-time non-tenure-track faculty having "voting privileges on all matters that pertain to them."

Goldner spoke against the amendment on the grounds of unfairness.

Motion to amend failed on voice vote.

Robertson spoke in favor of the main motion because it does two things that need doing: it gives opportunity and establishes rights for faculty who are very valuable to us and who contribute significantly to our work.

Comment from Jovanovic: The 19% adjunct rate is much more disturbing to him than the number of full-time non-tenure-track faculty. He supports the document in general.

Comment from Giammo: Can't determine where the final decision would get made. If we approve this, does it become policy?

Ford clarified that we are voting whether or not to accept the report from this task force, and that if we do, it will go to another body to draft the actual legislation.

Tramel and Smith-Olinde both spoke passionately in support of the importance of instructors and their full engagement in the work of their departments.

Q from Jovanovic: Would this enable instructors who have been here full time for many years to apply at once for promotion to tier three? *A:* Yes.

Much discussion ensured as to what adoption of the motion really means. Matson said the committee's understanding is that by accepting this report we are adopting policy, and that implementation of the policy will have to be worked out.

Nickels said that if any full-time non-tenure-track faculty who have terminal degrees in their fields could be placed in tenure-track positions. He holds that there is nothing that compels a university to deny them access to tenure.

Eshleman returned to the question of whether we are making policy or not. He has believed that this was similar to our work on tenure and promotion policy, in which we made recommendations but policy was made later and elsewhere. He asks if this is the case or not.

Ford said his understanding matches Eshleman's. Faust concurred.

Tschumi asked what the task force's intent is in bringing forward this report. Lowery said their goal was to bring forward a process that would enable full-time non-tenure-track faculty to be recognized and promoted.

Nickels moved to table; Edison seconded. Motion failed on show of hands.

Eshleman moved to amend the motion by removing the parenthetical phrase in the second paragraph of the document. Rhodes seconded.

Eshleman said with this phrase removed, we are accepting and approving the report from the task force and forwarding it on to be worked on.

Giammo spoke in support of the amendment. If we're saying this is the basis for what we will do in the future, I'm in favor of it. If we're saying this is the end product, I'm not. This amendment seems to clarify that.

Motion carried on voice vote.

Jovanovic moved the previous question, Tramel seconded. Motion failed on show of hands.

Nickels moved to postpone the motion, Faust seconded. Motion carried on voice vote.

VIII. Open Forum

Ford invited comments from the Senate.

Guellich raised the question about why he has to reapply for admission to the university so frequently as he periodically takes courses. Especially for non-degree-seeking students, the paperwork and hassle factor seem to discourage rather than encourage taking courses.

IX. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Faust, Secretary

Appendix A

Revisiting Step 3 of the Grade Appeal Process

As was mentioned a few meetings ago, several recent cases have suggested the need to revisit aspects of UALR's policies regarding academic integrity and grade appeals. The motion on today's agenda concerns an aspect of the academic dishonesty policy. This handout, on the other hand, concerns an issue about the grade appeal process that we would like to discuss further at our April meeting. Three alternatives are proposed, but you may have others to suggest as well.

As described in the *Faculty Handbook,* section 9, "Grievances and Appeals," the first step of the grade appeal process involves a meeting between the student and faculty member in question in an attempt to resolve the disagreement over the grade assigned. If the appeal is not resolved to the student's satisfaction at this meeting, the student next meets, in step #2, with the faculty member again along with the departmental chairperson (or dean if the faculty member is the chairperson) to determine whether the disagreement can be resolved. If resolution is not reached at either of these levels, the appeal proceeds, at the student's initiation, to step #3.

Here is the current wording concerning this step of the process:

As a last resort and only after Steps 1 and 2 have been carried out, the student may file a formal complaint in writing within three class days to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. If the student decides to file a formal appeal, he or she must meet with the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and bring to the meeting the written appeal which must include a written statement which clearly explains the basis of the appeal and the Grade Appeal Complaint Form. Following the conference, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will immediately consult with the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson. The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will notify the student in writing that the grade appeal will be referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee for a hearing or to the vice chancellor/provost if the case does not fall within the purview of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

Once an appeal makes its way to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee, the appeal is formalized and records of the appeal and the hearings of the committee are kept. Generally, of course, it is best if an appeal can be resolved before reaching this committee. In light of this, the current issue concerns whether the associate vice chancellor should—in his/her meeting with the student at this step—be trying to negotiate a solution to the problem before it goes to the committee. This is being done, but some think that this practice is inconsistent with the spirit if not also the letter of the current policy—that the intent of the policy is to restrict the role of the office (since power over academic appointments resides in the office of the provost/vice-chancellor of academic affairs) of the associate vice-chancellor to guarantee that the faculty member never feels real or imagined pressure by that office to concede to an appeal in order to "make a problem go away."

1) To address this concern, one option is to rewrite the current policy so that the intent to restrict the scope of the associate vice-chancellor's role is clear, perhaps in something like this fashion (changes highlighted):

> As a last resort and only after Steps 1 and 2 have been carried out, the student may file a formal complaint in writing within three class days to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. If the student decides to file a formal appeal, he or she must meet with the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and bring to the meeting the written appeal which must include a written statement which clearly explains the basis of the appeal and the Grade Appeal Complaint Form. The purpose of this meeting is to confirm that prior steps in the process have been followed properly (if not, the appeal will be re-directed back to the appropriate lower level) and that the student understands the next step in the appeal process. Following the conference, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will immediately consult with the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson. The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will notify the student in writing that the grade appeal will be referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee for a hearing or to the vice chancellor/provost if the case does not fall within the purview of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

Some are concerned, however, about the possible pragmatic difficulty of implementing the policy understood in this way. That is, currently, only 1/3-1/2 of appeals filed to the associate vice-chancellor reach the committee, the others having been resolved by him. If all appeals went directly to the committee, some worry that the committee would be overwhelmed, especially at the conclusion of the spring semester, given the nine-month contract of many faculty members.

2) A second option would be to rewrite the policy to endorse recent practice in something like the following fashion:

> If unable to resolve the difference with the chair and faculty member, the student shall take the grievance within five class days of this discussion to the associate vice-chancellor. The associate vice-chancellor shall attempt to resolve the dispute within 10 class days between the student and the faculty member. The student's grade will be changed at step 3 of this procedure by the written consent of the faculty member.
>
> As a last resort and only after Steps 1, 2 and 3 have been carried out, the student may file a formal complaint in writing within three class days to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. If the student decides to file a formal appeal, he or she must meet again with the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and bring to the meeting the written appeal which must include a written statement which clearly explains the basis of the appeal and the Grade Appeal Complaint Form. The purpose of this meeting is to confirm that the student understands the next step in the appeal process. Following the conference, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will immediately consult with the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson. The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will notify the student in writing that the grade appeal will be referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee for a hearing or to the vice chancellor/provost if the case does not fall within the purview of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

Of course, the worry here is again that faculty members may sometimes feel pressure to resolve grade appeals in the student's favor, despite regarding the appeal as having no merit otherwise.

3) A third option would be to investigate the possibility of creating a "stand-alone" position of university ombudsperson, a faculty-member position dedicated to hearing student appeals (and perhaps other complaints) and seeking means of mediation with the relevant parties prior to the appeals (and other complaints) being formalized. In other words, this person would seek to perform the mediating role recently practiced by the associate vice-chancellor but would not be associated with that office, thereby counteracting concerns by faculty members about the possibility of undue influence.

The rewrite of policy in this case would parallel that of #2, but with "ombudsperson" substituted for "associate vice-chancellor" in the first paragraph.

> If unable to resolve the difference with the chair and faculty member, the student shall take the grievance within five class days of this discussion to the university ombudsperson. The ombudsperson shall attempt to resolve the dispute within 10 class days between the student and the faculty member. The student's grade will be changed at step 3 of this procedure by the written consent of the faculty member.
>
> As a last resort and only after Steps 1, 2 and 3 have been carried out, the student may file a formal complaint in writing within three class days to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. If the student decides to file a formal appeal, he or she must meet again with the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and bring to the meeting the written appeal which must include a written statement which clearly explains the basis of the appeal and the Grade Appeal Complaint Form. The purpose of this meeting is to confirm that the student understands the next step in the appeal process. Following the conference, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will immediately consult with the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson. The associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will notify the student in writing that the grade appeal will be referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee for a hearing or to the vice chancellor/provost if the case does not fall within the purview of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

Appendix B
Commentary on the revised Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.

UALR Department of Rhetoric and Writing

To: Richard Ford, President
            Faculty Senate
Fr: George H. Jensen, Chair
Date: April 9, 2010
Re: Revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Document

On March 17, Chancellor Anderson and I discussed the recommendations of Fred H. Harrison, General Counsel, University of Arkansas System, in regards to UALR's proposed Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Revisions have been made in the attached version, labeled 4-7-2010. A summary of Mr. Harrison's concerns, our discussion on March 17, and the revisions made to the document is presented below:

2. Mr. Harrison pointed out that the phrase "probationary period" should be changed to "six years" to be consistent with Board Policy. The change is highlighted on page 7 (lines 285-86) of the current version. As a further point of clarification, the following sentence was added: "If tenure is denied in the sixth year, the seventh year will be the final year of appointment" (page 7, lines 286-87).

3. Mr. Harrison requested changing "evaluated" to "evaluates." The change is highlighted on page 8 (line 325) of the current version.

4. Mr. Harrison asked that we change "chair's decision" to "chair's recommendation" (page 10, line 402 of the current version). I went through the entire document and changed "decision" to "recommendation." Only the action of the Board is a decision, and that action is not covered in our document. When the document refers to the entire promotion and tenure process, I used the word "review." I did not highlight these changes.

5. Mr. Harrison was concerned about the wording of the following sentence because it raised privacy issues: "All faculty of the department are similarly encouraged to support tenure-track faculty by providing an opportunity to review recent successful tenure applications." We changed the wording to the following: "Applicants are encouraged to seek advice from tenured faculty and ask to review recent successful tenure applications." The change is highlighted on page 9 (lines 347-48) of the current version. We felt that this change would allow tenured faculty members to decide whether or not to share their dossiers.

6. Mr. Harrison pointed out that the document repeats the heading "3.G." This has been corrected. The change is highlighted on page 13 (line 550) of the current version.

7. In reference to statements about an appeal or rebuttal being exercised within five business days, Mr. Harrison said that "there should be some statement that there is a presumption that if the recommendations are placed in regular mail with sufficient postage that it is received within two business days after mailing." The chair is required to meet with the candidate to deliver his or her recommendation. The dean is likewise required to meet with the candidate if his or her recommendation is negative. Thus, the issue only applies to the recommendation of the provost. To the passage describing the recommendation of the provost, the following phrase was added: "seven business days from postmark, if mailed." The change is highlighted on page 11, lines 482-83, of the current version.

Promotion and Tenure Guidelines

University of Arkansas at Little Rock

1. Faculty Roles

For the university to achieve its mission, faculty must remain committed to teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members are expected to make contributions in each area, although some variation in emphasis is appropriate. The university recognizes that the contributions of individual faculty members to the mission of the university shift according to the faculty member's talents, the needs of departments and colleges, and the character of diverse academic disciplines. Faculty members, thus, need to determine responsibilities—teaching loads, scholarship agenda, and service commitments—in consultation with the chair of their department.[1] It is the responsibility of chairs to mediate the needs of their departments with the university mission and trends in the department's discipline.

In addition to contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service, the university expects that faculty will adhere to the ethical standards of the university and their respective disciplines as well as manifest standards of civility, professionalism, and collegiality.

1.A. Teaching

The nature of effective teaching may vary across disciplines, but certain qualities are universal: respect for students, faith in student abilities, a focus on student learning, and a commitment to student success. Equally important, faculty should view themselves as role models who convey the values of their disciplines and initiate students into their professions. In the pursuit of excellence in teaching, faculty members should remain current in their disciplines and in pedagogical strategies. They should consider teaching a continual process of improvement and growth.

The documentation of excellence in teaching takes many forms. One approach is through the preparation of a teaching portfolio. The content and format may vary by discipline and individual philosophy, but information about both teaching effort and teaching quality over time should be included. Standard products for the promotion and tenure dossier may include the following:

1. Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical strategies,
2. Teaching history including teaching loads, summary of courses taught and modes of instruction in each course,
3. Materials from individual courses – syllabi, exercises, projects, exams, websites, multimedia products, video of lectures,
4. Summary of advising, consultation, and supervision of students at all levels–pre-college, undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral,
5. Curriculum design, development, and administration,
6. Measuring student learning and instructional effectiveness through course, program, and core assessment activities and outcomes,
7. Professional development activities related to teaching,
8. Student course evaluations, compiled and interpreted to give the data contextual meaning,
9. Peer evaluations,

---

[1] In this document, *chair* will be used to cover chair, head, and director; *department* will be used to cover all academic units that form a college, including department, division, and school.

10. Self-evaluations, and
11. Awards.

Evidence of specific curriculum design and development, where appropriate, should be included in the dossier. Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present these aspects of course design (even experimental use) with an explanation of how the curriculum conforms to or extends principles of "best practice."

1.B. **Scholarship**

Scholarship is defined as a systematic, focused attention on a question, problem, or idea, characterized by expertise, originality, analysis and significance. Scholarship results in products that are shared with appropriate audiences within the academy and the wider community.

Scholarship is evaluated externally; scholarship and creative activities must be reviewed by methods accepted by the appropriate discipline. Scholarship may be defined in ways that do not neatly fit into traditional categories, but application of a clear method of review to such work is essential.

Increasingly, all forms of scholarship involve collaboration. The academic unit shall determine if such collaboration within or across institutional and disciplinary lines is encouraged. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work.

In this document, scholarship is a broad term that embraces a range of contributions faculty members might make to their respective disciplines: Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Creativity, Scholarship of Application, Scholarship of Integration, and Scholarship of Teaching.

Scholarship of Discovery is systematic inquiry or investigation designed to validate and refine existing knowledge and to generate new knowledge. At its core, this scholarship involves studies that use quantitative or qualitative methodologies to make significant contributions to knowledge. Primary empirical research, historical research, theory development, methodological studies and philosophical inquiry are all representative of this form. Typically, this scholarship is documented through peer-reviewed publication of articles or books; publication in law reviews or journals; papers presented at state, regional, national, or international meetings; grant awards; or recognition by professional organizations as a scholar in a particular area.

The *Scholarship of Creativity* entails developing or performing original works of art, literature, music, film and theater. It may also include the creation of new forms of electronic or digital media. Typical examples are production or scenic design of plays; writing, directing, or acting in plays; choreography and dance performance; creation and exhibition of visual arts such as painting, sculpture, and photography; musical composition and performance; direction or production of film and video; creative writing; and creation of websites, virtual reality programs, and multimedia communication tools. In all cases, however, there are accepted forms of peer review to determine the quality and significance of faculty work, from juried or invitational art

shows to publication. These conventional procedures must be part of the evaluation of faculty achievement.

The *Scholarship of Application* is the use of professional expertise or information in the process of solving social or community problems. It should not be confused with service or citizenship. Service activities typically benefit a particular group, organization, or community; the Scholarship of Application can potentially benefit many organizations. The Scholarship of Application must include a mechanism whereby the quality and influence of the contribution can be evaluated. This is most easily demonstrated when an artifact is created encompassing the work, e.g., a report, a training manual, a program evaluation, a video, or a website. Some activities include peer review; for example, the report written for a taskforce is reviewed by members of the taskforce as well as other agencies and institutions. In cases where this is not so, the department should initiate an alternative review process, such as sending the work to experts in the field to evaluate its significance, rigor, and impact. In all cases, the product of the scholarship of application must be subject to some form of peer review.

Scholarship of Integration involves synthesis across theories or across academic fields. As academics tackle social, economic, and technical problems, a need often exists for faculty members with broad and multidisciplinary perspectives to see connections across the unique perspectives of a theory or discipline. The Scholarship of Integration may result in a traditional academic product such as an article, book or presentation. It also may take the form of a product or patent. As in other areas, appropriate forms of external review must be used to determine the merit of such products.

The *Scholarship of Teaching* is not the same as "best teaching practice." Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching shall engage in publication appropriate to development and evaluation of teaching, teaching technique, curriculum development and related topics, including peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, workshops, and teacher handbooks that contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and learning. Thus, the Scholarship of Teaching is more than being an excellent teacher. It involves systematic inquiry about teaching, dissemination of the results, and peer review.

1.C. **Service**

Faculty members are expected to provide service to the university, their profession or discipline, and the public.

Service to the university is critical to the carrying out of the university's mission. Examples of such service include, but are not limited to, membership and leadership of unit committees or task forces; advising student organizations; involvement in faculty governance; coordination of programs, labs, and technical support; and recruitment.

Service to the profession is also expected, especially as faculty members develop their careers. Professional service includes activities such as serving on committees for a professional organization; planning a conference or event; contributing to the production of a professional journal; and reviewing manuscripts, grants, programs, or textbooks.

Particularly important to a metropolitan university is service to the community. Such activity necessarily incorporates a wide variety of efforts but is defined by the application of the faculty member's professional expertise to help the community at every level—local, state, regional, national, or international. Typical examples of community service include, but are not limited to, involvement in task forces seeking to solve community problems; consulting with governmental, business, or nonprofit organizations; and program review, coordination, or development.

Service to the community is a form of citizenship; it should not be confused with the Scholarship of Application, which develops new solutions to problems (as opposed to the application of existing discipline-related knowledge), benefits a single or small group of organizations (as opposed to having broad application), is not disseminated to disciplines (as opposed to publication in journals or on websites), and is not externally evaluated (as opposed to the peer-review of artifacts).

To assess excellence in service, faculty accomplishments may include the following:

1. Administrative duties such as chair, director, and program coordinator,
2. Committee/special project participation (academic unit, college, university, system; for example, assessment and recruitment projects),
3. Discipline-related community involvement,
4. Working in and with professional organizations,
5. Relating discipline expertise to the community, and
6. Development of cooperative ventures between the university and community.

1.D. Professional Performance

In the case of faculty with non-teaching appointments, evaluation may include evidence of the following: performance in the areas of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties; ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility, or leadership; cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels; efforts at self-improvement; innovations in program implementation; development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties; initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems; ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing. Evidence used to evaluate professional performance generally includes supervisors' evaluations, clientele evaluation, peer-evaluation, and self-evaluation.

2. Policies for Promotion and Tenure

The probationary period for tenure-track faculty may not extend beyond seven years, unless the faculty member receives approval for suspending the probationary period. During the first six years of the probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request his or her probationary period be suspended for reasons required under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, as amended. An initial appointment of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in leave of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the probationary period (Board

Policy 405.1, IV.A.4). Typically, an early tenure review occurs when the faculty member has been in a tenure-track position before being hired by UALR; the terms for an early tenure-review should be written into the faculty member's letter of appointment.

The process of tenure review, as delineated in departmental promotion and tenure documents, must be completed before the end of the sixth year. If tenure is denied in the sixth year, the seventh year will be the final year of appointment (Board Policy 405.1., IV.A.11).

Promotion to a higher rank requires qualifications or performance of the activities and accomplishments identified by the department significantly above those required at the applicant's current rank as well as evidence of potential for continued achievement.

The applicant shall be informed of the outcome at each level of administrative review.

The rules and standards regarding promotion and tenure review shall not discourage faculty members from developing and expressing divergent views. Mere expressions of opinions, however strongly expressed, however controversial such opinions may be, shall not constitute cause for denial of promotion and tenure. Disagreement is essential for intellectual, academic, and social growth; however, the fair exchange of ideas must involve respectful expression of views and the consideration of multiple points of view.

Decisions on promotion and tenure shall not be based on life-style, political affiliations, or religious convictions.

At any point, the candidate may withdraw from the review process by sending a letter to the person responsible for the next level of review. For example, if the candidate wishes to withdraw after the chair's recommendation, he or she sends a letter to the dean.

Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained.

3. Procedures for Awarding Promotion and Tenure

The procedure for recommending promotion and tenure begins at the department level (see Board Policy 405.1, III and IV.A).[2] This evaluation of promotion and tenure applications is based on written departmental guidelines established by the department and approved through administrative channels. The departmental recommendation is particularly important because it evaluates the candidate's dossier against the standards of the discipline.

Departmental promotion and tenure documents must be consistent with guidelines established in college, university, and the University of Arkansas System. These documents must also be consistent with applicable laws. When there is a conflict, the law or higher level policy will be enforced.

The granting of tenure requires documented evidence of sustained achievement, as well as evidence of potential for sustained future accomplishment over an entire career.

---

[2] If the college or school does not have departments, the promotion and tenure document for the college and school will typically establish a committee that serves the function of the department in the review process.

3.A. Process before Tenure

Departmental, college, university, and system-wide written criteria for promotion and tenure review shall be presented to the faculty member at the beginning of employment (see Board Policy 405.1).

In preparation for promotion and tenure, the chair may assign the tenure-track faculty member with a mentor. The mentor will provide guidance on developing a research agenda and building a dossier. ==Applicants are encouraged to seek advice from tenured faculty and ask to review recent successful tenure applications.==

A mid-tenure review by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), the department chair, and the dean is mandatory. The review, typically completed by May 15 at the end of the third year in rank, will follow procedures delineated in the departmental and college policies. After the review has been completed, the PTC will send a report to the chair. The chair will meet with the faculty member to answer questions about the review and then forward the report with a cover letter to the dean.

3.B. Recommendation of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTC)

All departments shall have a Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC). Only tenured faculty members and administrators who hold tenure shall serve on the PTC. Only faculty who hold a rank equal to or above the rank sought by the applicant shall participate in the promotion review process. No administrator, such as the department chair, college dean, associate dean, or assistant dean, may serve on the PTC to review any case for which he or she has participated as a reviewer within that academic year.

The department's promotion and tenure document should define a mechanism for supplementing the PTC when it has less than three members at the appropriate rank. (For example, if the PTC must vote on a candidate's promotion to professor, the PTC would need at least three members on the committee at the rank of professor.) If there is no mechanism for adding members, the faculty of the department, in consultation with the chair, will provide the dean with a list of at least four names, from which the dean will select the remaining members. Typically, the chair of the PTC should be a member of the academic unit.

The PTC shall present its recommendation in a letter to the chair. All members of the PTC shall sign the letter. Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as attachments to the PTC's letter; a minority report must be signed by the members of the PTC who endorse it.

3.C. Recommendation of the Chair

After reviewing the candidate's dossier and the PTC's recommendation, the department chair will make an independent recommendation. The chair will meet with the candidate to review the recommendation of the PTC and the recommendation of the chair. At this time, the chair provides a copy of each recommendation to the candidate. After the meeting, the chair will forward the PTC's recommendation, the chair's recommendation, and the candidate's dossier to the dean.

After receiving the chair's recommendation, the candidate has five business days to initiate a rebuttal (see 3.H.).

3.D. Recommendation of the College Review Committee (CRC)

A college may develop written criteria, policies, and procedures for promotion and tenure through its governance structure. Such criteria may include a college promotion and tenure review committee (CRC), which will advise the dean on recommendations about reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Colleges shall have procedures ensuring that a faculty member abstain from vote on a CRC if a candidate from his or her department is undergoing review and the faculty member on the CRC has served on the PTC. No faculty member may vote in the same case as a member of both the PTC and the CRC.

When a CRC exists, it reviews the candidate's dossier, the PTC's recommendation, the chair's recommendation and the candidate's rebuttal (if any); it then makes an independent recommendation to the dean (who will not serve on this committee) and provides a copy to the applicant. All members of the CRC shall sign the recommendation. Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as an attachment to the report of the committee; a minority report must be signed by the members of the CRC that endorse it.

3.E. Recommendation of the Dean

If the candidate initiates a rebuttal after the chair's recommendation, the dean will forward the rebuttal to the CRC before it begins deliberations.

After reviewing the candidate's dossier, all recommendations (those of the PTC, department chair, and CRC), and the candidate's rebuttal (if any), the dean will make an independent recommendation to the provost.

After receiving the dean's recommendation, the candidate has five business days to initiate either a rebuttal, if he or she did not do so after the chair's recommendation (see 3.H.), *or* an appeal (see 3.G), but not both.

If the recommendation is positive, the dean informs the candidate. If the candidate does not initiate a rebuttal, the dean forwards his or her recommendation and the following *summary materials* to the provost: the candidate's completed application forms, statement, curriculum vita, letters of evaluation (annual reviews, peer reviews, and letters from external evaluators, when appropriate), and the recommendations of all prior review levels. The remainder of the

applicant's dossier shall be retained in the dean's office until the review process is complete. If needed for their recommendations, the provost and chancellor may request the complete dossier be forwarded.

If the recommendation is negative, the dean shall meet with the faculty member to review the recommendation.

If the candidate initiates a rebuttal after the dean's recommendation, the dean forwards the summary materials and the rebuttal to the provost.

If the candidate initiates an appeal at this point, the dean forwards the appeal to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Council (FAC). The dean will provide the FAC with access to the candidate's dossier, including the summary materials. When the FAC has completed its deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the council's findings to the provost with a copy to the dean. At this time, the dean forwards the summary materials to the provost.

3.F. Recommendation of the Provost

After reviewing the candidate's summary materials, the rebuttal (if any), and the appeal (if any), the provost will make an independent recommendation to the chancellor and inform the candidate of the recommendation.

After receiving the provost's recommendation, the candidate has five business days to initiate an appeal (seven business days from the postmark, if mailed), if he or she did not do so after the dean's recommendation (see 3.G.).

If the candidate initiates a rebuttal or appeal after the dean's recommendation, the provost considers it in arriving at his or her recommendation.

If the candidate initiates an appeal at this point, the provost forwards the appeal, the summary materials, and the rebuttal (if any) to the Chair of the FAC. The dean will provide the FAC with access to the candidate's dossier. When the FAC has completed its deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings and summary materials to the chancellor. The Chair of the FAC also provides a copy the committee's findings to the provost.

At this time, the provost forwards the summary materials, the rebuttal (if any), and the findings of the FAC (if any) to the chancellor.

3.G. Recommendation of the Chancellor

After reviewing the summary materials, the rebuttal (if any), and the appeal (if any), the chancellor will make an independent recommendation to the president and inform the candidate of the recommendation.

3.H. Rebuttal

The candidate may submit one—and only one—rebuttal after receiving a recommendation from the chair *or* the dean. The rebuttal is directed to the next administrator in the review process.

The candidate may submit a rebuttal even if the recommendation of the chair or dean is positive. The purpose of a rebuttal is to provide the candidate with an opportunity to correct errors made in the preparation of his or her dossier, critique perceived misinterpretations of the dossier, or provide context that might alter the recommendation at subsequent levels of review. The rebuttal is in letter form. However, the candidate may include limited supporting materials that bear direct relevance to earlier recommendations. The supporting materials are considered part of the rebuttal and are forwarded with the letter.

The rebuttal is not an appeal; it does not prompt a reconsideration of recommendations by previous reviewers. It is, rather, an opportunity to provide a supplement to the record that is considered at subsequent levels of review.

Rebuttal after Chair's Recommendation. To initiate the option of rebuttal at this point, the candidate must notify the dean within five business days of receiving the chair's recommendation and provide a copy of the notification to the chair. Within ten business days of receiving the chair's recommendation, the candidate must submit the rebuttal to the dean. The dean forwards the rebuttal to the CRC before that committee begins deliberations. The rebuttal is also forwarded with the summary materials to each subsequent level of campus review.

Rebuttal after the Dean's Recommendation. To initiate the option of rebuttal at this point, the candidate must notify the provost within five business days of receiving the dean's recommendation. The candidate also provides a copy of the notification to the dean. Within ten business days of receiving the dean's recommendation, the candidate must submit the rebuttal to the provost. The rebuttal will be forwarded to the chancellor with the provost's recommendation.

3.I. Appeal to Faculty Appeals Council (FAC)

The candidate has the option of submitting one—and only one—appeal to the Faculty Appeals Council. The appeal may be initiated after a negative recommendation by either the dean *or* provost. If the dean's recommendation is negative and the candidate does not initiate an appeal, he or she reserves the right to appeal after the provost's recommendation, providing that recommendation is also negative.

The appeal is in letter form. However, the candidate may include limited supporting materials that bear direct relevance to earlier recommendations. The supporting materials are considered part of the appeal and are forwarded with the letter.

Appeal after the Dean's Recommendation. To initiate the option of appeal at this point, the candidate must notify the provost within five business days after receiving the dean's negative recommendation. The candidate also provides a copy of the notification to the dean. Within ten business days of receiving the dean's recommendation, the candidate must submit the appeal to the provost. The provost forwards the appeal to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Council. Upon

completion of the FAC's deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings to the provost.

Appeal after the Provost's Recommendation. To initiate the option of appeal at this point, the candidate must notify the chancellor within five business days after receiving the provost's negative recommendation. The candidate will also provide a copy of the notification to the provost. Within ten business days of receiving the provost's recommendation, the candidate must submit the appeal to the chancellor. The chancellor forwards the appeal to the Chair of the FAC. Upon completion of the FAC's deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings to the chancellor.

Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force II:
Full Time Non Tenure Track

Introduction

The Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force II (FRR2) was created in fall 2008 to study the roles of full-time, non-tenure track faculty (hereinafter "FT-NTT faculty") at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) and to consider rewards for this cohort. These faculty are important members of the UALR community. They make up 20% percent of the faculty, teach 29.2% percent of the courses, and are found in most but not all departments across the University. Although they are not eligible for tenure, they have contributed in diverse ways to the educational, service, and scholarly missions of the university. Some join our community on a temporary basis, while others have served UALR for many years. Some have primarily teaching responsibilities, while others serve important administrative and clinical roles.

The FRR2 Task Force believes that the contributions of FT-NTT faculty, like their tenure-track colleagues, should be recognized and their responsibilities should be clearly identified. We therefore make the following recommendation to the Faculty Senate (which, if adopted, would be submitted for approval to the Provost and Chancellor, to the President, and finally to the UA Board of Trustees):

> That an **advancement system** be adopted for those FT-NTT faculty demonstrating significant commitment and expertise and who choose to participate in an advancement system

The FRR2 Task Force recognizes the diversity of FT-NTT roles in units across campus, as well as the different structures adopted in various disciplines. This report therefore proposes a general structure all units must follow. The specific details and necessary changes to governance documents will be left to the appropriate units in the colleges and departments.

Background

In the 2007-2008 academic year, there were 101 FT-NTT teaching positions at UALR. They taught 43,000 SSCH, which was 30% of the total SSCH.* Two methods were used to determine responsibilities as determined by various departments and to gather opinions of these faculty regarding experiences and expectations. Department chairs were interviewed by task force members whenever possible. FT-NTT faculty were invited to attend one in a series of round-table discussions. 58 participated in these discussions.

*With a few exceptions and based on circumstances, most of these faculty have the title *Instructor*. For simplicity's sake, we use this term throughout the document.

Several differences were identified concerning how FT-NTT faculty are integrated into department activities. Among these are compensation, voting privileges, teaching load, service, and scholarship/professional development.

The task force reviewed policies from LSU, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, and the University of Colorado Boulder among others.

Instructor Advancement System

Tiers

The FFR2 Task Force recommends a three tier system for advancement. Departments and/or colleges should revise their appropriate governance documents to reflect this system in accordance with the guidelines below. Participation in this system by individual FT-NTT faculty members is voluntary and open to those FT-NTT faculty members who demonstrate significant commitment and expertise.

The three tiers in the advancement system are:

Tier One: Instructor

A Tier One faculty member is normally a full-time and non-tenure track member with a Master's degree or terminal degree. A department may choose to apply outside work experience (e.g., experience in a relevant profession) as equivalent in accordance with the appropriate governance document.

Teaching, administrative and service responsibilities are determined in accordance with the appropriate governance document.

Voting privileges are determined by the department and/or college and should be included in the appropriate governance document. It is recommended that FT-NTT faculty be granted voting privileges on all matters that pertain to them.

A Tier One faculty member is not required to pursue advancement.

Tier Two: Advanced Instructor

A Tier Two faculty member is normally a FT-NTT faculty member with a Master's degree or terminal degree who has held the rank of Tier One for at least five (5) years. All FT-NTT faculty members currently employed would be given credit for experience they have already accumulated as a UALR faculty member at the implementation date of this Tier system. A department would also have the option of giving credit for outside work experience (e.g., experience in a relevant profession) in meeting this experience requirement, in accordance with the appropriate governance document.

Application for advancement to Tier Two is the responsibility of the Tier One faculty member. A department may consider excellence in teaching alone as sufficient for advancement to Tier Two, but departments may also take additional factors into account when considering the application for advancement, e.g., scholarship, professional development, and service. Departments, in accordance with the appropriate governance document, will determine the criteria for advancement.

Voting privileges are determined by the department and/or college and should be included in the appropriate governance document. It is recommended that FT-NTT faculty be granted voting privileges on all matters that pertain to them.

Advancement to Tier Two will be accompanied by an appropriate increment in salary.

A Tier Two faculty member is not required to pursue advancement.

Tier Three: Senior Instructor

A Tier Three faculty member is normally a full-time and non-tenure track faculty member with a Master's degree or terminal degree who has held the rank of Tier One for a minimum of five (5) years and Tier Two for a minimum of five (5) years. All FT-NTT faculty currently employed would be given credit for experience already accumulated as a UALR faculty member at the implementation date of this Tier system. A department would also have the option of giving credit for outside work experience (e.g., experience in a relevant profession) in meeting this experience requirement, in accordance with the appropriate governance document.

Application for advancement to Tier Three is the responsibility of the Tier Two faculty member. A department may consider excellence in teaching alone as sufficient for advancement to Tier Three, but departments may also take additional factors into account when considering the application for advancement, e.g., scholarship, professional development, and service. Departments, in accordance with the appropriate governance document, will determine the criteria for advancement.

Voting privileges are determined by the department and/or college and should be included in the policy document. It is recommended that FT-NTT faculty be granted voting privileges on all matters that pertain to them.

Advancement to Tier Three will be accompanied by an appropriate increment in salary.

FT-NTT faculty members will be eligible for OCDA consistent with the Faculty Handbook and departmental resources.

At each level an appeals process will be in place utilizing the Faculty/Staff Appeals Committee.

Criteria for advancement

As noted above, departments may determine that excellence in teaching alone is sufficient for advancement for FT-NTT faculty. However, FRR2 recommends that departments have discretion to take into consideration contributions by such faculty above and beyond their teaching responsibilities, e.g., scholarship, professional development and service.

Teaching

The UALR mission statement places teaching as a central value. "The mission of the University is to develop the intellect of students; to discover and disseminate knowledge; to serve and strengthen society by enhancing awareness in scientific, technical areas; and to promote humane sensitivities and understanding of interdependence." FT-NTT faculty are expected to demonstrate effective teaching in response to this mission.

The 2006 Roles and Rewards Task Force I identified universal qualities of effective teaching. Although they were listed with tenured faculty in mind, they apply to non-tenured faculty as well. "The nature of effective teaching may vary across disciplines, but certain qualities are universal: respect for students, faith in student abilities, a focus on student learning, and a commitment to student success. Equally important, faculty should view themselves as role models who convey the values of their disciplines and initiate students into their professions. In the pursuit of excellence in teaching, faculty members must remain current in their discipline and in pedagogical strategies. They should consider teaching a continual process of improvement and growth."

Teaching is the primary role of FT-NTT faculty and complements the activities of the tenure-track faculty. Student, campus, and community needs cannot always be met by tenure-track faculty alone. In many instances FT-NTT faculty can meet those needs and allow the institution flexibility that might not otherwise be possible.

As an individual advances through the non-tenure track ranks from Tier One to Tier Three, the non-tenure track faculty member's teaching can be evaluated in a number of ways. Although these methods may be determined by the individual departments, FRR2 suggests following the criteria in the UALR Faculty Handbook, which calls for a combination of student evaluations, peer evaluations (which may include classroom visits), self-evaluation, curriculum design and development and creative/innovative teaching strategies. Other factors that the department may consider in evaluating teaching include the number of different course preparations taught by a faculty member, whether the faculty member teaches graduate as well as undergraduate courses, and the ability of the faculty member to teach with a variety of delivery methods, including traditional face-to-face, fully on-line and hybrid courses.

Scholarship/Professional Development

Advancement from one tier to another may include scholarship/professional development. The criteria will be determined by each department.

FRR1 endorsed Earnest Boyer's views. As Boyer writes, 'What we urgently need today is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar, a view "that recognizes the great diversity of

talent within the professoriate" (*Scholarship Reconsidered 24-25).*That talent is also reflected among the FT-NTT faculty who, when appropriate, should be encouraged, supported, and recognized for engaging in scholarship and faculty development. FRR1 adopted Boyer's four categories , adding a fifth one.

1. Scholarship of Discovery: the systematic inquiry or investigation designed to validate and refine existing knowledge and generate new knowledge.
2. Scholarship of Creativity: the creation of or performance of original works of art, literature, music, film and theater. It may also include the creation of new forms of electronic or digital media.
3. Scholarship of Application: the use of professional expertise or information in the process of solving social or community problems.
4. Scholarship of Integration: involves synthesis across theories or across academic fields.
5. Scholarship of Teaching: should be a reflection of excellence in teaching as well as a rigorous form of scholarship in which a faculty member systematically examines the impact of pedagogy upon learning.

Among the professional development opportunities might be workshops offered on the campus, sessions offered by the Academy for Teaching and Learning Excellence, STAR courses, and continuing education or consulting to maintain professional skills.

Service

An application for advancement from one tier to the next need not require, but can be enhanced by, the performance of service. Areas of service may include (1) service to the department, (2) service to the University, (3) service in the faculty member's profession, or
(4) service in the community.

(1) Service to the department may mean participation in committees and councils essential to the mission of the department. Committees on which FT-NTT faculty might participate will depend on the discretion of the department chair but may include assessment, curriculum or recruitment committees.

(2) Service to the University may include participation on committees, councils, task forces, or election to the Faculty Senate. Generally service to the University, other than election to the Faculty Senate, will be through appointments by the department chair, college dean, or upper administration officials.

(3) Service to the faculty member's profession can enhance an application for advancement. Service to the profession may include serving as an officer or on a committee in a professional organization; planning and coordinating a conference or event; editing or contributing to the publication of a professional journal; and reviewing manuscripts, grants, programs and textbooks.

(4) Service in the community is the application of a FT-NTT faculty members' expertise to the community at the local, state, regional, national or international level and may also

enhance an application for advancement. Typical examples of service may include involvement in task forces seeking to solve community problems; consulting with government, business, and non-profit organizations; training and presentations; and program review, coordination and development.

Each department and college will have its unique ideas for service in the four areas described above. Typically the type of service and the time allocated to service will be determined by the department chair and the personnel committee. It is important that the department chair and personnel committee clearly define in the appropriate governance document what is meant by service and what is expected of FT-NTT faculty.