



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, April 18, 2008, 1:00 p.m.

Dickinson Hall Auditorium (04/18 and 04/25)

Stephens Center (05/02)

Dickinson Hall Auditorium (05/09)

MINUTES

Present: **CAHSS**— Amrhein, Anson, Bunch, Chadwick, Cheatham, English, Dhonau, Eshleman, Estes, Levernier, Ramsey, Vinikas, **CB**— Brice, Edison, Holland, Nickels, Watts. **CE**— Barrett, Garner, Kushner, Lindsay. **CEIT**— Bayrak, Jovanovich, Tramel, Tschumi, Wright. **LAW**— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh, Foster. **LIBRARY**— Medin. **CPS**— Faust, Montague, Robertson, Turturro. **CSM**— Chen, Douglas, Elsalloukh, Kosmatov, Perkins, Sims, Tarasenko, Yanoviak. **EX OFFICIO**— Anderson, Bates, Ford, Rayaz, Williams.

Absent: **CAHSS**— Smith. **CE**— Moley. **CEIT**— Patangia. **CPS**— Gregg, Robinson. **CSM**— Davis. **EX OFFICIO**— Belcher,

I. Welcome & Roll Call

President Ford welcomed the Senate, noting the unusually full agenda of action items. The secretary called the roll.

II. Review of Minutes

There being no additions or corrections, a motion to accept the minutes as distributed carried on voice vote.

III Announcements

Ford announced that the Admission and Transfer Credit Committee will give us a report this year, following the Senate's instructions of last year. He will forward it to the Senate as soon as it comes.

Ford said that while we would normally recognize retiring faculty at this meeting, he intends to use the May 1, 2008, meeting of the University Assembly for that purpose.

About today's meeting, President Ford said he wanted to lead it "in an almost but not quite formal way." He has every intention of helping the body get to the end of the agenda but also does not want to repeat last month's marathon meeting. If necessary, the meeting will be recessed and resumed at a later date.

He expressed his intent to do everything he can to move the agenda along while still permitting thorough and thoughtful discussion and debate. He asked senators' to help by speaking as succinctly as possible and listening carefully to each other. He will be seeking comments from alternating pro and con positions on the motion on the floor, and will do

his best to follow Col. Robert's rule that no member of the body should speak twice to a matter before everyone else who wishes to speak has done so.

IV. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor spoke of recent significant budget developments. He has a meeting next week with the Planning and Finance Committee to discuss these matters.

He observed that all of us occasionally find ourselves in a place where our budget figures just don't work. In UALR's case, the anticipated revenue downturn will hit us for \$2.5M. Everyone's essentially in the same boat; some universities will be hurt a little more, some a little less. In summary, he said, the sky is not falling—we're not in a major budget crisis. It's going to call for some changes we won't like. Raises for next year are in doubt. One of our goals, he noted, was to raise faculty salaries to SREB 3 level. The last two years, we've headed in that direction, and the chancellor wishes we could keep the momentum this year. We had also anticipated we could do something about departmental maintenance budgets this year. It now looks like rather than our buttressing them, they may have to take a hit. We have other important needs, including information technology, safety, and lots of requests from academic units.

The chancellor said we've been directed to prepare three draft biennial budgets: modest increase, no increase, and 7% decrease.

Enrollment maintains its position of central importance to our funding. Ours has inched up, but it did so the last two years because of concurrent enrollment, that gives us numbers but not tuition dollars. He anticipates we may be down a few hundred students in the fall because of the changes we made last year to ratchet up our admissions standards.

He noted the administration decided to contribute an additional \$180,000 to cover increases in health insurance costs We're expecting to have to put \$235,000 to the same purpose in the coming year. We didn't hear about it because this will be the fifth year in a row we've covered those costs administratively, so that no employees have seen an increase in their insurance premiums. Also, as of April 1, classified employees will get merit raises under the new state performance evaluation system. Most will be realizing a 1.5 percent increase, some a few more. Promotion increments will be funded.

Looking ahead, the growing uncertainty about the economy suggests it's not a good time to be gambling much with budgets. We were surprised the Governor recommended such deep cuts at this stage, and we hope DFA's been unduly pessimistic. If they were, we can expect money to be restored to the budget; if they prove correct, we may be very glad for the Governor's prescience, and that we made the cuts now rather than later.

The chancellor added that he finds it personally frustrating and discouraging. We make progress each year, he said, moving this fine university forward, but we do it on a limited supply of resources. It's hard to take more cuts because they slow us down.

Acknowledging the FacFocus message sent out by Mary Anne Garnett about threatening students, the chancellor noted just some of the changes we've seen in recent years to our academic environment: the Buckley Amendment that makes grades private information, due process for students, student evaluations of faculty, ways we accommodate students with disabilities, assessment of

student learning outcomes, academic clemency, and federal financial aid changes. All that's preface to thinking about another change that's coming down the pike: student behavior in the classroom, and in particular, student incivility. He wants to suggest that we address this issue next year in a concerted way—perhaps by developing a code of classroom conduct that becomes part of every syllabus. We need to determine steps we can take to help faculty prepare for and deal with it when they must confront these kinds of problems.

He applauded the Senate for bringing forward for action two of the six strategies for student retention: midterm grades, and the proposed first-year experience courses. It appears to him these proposals have been well thought through, and that, particularly with the first-year experience proposal, there are good beginning steps in them. They may not deliver the all the goods yet, but he encouraged the Senate's affirmative vote on both these matters.

The chancellor told the Senate the provost is at the emeritus faculty lunch in the Stephens Center, having a good time. The announcement generated laughter and raspberries.

B. *Executive Director of Development Bob Denman*

Ford noted that Denman had requested 30 minutes on today's agenda, which seemed not to be desirable for either the Senate or Denman, under the circumstances. His presentation has been shifted to the University Assembly meeting May 1.

V. *Old Business*

A. MOTION. Senator Adjoa A. Aiyetoro (Second required; majority vote at one meeting)

Move to remove from the table the following motion: "The Faculty Senate, after further consideration of the five-year eligibility requirement to be nominated for a Faculty Excellence Award, recommends to the Chancellor that he reinstate the prior one-year eligibility requirement."

Robertson seconded. **Motion to remove from the table carried on voice vote.**

Sen. Aiyetoro presented the original motion, reminding the Senate of its history. Brief discussion followed.

The motion carried on show of hands.

B. MOTION. Sen. Pete Tschumi (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting.)

That the Faculty Senate approve the following motion.

Whereas the faculty as a whole are delegated responsibility for the curriculum by the Board of Trustees via the university's governance document, and

Whereas the Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock places primary responsibility for curriculum with the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the responsibility the Undergraduate Council has for issues that extend across multiple programs is restricted to reviewing and making recommendations to the Faculty Senate, and

Whereas the purpose of this legislative process is to create and foster transparency and to encourage broad, open debate of policy issues to ensure well-developed resolutions that

balance and take into account the full range of interest and concerns of all stakeholders, and

Whereas the change of the Fine Arts core courses from two credit hours to three credit hours affects the core requirements of all baccalaureate students, and

Whereas the Undergraduate Council failed in its duty to bring the issue before the Faculty Senate, thus violating the University Constitution,

Therefore the Faculty Senate rescinds the approval of the change from two credit hours to three credit hours with the understanding that the Faculty Senate is not directly concerned with the number of credit hours in the course but is concerned with the effect on the two core curriculums and how the changes affect a variety of majors.

Furthermore, the Faculty Senate encourages the various parties interested in causing this change to bring the issue back to the Faculty Senate when the issues have been broadly discussed and vetted by the campus as a whole and all concerns have been resolved.

Commentary: Basically both the Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council can approve policy issues that deal with a single program. However, any policy changes that effects multiple programs can only be approved by the Faculty Senate. As to the particular concern, this course change actually causes a core change for students in EIT majors and nursing majors.

Jovanovich seconded.

Tschumi then moved to separate the motion into B-1 and B-2 and substitute the two for the motion currently on the floor. Wright seconded. Copies were distributed. Motion carried.

Tschumi moved motion B-1; Jovanovich seconded. Tschumi said this motion attempts to distinguish what should and should not be brought forward from Undergraduate Council to the Faculty Senate for review.

Associate Vice Chancellor Hoffpauir was recognized and spoke against the motion because she sees the implementation as being problematic. She noted there had been recent discussion of having the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils send to the senators a timely summary of every action by the two bodies. She hopes we will do that. As the policy now stands, any action of the Councils can be referred to the Senate. If the actions of the Councils are made widely known, senators may bring up whatever they deem to need review.

Eshleman supported Hoffpauir's comment: we now have the power to review whatever we wish to review.

Cheatham spoke for the motion, saying we've changed our ways of operating without changing our ways of communicating. The system worked, she said, when our communication was through paper. There is, however, a limited window of time during which the Senate can act. Current policy makes actions of the Councils take effect ten days after they've been passed.

Sims spoke against the motion, finding its language still insufficiently clear.

Jovanovich spoke in favor. He understands that the intent of the motion is to restore the practice that has been in place for the last thirty years, and he believes it clarifies what we've been doing all along.

Aiyetoro asked if it's possible to amend this motion to say that before a council approves or disapproves an action that affects multiple colleges, the council will bring it first to the senate. Cheatham suggested that since our policy

delegates responsibility to the councils, this would be contrary to the Constitution.

Robertson spoke against the motion because it does not serve to clarify the issue of what should and should not come to the Senate.

Wright spoke for the motion, observing that our only current method of challenging decisions is by appeal, and through that route we can significantly delay matters—but shouldn't we err on the side of having more rather than less faculty review of important curricular matters?

Nickels commented that the attempt is worthy, but is coming from a single senator. He would like to see it referred to the councils in question for a recommendation. He thinks we're acting as a committee as a whole.

Nickels moved, Vinikas seconded, that this matter be referred to the appropriate committee. Following discussion, the motion to refer carried.

Tschumi moved, Jovanovich seconded, motion B-2, as follows.

MOTION B2. Pete Tschumi (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting.)

That the Faculty Senate, recognizing that the change in the three core Fine Arts courses from two hours to three hours affects the EIT core, determines that one of the following two actions must occur:

1. *The Undergraduate Council jointly with the EIT finds and approves a solution that is acceptable to EIT and does not require a change in the structure of the EIT core in which case the approving motions go together as one through the administrative channels for their action.*

or

2. *Either no acceptable solutions is found or the solution changes the structure of the EIT core in which case the issue must be brought to the Faculty Senate for resolution.*

Commentary: A great deal of effort has been made by faculty in EIT to develop a solution. This solution must move through the established democratic process before it will be known whether or not the issue will be resolved. This motion is meant to encourage to various parties to work to resolve the issue; however, if they cannot the senate recognizes its responsibility to make a decision.

After lengthy discussion, Cheatham proposed a **friendly amendment, accepted** by maker and seconder, to add to the first sentence, following its second comma, this phrase: "ratifies the action of the Undergraduate Council in establishing the three-hour classes, and".

Cheatham moved, and a second was recognized, to amend the motion such that motion B-2 remains in force only through the fall semester of 2008.

Wright moved to amend the amendment to urge Undergraduate Council to expedite the matter when EIT comes forward. **Motion died for lack of a second.**

Eshleman moved the question, Sims seconded. Motion for the question carried 30-4.

The president called for a **vote on the amendment to sunset motion B-1. Motion carried.**

Discussion on the motion as amended resumed.

Motion as amended carried 26-8

VI. New Business

C. MOTION. Executive Committee (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

Those applicants completing all requirements for various degrees in the Spring and Summer Semesters of 2008 at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock shall be approved for graduation.

Motion carried on voice vote.

The president recessed the meeting until 1:00 p.m. April 25.

The president reconvened the meeting at 1:07 p.m. on April 25, following a brief technical delay to ensure the availability of microphones to senators.

D. MOTION. Executive Committee (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

That a collegiate success program be implemented beginning in Fall, 2008 pursuant to admission policies approved in December, 2006, and legislation approved in May, 2004, for all first time entering students whose test scores indicate one or more developmental needs or whose admission decision requires additional preparation.*

Students needing developmental courses will enroll in prescribed developmental courses beginning in the first semester, and continue in additional developmental course work each semester until these courses are completed.

Additional prescriptive requirements may be established in order to improve the likelihood that the student will be successful. Such requirements shall be determined by the designated advisor and articulated in an enrollment agreement to be signed by the advisor and student.

The enrollment agreement may require the student to enroll in and complete a course designated as first year experience, be limited in credit hours per semester, have advisor's authorization to drop or add courses, or continue in prescribed coursework as deemed necessary by the advisor until the enrollment agreement has been successfully completed.

**First time entering students aged 25 or older whose test scores indicate placement in the Collegiate Success Program may be exempted from restricted enrollment upon approval of the Admission and Transfer of Credit Committee.*

Anson asked for clarification about format, and the body agreed for the secretary to make a silent correction to the format of the commentary. The motion was unchanged.

Associate Vice Chancellor Hoffpauir spoke for the motion, noting it requires that most students who need developmental courses take them in their first year, and get additional attention and support. She observed that it's modeled after the Donaghey Scholars Program. She underscored that the motion is intended to increase retention.

The motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

E. MOTION. Undergraduate Council. (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

Recognizing that performance evaluation as reflected in grades is a responsibility of faculty and that success for students in lower level courses may be enhanced by receiving midterm grades, that the policy on reports and examinations be amended as follows:

Reports and Examinations (Faculty Handbook – pages 7-9)

Grades are reported by faculty members to the Office of Admissions and Records on official report forms at times announced by the Office of Admissions and Records. Complete instructions for reporting grades are sent to each faculty member prior to the time for filing the grade report.

~~Although reporting midsemester grades is not required,~~ *Although reporting midsemester grades to administration is not required, [by amendment 04/25/08] the University Faculty Senate has established the policies that “any student has the right to an evaluation of his or her grade in a course prior to the end of the drop period and that faculty are expected to facilitate availability of grades to all students. In addition, faculty will report midterm grades for all semester-long 0 level, 1000 level and 2000 level courses offered during the fall and spring semesters.*

Each faculty member is expected to select appropriate times for the periodic ~~examinations~~ *evaluations [by friendly amendment, 04/25/08]* which are necessary or desirable during the course of the semester, but the complexities of an academic institution make it necessary that all faculty members comply with an orderly schedule of final examinations.

A copy of the final examination schedule is included as part of the printed schedule of classes, and each faculty member is required to use the specified schedule for final examinations. Whenever extreme circumstances make necessary a deviation from the announced schedule, clearance for such deviation must be obtained in advance from the appropriate department chairperson and dean.

Final examinations in summer term courses are given during the last scheduled class session.

Commentary: For many years research has shown that feedback on performance—particularly frequent and timely feedback—contributes significantly to student success. Reporting mid-term grades is a formal process that provides students with an evaluation of performance at a point in the semester when such information may increase the likelihood of their success. For this reason, all faculty are encouraged to provide mid-term grades for students.

Anson has some concern about the dates for midterm grades being set by an administrative office rather than by faculty. He is also concerned about the repeated reference to “examinations,” when grades may be based on methods of evaluation other than examinations.

Watts and Cheatham responded, with Cheatham noting that the indicated changes are made in existing policy. The rest of the policy exists, and changes in it are not at present being proposed.

A friendly amendment was accepted to change the word “examinations” in the second paragraph to “evaluations.”

Jovanovich spoke against the motion because of his reluctance to report midterm grades to administration and not just to students themselves.

English spoke in favor of the motion, believing midterm grades to be useful to students and likely to help with retention.

Tramel spoke to a question about the purpose of the motion, which he sees as enabling students to know where they stand.

Tschumi spoke, saying that professors who are giving students midterm grades are already doing what the motion proposes. This would require faculty to give midterm grades, which are not now required, in the courses specified by the motion..

Jovanovich moved, Bayrak seconded, to amend the motion to restore the struck phrase. and substitute “will inform students of midterm grades” for the “reporting midterm grades” part. Then changed it to “[a]lthough reporting midsemester grades to administration is not required...”

Jovanovich spoke for his motion to amend based primarily on concern about confidentiality between student and faculty.

A question was raised about what would appear in student transcripts. AVP Hoffpauir said midsemester grades absolutely would not appear on student transcripts under any circumstances.

Another senator expressed concern about the unintended consequences of putting out a single letter grade as a “midterm grade,” and finding that students believe they have a grade for half their work toward the course’s final grade.

AVP Hoffpauir observed that unless students are in EIT, they’re not being advised in disciplines but in University College. Academic advisors need to be able to explain what midterm grades mean, and to confer with students about what they need to do should they not get good midterm grades.

The amendment carried on show of hands.

With friendly amendments incorporated, the revised motion would make these changes in the second and third paragraphs of the section “Reports and Examinations” in the Faculty Handbook”

“Although reporting midsemester grades to administration is not required, the University Faculty Senate has established the policies that any student has the right to an evaluation of his or her grade in a course prior to the end of the drop period and that faculty are expected to facilitate availability of grades to all students. In addition, faculty will inform students of midterm grades for all semester-long 0 level, 1000 level and 2000 level courses offered during the fall and spring semesters.

“Each faculty member is expected to select appropriate times for the periodic evaluations which are necessary or desirable during the course of the semester, but the complexities of an academic institution make it necessary that all faculty members comply with an orderly schedule of final examinations.”

The motion carried on show of hands.

F. MOTION. Executive Committee (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

That beginning fall, 2010 all first time entering students will enroll in an approved first-year colloquium designed to facilitate their transition into the academic environment at UALR.

Under the oversight of the provost, implementation will begin in fall, 2008 on a phased-in basis. Because the goals of this new first-year colloquium are broader than the existing PEAW First-Year Experience, this legislation requires a modification of the course to become First Year Colloquium. During the fall, 2008, the Undergraduate Council will process needed curricular change forms.

During the two-year period of implementation, the provost or the provost's designee shall report to the Faculty Senate each semester on progress and problems so that this policy can be revised if experience in implementation shows a need to do so.

Commentary: An approach similar to this proposal has been used for many years in the freshman colloquium of the Donaghey Scholar's Program. This project will expand that concept for all first year students. Many universities require a similar course for first year students including UA Fayetteville, UCA, ASU, Hendrix and Lyon College. National research supports the value of first year colloquia in assimilating and retaining students. This course can mark a cornerstone for a student's progress toward degree completion.

First-Year Colloquia are small classes offered exclusively for first-year students, and it is anticipated they will be taught by some of our best faculty members. Opportunities for faculty engagement will be solicited. Some topics in colloquia may vary to reflect each instructor's expertise and to appeal to students, but each colloquium must include course objectives approved by the Undergraduate Council and reported to the Senate.

Beyond the important benefits to be gained by students from these courses and the anticipated increase in retention toward degree completion there are several additional ways to bring about positive change from which the university will benefit.

The Governor and other state officials, believing there is a critical need for more college graduates in Arkansas, have urged colleges and universities to improve student retention and graduation rates and have stated their intention to allocate a significant portion of future state funding of colleges and universities on the basis of improved student retention and graduation rates. Improved retention will likely bring additional state funding to UALR.

UALR's student retention and graduation rates compare unfavorably with all other public universities in Arkansas and also with peer group institutions. The improvement in graduation rates will reflect positively on the institution's image to a variety of constituents.

The Faculty Senate approved enhanced admission standards in 2006-07 to improve the quality of entering students. Every effort needs to be made to retain students who are qualified for regular admission.

Research shows that for beginning college students the first few weeks and months often determine whether a new student, either academically weak or strong, becomes an early drop-out or a successful degree completer. The First-Year Colloquium will enhance the likelihood that qualified students will become degree completers.

Anson spoke against the motion for reasons of straitened financial circumstances: he sees this as adding another course we can ill afford to staff. Carol Thompson, who has chaired the task force that developed the proposal, spoke for it, and specifically noted that the course will pay for itself, and that departments will not be asked to provide additional teaching or suffer any loss

of available revenue as a result of instituting this first-year experience course. She spoke to the need to help students with the transition to college and with developing their “academic voice” as students in higher education. She reminded the Senate of the chancellor’s figures, presented at the retention summit, that showed the significant returns to the university’s revenue for even minor increases in retention of students.

Eshleman expressed some skepticism about the assurances of no negative up-front financial effects on departments, and noted also that it seems odd to approve addition of a course to the curriculum without having course objectives.

Jovanovich expressed concern about requiring the course of all first-time, full-time students

A question was raised as to why the motion is coming from the Executive Committee rather than from the Undergraduate Council, since it is the body that oversees curriculum.

Cheatham responded that it was not possible to put all the pieces together in a timely way so as to come forward with “a course” which would go through the Council. The intent here was to create the enabling legislation that permits us to move forward, and that permits departments to tailor their own first-year experience courses as they deem appropriate. All will move through the normal curriculum review process.

After further discussion, Faust moved the question. Aiyetoro seconded.

Motion for the question carried on voice vote.

Motion carried on show of hands.

G. MOTION. Calendar and Scheduling Committee (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

The Calendar and Scheduling Committee moves the Academic Calendar for 2011-2012 as presented in Attachment G1.

Amy Barnes, chair of the committee, spoke to the proposal.

Nickels recalled the discussion at the end of last year on the calendar proposal at that time, specifically with reference to late registration dates and the difficulty of getting web-based courses off the ground when people register late and miss required activities. His concern is that the dates of late registration are “to be determined.” By whom and when?

The president took responsibility for having overlooked this matter before the item got on the agenda. He said Barnes had agreed to run for chair of Calendar and Scheduling in the coming academic year, and he charged her and the committee to return to this question and resolve it.

The Calendar Committee accepted as a friendly amendment a suggestion to strike the reference to late registration, and agreed to come back to the Senate with a proposal in the fall.

Motion, with the friendly amendment accepted by the Committee, carried on unanimous voice vote.

H. MOTIONS. Graduate Council (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

Motion 1. Special Topics Courses

A graduate special topics course with essentially the same content should not be offered more than three times. During the term in which such a course is taught for the second time, the department or program offering the course should prepare and submit a request for a new course to the college curriculum committee and the graduate council.

Anne Lindsay, chair of Graduate Council, spoke to the motion. Lindsay says she has recently learned that the motion might not have strictly speaking been required since the existing curriculum policy was meant to apply to both undergraduate and graduate curriculum policy. However, since it needs to be included in the Graduate Catalog, and since enforcement of the policy will have some value in recruitment of graduate students, it seemed wise to clarify the matter in this way.

Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

Motion 2. Transfer of Credit (pg 21 of 2007 Grad Catalog)

Graduate credit may be granted for equivalent courses from other institutions with approval of the appropriate program coordinator and the Dean of the Graduate School. Such credit may not exceed one half of the program requirements, exclusive of thesis or other exit project credits, must be no more than five years old at the time of transfer, and must have a letter grade of B or better.

Courses without letter grades (graded as credit, satisfactory, pass) must be accompanied by official evidence that such grades equated to a B or better at the institution at which they were earned. Accredited graduate programs usually accept transfer credits only from similarly accredited programs. Credit earned at virtual universities and for-profit universities will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Transfer grades are not computed as part of a student's GPA.

Individual programs may accept fewer transfer hours than the Graduate School maximum. Applications for transfer of credit for previous course work must be made and recorded within 12 months of admission to the UALR Graduate School. Credits accepted for transfer will be posted when the student's Application for Transfer has been approved and forwarded by the Dean of the Graduate School.

Lindsay clarified that the only changes proposed to existing policy are these: the word "maximum" was added to the first sentence of the final paragraph, as was the next full sentence. The intent is to get the credit transfers posted as soon as possible.

Friendly amendment by Anson accepted to add the sentence "In rare circumstances, appeals may be made to the Dean of the Graduate School regarding exceptions to the time limits" after the second sentence of the last paragraph.

Motion, with friendly amendment, carried on voice vote.

Motion 3. Graduation requirements

On page 23 of the 2007 Graduate Catalog, replace third paragraph of this section in the printed catalog with the following:

All requirements must be completed within seven consecutive calendar years for master's degrees and within ten consecutive calendar years for specialists and doctoral degrees from date of admission to the UALR Graduate School. Time lost for military service is excluded from the time requirements.

Lindsay spoke to the policy, noting that its intent is to reduce the number of exceptions currently going to the Dean of the Graduate School for individual decisions. The proposed change extends the times, respectively, from six and seven years to seven and ten years.

Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

I. MOTIONS. Tenure Committee (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

The University Committee on Tenure proposes that the following be included in the UALR Faculty Handbook, under the heading in Section 6, "UALR Criteria and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Promotion, and Awarding of Tenure" beginning with III (Roman numeral III under that heading), and replacing the current handbook text at III and IV with the following:

[See attachment I-2 for the 23-page motion.]

Commentary: Tenure Committee's Statement, delivered by Chair Gary Geissler

On behalf of the University Committee on Tenure, I would like to clearly communicate our rationale for moving forward with our promotion and tenure proposals, as follows:

1. We kept the faculty informed of our progress throughout this process. For example, I spoke at four Faculty Senate Meetings during this academic year.
2. We gathered extensive faculty input. The results from our faculty survey last Fall are strikingly similar to results from a previous survey and to concerns expressed in open meetings both conducted by the Faculty Roles & Rewards Task Force. We feel that we have effectively addressed those concerns in our proposals.
3. We presented and discussed our proposals at the last Faculty Senate Meeting.
4. We further vetted this document in a recent series of open meetings at three different locations across campus.
5. We have revised our document based on these open discussions.
6. We have also reformatted our document to clearly distinguish proposed promotion and tenure requirements from guidelines. We feel that both sections should be included in the Faculty Handbook.
7. We do not feel that delaying the process at this point would be beneficial. That is, those who are opposed to this document (and to change) will likely still be opposed to it in the Fall Semester. And, it is unlikely that faculty members will spend much time considering our proposals during the summer.
8. We feel that we have fulfilled our charge to the best of our abilities. We worked diligently on this project from the start.
9. We cannot control what the Faculty Senate or administration do with our work. We are open to amending our document, where appropriate. However, we do not feel that

it is our job to “sell” this document. Our job was to develop the best document that we could so that both our faculty and administrators recognize the benefits of adopting our proposals. That is, it should sell itself.

10. We strongly believe that adopting this document is in the best interest of the university.

Geissler thanked the faculty for their input and discussion throughout the process of examining tenure policies and procedures. He and the committee are very clear that our current tenure and promotion policies and procedures are seriously out of date. There is, he noted, “a grand total of 287 words of text in our current university policy dealing with these important topics.” The committee’s comparative study showed how our present policy fails to meet the standard of policies at other universities.

Geissler said the committee strongly supports the document before you, which includes policy, procedures, and guidelines. Geissler acknowledged the hard work of the sixteen committee members, and asked the members present to come to the front of the auditorium and join him: Jane Brown, Linda Holzer, Charlie Bolton, Ken Gallant, Mike Gealt, and Linda Pine did so.

The president suggested that the Senate look first at the bigger picture issues, and save line-by-line changes for later in the discussion.

Wright said he agrees with 75 to 90 percent of this document from the committee, and agrees that this proposal should move on—but noted that it’s equally important to adopt something that sticks. Wright asked, since the document contains both policy and procedures, and talks about what governance documents “shall” do, whether adoption of the proposed policy will impose requirements or limitations on departmental governance.

The parliamentarian suggested that the document stands outside the Senate’s exclusive responsibility. The Assembly constitution is our governance structure, and the Assembly has authority on six specific items. T & P is not one of them. On those issues, we can only recommend to the chancellor. Departmental governance documents have to be approved through the governance structure. Faculty do not unilaterally approve these matters on tenure and promotion policy, which must conform to Board policy 405.1.

Gallant said this document does have to go up the line for adoption. When it is adopted, the answer is undeniably “yes”; it will become part of our governance structure.

Tschumi underscored the notion that we do have legislative authority over our governance documents, but we do not have singular authority over tenure and promotion policy. He reinforced that our actions on promotion and tenure are only recommendations.

Gallant says he is fairly confident this document does not go beyond tenure and promotion recommendations, and does not change the governance structure.

Jovanovich believes the document is too specific in telling departments what they must do. He gave as an example the limitation set by this document that only tenured faculty members may be part of the tenure committee; different schools may have different ideas about how departmental tenure and promotion committees should be comprised.

Anson asked that we end the discussion of broader issues and go through the document line by line. The question was raised as to whether we have any reading on the administration’s reaction to the proposal. President Ford and

Vice President Ramsey both spoke to the provost's expressed opinion that a careful look at our universitywide policies on promotion and tenure is overdue, and that he looks forward to the Senate's recommendation.

There was considerable discussion about how to move through a large and detailed document.

Motion by Wright, seconded Tramel, to amend the committee's morion. (The motion to amend was presented in writing to senators.)

Watts moved, English seconded, to table the amendment. Motion to table passed on voice vote. Watts's effort was to delay action on the amendment until senators have had time to read it. Consternation followed, with the question of whether the Senate could proceed to debate the Tenure Committee's motion. The parliamentarian declared that the entire matter had been laid on the table and could not be discussed until there was a motion to remove it from the table. Faust called a point of order, asking that the parliamentarian consult the rules of order, since it appeared to her that the committee's motion had not been laid on the table; what was tabled was rather a motion to amend it. The parliamentarian conceded the point of order, and discussion proceeded.

Following some discussion of how to do a straw poll or otherwise acquire a nonbinding sense of where the bulk of opinion is in the Senate, **Ramsey moved, Anson seconded, that it is the sense of the Senate the the body endorses the fundamental principles embodied in the proposed document.**

Jovanovich objected to the motion, indicating that he had many amendments to offer, and that the only reasonable course of action is to proceed with line-by-line review.

Amrhein noted that there have been multiple opportunities to offer specific changes.

The motion carried on voice voic.

The president recessed the meeting until 1:00 p.m. on May 2.

The president reconvened the meeting at 1:10 p.m., May 2.

The president suggested moving through the document one page at a time, with all senators who have amendments to propose bringing them up as they apply. Having seated the Tenure and Promotion Committee at the front of the room, the president asked that the committee be given the option of accepting senators' amendments as friendly. If they are not accepted by the committee, we will proceed to discussion and vote on each proposed amendment to the motion.

Jovanovich objected to the process by which the Tenure Committee's proposal was developed, and Robertson quickly raised a point of order, asserting that Jovanovich's issue was not germane to the motion on the floor. The chair moved on.

After some discussion of how to proceed, the chair indicated that he will exercise his power to try to move the discussion along expeditiously, including calling alternately for speakers with position pro and con on the morion then on the floor, and not returning to previous speakers until all who wish to speak have spoken.

Eshleman proposed a friendly amendment to Section 1, III.A.1 to the following : "that standards be set for faculty demanding high performance in

teaching, scholarship, and service.” **Friendly amendment accepted by the Committee.**

Jovanovich moved to amend by adding the word “member” after “faculty” where it appears in Section 1, .III.B. Friendly amendment rejected. Moved Jovanovich, seconded Wright. **Motion to amend carried on show of hands.**

Nickels moved, Tramel seconded, to replace the word “faculty” with the words “faculty member” or “faculty members” where appropriate throughout the document. **Motion to amend carried on voice vote.**

Jovanovich moved to amend III.C. by adding the following words to the end of the sentence: “as well as evidence of potential for sustained future accomplishment over an entire career.” Seconded Anson. Brief discussion followed. **Motion to amend carried 12-10.**

Jovanovich moved to amend section III.E adding to the end of the sentence the phrase “but departments also may choose to include other groups, e.g., nontenured faculty members, staff members, students, and nontenured administrators in the process.” Perkins seconded.

The committee rejected the amendment as a friendly one, since their clear intent was to make tenure and promotion a peer review process. It intentionally excludes other participants than tenured or tenure-track faculty.

After brief discussion, **the motion to amend failed.**

Jovanovich moved to amend Section III.G by deleting the last sentence: “When there is a conflict, the higher-level policy will be enforced.” **Tschumi seconded.**

Question asked: Isn’t this a given? Tschumi noted there is in Board policy language that says in the instance of new Board policy, existing documents with earlier policies remain in effect until they come forward for revision. Tschumi said he seconded the motion to amend in order to be sure that point was raised and discussed.

Jovanovich’s concern is changing the rules on a candidate midstream. Other senators expressed their opinion that such would not be the effect of this language in the proposal.

After considerable discussion, **the motion failed.**

Wright moved, Faust seconded, to remove from the table his previous motion (starts on page 2 of the handout). **Motion to remove from the table carried.**

Wright spoke to the original motion, which contains in its last paragraph reference to how documents should be changed when substantial changes to higher level policies occur. The intent of the motion to amend is to move the parts of the original motion that are essentially procedures out of the policy section of the document. There is a deletion in the section that defines the college review committee because as written, Wright believes it would prevent faculty members in his department from ever being able to serve on the college-level review committee.

The committee was asked to speak to each paragraph of the motion to amend. Geissler said the question of what’s policy and what’s procedure is debatable and not easily resolved. He also noted the change of period from five

years to ten years for review of departmental governance documents. He said the committee was confused by the third paragraph.

After considerably more discussion, **the motion to amend failed.**

Wright moved, Faust seconded, to amend section III.G by adding the paragraph beginning “whenever a substantive change in a higher-level policy occurs or whenever a change in ...”

Jovanovich moved to amend the amendment by striking the sentence containing the term “ten year.” **Motion died for lack of a second.**

The committee could not accept the ten-year review cycle

By friendly amendment, the last sentence was deleted.

The mover and seconder **accepted a friendly amendment** to change the period for departmental review from ten to seven years. Mover and seconder accepted a friendly amendment to move the sentence beginning “The college dean” to the end of the paragraph.

Motion to amend carried on show of hands.

Jovanovich moved to amend III.H by deleting the words “by a faculty process with a parallel administrative evaluation.” **Committee offered to amend its proposal to read** “The evaluation of applicants shall be performed by a faculty and administrative process at the department, college, and university levels.” This was acceptable to Jovanovich and brought applause from the Senate.

Jovanovich moved to amend III.J to delete the words “promotion and/or.” **Accepted as friendly by the committee.**

In the same section, the committee **accepted a friendly amendment** as follows: “The process shall allow for faculty application for tenure.”

Friendly amendment proposed by Nickels to add the sentence to I “The university will comply with the FMLA of 1993,” and to delete Section K. **Not accepted** by the Tenure Committee.

Robertson reminded the Senate about our capacity to make a record in these minutes of our concerns which will accompany our recommendations to the chancellor about tenure and promotions policy.

Robertson moved, Ramsey seconded, that it is the sense of the Senate that there is concern about the language in section III.K. **Motion carried on voice vote.**

Jovanovich moved to amend III.L to delete the words “positive or.” Committee did not accept it as friendly. **Wright seconded.**

The committee’s intent was to be sure that positive feedback as well as negative feedback is communicated to the applicant. The other side’s argument is for useful transparency; that is, the applicant need only respond to negative feedback.

Jovanovich accepted a friendly amendment from Cheatham as follows: “The applicant will be informed in writing of progress throughout the formal application procedure.”

After considerable discussion, **the motion to amend failed.**

Cheatham offered as a friendly amendment the preceding. **Friendly amendment accepted by the committee.**

The committee accepted as friendly an amendment that would change all references to “candidate” or “candidates” for tenure to “applicant” or “applicants” where appropriate.

Wright moved to replace all of section N with this language: “Tenure may be denied for conduct which would be grounds for dismissal per Board policy 405.1, section IV.c.”

The committee accepted as friendly an amendment that deletes the clause “which would...with tenure.”

Wright happily withdrew his motion to amend.

Friendly amendment from Robertson accepted by the committee to substitute the phrase “may also be” for “may be” in the first sentence of III.N.

Jovanovich moved to amend III.N by deleting it. Died for want of a second.

Jovanovich moved to delete III.P. Wright seconded.

Robertson spoke against the motion to amend, citing, among other things, AAUP standards.

Motion to amend carried on show of hands.

Robertson moved to amend by substituting his motions for IV. A. 1., 2., and 3. The first amendment applies to section A.1, and replaces the words “candidate at the time of employment” with “faculty member at the beginning of the employment.”

Accepted by the Committee as friendly.

His amendment to IV.A.2 would strike “The standards become fixed as of” and substitute “Any,” and adding at the end of the sentence “shall be agreed upon by the faculty member and the Chair.” His purpose is to insure that changes not be made to requirements unless both the applicant and the department chair agree.

Discussion was extensive and somewhat confusing. Some floor negotiation eventually resulted in this proposal as a substitute for the sentence in question: “In order for any changes made after the last probationary review prior to coming up for tenure to apply to the applicant, the applicant must accept those changes.” **Accepted as a friendly amendment to IV.A.2.** by the committee.

Moved by Jovanovich, seonded by Marian Douglas, an amendment which would add the following after the first sentence of IV.A.2: “An applicant is subject to the written criteria in effect at the time of hire unless the application for tenure includes a written request to be evaluated according to newer approved criteria. Regardless, the applicable written criteria shall be included in the application.”

In discussion, the question became which of these two—the committee’s original language or the language of the motion to amend—is friendlier to the faculty member who is applying for tenure. One difference is in the timing of the applicant’s acceptance of changes or request to be subject to newer criteria.

Robertson's limits such changes to the middle of the pretenure period. Jovanovich's amendment permits changes at whatever time the applicant likes.

Cheatham asked for a sense of the Senate that while we debate these two options, it is our intent to protect the applicant from capricious or other modifications in what's required for tenure. **There was unanimous concurrence in this sense of the Senate.**

Nickels moved the question; Watts seconded. Motion for the question carried.

Motion to amend carried on show of hands.

Robertson moved to amend IV.A.3. "These written criteria shall constitute the primary criteria for promotion and tenure that will be applied by all persons in the process." **Accepted as friendly by the committee.**

Anson moved to amend the motion by restoring the original proposal's section IV.A.3. Cheatham seconded.

Gallant noted that the committee was not in consensus about this provision, though the majority supported the language "sole." He spoke in favor of the motion to amend.

Robertson, Wright, and others spoke against.

Anson spoke for. Again, the arguments were based on what people judged to offer the best protection for candidates.

Motion to amend failed on show of hands.

Motion to recess until 1:00 May 9, 2008.. Seconded. Carried.

The president reconvened the meeting at 1:09 p.m., May 9, 2008.

Ramsey moved to divide the question by Roman numerals. Ramsey. Wright seconded. Tschumi suggested we might be better off without having a motion to divide at this stage, but rather wait until we've finished our work today, and then move to divide at the close of the last section we've worked through.

Ramsey moved approval of section III, as amended. Seconded by Wright. Approved unanimously by voice vote.

Moved Eshleman, seconded Sims, to amend IV.A.4 to read as follows:

4. Although there should be balance in teaching, scholarship, and service, not all faculty members will contribute equally in each area due to personal strengths, opportunities, the stage of their career, or the nature of their appointment. All probationary faculty members must strive for some achievements across the three categories; however, tenured faculty may choose to emphasize a given area at different stages of their careers with the approval of a chair or director and dean. A faculty member with a non-teaching appointment or an appointment with diminished teaching duties shall be judged according to the relevant measures of professional performance.

Accepted by the committee as friendly.

Moved Jovanovich, seconded Tschumi, to amend IV.A.4 by replacing the first paragraph with the following language: "Although the work of faculty

members can be classified as teaching, scholarship, or service, not all faculty members will contribute equally in each area due to personal strengths, opportunities, the stage of their career, or the nature of their appointment. All probationary faculty members must demonstrate competence as teachers and scholars; however, tenured faculty members may choose to emphasize a given area at different stages of their careers. A faculty member with a nonteaching appointment shall be judged according to relevant measures of professional performance," and by deleting the last two sentences from the third paragraph

After brief discussion, the **motion to amend failed.**

Moved by Eshleman to amend IV.A.6 by replacing it with the following words, described by the maker as "weaker": "6. Student evaluations, if considered, shall not serve as the sole measure of teaching quality." **Accepted as friendly by the committee.**

Aiyetoro moved to amend, seconded Tramel, to restore the original word "predominant" to section IV. A.6. **Accepted as friendly by the committee.**

Section IV.A.6 in the main motion now reads "Student evaluations, if considered, shall not serve as the predominant measure of teaching quality."

Ramsey moved, seconded Vinikas, to amend Section IV.A.6 to read as follows: "6. Student evaluations, if considered, shall not serve as the sole measure of teaching quality.

Eshleman spoke for the motion, based on how important it is to leave in the hands of the department the methods for evaluating teaching. The committee's original language was actually more restrictive from the point of view of departments, a problem that can be especially difficult for small faculties with few senior members.

Bunch spoke against the amendment, wishing to limit departments' ability to rely heavily on student evaluations because of the well-documented frequency with which student evaluations reflect gender bias.

Further discussion came from faculty on both sides of the motion to amend.

Motion to amend passed on show of hands.

Jovanovich moved, Ramsey seconded, to amend IV.A.9 to read as follows "Research Scholarship or its equivalent in the creative and performing arts is expected of all tenure-track and tenured faculty members whose teaching loads are less than 12 Instructional Units per semester at UALR, as well as all research faculty, scientists, and scholars."

Jovanovich spoke for the motion to amend, citing the obvious concern that faculty members teaching twelve hours are engaged full-time in meeting those responsibilities. People teaching four courses a semester, he said, should not be expected also to do scholarship.

Holzer spoke against the motion since the term "instructional units" is not synonymous with "teaching load."

Ramsey spoke in favor of the motion, reiterating that anyone expected to teach four courses a semester should not be expected to do research or creative work.

Eshleman spoke against the motion, supporting the intent of the original language to require that everyone awarded tenure must also be contributing to research or creative endeavor.

Jovanovich spoke for the motion again.

Wright spoke against the motion, suggesting that to adopt it would unintentionally give sanction to the administration should it wish to keep assigning teaching duties such that faculty members find it difficult to do their research or service.

Robertson spoke against the motion as well.

Jovanovich spoke for the motion.

Chen spoke against the motion, yet again underscoring the importance of scholarship to the university.

Cheatham asked about the terms “scientists” and “scholars” noting that they do not appear in current board policy. Accepted a friendly amendment to the end of the last sentence of his motion to replace the words “scientists, and scholars” with the word “members.”

Jovanovich spoke in favor of his motion in what he hoped was the final time, but more discussion followed. Bolton, a member of the Tenure Committee, was recognized, and said that it seemed to him such an amendment is targeted at policies not central to tenure and promotion policy. His comments were in opposition to the motion.

Motion to amend failed on voice vote.

The committee **accepted a friendly amendment** to change the first word to “Scholarship” and to replace the last three words in the section with the word “members.” **Also accepted as friendly** to delete the word “positively” in section IV A.10.

Moved Jovanovich, seconded Ramsey, to amend IV.A.11 as follows:

“Research, scholarly and creative accomplishments outside the fields defined by primary teaching responsibilities are permissible and should be rewarded. as long as they are in the discipline or interdisciplinary purview of the faculty member.”

The committee agreed to accept a friendly amendment to delete IV.A.11.

Ramsey withdrew his second, and the motion to amend died for want of a second.

Jovanovich moved, Wright seconded, to delete section IV.A.12.

Show of hands tied, and the president voted against the motion. **Motion to amend failed.**

Moved Ramsey, seconded Robertson, to adopt section IV as amended. **Motion passed unanimously on voice vote.**

Wright moved, Jovanovich seconded, to amend section V by deleting section V.A. Accepted as friendly by the committee.

Wright moved, Sims seconded, to amend V.B by replacing “letters of offer” to “notice of appointment.” **Accepted by the committee as friendly.**

Friendly amendment accepted by the committee to add the words “for the individual appointed” to the end of V.B.

Moved Wright to replace section V.D as follows:

D. A mid-tenure review by the departmental promotion and tenure review committee (DRC), the department chair or director (or dean, if the college does not have a department structure), and the dean shall be mandatory. The mid-tenure review shall be completed before May 15 and communicated to the faculty member. Failure to conduct the review shall be grounds for appeal from a negative tenure decision. The amendment was **accepted as friendly by the committee.**

Moved Wright, seconded Cheatham, to delete section V.F.

The committee asked if deletion of this section would not put some faculty at risk?

Wright argued that we do not have a clear definition for joint appointments, which makes this

Accepted as friendly by the committee.

Wright moved to delete V. L and replace V.G with the following:

V. G. Departmental Review Committee (DRC)

All academic units shall have a department-level promotion and tenure review committee (DRC). It is imperative that a DRC have at least half its membership from its own academic unit faculty. If there are only one or two faculty members within the academic unit eligible to serve on the DRC (see section V. I), then only one outside member shall be selected. Otherwise, the DRC shall have a minimum of three members. In the event that there are insufficient, qualified faculty members to serve on a DRC, the academic unit governance process should define a mechanism for replacement. If there is no mechanism for replacement, the academic unit faculty, in consultation with the academic unit chair, will provide the college Dean with a list of at least four names, from which the college Dean will select the remaining members. If possible, the chair of the DRC must be a member of the academic unit.

Wright noted that he will move the change to section V. I. referred to in the motion.

The committee asked is Wright would accept the word “tenured” in the third sentence of his motion. He did. We are overcome with friendliness.

Wright’s motion to amend is accepted as friendly, including the committee’s own change.

Wright moved to delete V.H and replace it with the following:

V. H. College Review Committee (CRC)

A college or school may develop written criteria, policies, and procedures for promotion and tenure through its governance structure. Such criteria may include a college-level promotion and tenure review committee (CRC), which will advise the college Dean on recommendations about reappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure. Such a committee must have a minimum of three members, each of which must represent a different academic unit within the college. If the college procedures provide for more committee members than the college has academic units, any academic unit may have more than one representative. The CRC shall elect its chair from its members. In the event that there are insufficient, qualified faculty members (see section V. I) to serve on a CRC, the college or school governance process should

define a mechanism for replacement. If there is not mechanism for replacement, the college or school faculty will provide the college Dean with a list of at least four names, from which the college Dean will select the remaining members.

Colleges shall have procedures ensuring that a faculty member abstain from vote on a CRC if a candidate from his or her own academic unit is undergoing review and the faculty member on the CRC has served on the DRC in reviewing or providing recommendations about nonreappointment, promotion, or the conferral of tenure for the candidate. No faculty member may vote in the same case as a member of both the DRC and the CRC.

It is the responsibility of members of the CRC to act in the interest of the college in general. Members of the CRC do not serve on that body to represent the interests fo their home departments in supporting or opposing the case of any faculty member under consideration by the CRC.

Wright noted that what was included in the fourth paragraph of the committee's original proposal will be moved in a later motion.

The committee accepted Wright's motion as friendly.

Tschumi questioned the word "school," noting that we don't typically have academic units within schools at this university. The chair pointed out that the language is permissive rather than prescriptive.

Jovanovich moved to strike the last paragraph from V. H. Accepted as friendly by the committee.

Wright moved to replace V.I with the following:

Eligibility to serve on promotion and tenure review.

Only tenured faculty members and administrators who hold tenure shall serve on a DRC or CRC in the tenure review process. 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 an academic unit chair, academic unit director, college dean, associate dean, or assistant dean, may serve on a DRC or CRC in reviewing anycase for which he or she has or had responsibility for participating in administrative review within a given academic year.

Accepted by the committee as friendly.

One issue remained unresolved since it was not specifically contemplated by the Tenure Committee in their original document: it is not clear whether someone who was an administrator participating in an administrative review and later steps down could participate as a faculty member on either DRCs or CRCs once she or he had stepped down.

Wright moved to delete V. J.

Accepted by the committee as friendly. Tramel was concerned about how a small department will populate review committees. There was significant discussion, referring back to the language of V.G., and the clear sense of the Senate is that the language includes no prohibition against selecting tenured faculty members from wherever a department can find them.

Wright moved to delete K. Jovanovich seconded.

Believes all the issues have been covered in other sections of the document and that no additional structure is needed to cover external reviews.

Accepted by the committee as friendly.

Jovanovich moved to amend V. M. to add the words “applicant and” before the words “department chair.”

Accepted by the committee as friendly.

Wright moved, Elsalloukh seconded, to replace V.N with the following:

"All levels of committees that act on promotion or tenure shall report the decision (recommend or not recommend), which is then forwarded to the next level of review. The report shall include the names of the committee members, with a notation of who are absent for the decision or who are required to abstain from the vote."

Wright put the amendment on the floor even though he does not personally have strong feelings about it.

The original language requires a vote tally, and the committee arrived at it by looking at the practices of other universities.

Ramsey, Jovanovich, and Robertson spoke for the amendment. Robertson believes the whole notion of “tally” is irrelevant. Many departments work hard to reach consensus, and the original language might be taken as discouraging that as a form of decision making.

Gealt, a committee member, spoke against the motion, having had the experience of divided committees.

Motion to amend carried on voice vote.

With regard to section V.O, Cheatham noted that the language of our policies does not speak to a process for rebuttal, and questioned whether this is meant to refer to the candidate’s appeal of a negative decision. The committee spoke to this provision as clarifying the applicant’s “opportunity for rebuttal” **Accepted as friendly by the committee.**

The committee **accepted a friendly amentment** to delete the word “including the vote referenced above” from the first sentence of V.O.

Ramsey moved, Wright seconded, the acceptance of section V as proposed and amended. Carried unanimously on voice vote.

Jovanovich moved to suspend the rules to introduce a resolution having to do with trees. Tschumi seconded. **Motion carried on show of hands.**

Jovanovich moved that we endorse the recommendation of the Environmental Impact Committee regarding the tree-cutting plans for the summer of 2008 for creating a new parking lot in connection with the new EIT building.

Motion carried on voice vote.

Motion to amend VI.A as follows: Change the last phrase from "faculty member's promotion or tenure appointment." to "faculty member's promotion and/or tenure applications."

Accepted by the committee as friendly.

Wright moved, Aiyetoro seconded, to amend VI. A as follows: in the first sentence, delete "both the faculty member and".

Wright's argument was that it is an administrative responsibility rather than a faculty member's responsibility, and further, that if the intent is to enforce the provision by, say, subsequently denying the tenure or promotion application, the language should be struck in either case.

The committee said they did intend to instruct applicants to maintain documentation, and that not doing so could indeed affect later decisions.

Bolton spoke against the motion to amend, saying an expectation that applicants maintain documentation is necessary to their application.

Aiyetoro believes that earlier sections that speak to the applicant's responsibility for putting together application materials cover this matter adequately.

Eshleman offered alternative language intended to clarify, to no avail.

Robertson spoke for the amendment, as did Ramsey and others.

Motion carried on voice vote.

Jovanovich moved to amend VI. D so that it's clear the report of the DRC goes to the applicant and not just to the chair. **Accepted by the committee as friendly.**

"Decision" to replace "vote" in VI. D. **accepted as friendly by the committee.**

Jovanovich proposed the same changes to VI. F. as to VI. D.

Accepted as friendly by the committee.

It is the sense of the Senate that if minority reports exist, they shall also be communicated to the applicant.

Ramsey moved, Robertson seconded, the acceptance of section VI as amended.

Nickels moved to amend the motion on the floor to exclude section VI. K. Seconded Jovanovich.

Wright spoke against the amendment, observing that subsection K does show some support, at least for the most stubborn of applicants.

The motion to amend failed on voice vote.

The main motion to accept section VI as amended carried unanimously on voice vote.

Ramsey moved, English seconded, that it is the sense of the Senate to accept the principles put forth in Section 2 of the Tenure Committee's motion.

Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

Robertson moved to amend Section 2, VII.C to add a new number 1 to the list:

"Administrative duties such as chair, director, and program coordinator."

Accepted as friendly by the committee.

Wright moved, Jovanovich seconded, the amendment of Section 2, VII, first paragraph, to strike the last full sentence, beginning, "Also, departments should support..."

Wright observed that the proposal is very clear in an earlier section that the application document is confidential, and further, that the application document is the intellectual property of the applicant and is not ours to take.

Holzer spoke for the committee, saying that its intent was benign and helpful, and was in no way intended to coerce faculty members into giving up their intellectual property against their will.

Committee accepted as friendly an amendment adding the words “with the permission of previous applicants” to the end of the last sentence of the paragraph. Wright withdrew his motion.

Wright moved to amend Section 2, VII.B, the first two sentences of the third paragraph as follows: “Only externally peer-reviewed scholarly activities should be accepted in the assessment of scholarship for promotion or tenure. The character of peer review is unique to disciplines....”

Robertson spoke against the amendment as being unduly restrictive of departmental judgment about what constitutes acceptable scholarship.

Quorum was called. Failing a quorum, the president adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m. on May 9, 2008.