UALR FACULTY SENATE

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK
Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, May 7, 2010, 1:00 p.m.
Richardson Court, Stephens Center

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Anson, Bailey, Clausen, English, Eshleman, Giammo, Groesbeck, Ramsey, Yoder. *CB*— Edison, Nickels, Watts. *CE*— Hayn, Hughes, Pack. *CEIT*— Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. *LAW*— Fitzhugh. *LIBRARY*— Russ. *CPS*— Driskill, Faust, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. *CSM*— Douglas, Kosmatov, Guellich, McMillan, Prince, Tarasenko, Yanoviak., *EX OFFICIO*— Anderson, Belcher, Ford, Williams.

Absent: CAHSS— Amrhein, Chapman, Garnett, Vinikas, Webb. *CB*—Holland. *CE*— Bandre, Kuykendall. *CEIT*— Chan. *LAW*— Aiyetoro, Goldner. *CPS*— Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Rhodes. *CSM*— Chen, Perkins, Seigar, Sims, Thompson, Wright. *EX OFFICIO*— Davis, Smith.

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 April 16, 2010, meeting of the Senate were reviewed and approved on unanimous voice vote.

III. Announcements

Ford announced that the Chancellor has given his final approval to the universitywide policy on promotion and tenure, the culmination of more than two years' work by the Faculty Senate and the administration.

Ford thanked the Senate for the opportunity to serve it as president for two terms, and also generously thanked the members of the Senate's executive committee, and all those who led the Senate's work through committees and councils.

IV. Introduction of new topics

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

Ramsey thinks it would be a wonderful policy at UALR for all administrators with faculty standing to teach. He said this idea isn't at all about thinking the provost and chancellor, say, haven't enough to do, acknowledging that he couldn't keep up with either of them.

Marian Douglas is curious about how many times students may retake a course. She asked if AHSS has a policy, and on hearing yeses and seeing nods around the room, asked how she

might get that information. She got several private answers, and senators are reminded they may send messages or inquiries to the entire Senate simply by sending mail to facultysenate@ualr.edu, the Senate's listserv.

Robertson observed that one issue we have every year is people willing to put their names on committees but unwilling to work. He suggested that committee volunteers need encouragement. If we know people on our faculties who are to serve on committees in the coming year, Robertson urges us to take a little time to talk with them and encourage them to be serious about their work.

At some future point, he said, we may need to consider how to confront nonperformance and replace committee members who do not participate in the work. Faust reiterated one of Ford's themes: we must find ways to be sure good work on committees gets formally acknowledged to department chairs and deans.

Russ had an important reminder from the Library: If you have graduate students who will not be taking courses this summer, but are working on their theses or dissertations, be sure you've signed off on their off-campus data-base access for the summer. Some department chairs leave that responsibility to advising faculty members.

V. Progress report on "Rethinking the Bachelor's Degree

Ford had hoped he and the provost would be able to announce the composition of the working group that will lead the process of rethinking the bachelor's degree next year. He said they aren't quite there yet, but will be by the time the semester ends. He again noted how pleased he was with the excellent slate of nominees.

VI. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor said again he thinks it's been a very good year. He thanked us, observing that circumstances were such that anyone who wanted to make it a not-so-good year would have been able to do so.

He had a couple of pieces of news he said are not so good to hear, but they're matters that are consequential to UALR and all of us who work here.

Monday, the governor announced a $4.1M projected shortfall in state revenue for this fiscal year. Fortunately, he decided to use a portion of the state's rainy-day fund to shield agencies from budget cuts. This down-tick in revenue projections, the chancellor said, serves to make us a little more anxious than we were about future revenue. He did note that Richard Weiss, director of the Department of Finance and Administration for the state, said he was a bit encouraged, in that Individual tax withholding is up and a couple of other indicators seem positive.

The chancellor confirmed a 2% pool of funds for merit increases for nonclassified employess and for completion of the planned adjustments to classified employees' compensation.

Other news: graduation rates were reported in Saturday's paper. The UALR figure, he said "is a standout any way you look at it" because ours is far and away the worst of all the numbers, which ranged from a high of 57% to our low of 14.3% He does have some criticism of the methodology of calculating retention rates, which uses assumptions based on the old model that the path to a degree is for people to graduate from high school in May, go to college in August, and emerge four years later, degree in hand. That does not describe a majority of our students.

However, five years ago, our retention rate was 25.4%. It has fallen 40%, while our goal was to improve it by 20%. We've got to acknowledge, the chancellor said, that we have fallen far short of acceptable performance on this. There seems to be some kind of disconnect between the caliber of university we have here, which is attested to in so many ways, and the graduation rate. We don't need to wring out hands, he said, but we do need to take some action.

He sees us as a high-tech institution, but perhaps not as a high-touch institution. This costs us in terms of student retention and graduation. We all know we have challenges related to the demographics of our students, but the fact is that if we don't do something about our graduation rate, it's going to seriously harm us. His fear is that policy makers will nod, and say, yes, you have nontraditional students, part-time students, we understand—and then go right on to make policies that follow the traditional approach and are not good for us. There are things we can do—and by and large we know what they are. We're doing a number of them now including mandatory orientation, midterm grades, FYE courses, on-campus housing, and others. The chancellor thinks they should have helped already, though it is not yet apparent that they have..

He closed by saying that whatever the challenges, we have now time to celebrate the grand event of graduation.

B. Provost Belcher

The provost voiced his support for the report of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force II. The full-time non-tenure-track faculty here are important, he said, and we should acknowledge that better than we do. He did say it is worth noting that the report from the task force leaves much to the departments, as should be the case.

The provost called our attention to his two recent e-mails seeking input into the strategic planning process updating *UALR Fast Forward.*

It's been a difficult, challenging, good year, the provost said. We have a lot to be proud of.

The provost acknowledged the four years Richard Ford has been Assemby and Senate president, praising his accomplishments during that tenure and recognizing what has been a productive partnership between faculty and administration.

The provost did note that he "almost made Fred Williams cry when I told him Ford is going on OCDA in the fall," which means Williams will still be the acting immediate past president of the Assembly, extending even further what has no doubt seemed a nearly endless term.

VII. Old Business

The motion to accept the report of Roles and Rewards Task Force II had been postponed from last month's agenda. Sen. McMillan, on behalf of the Task Force, introduced a substitute motion.

Substitute 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 A.

McMillan made the motion, and turned the floor over to Catherine Lowry, who chaired the task force. She thanked the Senate for the suggestions that surfaced at the last meeting three weeks ago. The task force went back and revisited the document, improving the flow and the readability, she said.

They added a section on general principles, on page 2. These are drawn from existing policy. The document now speaks to teaching, administrative service, and professional development. The matter of appeal is now covered in the general principles section, as it is covered already by existing policy.

Q from Edison: What's meant by "matters that pertain to them" in reference to the provision encouraging that full-time, non-tenure-track (FT-NTT) faculty be permitted to vote on all such matters. *A from Lowry:* That's entirely up to departments through their governance documents.

Q from Clausen: Would it be reasonable to assume that since promotion and tenure don't pertain to them, they would not vote on those matters? *A from Ford:* The university policy on tenure and promotion addresses that, as must each department's T&P document.

Edison offered a friendly amendment to delete the last sentence on page 4. It was not accepted. **Edison moved, Anson seconded, that the last sentence on page 4 be deleted.**

Ramsey spoke for the motion. If the first section is sincerely meant, he said, this statement is not necessary.

Speaking against the motion, Tschumi reminded us that this matter came up last time, and Goldner was particularly eloquent in defending the recommendation. Tschumi said this sentence in no way binds the colleges or departments. He gave an example of one department that once had a single tenured professor and all the rest were FT-NTT faculty. All the statement does is encourage colleges and departments to think clearly about fairness and what is the right thing to do.

Hughes understands the ambiguity of the last sentence, having been both FT-NTT and now a tenure-track faculty member. Would be stronger, perhaps, if it said "encourage"?

Anson spoke for the motion. He doesn't like that the sentence seems to suggest that this is appropriate for all departments.

The amendment failed on show of hands.

Discussion returned to the substitute motion on the floor.

Q from Ramsey: Has thought been given to phasing in the grandfathering of long-serving FT-NTT faculty? *A from Lowry:* The chancellor is aware of the issue, and says they're ready for that.

Q from Jovanovic: May FT-NTT people who have been here a long time go up and apply for tier three directly? The current language says "normally" this would be the case, and so there seems to be some wiggle room.

Jovanovic proposed a friendly amendment that FT-NTT faculty who have been instructors for at least ten years at the time the policy is enacted may apply for tiers two and three simultaneously. Tschumi seconded.

Robertson suggested that it be added as item 7 on page 3.

Watts suggested that the first sentence under "For all Tiers" really covers the content of this amendment quite well.

Jovanovic amended his friendly amendment. and specified that it be inserted in the first paragraph of "For all tiers." **The amendment was accepted as friendly by the task force.**

The substitute motion passed on voice vote.

VIII. New Business

Motion. Executive Committee, Andrew Eshleman, Resources Manager (No second required; majority vote at one meeting)

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves to amend, in the manner shown below, the policy on grade appeals as described in Step 3 of "Steps Toward Redress for Grade Appeals" in the Faculty and Student Handbooks:

> 3. As a last resort and only after Steps 1 and 2 have been carried out, the student may file a formal ~~complaint~~ appeal in writing within three class days to the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. If the student ~~decides~~ wishes to file a formal appeal, he or she must meet with the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs and bring to the meeting the 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: a) confirm that prior steps in the appeal process have been followed properly (if not, the appeal shall be re-directed back to the appropriate lower level); b) review the relevant grounds for a grade appeal with the student; and c) inform the student of the next step in the appeals process. Following the conference, if the student decides to file the formal appeal, the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs will immediately consult with the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson. On the basis of this joint consultation, 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.

Commentary: This motion aims to clarify the third step in the grade appeal process. On the one hand, the Faculty Senate wishes to acknowledge the important role played by the associate vice-chancellor (AVC) for academic affairs in the handling of grade appeals. The authority of the office permits the AVC to make sure that appeals have been handled properly at earlier stages of the appeal process. Also, given the AVC's accumulated experience in that role, s/he is likely to be uniquely qualified to counsel the student on the grounds of appeal and the process that lies ahead if the student wishes to press forward. On the other hand, the Senate wishes to make clear that it does not regard the AVC's role in this third step as analogous to the departmental chair's role in the second step—namely, as a mediator attempting to negotiate a resolution between the faculty member and the student. If the AVC has determined that the appeal has been handled properly at earlier stages in the process, and the student still wishes to proceed with the appeal after consultation with the AVC, then the appeal should be forwarded.

Eshleman presented the motion. We had hoped, he said, for a consensus to emerge at the last meeting as we discussed this matter. It didn't happen. If we held it and waited, would consensus emerge? Probably not. So the executive committee had a shot at resolving it, and places that effort before the Senate. It tries to capture the

sentiment of a good portion of the Senate that it's important to distinguish the role played by the AVC and by the department chair, while still honoring the fact that the AVC's contributions do go beyond those of "just a clerk."

Jovanovic spoke in support of the motion. He observed that there have been situations that dragged on for months. He lauded the executive committee for working to solve this problem.

Robertson spoke in support of the motion. He sees it as a good way to take advantage of flexibility and still keep policy clear about how appeals work.

The chair begged for dissent in order to broaden the discussion.

Ramsey ventured that we may have found consensus.

English said, to laughter from the Senate, "If Nick made the motion I'm opposed to it!"

The motion passed unanimously on voice vote.

VIII. Open Forum

Ford invited comments from the Senate, having pointed out that the only thing standing between the Senate and cold beer is whatever issues we wish to raise.

Ramsey took the floor, and with the help of Eshleman, recognized the last of Ford's term of office with a highly personal token of appreciation: a freshly opened can of cheap beer.

As the frivolity wound down, Nickels shared copies of a couple of documents he wished to leave with the President-elect Eshleman showing trend lines in funding for higher ed in Arkansas. His final comment: "When you see how much public money has flowed to us, you may wonder why our salaries have been so slow to increase."

IX. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Faust, Secretary

Attachment A

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 offer the following motion to the Faculty Senate:

> That the Faculty Senate recommend to the Chancellor that UALR adopt the following framework for an **advancement system** for full-time non-tenure-track faculty demonstrating significant commitment and expertise 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 document therefore proposes a general structure for all units to 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.

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.

---

[*] 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.

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

Instructor Advancement System

General Principles (with reference to the UALR Faculty Handbook –1996 version)

1. As faculty, FT-NTT instructors enjoy the rights and responsibilities outlined in the UALR Faculty Handbook for faculty in general, including but not limited to those pertaining to appointments, dismissals, annual review, and faculty excellence awards. (See Faculty Handbook section, "Policies Governing Faculty Service," pp. 49-64.)

2. As non-tenure-track faculty, FT-NTT instructors are not eligible for tenure or for non-reappointment procedures. (See Faculty Handbook on Tenure and on Non-reapppointment at pages 52-54.)

3. Departments and/or colleges shall develop appropriate criteria and procedures for FT-NTT advancement. These policies shall be submitted to the Dean, the Chief Academic Officer, and the Chancellor for approval. Peer evaluation shall be a component of the evaluation at either the departmental or college level. [This parallels the requirement of peer review for promotion procedures. See Faculty Handbook on promotion, page 52.]

4. Departments and/or colleges shall develop appeal procedures for those desiring reconsideration of a negative advancement decision. These policies shall be submitted to the Dean, the Chief Academic Officer, and the Chancellor for approval. Should a faculty member continue an appeal beyond the Dean, he or she shall do so through the Faculty Appeals Council. (See Faculty Handbook describing the Faculty Appeals Council at page 40; and see the section, "Faculty Appeals and Grievance Procedures," pp. 105-106, describing its procedures.)

5. Since the decision to pursue advancement is not mandatory, an application for advancement shall be initiated by the FT-NTT faculty member, who shall prepare materials to support the application.

6. Recommendations for advancement shall be forwarded by the Department Chair and/or Dean to the Chief Academic Officer and then the Chancellor for approval.

Tiers

The FFR2 Task Force recommends a three-tier system for advancement. Departments and/or colleges shall 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, service, and/or professional development responsibilities are determined in accordance with the appropriate governance document.

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. A department has the option of giving credit for outside work experience (e.g., experience in a relevant profession) in meeting the 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.

Advancement to Tier Two will be accompanied by an appropriate increase 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. A department has the option of giving credit for outside work experience (e.g., experience in a relevant profession) in meeting the 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.

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

For All Tiers

All FT-NTT faculty currently employed will be given credit for experience already accumulated as a UALR faculty member at the implementation date of this advancement system. Those who have been instructors for at least ten years at the time the policy is enacted may apply for tiers two and three simultaneously."

FT-NTT faculty members are eligible for Off-Campus Duty Assignment (OCDA), consistent with the Faculty Handbook and departmental resources. (See Faculty Handbook in the section, "Information Related to Faculty Service," p. 76.)

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 matters that pertain to them.

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, the Scholarship of Creativity:

- Scholarship of Discovery: the systematic inquiry or investigation designed to validate and refine existing knowledge and generate new knowledge.
- 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.
- Scholarship of Application: the use of professional expertise or information in the process of solving social or community problems.
- Scholarship of Integration: involves synthesis across theories or across academic fields.
- 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.

It is important that the department chair and personnel committee clearly define in the appropriate governance document what is meant by scholarship and professional development and what is expected of FT-NTT faculty.

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.