



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, November 20, 2009, 1:00 p.m.
122 Ross Hall

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Anson, Bailey, Clausen, English, Eshleman, Garnett, Giammo, Groesbeck, Ramsey, Vinikas, Yoder. CB— Edison, Nickels, Watts. CE— Hayn, Hughes, Pack. CEIT— Anderson, Chan, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh, Goldner. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS— Collier-Tenison, Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Guellich, Kosmatov, McMillan, Prince, Tarasenko, Thompson, Wright, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Belcher, Davis, Ford, Smith, Williams.

Absent: CAHSS— Amrhein, Chapman, Webb. CB— Holland. CE— Bandre, Kuykendall. CPS— Barnes, Driskill. CSM— Siegar, Perkins.

I. Welcome & Roll Call

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

II. Review of Minutes

The Senate reviewed the minutes of the September 18, 2009, meeting. **Motion and second to accept the minutes. Carried on voice vote.**

III. Announcements

President Ford announced the move of the December meeting from the eleventh to the fourth of the month. The meeting will be in the Legends Room of the Stephens Center.

Tschumi asked when agenda items would be due to the Executive Committee. Ford will be sending out the agenda Wednesday of next week, so items should come to him before that day.

IV. Introduction of new topics

Ford asked if any senator had a topic he or she thinks the Senate should know about. Jovanovich reminded the body that the end of the comment period for the proposed IRB policies is November 23.

Jovanovic moved to suspend the rules to take up the third motion immediately so that the chancellor would be present for the discussion, and so we wouldn't risk losing senators toward the end of a long meeting. **Tschumi seconded. The motion failed** on voice vote.

Edison spoke about the Academy for Teaching and Learning Excellence (ATLE), encouraging faculty to visit the ATLE office for morning coffee and conversation on Wednesday mornings, 9:00 to 10:00, and to attend events and be involved. He highlighted

the good doughnuts and the good teaching demonstrations, and asked to hear from senators any time <swedison@ualr.edu> for an update about what's going on.

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

President Ford asked Daryl Rice, associate dean for academic affairs in the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences, to address some constraints we have to take into account as we undertake rethinking the bachelor's degree.

Rice began by saying that if we had undertaken this probably three years ago, he would have said with feeling, "Oh no..." Now he thinks we do need to—and the best argument for it is that perhaps only ten people now in the Senate were here when we last redid the core. Faculty, he said, needs to own the curriculum.

One approach, he said, is "let's just think about what every student ought to know: put aside all that we've done before, put aside courses and disciplines, pretend resources aren't an issue...." There's good reason to do some of this—it frees thinking, gets everything on the table—and it can be problematic.

Whatever we do has to meet the 35 hours of the state's minimum core requirement. That certainly doesn't mean that the exercise of thinking about what students need to know is a waster of time. We now have a 44-hour core. We could keep all the courses but change the criteria. We could have more courses or fewer.

Rice said he hears no bigger complaint from faculty than that students can't write. Our writing folks say, "Look we're doing all we can do. You guys have to help us out." He reminded us that back when we did the core last time, we recognized that same issue. and were supposed to have put significant emphasis on writing across the curriculum.

Another consideration is that we have large numbers—70-75%—of students who have transferred into UALR. We've become a lot more flexible in the way we handle transfer of courses to meet the core. Rice thinks that's the right approach, and one essentially written into the Roger Phillips Transfer Act—we have to accept core transfer from in-state holders of AA degrees. Then there's the Arkansas Course Transfer (ACT) system at ADHE, which seems to be pushing us toward having to accept all lower-level courses in transfer. A problem it creates for us is that we often require more of our native students than of transfer students.

There is pressure, Rice noted, to drop the requirement for a minor. We're looking at the relationship of hours in the core to hours for a degree.

Q from Eshleman: Heard from a philosophy professor at Fayetteville that ADHE is saying you must make the core requirement for your native students the same as for your transfer students. True? *A:* Not the case. But if you require any additional lower-level courses of transfer students with an associate's degree, the courses must be prerequisites for necessary upper-level courses, or required for the major, or required by accreditation standards.

Q from Ramsey: Recalled the problem encountered soon after passage of the transfer legislation regarding our core requirement of nine hours of foreign language. What's the status now? *A from Provost Belcher:* He and the chancellor got it resolved. They went down to ADHE and made "a brilliant and compelling argument" for letting the faculty's judgment prevail. (Appreciative laughter followed.)

As discussion ended, Ford reminded the Senate we're going to talk about this in some way at every meeting. He encouraged faculty to take a look at the booklet "Rethinking general education: avoiding the potholes." Ford said we'll be talking about it, and added that in the spring semester we're going to have to think about how to actually do the revisiting of the baccalaureate degree next academic year.

VI. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor observed that standing in this room makes him feel professorial, having taught many a student here.

With regard to IRB and the proposed policies out for comment, in some ways he feels responsible for all the debate and discussion, as on FacFocus recently. he sees it as good. Three years ago, five faculty members approached him, including one who had been the subject of what he thought was a bad process, and asked that the institutional review board process be fixed.

We had been through this once before. The chancellor said this time he wanted to see broad faculty input and eventually to have the Faculty Senate sign off on policies and procedures. After the IRB Committee's efforts to get faculty review of the draft document last spring, he got a new plan in August that called for another year before a final draft would be ready. He said no, the process has gone on too long, and asked them to clean up the document, post it one more time for comments, and that he would then move with all deliberate speed toward getting a policy promulgated. The federal sanctions for violating human subjects research guidelines are not hypothetical, he observed, and we need to be sensitive to that.

He intends to give the existing IRB Committee a couple of weeks to respond to the issues that have been raised both on FacFocus and directly to him. Matt McCoy in general counsel's office at the UA System is working on the document as well. One advantage is that whatever issues we may have with the proposed policies and procedures, System counsel deals with the same policies on multiple campuses. He will not arbitrarily ignore any comments that might come late.

The chancellor acknowledged that whatever gets put on paper is almost guaranteed to get into heavy weather.

He commented on a couple of issues that have emerged in the discussion:

First, the length of the document did not escape his notice. He has asked counsel to review for possibilities to shorten it. He wants to respect the committee deliberations, but would like to have a more manageable and accessible set of policies and procedures..

Second, he recognized questions about whether or not we should have standards stiffer than the federal standards. His first reaction, he said, would naturally be "no." Surely it will require time, money, and effort to go beyond. On the other hand, if the IRB Committee thinks we should, he's going to listen carefully to their analysis.

Third, the question of how the document affects classroom teachers is an important one. We don't want faculty jumping through unnecessary hoops, yet we need to take the whole set of protection questions seriously.

Q from Ford: You said in a couple of years, we'll revisit this. What will trigger the review? *A:* The chancellor said he will probably answer that with pen in hand when we have something to promulgate.

Q from Jovanovic: Your original plan was to have the IRB come to the Senate to seek approval. Why did that change? *A:* "Well, it just looked to me like that was going to add a whole lot of time to the process and may not much affect the outcome." He noted that Senate approval is not required, and he judged it best to move things along. He has been frustrated that it has taken us this long.

Jovanovic noted that most points raised on FacFocus were raised here in the Senate last spring. Robertson recalled that it was the action of this body to appoint senators to shepherd college-level meetings.

The chancellor moved on to the budget: You've been reading the same new reports I have. We've now had the cut previously discussed at the end of September. October revenues were below the revised forecast, but the governor and DF&A did not seem particularly concerned about it. He suggested that we

not take a *lot* of comfort in that. The governor has said they'll look again in December. We'll know then whether we need to make more reductions this year. The chancellor still has his fingers crossed.

The chancellor used this device to help us see the university's present budget situation: Imagine a vertical line with \$50 million indicated by tick marks, the \$50M being roughly what we got from the state last year. We didn't even budget the top million. That was one-time money last year, and essentially reduced our base budget by a million. When the million-and-a-quarter cut came, we were in pretty good shape for the cut; we had most of it sitting there unspent. The problem is the cut was of permanent state funding. We could plug in the one-time million to cover, but the bottom line is we're really down \$2M for the next budget year.

It may be, if we hang onto enrollment, there's a bit more money in tuition and fees to help us. And it may be possible that the trustees will permit some increase in fees or tuition.

Q from Goldner: Any idea what to expect from first-ever budget session? coming up in January *A:* None. If the governor has his way, it should be short and tightly focused.

B. Provost Belcher

Devoting his report to reaccreditation: We have nine site visits this year, with six already done this fall. As cumbersome and time-consuming as they are, these reaccreditation processes are very important to us. Because they're external, we get valuable confirmation about what we're doing well and we get good guidance about improvements

We had nursing, and construction management in September, and engineering last month. Initial feedback from visiting teams has been good.

Two in the last twenty days have been NCATE and North Central.

NCATE does not involve only the College of Education but also the College of Science and Mathematics and the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences. The site team noted seven particular areas of strength, and gave us solid ratings across the board.

North Central's visit, of course, was early this month. The recommendation of the site team is for full ten-year reaccreditation with no stipulations. This is very good, the provost said. He saluted Susan Hoffpauir, who led the effort, and she was roundly applauded by the Senate..

Among the strengths noted: Faculty and staff commitment to educating students. The design and delivery of distance education. Support for teaching, as exemplified by ATLE. The strategic plan and the faculty's endorsement of its direction. Curricular process and review. The University District and Shepherd projects. Universitywide attention to assessment. The Donaghey Scholars and other honors programs. Commitment to regional engagement and support.

Among the areas we need to pay attention to: Moving toward a more focused mission for the institution. The fact that a large number of faculty and administrators will be retiring. More communications among departments, fewer silos. The disconnect between student and faculty demographics. Paying attention to the interconnectedness of mission, admission, student success, and retention.

The provost saluted the people who ran all these self-study processes. He also recognized the people who do all the work that makes these good programs—the Senate and all their faculty colleagues.

We have three more in the spring. The provost noted that theater and law will happen within two weeks of each other. (He noted parenthetically that someone had said to him, “Can’t you combine them? After all, they’re really the same thing.”) Art comes a little later.

This gives us a moment in time to step back, the provost said, and see where we are and where we’re going. We’ve accomplished a lot of things in our strategic plan, and it gives us a change to think about what we ought to be trying to accomplish now.

VII. Old Business

MOTION. Tenure Committee, presented by Paula Casey, chair. (Motion; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

UALR faculty accepts the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines as written in the attached document. (See appendix A.)

Ford recounted the history of the Tenure Committee’s long, solid work, and the Senate’s marathon consideration and amendment of the proposed policy. We forwarded it in the fall of 2008 to the chancellor. The chancellor took it, set George Jensen to work putting it in one coherent voice, and incorporated his guidance about how it should be, and sent it back to the Senate. Ford assigned it to the Tenure Committee this fall, and asked them to bring us a final version. That’s where we are now.

Ford recognized Paula Casey, chair of the Tenure Committee, to bring forward the motion. He observed that she is new to the committee this year, but that many members were there during the entire process.

Casey said the committee was asked to determine whether the substance was still the same, and asked to clarify two things in particular: when a candidate may rebut, and when a candidate may appeal.

The committee came to the conclusion that the two documents were substantially the same. “The original document had suffered the ravages of the democratic process,” she said, and had been set right by Jensen’s editing.

The committee believes candidates should be given some latitude: they may rebut either after the chair’s or dean’s decision, and may appeal after the dean’s or provost’s decision.

Chan offered an editorial correction, noting that one acronym was used before it was named. Tramel helped locate the lines in question: 354 and 361. The body agreed this is a minor editorial change, and affirmed that it will depend on the committee to correct it.

Q from Jovanovic: Several faculty members asked him to raise this question—is it true the document has been distributed only to members of the Faculty Senate? .
A from Ford: Not true. Ford e-mailed it to all faculty two weeks ago, and it has been posted on the web site for some weeks longer.

Groesbeck sought clarification on a matter related to a negative vote at the first level. (The secretary failed to capture the substance.)

Ramsey praised the two committees and George Jensen.

Eshleman said—somewhat reluctantly, he noted—that the language the Senate had included about applicants being evaluated according to the policies in force at the time of their hiring unless they choose to be evaluated under policies changed after their hiring. He spoke with the chancellor about the exclusion of this language from the document, and the chancellor said he sees it as issue about the

criteria for promotion and tenure decisions, and so inappropriate for a university wide document about the process. Promotion and tenure criteria are not established in this document, and faculties may include such a provision in their departmental documents. Eshleman said he believes we should approve this document as the Tenure Committee has presented it, but he did want to note the absence of this provision.

Chan and Jovanovic spoke about the ten-year struggle to actually get departmental governance and T&P documents.

Tramel asked about an issue having to do with small faculties, and confirmed the intent of the document was indeed as he understood it.

Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

VIII. *New Business*

A. *RESOLUTION.* Ad hoc committee on university professor, presented by David Spillers, chair. (Resolution; second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

UALR faculty recommend that the UALR make more regular and systematic use of the University Professor appointment.

Commentary:

Rationale Appointment as a University Professorship is a special honor conferred only upon active faculty in recognition of exemplary service to the University of Arkansas at Little Rock and to their profession. Such appointment will provide additional incentives for full professors to continue to grow and strive for excellence.

Eligible faculty members must have wide recognition among their peers for their sustained excellence in teaching and in research or creative activity in their disciplines and service to the University and the community. Once appointed as a University Professor, an individual shall retain this appointment for the remainder of his/her tenure at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Eligibility Active faculty members who hold the rank of Professor are eligible for appointment as a University Professor. Normally, the faculty member will have held the rank of Professor for at least 10 years, at least 5 of which were in an appointment at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

Criteria, Procedures and Timetable Upon approval of this proposal by the Chancellor, the Provost and the President of the Faculty Senate shall appoint a University wide task force to establish uniform and campus wide criteria and procedures for appointment as a University Professor. The task force shall also establish a timetable for implementation.

Motion seconded by Robertson.

David Spillers noted that the only people interested in this motion are over fifty. That said, Spillers asserted that "university professor" is an appointment rather than a fourth faculty rank. This is, he said, about an honor, "a cluster on the Eagle Scout's sash."

Q from English: Would appointment result in monetary benefit as well as increase in rank? *A:* The chancellor has said it probably would. English asked a follow-up question to clarify the minimum criteria. Spillers said a university professor had to have been a full professor for five years. English quickly affirmed his support of the motion.

Q from Eshleman: Why is it not a rank? A from Spillers: The chancellor is not interested in a fourth rank as the next rung in a career ladder. He sees it as an honor.

Q from Jovanovic: What's the difference between "rank" and "appointment"? A: The issue about "rank" is the setting up of an expectation that University Professor becomes a next predictable path of promotion.

Q from Jovanovic: Does it mean promotion and tenure policies doesn't apply? A: Yes.

Q from Chan: Does it mean you can't hire someone in from outside at the rank of UP? A: No. Indeed it is one of two ranks that can be used in that way—distinguished professor and university professor.

Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

B. RESOLUTION. Put forward by Sen. Nicholas Jovanovich (Resolution; second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

WHEREAS, many faculty members have expressed concern about the proposed IRB policies; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate does not endorse the proposed IRB policies and recommends that faculty concerns be addressed before new IRB policies are established."

Jovanovich presented the motion. Vinikas seconded.

Jovanovic said that since we've been cut out of the loop of endorsing the document, and since we haven't seen any response to the questions we've raised, we should *not* endorse it.

What he would hope to see in a good policy, at a minimum, is clear exemption for all the things the federal law clearly states are exempt: activities that arise in normal classroom activities, research on teaching, and research using secondary and already collected data.

Ramsey asked for some assurance from members of the committee who are present that the IRB Committee is listening. Robertson, a member, said they did decide that members would not respond on FacFocus to points being raised. Legitimate points were brought up, Robertson said—that is, points that have prompted the IRB Committee to begin thinking and discussing how they might respond to those issues. Robertson observed that while we've moved a long way, we've got a long way to go. There are problems with implementation that we must deal with: approvals often take too long, for example. Robertson, as his final point, asked that senators understand that we are required by the university and by the feds to have our primary concern not be about our own research but about protecting the human subjects of our research. As his *really* final point, he added that he had hoped to have a much shorter document, and that he now believes one significantly shorter is probably not possible.

Prince asked if the committee has looked at implementation strategies. Described the use of irb.net at another institution, and noted that it worked beautifully—makes preparation of packets easy, revision easy, enables multiple submission to institutions.

Considerable discussion ensued, primarily between Jovanovic and Robertson.

Garnett observed that the voice of the faculty hasn't really been heard on this, and that a real concern is that it seems the document as written is subject to

widely different interpretations and thus seems not to provide real clarity about policy.

Tschumi spoke for the motion, noting that the present document does not appear to contain provisions that would prevent the kind of incident several years ago that led to this formal reconsideration of policy. Tschumi said he believes this document should come to the Senate for endorsement.

Robertson observed that the action taken in the situation to which Tschumi referred was not taken with the approval of the IRB.

Watts moved, Nickels seconded, the question. Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

Motion carried on show of hands.

IX. Open Forum

Fitzhugh asked if Is there a committee on campus security. There seems not to be one, though there has been an *ad hoc* committee in the recent past.

Eshleman noted that current policy permits a student facing an academic integrity charge to drop a course, and thus avoid a grade sanction. He asked that people with a concern about or experience with this issue contact him <aseshleman@ualr.edu>.

Guellich asked why there's not a policy to require students to get a faculty signature when the student contemplates dropping a course. He added that he's concerned from a retention standpoint. Sees a lot of good students dropping, and would like a chance to talk with them.

McMillan added that a requirement for signature would provide an advising opportunity.

Goldner told of a Law School policy that does require notification of teachers and administrator. He reported good experience with it over the years; the process with some frequency has generated options and strategies for students who were about to drop to be able to continue.

There was some discussion of what group this might be referred to, and the body seemed to arrive at agreement that referral to Undergraduate and Graduate Councils for their review and recommendations would make sense..

Hughes noted, as someone who teaches almost exclusively on-line, that both Councils should take specifically into account the implications of specifically requiring a signature of students who live out of state.

The Academic Integrity and Grievance committee should be looking at the issue of students trying to drop courses in order to escape the grade penalty. Ford indicated his intent to refer the matter to them.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Faust, Secretary.

Appendix A

1 **11-02-09**

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

12 **Promotion and Tenure Guidelines**

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **University of Arkansas at Little Rock**

33
34
2

1. 35 **Faculty Roles**

36

37 For the university to achieve its mission, faculty must remain
38 committed to teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members are
39 expected to make contributions in each area, although some variation
40 in emphasis is appropriate. The university recognizes that the
41 contributions of individual faculty members to the mission of the
42 university shift according to the faculty member's talents, the needs of
43 departments and colleges, and the character of diverse academic
44 disciplines. Faculty members, thus, need to determine
45 responsibilities—teaching loads, scholarship agenda, and service
46 commitments—in consultation with the chair of their department.¹ It is

47 the responsibility of chairs to mediate the needs of their departments
48 with the university mission and trends in the department's discipline.
50 In addition to contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service, the
51 university expects that faculty will adhere to the ethical standards of
52 the university and their respective disciplines as well as manifest
53 standards of civility, professionalism, and collegiality.

54

55

56 1.A. Teaching

57

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

67

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

74

- 75 1. Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical
76 strategies,
- 77 2. Teaching history including teaching loads, summary of
78 courses taught and modes of instruction in each course,
- 79 3. Materials from individual courses – syllabi, exercises,
80 projects, exams, websites, multimedia products, video of
81 lectures,
- 82 4. Summary of advising, consultation, and supervision of
83 students at all levels—pre-college, undergraduate, graduate,
84 and post-doctoral,
- 85 5. Curriculum design, development, and administration,
- 86 6. Measuring student learning and instructional effectiveness
87 through course, program, and core assessment activities
88 and outcomes,
- 89 7. Professional development activities related to teaching,
- 90 8. Student course evaluations, compiled and interpreted to
91 give the data contextual meaning,
- 92 9. Peer evaluations,
- 93 10. Self-evaluations, and
- 94 11. Awards.

95

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

104

105

106 **1.B. Scholarship**

107

108 Scholarship is defined as a systematic, focused attention on a question,
109 problem, or idea, characterized by expertise, originality, analysis and
110 significance. Scholarship results in products that are shared with
111 appropriate audiences within the academy and the wider community.
112

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

118

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

124

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

130

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

143

144 The *Scholarship of Creativity* entails developing or performing
145 original works of art, literature, music, film and theater. It may also
146 include the creation of new forms of electronic or digital media.
147 Typical examples are production or scenic design of plays; writing,
148 directing, or acting in plays; choreography and dance performance;
149 creation and exhibition of visual arts such as painting, sculpture, and
150 photography; musical composition and performance; direction or
151 production of film and video; creative writing; and creation of
152 websites, virtual reality programs, and multimedia communication
153 tools. In all cases, however, there are accepted forms of peer review to
154 determine the quality and significance of faculty work, from juried or
155 invitational art shows to publication. These conventional procedures
156 must be part of the evaluation of faculty achievement.

157

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

174

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

184

185 The *Scholarship of Teaching* is not the same as “best teaching
186 practice.” Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on
187 excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching shall engage in publication
188 appropriate to development and evaluation of teaching, teaching
189 technique, curriculum development and related topics, including peer
190 reviewed publications, conference presentations, workshops, and
191 teacher handbooks that contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge
192 about curriculum or effective teaching and learning. Thus, the

193 Scholarship of Teaching is more than being an excellent teacher. It
194 involves systematic inquiry about teaching, dissemination of the
195 results, and peer review.

196

197

198 1.C. **Service**

199

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

202

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

209

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

216

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

226

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

235

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

238

239 1. Administrative duties such as chair, director, and program
240 coordinator,

- 241 2. Committee/special project participation (academic unit,
242 college, university, system; for example, assessment and
243 recruitment projects),
244 3. Discipline-related community involvement,
245 4. Working in and with professional organizations,
246 5. Relating discipline expertise to the community, and
247 6. Development of cooperative ventures between the
248 university and community.

249
250

251 **1.D. Professional Performance**

252

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

265

266

267 **2. Policies for Promotion and Tenure**

268

269 The probationary period for tenure-track faculty may not extend
270 beyond seven years, unless the faculty member receives approval for
271 suspending the probationary period. During the first six years of the
272 probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request his or
273 her probationary period be suspended in accordance with the current
274 version of the Family and Medical Leave Act. An initial appointment
275 of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the
276 probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in leave
277 of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the
278 probationary period (Board Policy 405.1,IV.A.4). Typically, an early
279 tenure review occurs when the faculty member has been in a tenure
280 track position before being hired by UALR; the terms for an early
281 tenure-review should be written into the faculty member's letter of
282 appointment.

283

284 The process of tenure review, as delineated in departmental promotion
285 and tenure documents, must be completed before the end of the
286 probationary period, consistent with Board Policy 405.1.

287

288 Promotion to a higher rank requires qualifications or performance of

289 the activities and accomplishments identified by the department
290 significantly above those required at the applicant's current rank as
291 well as evidence of potential for continued achievement.

292

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

295

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

304

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

307

308 At any point, the candidate may withdraw from the review process by
309 sending a letter to the person responsible for the next level of review.

310 For example, if the candidate wishes to withdraw after the chair's
311 recommendation, he or she sends a letter to the dean.

312

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

315

316

317 **3. Procedures for Awarding Promotion and Tenure**

318

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

326

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

332

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

336

337 **3.A. Process before Tenure**

338

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

342

343 In preparation for promotion and tenure, the chair may assign the
344 tenure-track faculty member with a mentor. The mentor will provide
345 guidance on developing a research agenda and building a dossier. All
346 faculty of the department are similarly encouraged to support tenure-
347 track faculty by providing an opportunity to review recent successful
348 tenure applications.

349

350 A mid-tenure review by the departmental promotion and tenure review
351 committee, the department chair, and the dean is mandatory. The
352 review, typically completed by May 15 at the end of the third year in
353 rank, will follow procedures delineated in the departmental and college
354 policies. After the review has been completed, the PTC will send a
355 report to the chair. The chair will meet with the faculty member to
356 answer questions about the review and then forward the report with a
357 cover letter to the dean.

358

359

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

362

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

371

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

382

383 The PTC shall present its recommendation in a letter to the chair. All
384 members of the PTC shall sign the letter. Significant minority opinions

385 may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of
386 the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted
387 as attachments to the PTC's letter; a minority report must be signed by
388 the members of the PTC who endorse it.

389

390

391

392

393 **3.C. Recommendation of the Chair**

394

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

403

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

406

407

408 **3.D. Recommendation of the College Review Committee** 409 **(CRC)**

410

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

420

421 When a CRC exists, it reviews the candidate's dossier, the PTC's
422 recommendation, the chair's recommendation and the candidate's
423 rebuttal (if any); it then makes an independent recommendation to the
424 dean (who will not serve on this committee) and provides a copy to the
425 applicant. All members of the CRC shall sign the recommendation.

426 Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be
427 attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority
428 reports may be written and submitted as an attachment to the report of
429 the committee; a minority report must be signed by the members of the
430 CRC that endorse it.

431

432

433 3.E. Recommendation of the Dean

434

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

437

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

442

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

446

447 If the recommendation is positive, the dean informs the candidate. If
448 the candidate does not initiate a rebuttal, the dean forwards his or her
449 recommendation and the following *summary materials* to the provost:
450 the candidate's completed application forms, statement, curriculum
451 vita, letters of evaluation (annual reviews, peer reviews, and letters
452 from external evaluators, when appropriate), and the recommendations
453 of all prior review levels. The remainder of the applicant's dossier
454 shall be retained in the dean's office until the review process is
455 complete. If needed for their decisions, the provost and chancellor may
456 request the complete dossier be forwarded.

457

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

460

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

463

464 If the candidate initiates an appeal at this point, the dean forwards the
465 appeal to the Chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee (FAC). The
466 dean will provide the FAC with access to the candidate's dossier,
467 including the summary materials. When the FAC has completed its
468 deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings
469 to the provost with a copy to the dean. At this time, the dean forwards
470 the summary materials to the provost.

471

472

473 3.F. Recommendation of the Provost

474

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

479

480 After receiving the provost's decision, the candidate has five business

481 days to initiate an appeal, if he or she did not do so after the dean's
482 decision (see 3.G.).

483

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

486

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

494

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

497

498

499 **3.G. Recommendation of the Chancellor**

500

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

505

506

507 **3.H. Rebuttal**

508

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

512

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

522

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

527

528 *Rebuttal after Chair's Decision.* To initiate the option of rebuttal at

529 this point, the candidate must notify the dean within five business days
530 of receiving the chair's decision and provide a copy of the notification
531 to the chair. Within ten business days of receiving the chair's decision,
532 the candidate must submit the rebuttal to the dean. The dean forwards
533 the rebuttal to the CRC before that committee begins deliberations.
534 The rebuttal is also forwarded with the summary materials to each
535 subsequent level of campus review.

536

537 *Rebuttal after the Dean's Decision.* To initiate the option of rebuttal at
538 this point, the candidate must notify the provost within five business
539 days of receiving the dean's decision. The candidate also provides a
540 copy of the notification to the dean. Within ten business days of
541 receiving the dean's decision, the candidate must submit the rebuttal to
542 the provost. The rebuttal will be forwarded to the chancellor with the
543 provost's recommendation.

544

545

546 **3.G. Appeal to Faculty Appeals Council (FAC)**

547

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

554

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

559

560 *Appeal after the Dean's Decision.* To initiate the option of appeal at
561 this point, the candidate must notify the provost within five business
562 days after receiving the dean's negative decision. The candidate also
563 provides a copy of the notification to the dean. Within ten business
564 days of receiving the dean's decision, the candidate must submit the
565 appeal to the provost. The provost forwards the appeal to the Chair of
566 the Faculty Appeals Council. Upon completion of the FAC's
567 deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings
568 to the provost.

569

570 *Appeal after the Provost's Decision.* To initiate the option of appeal at
571 this point, the candidate must notify the chancellor within five
572 business days after receiving the provost's negative decision. The
573 candidate will also provide a copy of the notification to the provost.
574 Within ten business days of receiving the provost's decision, the
575 candidate must submit the appeal to the chancellor. The chancellor
576 forwards the appeal to the Chair of the FAC. Upon completion of the

577 FAC's deliberations, the Chair of the FAC forwards the committee's
578 findings to the chancellor.
579

Footnote to line 46

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

Footnote to line 320

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

