



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, December 4, 2009, 1:00 p.m.  
Legends Room, Stephens Center

### MINUTES

*Present:* CAHSS— Bailey, Clausen, English, Eshleman, Garnett, Giammo, Groesbeck, Ramsey, Vinikas. CB— Edison, Holland, Nickels. CE— Hayn, Hughes, Kuykendall. CEIT— Chan, Jovanovich, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh, Goldner. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS— Barnes, Driskill, Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Guellich, Kosmatov, McMillan, Prince, Tarasenko, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO— Belcher, Ford, .

*Absent:* CAHSS— Amrhein, Anson, Chapman, Webb, Yoder. CB— Watts. CE— Bandre, Pack. CEIT— Anderson. CPS— Collier-Tenison. CSM— Perkins, Seigar, Thompson, Wright. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Davis, Smith, Williams.

#### *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 November 20, 2009, meeting. **Motion and second to accept the minutes. Carried on voice vote.**

#### *III. Announcements*

President Ford encouraged participation in ATLE's programs..

#### *IV. Introduction of new topics*

Tudoreanu, in connection with the impending switch to Google Mail, asked about privacy policies, back-ups, and other security protections of the new e-mail system.

Nickels raised an issue with parking. Last night when he came to class "it seemed the restricted lots were not restricted." At 5:45, the entire lot was full. Nickels was reminded that the University's policy for more than a year now has been to open all lots to any person with a valid parking card after 4:00 p.m. There was brief discussion, in spite of the president's best efforts, about how individually reserved parking spots are intended to be restricted to parking only by the person who paid for 24-hour access to that space, but that even this seems regularly to be ignored by evening parkers.

#### *V. Progress reports on "Rethinking the Bachelor's Degree" — "Revising General Education and Avoiding the Potholes, a synopsis by Earl Ramsey*

President Ford indicated he's considering in the future using this time slot for limited discussion on a specific topic related to rethinking the bachelor's degree, perhaps ending with a straw poll on the issue under discussion. He would welcome [input](#) about this.

Having been given the floor, Sen. Ramsey said in some ways his message was continuous with Daryl Rice's at the last meeting: Imagining new is great, and there are constraints.

He called the Senate's attention to the monograph "Revising General Education: Avoiding the Potholes," which he believes is useful for us. A publication of the Association of American Colleges and Universities, it identifies fifty ways to go wrong in revising general education, and it also provide "patches" for each, ways you might do it better.

Ramsey said he thought he knew by now about all there was to know regarding gen. ed. curricula, and learned different from the monograph. Examples of surprises he found included these:

- The distribution requirement: A potpourri of choices (Pothole 20) doesn't help students integrate learning and solve problems.
- Potholes 6 and 39 both seem to suggest a similar theme: Out tendency is to try to use the usual protocols, the usual processes, the usual committees, but this is not business as usual. We need to rethink methods and processes as well as curriculum.

The pamphlet, he said, convinced him of the wisdom of his "colleague and mentor," President Ford, in suggesting that we spend a year planning for the process of rethinking the bachelor's degree.

He encouraged senators to get hold of a copy of the publication and read it. The provost's office hasn't any left at the moment, but the provost indicated that they could certainly order some more.

## VI. Reports

### A. Provost Belcher

The provost promised brevity, saying he certainly didn't want to stand between the Senate and the real reason it came to the Stephens Center to meet. He did note as well that it had only been two weeks since his last report, and there was not a lot more to say.

He quickly summarized the work that has characterized the fall semester: Six reaccreditation visits, finishing up work on promotion and tenure policies, tackling proposed IRB policies, grappling with the curriculum, and following the ongoing work of Faculty Roles and Rewards II. There are tough issues in that lot, he said, and It's not unusual for us not to agree on all these things. He reminded the Senate that if there's anywhere debate *should* take place, it's surely in a university setting. There are good people working on all sides of important issues here. He thanked the faculty for being good people who are willing to engage in this work and who don't always agree—and that's okay. We value each other as colleagues even when we don't agree, and he applauded us for that.

### B. Roles and Rewards Task Force II – Catherine Lowry

Ford reports Lowery was unable to be here, but sent a brief statement to be read. Sen. Ramsey read it:

The Roles and Rewards II task force has met with the chancellor and provost with a draft document suggesting a process for recognizing outstanding teaching among the full-time nontenured faculty.

In January 2010, two roundtable meetings will be held to hear comments from this faculty regarding the document. The task force

hopes to have the plan to the Faculty Senate for consideration in March 2010.

### C. *Resource Manager's report – Dr. Andrew Eshleman*

Eshleman reported briefly on two issues that have come to the executive committee's attention and been discussed and explored a bit. He wanted to bring the rest of the Senate in.

First, grade appeals. It seems step three of the grade appeal process set out in the Faculty and Student Handbooks is being interpreted by the provost's office as yet another opportunity to reach resolution among the parties to the appeal. It is the sense of many that this is not the intent of the policy, but rather that this step provides only for being sure the process has been correctly followed so far and making a timely referral to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (AIGC) for the next step in the appeal.

This leaves us, Eshleman said, with the question of what to do. We could return to the concept of original intent, and interpret the legislation in this way. That would be a perfectly legitimate thing to do.

It would also be possible for us to revise our own interpretation of step three in light of practical considerations. We've been told that if every appeal that hits step three in fact goes to AIGC, the numbers would be overwhelming.

The next issue has to do with whether we as a Senate wish to provide more guidance as to the makeup of the panels AIGC set up to hear individual grade appeals. There's wording in the language that suggests it is wise to consider the makeup of a committee based on whether the appeal involves graduate level courses, with the implication that faculty who teach graduate courses should be assigned to panels hearing a graduate student's grade appeal, for example. However, there's no similar, explicit recognition of appeals involving doctoral students appealing grades in a doctoral-level program.

There was a question about what the problems have been that led to these issues surfacing. Eshleman gave an example: If step three of the grade appeal process is really about possible *resolution* of the disagreement between student and professor about a grade, then the faculty member should be present at the step-three meeting, which the policy clearly says is between only the student and the associate vice chancellor assigned to handle the review and routing of appeals.

Robertson suggested that in most administrative appeal procedures, someone has greater flexibility to reach resolution, and that seems to be what has been happening. Eshleman said indeed, it has, and that's become problematic.

Tschumi shared his reading that the policy calls for the provost's office only to be the link between the student and the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee. He suggested that efforts to resolve these matters by the provost's staff are a problem because the faculty member falls into a line of accountability that leads straight to the provost. Such a circumstance can create significant pressure on a faculty member to comply with a resolution that s/he might otherwise refuse.

Jovanovic noted that there are several "clerking duties" that fall to the AVP listed in this policy. The committee should be involved immediately, he said, even if the matter ends up not going to the AIGC at all. He doesn't see anything in the policy that indicates it's part of the AVP's role to negotiate a resolution.

Smith-Olinde asked if anyone knows how many grade appeals there are, customarily, in a semester. No one knew. The provost said summer, in his

experience, is difficult—there can be as many as fifteen or more appeals over the course of a summer.

*Q from Prince:* Recalled that Eshleman had shared at the last faculty meeting a concern about students being able to withdraw from courses in order to avoid a grade penalty. Same? Related? *A:* Different.

Tramel talked about having a student trying to follow the policy and being refused at step two of the grade appeal policy by the department chair, who would not meet with the student and the faculty member as the policy requires. What, he asked, is a student to do then?

## VII. Old Business

There was no old business before the Senate.

## VIII. New Business

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

*Be it resolved by the Faculty Senate of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock that students who have met all graduation requirements at the conclusion of the 2009 fall semester shall be approved for the appropriate degrees for which they applied."*

Vice President Ramsey presented the motion.  
Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

- B. *MOTION.* Athletics Committee, presented by Jim Carr, chair. (Legislation; no second required; 3/5 majority vote required at two meetings.)

*The Faculty Senate moves to amend the UALR Faculty Handbook as indicated in Attachment 1.*

The committee wishes to amend its charge and the composition of the committee, and where the language now lists a number of specific activities, they recommend including the words "not limited to."

The recommendation is to expand from the committee from six to ten members, and to open up the language to enable them to reach interested people across the university. They want also to make the language clearer about presenting a list of nominees to the chancellor.

Tschumi: fine in the minutes to use colors, but that won't do **in the permanent minutes, which may need to be copied so additions need to be underlined. Also the motion should not be a motion to amend the Handbook but is properly a motion to amend the Constitution of the University Assembly.**

The secretary offered a **friendly amendment** to change the motion's language to "*amend the description of the Athletic Committee in the University Assembly Constitution.*" **The chair accepted the friendly amendment.**

Eshleman asked why more committee members are needed, saying he has a constitutional reluctance to increase the sum of committee work. Carr said the work of reaccreditation was extraordinarily demanding on the small committee. They'd like to have sufficient people to organize themselves into committees.

**Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.** It will be on the agenda for a second vote at the January 2010 meeting.

- C. *MOTION.* Undergraduate Council, presented by Jeanette Clausen, chair.  
(Motion; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

*The implementation period for the first year colloquium (FYC) should be extended through fall 2011 because implementation did not proceed as planned and it is now late in the day to get sufficient courses approved to accommodate all first-time students in fall 2010.*

In April 2008, a task force, headed by Carol Thompson, to develop criteria and objectives for implementation of a first-year experience course for all first-time, full-time students made a recommendation passed by the Senate that such implementation should occur by 2010. Commentary on the motion then said each colloquium must include course objectives approved by the Undergraduate Council, which will be taken up in Motion F. Associate vice-chancellor Hoffpauir was recognized and recounted some history as to why it didn't get addressed: the task force took the matter through the budget process trying to get resources to support implementation, and failed.

Clausen cited three reasons to extend the period: 1) There isn't time now to approve all those courses for some 800 first-time students in the fall. 2) There may be relevant fallout from reconsidering the baccalaureate degree next year, and we'd like time to take it into account. 3) There are good programs now not meeting the standards (proposed in Motion D), and they don't need to be messed with, while at the same time more departments are coming forward with their own proposals.

Clausen mentioned another point, which is that we have lots of students coming straight from high school with more than fifteen credit hours—some more than twenty. Still, they're newcomers to the environment and should be included even though they may have standing beyond freshman level.

*Q from Giammo:* Doesn't object to moving the deadline, but wonders how the work on new FYC courses begins. *A:* Not sure there is a single trigger, but the Council has received several so far.

Ramsey suggested a **friendly amendment:** that "through fall 2011" be replaced by "until such time as the general education curriculum review process is completed."

Groesbeck questioned the advisability of the policy of requiring the FYC at all—noting that he wasn't on the Senate when the policy passed.

Garnett supported Ramsey's proposal for a friendly amendment.

Robertson suggested that this should be a formal rather than a friendly amendment.

Clausen **refused the friendly amendment**

**Ramsey moved, Garnett seconded, to amend the motion such that the phrase "through fall 2011" be replaced with the phrase "until such time as the general education curriculum review process is completed."**

Jovanovic said he hears people being concerned about adding to the hours required for graduation. He argued that it's not necessarily an increase in the required hours. That depends entirely on how the department handles it.

Tschumi spoke in favor of the amendment.

Sims noted that of the 800 new students, 400 are remedial and are already required to take an FYC.

English is concerned about demands on faculty if they are required to teach beyond their current commitments. Clausen reiterated that no department is required to have an FYC.

Robertson spoke against the motion on the general principle that we should move ahead rather than delay further.

Jovanovic reminded the Senate we've been asked by Ford to "rethink the bachelor's degree," and not just to rethink the core. He believes this fits right it, and it only makes sense to wait to develop the final guidelines and formally implement the process.

Driskill described himself as feeling a bit pulled in both directions, but came down in support of the original motion. He thinks it's already been worked on, and pushed forward, and that many voices have been heard. We could be four or five years out from having significant changes to the curriculum.

Jovanovic suggested, to Driskill's point, that nothing need stop any program from going ahead and developing a first-year experience course.

**Motion to amend carried on show of hands.**

**Main motion carried unanimously on voice vote.**

*D. MOTION.* Undergraduate Council, presented by Jeanette Clausen, chair.  
(Motion; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

*The criteria and objectives proposed by the FYC Task Force should be adopted with slight modifications to accommodate differences among the various departments and colleges that wish to propose FYC courses.*

*Required for ALL courses designated FYC:*

- three credit hours
- small class size (15-30) to allow significant interaction
- activities that require students to learn about and use campus and off-campus resources needed for success at UALR
- a section on goal setting and time management
- active and integrative learning strategies appropriate to the discipline(s), such as problem solving, case studies, discussions, writing assignments, presentations, group projects, etc.

*Highly recommended for courses designated FYC:*

- a service learning project of not less than four hours with a requisite reflection piece that documents the value of applying academic learning to real-life situations

*Learning Outcomes. FYC courses should be designed to meet these learning outcomes:*

- demonstrate competence in finding university sources for assistance in academic, developmental, and social areas
- demonstrate the ability to build appropriate connections with faculty and other students
- demonstrate ability to set goals and organize academic and personal life through knowledge of time management skills
- demonstrate understanding of the academic content of the course
- demonstrate academic skills appropriate to the discipline and the course level (e.g., writing, oral communication, working collaboratively)

Tschumi, noting that Clausen had earlier referenced favorably the one-hour first-year-experience courses offered by the Donaghey Scholars program, asked how the committee reconciles that with the three-hour=credit requirement here. Clausen acknowledged the point, and said shorter courses now existing that are working are, in effect, grandmothers in and won't be affected. However, the Council understands that one-hour courses tend not to work if they are open to a wide range of students, unlike the Scholars program courses.

**Ramsey moved, Jovanovic seconded, to amend the first bullet to read "offered for credit."**

**Motion to amend carried on show of hands.**

Eshleman noted the word "should" in the introduction to the list of bullets related to learning outcomes, and asked if these were indeed intended to be recommendations rather than requirements. Jovanovic observed that the words "shall" or "must" would indicate requirements, while "should" indicates only recommendation. Clausen concurred in this reading.

**Main motion as amended carried on voice vote.**

- E. MOTION. Undergraduate Council, presented by Jeanette Clausen, chair. (Motion; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

*Proposals for new courses or modifications of existing courses for FYC can be accommodated within the current course approval process by adding a section on the FYC criteria and learning objectives to the CCF guidelines. The course approval process will thus be the same as for any other new course or course change.*

The motion was withdrawn when, upon discussion, it became clear that no action was required to accomplish the intent of the motion.

- F. MOTION. Admission and Transfer of Credit Committee, presented by George Tebbets, chair. (Legislation; no second required; majority vote of 3/5 required at two meetings.)

*That the description of the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee in the Constitution of the University Assembly of UALR be changed as shown below:*

*Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, this committee shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining appropriate standards for admitting students to UALR and accepting transfer credit. It shall recommend policies to the Faculty Senate in the areas of its responsibility. It also shall hear appeals from applicants for admission and from students concerned with transfer credit.*

*The committee shall consist of ten full-time faculty members to be appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly, two student members appointed by the Student Government Association, and the administrative officer in charge (or designee) of the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid, the Office of Records and Registration, the Office of Transfer Student Services, University College/Academic Advising, and the Office of Testing Services. An Admissions Office designee shall serve as coordinator for the Admissions Committee proceedings. The ten faculty members shall serve two-year staggered terms and there shall be a minimum of one faculty member from each College except the Bowen School of Law, and a maximum*

*of three faculty members from any one College. All members of the committee are voting members.*

**Commentary:** The organization of this committee reflects an older organization of the University (the Office of Admissions and the Office of Records are now two separate offices; the Dean of Students or his/her designee does not participate in the proceedings of this committee) and the organization did not include the administrative officer (or designee) of the Office of Transfer Student Services which was created in February 2009. The new organization of the committee will more appropriately represent the newer administrative organization of the University and will expand faculty participation to ensure that a 2:1 ratio of faculty to staff voting membership is maintained on this committee, so that faculty maintain responsibility for decisions affecting transfer credit articulation to UALR curriculum.

Tebbetts talked the Senate through the proposed changes.

Eshleman asked if the committee would accept a friendly amendment to return to the current faculty membership level of eight, again on the principle that enlarging the amount of committee work performed by faculty ought only to happen for compelling reasons.

Tebbetts refused the friendly amendment, and several senators—some on the committee and some observers—noted that the workload for the committee has been large in recent years, and the expansion in membership would be helpful to all members..

**Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.** The motion will be voted on again in the January 2010 meeting.

## *IX. Open Forum*

Ford invited people to talk if they wished, though he did feel compelled to remind them that any such talking would only delay their enjoyment of the refreshment to be provided by Chris Peterson at the close of the meeting.

Jovanovic recalled last meeting's discussion about the state minimum core and whether our students are locked into taking particular specific courses, designated by course number, in order to have satisfied the core. His reading of the policy differed from what we heard last month. Discussion ensued among several people familiar with the core and transfer credit, and was difficult for amateurs in such matters to follow. Jovanovic kindly closed the discussion by saying he'd explore further and come back when he had a better-framed question to raise.

Tramel reminded the Senate that there are five departments presently engaged in a pilot program on transfer of credit in which they are making many decisions at the departmental level that would otherwise have been referred to the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee.

## *VIII. Adjourn*

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,*

Judith Faust, Secretary.

# Attachment 1

## Athletics Committee

### *Appointed Committee of the Senate*

This committee shall consider matters pertaining to the intercollegiate athletic program and shall be advisory in nature with respect to the relationship of athletics to the academic purposes of the University. These matters may include, but are not limited to, the monitoring of academic progress and eligibility of student-athletes, scheduling of athletic events, allocation of scholarships, recruitment of student-athletes, the adding and dropping of sports, NCAA, ~~NAIA~~ and conference rules and changes, and other matters related to intercollegiate athletics.

The committee shall be composed of ~~six-ten~~ full-time faculty members to be appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly, with the proviso that no more than representation by at least one voting member shall be selected from any single each academic college or school (with the exception of the Bowen Scholl of Law) and no more than two member from each academic college or school (including the Bowen School of Law). The Committee on Committees shall also appoint two staff members to the committee. The Student Government Association shall appoint two students to the committee. The faculty and staff members shall serve two-year, staggered terms, and the student members shall serve one-year terms. The director of athletics, registrar, and the advisor for student-athletes shall serve as ex officio members without vote.

A faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) will be appointed by the chancellor with advice from the Athletics Committee. The FAR will serve for a three-year term and may be reappointed for subsequent three-year terms. Appointment of the Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) will be for a three-year term and may be renewable. The FAR will be appointed by the chancellor from a recommendation provided by the Athletics Committee. The FAR will serve on the Athletics Committee as an ex officio member with vote.

#### Comments:

First paragraph—just some housekeeping changes, eliminating reference to NAIA and permitting the committee to provide advice or topics not enumerated in the committee's charge.

#### Second paragraph—

Expands committee by four additional faculty. Each school or college would be represented by at least one faculty member but no more than two. The Bowen School of Law would not have to have representation but could. That language and option was used because the law school really doesn't have much interreaction with students athletes but there might be someone on their faculty with a particular interest and/or expertise that could serve the committee.

#### Third paragraph—

Separated from second. Clarifies that committee's role in the appointment of the FAR by the chancellor as advisory. The previous language made it seem as if the chancellor would have to follow the committee's recommendation which is probably not the case.

Any suggestions for wording, structure, content, etc. are welcome.

