



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, December 5, 2008, 1:00 p.m.
Donaghey Student Center, Rooms B & C

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Anson, Bunch, Chadwick, Clausen, Eshleman, Estes, Giammo, Martin, Ramsey, Vinikas, Webb, Yoder. CB— Brice, Edison, Holland, Nickels, Watts. CE— Bandre, Hayn, Lindsay, Pack. CEIT— Jovanovich, Patangia, Tramel, Tschumi, Tudoreanu. LAW— Foster. CPS— Faust, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Chen, Douglas, Kosmatov, McMillan, Perkins, Prince, Sims, Tarasenko. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Belcher, Ford, Williams, Davis.

Absent: CAHSS— Levernier. CE— Garner. CEIT — Chan. LAW— Aiyetoro, Fitzhugh. CPS— Robinson. LIBRARY— Pine. CPS— Collier-Tenison, Robinson. CSM— Wiscaver. EX OFFICIO— Lyn-Cook.

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 14 meeting. **Motion and second to accept the minutes carried on voice vote.**

III Announcements

President Ford deferred announcements in favor of permitting more time for the Senate's invited guests.

IV. Reports

A. Arkansas State Representative Johnnie Roebuck

President Ford introduced Rep. Roebuck, who as chair of the Task Force on Higher Education Remediation, Retention, and Graduation, was a principle participant in the process that resulted in the "Access to Success" report.

Rep. Roebuck, once a professor of educational leadership at Henderson State University, said coming to the legislature from academia was a bit of a shock. Among other differences, work there is not research-based, not data-driven. She congratulated us on having two faculty members joining the General Assembly, Jim Nickels and Ann Clemmer.

She said it was important that the task force address some of the issues coming out of her experience. One was the enormous need for remediation. She asked whether the General Assembly had ever studied the issue, and discerned from what followed that they had, as Rep. Bisbee said, “talked it to death.” They got a bill through to create a task force to study it and report to the Assembly by November 15. The task force, she said, included practitioners; only four of the fifteen members were legislators. They concluded their work in August.

Rep. Roebuck’s view is that the worst outcome that might result from the report would be a bunch of new laws. The best outcome would be a raft of new policies and practices in educational institutions.

She encouraged senators to read the report, suggesting we’d like what we see. There are, she said, no opinions in it: it’s all research-based and data-driven.

Arkansas is at 49th in the nation in percentage of college graduates. The goal is that by 2015, the state will be at the SREB median. While getting there may be a daunting task, she said, the goal is sound.

She praised the participation of Chancellor Anderson and Department of Higher Education Director Jim Purcell, and noted this is not just a higher=education effort; it’s a prekindergarten-through-16-or-18 effort.

She noted that UALR has an Educational Renewal Zone, and challenged us to find out what that ERZ is about. They resulted from legislation sponsored by Rep. Calvin Johnson.

Rep. Roebuck said they have some money available, and some pledges of private money, to get a pilot project up and running by February 1. It will start with 30 students in the eighth grade who will enter a “preparatory academy.” They’ve dug out test scores that constitute a goldmine of descriptive and diagnostic data.

She said we’re spending \$53M a year, \$20M of it in state dollars, on remediation. She suggested we can solve this problem, and we can do it faster, more efficiently, and more effectively than the 135 legislators can. There will be legislation, of course, but the real work of problem solving has to happen through policy and practice at ADHE, colleges and universities, and local school districts.

Q from Eshleman: Has anybody looked at whether students who score proficient on those state exams still need remediation? *A:* Yes, and some of them do. We’re very concerned about end-of-course exams and whether they mesh well with the ACT. We could have used theirs, but we chose to develop our own, and we’ve been meeting with them. Have 76 school districts now that pay for every student to take the ACT.

Comment from Jovanovich: If we want to increase the number of graduates, we have to make higher education affordable. Scholarships currently aren’t sufficient or sufficiently accessible. *A:* She appreciated the comment, she said, pointing out that they’ve hammered on Jim Purcell with their concerns about the existing scholarship funds and about how important it is to broaden the reach of scholarships. The lottery will give us a new pot of money, she said, and we’re looking now at options for structuring the lottery scholarships.

B. Director, Arkansas Department of Higher Education, Jim Purcell

Director Purcell reported on the state of the state in higher education, including in it such disturbing facts as this: in 2002, we had more adults in Arkansas with bachelor’s degrees than we do now.

We got our “Measuring Up” report card: not so good. The silver lining is we’re better in four out of five categories than before, but it’s still not one to take home to momma with a proud grin. The task force chaired by Rep. Roebuck, he noted, says we must improve the current production of bachelor’s degrees by 68% by 2015.

We have a 38% six-year graduation rate, which is 16 or 17 points behind the rest of the country.

Who’s paying for higher education now? Student loans are bearing far and away the heaviest share of the cost of higher education.

Purcell says the plan is based on two principles: speed to market and closeness to the customer. There are three goals: 1) Expedite the number of degrees produced and the speed with which they are, through a funding formula focused on course completion rather than enrollment. 2) Target workforce shortages. 3) Streamline the state’s financial aid programs. They’re working on a single application for all state scholarship funds, and on consolidating as many funds as possible.

Some current policy initiatives in ADHE: Funding formula—90% based on snapshot of enrollment; 10% now based on course completion rates. Institution-funded scholarships—seeking to reduce the cap back to 15%. Institutional financial health—UALR ranks third; does a lot in student support, and is modest in administrative expenditures. Decided universities can only borrow only on real money, not on made-up money. Finally, raising thresholds of the numbers of degrees that must be granted by programs—ADHE will no longer fund degree programs that drop below the thresholds.

Future things to do: Seamless transfer of credit. Alignment of academic programs in the state. Designing the lottery scholarship program

Q from Jovanovich: Seems to be a lot of overlap between the state minimum core in HE and the smart core in high schools. Anybody looking at changing the state minimum core to align it better with the smart core? *A:* Purcell apparently heard the query differently and talked about something else.

Q from Ramsey: To clarify the meaning of “course completion,” would earning D’s and F’s qualify as “completing the course”? *A:* Yes. Some institutions were keeping students who had withdrawn on the rolls just to get the money, and we wanted to put a stop to that.

Q from Jennings about seamlessness of transferring credit. *A:* Purcell used Georgia as an example; they have identical course numbering across institutions. Such an approach requires oversight to be sure they *are* the same courses. Said this may not be the path we choose, because it would be expensive, but it’s a good model.

Comment from Webb about psychology courses at Pulaski Tech, where he said the sections are twice as large and there are no psychologists on the faculty. This gives him grave concern about how strong a correspondence we can expect between a course at one institution and the “same” course at another.

In further comments about scholarships, Purcell talked about Increasing need-based awards, and permitting some stacking of scholarships. He pointed out the \$50M in unspent balances of existing state scholarships, and said we need to move that money. Referred again to simplifying the application process and combining as many funds as possible.

Q from a senator: We have a tremendously undereducated population of folks in their twenties and thirties who are going to be in the workforce for the next many decades. Some of the performance models discourage us from inviting those folks back in and taking care of them. Is there some way to balance? *A:* Yes. Compare your experience to what you’ve done in the past, and keep a number of the performance measures tied to

first-time, full-time students. We actually have a grant program for an adult degree-completion program.

Comment from Tschumi: One of our concerns is evaluating UALR by native students, given our circumstances. *A:* At UALR, you could count your graduates at UAMS in your calculation. The degree-production measure addresses that. Our intent is to combine retention and completion rate measures with measures designed by the institutions themselves

Q from Ramsey: Will seamless transfer result in standardization of content? *A:* It's important that the academy address issues of quality. He thinks academic programs should set the standards for admission into their programs: the prerequisite courses, the grade-point requirement, and whatever other savvy you think is needed to be a historian, for example.

Q from Eshleman: Will the 10% go up? *A:* Yes. Probably to a maximum of 50%—beyond that, it begins to show some adverse results. Eshleman and others wonder if such a policy doesn't create an incentive for institutions to pass students who shouldn't pass,

Q from Bunch: She connected course withdrawal with factors other than her teaching, naming several. So, how can we judge the educational quality of an institution by this measure? *A:* He wants Bunch to keep doing exactly what she's doing, teaching her courses the way they ought to be taught and letting the chips fall where they may.

Comment from Webb: He didn't see any semicolons in Purcell's presentation. Why not? Spoke of a student who wrote his complete exploratory essay with semicolons, having read Joyce's *Ulysses* the previous summer, and who was placed in remediation as a result. Remediation, Webb said, should be academic triage; instead, it's taught in the form of a lecture-format class. We should be identifying what the issues are, and addressing them.

Comment from Chen about his concern regarding the degree programs that by nature cannot have lots of graduates. *A:* There are a number of specific caveats in connection with the policy about the number of degrees that must be produced for a degree program to receive funding—and when you're dealing with a bunch of university presidents, he added, you certainly will have a number of caveats—intended to take into account such programs as highly specialized ones in sciences.

Purcell's final comment was that what we need to do here is make it so that more people, as was true for him, can *know* they're going to college. We can do that, he said.

C. Chancellor Anderson

The chancellor expressed his intent speak briefly in the train of two such informative presentations about issues so important to us. He complimented the Senate for having Roebuck and Purcell here today to talk about these issues. He also commended professors Nickels and Clemmer for having stood for seats in the Arkansas General Assembly and won them. He said it bodes only, well for us to have two UALR faculty members in the legislature. With that, he deferred to the provost, who would present a couple of other things he sees as important.

D. Provost Belcher

The provost too praised the Senate for having the two leaders here today to talk about the issues higher education—and the entire educational system—is dealing with in Arkansas today.

The provost had “two quick things” for the Senate’s consideration. First, after the last meeting, he noted a lot of chatter on FacFocus about core curriculum review. He is glad to see that discussion is happening, and it seems logical, especially as we go through North Central accreditation and since it has been many years since we last addressed the entire core. The provost encouraged the senate to be slow about making piecemeal changes; the issues coming up are right on target and need attention, but it seems to him wise that we get through our reaccreditation self-study process before we take it on.

Second, the provost spoke in anticipation of Clausen’s motion to suspend the rules to permit a vote today on the issue of transfer of military credit. He said that for him one of the most compelling arguments in favor of supporting the measure is the quality issue. We’re talking about accepting courses articulated under the aegis of the American Council on Education (ACE). He added that the forthcoming newest version of the GI Bill also makes this issue of special importance and promise to us.

E. Reports of Standing Committees:

1. Graduate Council, Anne Lindsay, Chair

Graduate Council is addressing policy regarding 4000-5000-level courses. Those coming before the Council now are all over the place; apparently folks aren’t following the policy as it presently exists. The interim dean of the Graduate School is going to call a meeting in January for all graduate coordinators. Senators who have issues or judgments about these courses should get with their graduate coordinators to prepare them for the meeting. Quality of courses is the issue.

2. Undergraduate Council, Jeanette Clausen, Chair

In keeping with its charge to streamline, the Undergraduate Council has only met once since the last Senate meeting. Their discussion is ongoing concerning the minor requirement. The Council’s next step will be to contact curriculum committees at the college level to get further information and perspective.

Next week, advance comment about the proposed BS degree in dance will begin.

The last item the Council wishes to present has to do with a clarification in our policy about accepting transfer credit from military service. Clausen said she will postpone discussion until Ford recognizes her for a motion to suspend the rules to get on the floor the motion she had earlier sent to senators.

F. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

Roles and Rewards II, Catherine Lowry, Chair

This task force jointly appointed by the provost and the president of the Senate has now met three times. Lowry said they are beginning by looking at our own campus, reading governance documents, and talking to deans and department chairs. They will also look at what other universities are doing. She asked that if senators know of programs the task force ought to examine, they contact her at colowry@ualr.edu.

Roberstson added that following this task force on roles and rewards for full-time non-tenure-track faculty, we should be looking at the same issues for research staff and other professional staff.

V. New Business

A. MOTION. Executive Committee/. (No second required. Majority vote at one meeting.)

That all students who have met the requirements for graduation for the fall semester of 2009 be approved by the UALR faculty for graduation.

President Ford recognized Smith-Olinde to make the motion. **Watts offered a friendly amendment to change the date from 2009 to 2008. Accepted as very friendly.**

Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

President Ford recognized Jeanette Clausen, chair of Undergraduate Council. **Clausen moved, Sims seconded, suspension of the rules in order to make a motion. Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.**

Clausen, for the Undergraduate Council, **moved the following:**

Transfer credit policy applies to military credit as articulated by the American Council on Education (ACE).

Tschumi offered alternative language as a friendly amendment. It was accepted as friendly and the motion now reads as follows:

That military credit that has been certified by ACE as equivalent to college level courses shall be accepted for transfer into UALR.

Q from Jovanovich: Does this apply to courses taken or to on-the-job experience? *A from Clausen and AVC Hoffpauir:* It's all about training, and is sometimes a mix of things.

Robertson commented, suggesting to the Council that they recognize that what ACE sends is not in the form of a transcript, and that they coordinate carefully and resolve that issue with the admissions people, who have heretofore sometimes failed to accept the ACE information as transcript. Ford pointed out that Robertson was raising an issue about procedures and policy, while we're here acting on legislation. Robertson agreed. Ford asked the provost if he would be aware of this matter and facilitate its resolution as appropriate. The provost agreed.

Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

B. MOTION. Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee. (No second required. Majority vote at one meeting.) (*N.B.: The templates, as Microsoft Excel files, are being transmitted separately. They are also available on the Faculty Senate web page as attachments to the agenda for the meeting of 05 Dec 2008.*)

That the final exam templates which were prepared and approved by the committee and based on consultation day as the starting point for each template be approved along with the following action:

- 1. That in accordance with the UALR Faculty Handbook (page 7.9) all faculty members must comply with '...an orderly schedule of final examinations...' and that each faculty member who gives final exams is '...required to use the specified schedule for final examinations.'*
- 2. That should there be conflicts between information contained in these templates and previous action taken by the Faculty Senate or other university representatives, these templates will supersede the previous action.*
- 3. Once these templates are approved by the Faculty Senate, the note "Approved by UALR Faculty Senate, December 5, 2008" is to be added to each template.*

Amy Barnes presented the motion, which carried on unanimous voice vote.

C. MOTION. Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee. (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

That students transferring to the University from a regionally accredited college or university shall meet the UALR core requirement if they transfer 44 hours meeting the following distribution of courses:

- 1) *3 hours of college algebra or college mathematics,*
- 2) *6 hours of English composition,*
- 3) *6-12 hours of social science*
- 4) *3 hours of U.S. history or U.S. government*
- 5) *8 hours of lab science,*
- 6) *6-12 hours of arts and humanities, and*
- 7) *0-3 hours of speech.*

Students missing some of this distribution of courses will only be required to add the courses they are missing. These missing courses must be added from the approved core courses in the corresponding UALR areas.

This legislation becomes effective for students entering UALR Spring 2009. Students, who entered UALR prior to Spring 2009 may choose to use this policy.

Commentary: The current transfer policy has been created in a piecemeal fashion as we have reacted to various issues. As a result, despite there being only small variations between existing policies, there have been problems with advisors misunderstanding which policies to apply and with students being ill-advised. The purpose of this policy is to replace the various existing policies with one policy. This policy ensures that we meet the State Minimum Core Required for a Baccalaureate Degree. Students transferring into UALR from Colleges or Universities with degrees that meet the Articulation Agreement of the Arkansas Department of Higher Education of 1994 satisfy this Core.

George Tebbetts, chair of the Admission and Transfer of Credit Committee, presented the motion. Discussion centered around why the treatment of transfer students in connection with the core is so different from the requirements we have for our native students. There was consternation about the “0-3 hours” requirement regarding speech. Hoffpauir finally clarified that the minimum core requirement from the state was originally “6-9 hours in comp and speech.” When we began, as a state, to look at how to make transfer of credit easier, the distribution range of credits in speech was finally offered as “0-3.”

A question raised about the effects of this on students transferring in. Associate Dean of AHSS Darryl Rice was in the audience, was asked to respond, and did so eloquently.

Hearing no more discussion, the chair called for a vote on the motion. **Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.**

D. MOTION. Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee (Legislation; no second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

That the addition is hereby authorized of a new undergraduate student classification of “non-degree, non-international student” to offer educational opportunities to the community for personal enrichment and/or career development, without the current temporary student status restriction of four credit hours per term and cumulative limit of eight credit hours. The student is not degree-seeking and would not qualify for financial aid. If the student chooses to become degree-seeking, he or she is required to reapply and would be responsible for satisfying all admission requirements for admission as a degree-seeking student.

Commentary: The classification is consistent with offerings from other institutions, such as University of Massachusetts-Boston, where the non-degree student is identified as those who “...enroll because individual courses can help them advance in their current careers or prepare for new careers, or simply because they seek the personal growth and enrichment that university study can give them.” The new classification will open doors of educational enrichment to the community and remove roadblocks from those who do not intend to earn a degree.

George Tebbetts, chair of the Admission and Transfer of Credit Committee, presented the motion and its rationale. Jovanovich said there is currently a status, “temporary student,” that permits students to do this.

Hoffpauir spoke of this as primarily a community service, enabling people from the community to come in and take a course or two.

Edison asked about students with a degree already. *A:* They already have a recognized status as postbaccalaureate students.

Dim memories were stirred of having once had a category of non-degree-seeking students that was in some way exploited and was done away with.

Ramsey spoke to the intent of this motion to ease the rigamarole of having to purchase transcripts and such things simply to take a class.

Webb suggested that we stop making this complicated. The motion is about removing the barriers

Moved Webb, seconded Martin, to end debate. Motion carried on voice vote.

Motion carried on unanimous voice vote.

E MOTION. Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee. (Legislation; no second required; three-fifths majority vote at two consecutive meetings.)

That the Admission and Transfer 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 eight 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 admissions and records, Dean of Students, University College/Academic Advising, Testing Services. An Admissions Office designee shall serve as coordinator for the Admissions Committee proceedings. The eight faculty members shall serve one 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 two faculty members from any one College. All members of the committee are voting members.

Commentary: The current faculty appointments to the Committee are for a one year term. There is therefore the possibility that there can be a committee made up entirely of new faculty members with a consequent lack of continuity. Two year staggered terms should insure that there is a combination of experienced committee members and new members. Although appointed faculty members are not selected to represent their own college, each college should be represented. Since there are more faculty seats than there are colleges, there will need to be more than one faculty member from some of the colleges. The minimums and maximums should allow an equitable distribution.

George Tebbetts, committee chair, presented the motion and its rationale.

The president observed that he had made an error in the description of the motion. Since it is an amendment to the constitution, passage requires a three-fifths majority at two meetings of the Senate, a requirement which was not noted on the meeting's agenda.

Friendly amendment from Foster that the Law School be excluded from the composition of the committee. Accepted as friendly by the committee.

The motion passed unanimously by show of hands.

VI. Open Forum

Due apparently to the lateness of the hour, there were no matters raised for discussion in open forum.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith Faust, Secretary.