



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, November 19, 2010, 1:00 p.m.
Ross Hall 122

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Anson, Bailey, Chapman, Clausen, Deiser, Giammo, Groesbeck, Vinikas, Yoder. CB— Edison, Nickels, Watts. CE— Hughes, McAdams, Nolan. CEIT— Anderson, Babiceanu, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi. LAW— Aiyetoro. Fitzhugh, Goldner. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS— Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Driskill, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Douglas, Grant, Guellich, McMillan, Sims, Tarasenko, Wright, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO—Anderson, Belcher, Eshleman, Faust, Ford.

Guests Present: Epps, Hoffpauir.

Absent: CAHSS— Amrhein, English, Estes, Garnett, Kleine. CB – Funk. CE— Hayn, Kuykendal. CEIT— Tebbets. CPS – Golden. CSM— Seigar, Thompson. EX OFFICIO— Patterson, Lewis.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Eshleman welcomed the senators at 1:04 p.m. and invited the secretary to call the roll.

II. Review of minutes

The minutes of the October 15, 2010, meeting of the Senate were reviewed. The summary of Sandra Robertson's report was amended by correcting the title of the new Student Success Champion and specifying reporting lines as follows (changes in italics): "The Student Success Champion—*an Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs/Student Success*—will report to the provost. *The Office of Academic Advising and the Academic Success Center will report to the new Associate Vice-Chancellor.* In addition, the following acronyms were corrected and expanded: CCA (*Complete College America*) and IPEDS (*Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System*). In the Open Forum comments, Watts's statement was amended to read ". . . two classes of *faculty.*"

Vinikas moved and Smith-Olinde seconded that the minutes be accepted as amended. Motion passed on a voice vote.

III. Announcements

President Eshleman reported several items:

1. Upcoming business: there is a passage in the new Promotion and Tenure document that requires interpretation and review / approval by the Senate. The Executive Committee will bring a recommendation to the next meeting.
2. Since several faculty had expressed concerns about possible trends in the hiring of faculty, President Eshleman will form an ad hoc committee to investigate actual practice. Earl Ramsey and Mike Watts have agreed to serve. President Eshleman would like to have two or three volunteers to fill out the ad hoc committee. Its first task will be to determine what kind of data are needed.
3. Since the next Senate meeting (December 3) is very close to this one, the Executive Committee will determine whether there is business urgent enough to hold the meeting; watch for an announcement. Tschumi commented that we could move to approve December graduates at this meeting.
4. Another important meeting on campus will begin at 2:00pm, so some people will be leaving at that time.

IV. Introduction of new topics

Eshleman opened the floor for senators to bring up items that need to come to the Senate's attention. There were none.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The Chancellor commented that meeting in Ross Hall 122 makes him nostalgic because he used to have classes here. He promised to be quick.

1. Inclement Weather Policy. The Chancellor will send the draft of the new inclement weather policy out on FacFocus and Staff Focus. The new policy decouples our closing from that of the Little Rock School District (LRSD); it states that there may be situations when campus is open but classes are cancelled; it specifies how notification will be done. Under the new policy, the Arkansas Studies Institute and the Law School may make different decisions than UALR. Whether to cancel online classes is left to the discretion of the faculty member; the faculty should communicate with their own students.
2. Institutional Research Board. The latest IRB draft policy (by George Jensen) is now out being looked at by the IRB people and others. Hopefully we are close to a final draft.
3. Complete College America (CCA). The Chancellor was part of the Arkansas group that attended a CCA meeting in Denver. Some 22 states have embraced CCA or are on the verge of doing so. The CCA goals are: (1) Increase the number of degrees and certificates that are awarded (certificates must be substantive and position the person for moving into a career), and (2) close achievement gaps (specifically those involving minority and low income students). The issues, as the Chancellor perceives them, are how we package education and how we move students through it. If the CCA initiative takes off, it may be very positive for us and other institutions, especially those that are able to be nimble in responding to

challenges and opportunities. Another strong impression is that for legislators, there will always be an incentive to make the money go as far as possible.

The Chancellor highlighted several topics that were a focus of the CCA meeting. One is performance funding. There are some funding models (particularly out of Ohio) that are more acceptable because they have gotten away from graduation rates and are looking instead at graduation: If you graduate students in a hard-to-graduate group, there might be a premium that goes with that. Performance funding, one way or another, is coming, but there may be versions of it that are more encouraging than has been the case in the past.

Another topic that generated a lot of talk is remediation. There seemed to be no particular consensus on what people ought to be doing -- recommendations include more diagnostics and more customization, all of which make sense.

The third focus was time to degree. The Chancellor summarized several recommendations for shortening time to degree. (1) The typical undergraduate degree should not be more than 120 hours. The Chancellor commented: "I don't really have a problem with this." Years ago it was said that the 4 hours [of the 124] were the 4 hours of Physical Education, which we no longer have. (2) A common course numbering system, which would be very tedious to accomplish but "it's hard to say it wouldn't be a good thing." (3) Transfer hours. In the old model, six years was considered a generous span of time. (4) A common academic calendar statewide; this too would be a good thing, but the Chancellor would have to oppose a hunting recess (laughter). (5) Retention initiatives. Interruptions do lead to drop-outs and lack of success. (6) Highly structured programs -- students prefer them.

There was also discussion about limiting the number of transfer hours that a student can bring; you'll be hearing about these and other topics in the next months. The goal, to double the number of graduates in a ten-year period, is daunting. The Chancellor said he wouldn't take time for questions "but you can shoot me an email."

B. Provost Belcher

Strategic Planning. The Provost began his report with "the never-ending strategic planning process." Today or Monday, his office will distribute two documents: (1) the accountability report, an overarching reflection of the past few years ("you need to know where you've been"), and (2) a draft of the new strategic plan -- "Please take it away from us!" What you will see is a rough draft -- it has redundancies, old ideas, etc. -- but it's time to share it with the campus community. The Provost stated that he charged the strategic planning committee with streamlining the draft (omit routine actions, omit initiatives that are not strategic, those that are not realistic, and those that are not priorities). In his opinion it's still too long and there is plenty of opportunity for feedback and improvement. Kathy Oliverio has created a response form that allows you to comment on each goal, strategy, and tactic. Please take advantage of this opportunity for input into the strategic planning process.

Undergraduate Curriculum Revision. The Provost reminded the Senate that the Task Force on Undergraduate Curriculum Revision had recently sent out a request for input and urged us to respond.

University of Arkansas Board of Trustees meeting. A highlight of last week's BOT meeting was the official approval of the creation of the Institute on Race and Ethnicity at UALR. We expect many faculty and staff across campus to want to participate; the Institute will also be a great nexus for interdisciplinary work. The UALR Board of Visitors has endorsed the Institute and the George A. Donaghey Foundation has given us start-up funds in the amount of \$200,000 over a three-year period.

Campus Community Book Discussion. The announcement of the annual book discussions will go out on Monday after Thanksgiving. The book is by Richard Florida, *The Great Re-Set*. It explores our current economic challenges against the backdrop of two recent economic challenges, The Great Depression of the 1930s and the Long Depression of the Nineteenth Century. Watch for the announcement.

C. Report from the Undergraduate Curriculum Task Force: Felecia Epps

Epps said she was thinking of requesting an office on campus, and she enjoys being here. There is not much of an update yet; the Task Force is meeting again today 2pm. They are working now on the focus groups. Yesterday they conducted a focus group with the Board of Visitors, which yielded some familiar themes: college graduates should have writing, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills, they should know how to work in teams/play well with others. There are two more focus groups scheduled for this semester, alumni and employers. The Task Force needs faculty input on core competencies, etc. for general education. The survey soliciting input went out electronically but she also has paper copies. A few people said they had replied to the survey, so maybe the web site isn't working. Epps will follow up with Kathy Oliverio.

Tschumi suggested that if the comments didn't go through, it's a good reason for the administration to re-send the message.

D. Report on Pilot Project for Transfer of Credit: Susan Hoffpauir

Hoffpauir began by reminding the senators that the Chancellor had invited faculty to meet with him in 2007-08 to look at the evolution of UALR from an institution with mostly native students to what we have now. The outcome was the Transfer-of-Credit Pilot Project, which began in spring 2008 with four departments: Criminal Justice, Construction Management, History, and Biology. Those programs basically volunteered to participate. The guidelines for participation were:

Only transfer students could participate.

Participating departments had flexibility with 5 baccalaureate requirements: the 45 upper-level hours, the 30 hours in residence, major requirements, minor requirements, and core requirements.

Participating departments were required to keep two broad criteria in mind: would the students be as prepared for graduate school and as prepared for employment as other UALR graduates.

Participating departments were required to collect data on each student to determine whether the outcomes of the pilot project do or do not support a case for revision of policy and practice concerning transfer credit.

Hoffpauir presented charts and tables summarizing the results of the Pilot Project after five semesters serving 110 students. Some highlights:

The average number of core hours waived was 3.5.

The average number of hours saved toward graduation was 9.2. One chair pointed out that transfer students come in with an average of 65 hours. Saving 9.2 hours gets them finished about one semester sooner than without the flexibility of the Pilot Project.

The chairs of the participating departments met with the chancellor and provost to collect some qualitative data. They didn't use the waiver unless it made sense for the student.

There was no move to give away the farm. No one waived the 30 hour residency requirement. Waivers were used very judiciously.

Tschumi asked whether 110 students represented the number of students who were considered or the ones who received waivers. Hoffpauir replied that 110 is the total number of students who received a waiver. Tschumi asked how many students total were considered. Hoffpauir did not have that information.

Maguire said that in History, waivers were granted to 16 out of the total number of students advised in the department. Tramel said the students counted in their report are ones that graduated: "I only dealt with graduating seniors." Also the reason their number of core hours waived is higher is because they (EIT) have a unique core.

Faust commented that the averages are in some ways less impressive than looking at the individual students.

Rice commented that the reason for low numbers of courses waived in the major requirements is that departments already had authority to make exceptions for the major, so there was nothing new in that respect. He asked about the minor –did departments have authority to create minors that don't really exist?

Hoffpauir referenced History and Criminal Justice. Maguire (History) said that what she did mostly was waive the minor requirement. Hoffpauir recalled cases in which "you could almost put a minor together" but the student lacked a couple of hours and it didn't make sense to ask them to take those hours, given the large number of hours that they had completed toward graduation. Maguire commented that she waived the minor only when students had "a boatload of hours" and making them complete a minor would have either kept them here two more semesters or they would go elsewhere.

Groesbeck asked if there were certain courses in the core that were more likely to be waived. Hoffpauir said she has the data but had not sorted it out to compile that information. Tramel said he kept records of every course waived: "For us it was primarily the

survey of Econ, next was Speech, then History, and English Comp. Maguire said that most students who benefited were those who had already completed the core. Tramel said that his department decided as a faculty that they would only accept a transfer course for the core if the transfer course counted as a core course at the other institution. Also, they didn't waive upper-level hours.

Robertson, noticing that no residency hours had been waived, asked if it had simply not come up. Maguire said it didn't come up. Hoffpauir confirmed that it wasn't an issue.

Jovanovic asked whether, in theory, the kinds of requirements that were waived could have been done without the Pilot Project by a more cumbersome process of going to the departments to ask for waivers. Hoffpauir said that it could, but that many faculty who are advising don't know that there's a way to get these things done and it shouldn't just be the luck of the draw. It's more fair this way, "you don't have to know the secret handshake."

E. Undergraduate Council—Jeanette Clausen, chair

Clausen reported that the UGC had been very busy since last report. The UGC has reviewed and approved proposals for course and program changes from COB, AHSS, CPS, CSAM, and EIT; all are reported on the web site. She highlighted one very comprehensive program change, from Construction Management/Construction Engineering. They submitted a comprehensive revision/reorganization of the two degrees complete with 8-semester plans for each of them, and rationales for each change. This proposal was a thing of beauty – for any department planning a large-scale curriculum, the CNMG/CNEG proposal provides a model of clarity that deserves to be emulated.

First Year Colloquium: the Guidelines for FYC courses, sent out by the Provost on October 15, 2010, apparently escaped the notice of some, based on questions from chairs and administrators. The guidelines have now been sent out multiple times, and are also posted on the UGC web site. The guidelines indicate that courses developed in the spirit of FYC but prior to the FYC requirement should be submitted to UGC for review and to be blessed, as it were, for publication to students and faculty as options for meeting the new requirement. So far UGC has reviewed six such courses and found them all to be well in line with the FYC criteria. The courses are:

PEAW 1300	The First Year Experience
PEAW 1124-01	Chancellor's Leadership Corps
PEAW 1124-02	EIT version
ECET 1302	Freshman Experience in Technology and Computer
IFSC 1305	Information Science Freshman Experience
SYEN 1310	Introduction to Systems Engineering

Though two of the above are one-credit courses and the others are three-credit, all met the expectations articulated in the FYC request for proposals.

An important point to keep in mind is that in the case of a multi-section course, ALL sections of the course must follow the FYC criteria; it is not possible to designate one section of, e.g.,

Introduction to Sociology or U.S. History for FYC but not the other sections. Therefore, departments thinking of adapting an introductory course for FYC should consider very carefully whether the course can really serve two purposes, both FYC and an introduction to the discipline or sub-discipline. It is, however, possible to designate sections of one FYC course for specific first-year populations, as with PEAW 1124, which has one section for Chancellor's Leadership Corps and one for EIT students. Clausen is glad to answer questions about any FYC issues.

F. Graduate Council—Steve Jennings, chair.

Jennings assured the Senate that Graduate Council is not disbanding. Minutes are on the web site. The main issue to be addressed is that they are updating policy. They have approved two policies concerning graduate assistantships and grading; these are on the web site. The Council wants to get a sense of the Senate as to how we should proceed with these policies, which are about to go into effect. They have observed the standard review periods where anyone can raise objections but are asking for feedback from the Senate.

Tschumi said that policies that extend across departments and colleges must come to the Senate. Robertson added that such policies/policy changes should be submitted as part of the regular agenda of the Senate meeting. "Hearing about it isn't the same thing as seeing it." Eshleman asked whether Grad Council acts on the new or revised policy before the Senate sees it. Robertson pointed out that our constitution says the Senate has to be informed. Tschumi explained that early on, there was an understanding that many things had to come to the Assembly (Senate didn't exist at the time). In terms of things that stretch across departments you were expected to err on the side of caution and bring it to the Senate. "We sort of lost that." Some universities list all actions of each group and put the list on a "consent agenda" and anyone can pull it off the consent agenda. This ensures that everyone who sees the agenda will see everything that has gone on. It creates a longer approval period. Eshleman said it was something for us to think about. Tschumi said the transfer of credit issue recently passed by UGC should have come to the Senate. Faust commented that everyone has access to the Senate. "What I would appreciate is a little poke – I'm grateful to receive the minutes but I don't read them."

Douglas asserted that a change of policy should come to this body. Robertson said that the Constitution doesn't say that – requiring it would require a change to the constitution. There ensued an exchange in which Tschumi and Robertson expressed different interpretations of the language of the constitution. Tschumi said that the language comes "from way back and it was understood for decades." He also said the language can be read either way.

Sims asked whether it takes a long time to read the actions of the UGC or the Grad Council. Aiyetoro recommended looking at the constitution again. We should err on the side of caution. Robertson said the Executive Committee can decide what kinds of actions should come to the Senate. Jennings said that Grad Council just wanted the Senate to know the Council had adopted some policies.

Eshleman commented that there are two issues – the actual policies, and the larger issue of how to handle policy changes/when to bring them to the Senate. Jo-
vanovic noted that we could have reviewed the policies in less time than this dis-
cussion.

G. Motion Concerning December 2010 Graduates

Tschumi moved that we suspend the rules (there was a second but the secretary
didn't catch who it was from). The motion passed.

Tschumi moved that the Faculty Senate approve the graduation of students who have met
all the requirements of their respective programs and colleges. Sims seconded. The mo-
tion was approved unanimously on a voice vote.

VI. New Business: Motion presented by Vice-President Laura Smith-Olinde on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee

(Legislation: requires majority vote at one meeting)

See attachment, "Pilot Project Extension 11.19.10"

Smith-Olinde moved to continue the pilot project for the four participating departments
(as per the attachment).

Tramel: I've said what I have to say and I have the data from my department if anyone
wants to see it. We didn't give the farm away, we took it very seriously.

Maguire: One of my department colleagues expressed a concern about giving away the
farm; we were very conservative. These were students who would have given up, or who
would have gone elsewhere. I would encourage you to extend this flexibility to other de-
partments advising transfer students and possibly extend it also to students who transfer
internally.

Vice President Smith-Olinde moved the question.

It passed unanimously on a voice vote.

VII. Open Forum

President Eshleman invited comments from senators.

Watts referenced an article in Sunday's paper, an excerpt from the book *Higher Edu-
cation? How Colleges are Wasting our Money and Failing our Kids, and What We Can Do
About It*. He commented that the public library has a copy of this book but the
UALR library does not.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:37 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeanette Clausen, Secretary