



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

*Friday, January 28, 2011, 1:00 p.m.
Ross Hall 122*

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS— Amrhein, Anson, Bailey, Clausen, English, Estes, Garnett, Groesbeck, Kleine, Vinikas, Yoder. CB— Edison, Nickels, Watts. CE— Hayn, Hughes, Kuykendal. McAdams, Nolen. CEIT— Anderson, Babiceanu, Jovanovic, Tramel, Tschumi. LAW— Aiyetoro.. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS— Barnes, Collier-Tenison, Driskill, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Douglas, Grant, Guellich, McMillan, Tarasenko, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO—Anderson, Belcher, Eshleman, Faust, Ford.

Guests Present: Hoffpauir.

Absent: CAHSS— Chapman, Deiser, Giammo. CB – Funk. CEIT— Tebbets. Law: Fitzhugh, Goldner. CPS – Golden, Rhodes, CSM— Seigar, Sims, Wright, Thompson. EX OFFICIO— Patterson, Lewis.

I. Welcome and roll call

President Eshleman welcomed the senators at 1:03 p.m. and invited the secretary to call the roll.

II. Review of minutes

The minutes of the November 19, 2010, meeting of the Senate were reviewed. Robertson moved and Ford seconded the motion that the minutes be accepted. Motion passed on a voice vote.

III. Announcements

President Eshleman reported several items:

1. Ad hoc Committee on Faculty Hiring and Composition. This ad hoc committee has been appointed in response to concerns on the part of faculty as to whether the proportions of tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty are changing. Prof. Earl Ramsey, who raised the issue in the Senate last year, will chair the committee. The other members are Senators Mike Watts, Gail Hughes, and Joe Giammo, and Prof. John Kirk, Chair of the History Department. Charge: The committee should work with the administration (in particular, with the Director of Budget, Planning, and Institutional Research) to collect and analyze data on faculty hiring and composition over the past ten years in order to discern any trends and their possible significance. This should include, but need not be limited to data on the numbers of and credit hours of teaching delivered by tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty, and by full-time and part-time faculty, and on trends in the budget allocation devoted to faculty as a percentage of the total university

Minutes, January 28, 2011

budget. The Ad Hoc Committee will report to the Senate before the end of the spring 2011 semester.

2. Upcoming: There has been some discussion of the significance of UALR's withdrawal date, which allows students to drop a class or classes late in the semester (end of the 12th week) with a grade of W. The ramifications are becoming acute, since course completion is counted as a measure of productivity but of course, withdrawals don't count.

3. Upcoming: Discussion and possible recommendations on benefits. Later in the semester we will take up two benefits issues in a more formal way: (1) how benefit dollars are distributed based on whether only one person is covered, or whether it is two or more; and (2) the possibility of extending benefits domestic partners.

IV. Introduction of new topics (two minute limit, no discussion)

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

A senator asked whether an F counts as course completion. The answer is yes.

Guellich requested clarification: so if the student gets an F, we get money for them, but if they get a W we don't? Again, the answer is yes.

V. Reports

A. Chancellor Anderson

The Chancellor arrived after the Provost had already given his report. The Chancellor began by noting that the Board of Trustees meeting, which he had just left, was not yet over and Sandra had just texted, regretting that she was there and not here. The BOT was discussing two big topics: (1) strategies for dealing with the financial problems of UAMS and (2) the sixteen capital projects of UAF. Since there were no UALR items on the agenda, President Sugg gave Chancellor Anderson permission to leave. The Chancellor then commented, recalling his days as Provost of UALR, that provosts like to go first because if the Chancellor goes first he might steal your material or he might get some of it wrong and you don't feel comfortable correcting him.

Meetings with Department Chairs. The Chancellor commented briefly on the meetings that he and the Provost have been having with all the department chairs. These had been very productive meetings and he appreciated the opportunity.

Student success. We must continue to look for barriers to graduation. The barrier may be something that's "always" been there, e.g. if there is a requirement of 45 upper-level hours, one just doesn't question it. This is not to say we should change it but it's appropriate to look at it. When the governor or the legislature gets into these things, there usually is a reason. It's good to remember that the university exists to serve the people of the state. We need to listen respectfully when the issues are raised. It's early in the legislative session so there has been

Minutes, January 28, 2011

only one skirmish so far, a new bill from Justin Harris, opposing in-state rates for children of illegal immigrants. Chancellor Anderson spoke out against it, saying the bill wasn't needed because this is what is done now, based on Federal legislation. The Chancellor stated that he is opposed to Harris's bill on many grounds, one being that it brands people as "other," and another that the way we treat children of undocumented immigrants is contradictory: those children are required to attend K-12, but then prevented from pursuing postsecondary education. If the federal legislation is removed at some point, we don't need a state barrier there as well. These are motivated students who want a degree and it's in the state's interest to educate them.

Presidential Search: no news yet.

Performance funding. In the future, this will shift from graduation rates [students who graduate with a B.A. in six years or less) to output of graduates. This shift will be quite helpful to us, since we will be able to count all our graduates. However, relatively speaking, we don't graduate all that many people. There are some smaller institutions in the state (e.g., Henderson) that come close to our numbers of graduates, and formula funding will put us on a par with those institutions. Overall, it will be a salutary process and will probably make us a better institution.

The Chancellor invited questions: Tschumi mentioned that a few years ago we learned that PTC was not advising students every semester. Has that changed? The Chancellor said we are still dissatisfied. Performance funding may make it more possible for one institution to let another institution know they are making problems for us.

Provost Belcher: We're in discussion about what counts: ABCDF and S are the grades that count. IP (in progress) does not count; we get docked for that. The F question has come up before. Remember, you heard it here.

B. Provost Belcher

The Provost had several issues to report on.

1. Student Progress Meetings with Chairs and Deans. The Provost and Chancellor finished those meetings yesterday. There are 34 departments that have undergraduate majors. The meetings with those departments have been fascinating and informative. Some departments are doing things that are very helpful to students. Some departments found the data they were given to be revelatory and began re-examining what they do based on this new information. The meetings and initiatives are idiosyncratic based on the department. Several people have had ideas for policy changes. One chair suggested that we not have this almost unlimited opportunity to drop a class – a topic very worthy of discussion, and the administration will look to the Senate for leadership on this. The Chancellor and Provost will continue to hold these meetings once a year but will streamline them, time them better to be more useful to the departments, and make the data more useful. All in all it has been a good and helpful process.

2. Strategic planning. Meetings with the external community had been scheduled for January 10 and 11, but inclement weather caused them to be postponed until just this

week. There was much great feedback, which will be sent out to the strategic planning committee, and another update will be forthcoming.

3. Annual book discussion. These book discussions have been held for eight years now. The purpose is to bring together faculty, staff, community members and students to discuss a book that has some implications for what we do. The idea goes back to a conversation the Provost had with Roby Robertson during the keynote address at a conference in Ypsilanti, Mi. We have had lots of good feedback on the discussions, in which 70 faculty and staff, 64 community members, and 6 students.

4. Budget season: we have very little concrete information about what the budget scenario will be but will proceed with budget hearings in the next few weeks. Last year they were canceled because it was known that there would be no money, but “we missed the opportunity to get input about what’s important to people.” As is customary, the planning and finance committee has been invited to attend. The Chancellor and the Provost learned earlier in the week that Governor Beebe is filing some bills, one of which has to do with higher education funding based on performance. The new formula is modeled on what was done in Ohio, based on a five-year process. The shift away from graduation rates to numbers of graduates will help us. Other proposed measures are the numbers of transfer students graduated and the numbers of underrepresented populations. “Those are already out there on paper.” Interesting fact is that some students bring in 100 or more transfer hours from two-year institutions. If the two-years got credit for getting their students to transfer to a four-year, that would help with the problem of excess lower-level hours.

C. Undergraduate Council—Jeanette Clausen, chair

Clausen said the UGC had conducted only routine business and therefore she had no report. The UGC is hoping to get more proposals for FYC courses.

E. Graduate Council—Steve Jennings, chair.

Jennings said that the Graduate Council too had only routine business at the moment. The Council is starting discussions of policy on scholastic standards but has nothing to report yet.

VI. New Business:

A. Former President Richard Ford, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, moved the following: (Legislation: requires majority vote at one meeting).

See: “Attachment A - P&T Passage Revision 1.28.11”

Ford commented: “I’ve been asked to move this as a ghost of meetings past.” The P&T saga is not over, but the last step is an easy one.

Ford offered a friendly amendment to his own motion: in the parentheses, insert comma, college committee, if one exists, so that the motion now reads (added text in italics)

No administrator, such as the department chair, college dean, associate dean, or assistant dean may serve on the PTC (or college promotion and tenure review

Minutes, January 28, 2011

committee, *if one exists*) to review any promotion and/or tenure case for which he or she will also participate as a reviewer in his or her capacity as an administrator.

President Eshleman invited discussion. There was none.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

B. Vice-President Laura Smith-Olinde, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, moved the following: (Legislation: requires majority vote at one meeting)

See: “Attachment B – Dept Auth Modify Req Trans Students 1.28.11”

Smith-Olinde commented that the motion concerns the flexibility for transfer students that was granted to four departments in the pilot project; this motion would extend that authority to all departments. She added the information that high school students with concurrent credit are not considered transfer students.

Anson said that he would like to have statistics come back to the Senate each year, automatically, rather than our having to request them (Point #4 of Attachment B). He moved that a report be given each year with statistics on how many requirements have been waived in each of the categories, and that the data presented in an overall report from the Provost’s office. In other words, departments should be required to report each year (rather than “prepared”).

Hoffpauir commented that they can use the same reporting sheet that’s been used so far. Chairs send the information to her, and her office collects and collates it.

There was further discussion of the wording of the motion. Someone asked if the Senate has the authority to ask the Provost’s office to give us a report. Ayetoro commented that if the Senate has to pass the legislation, we also have to be able to ask for a report. After further discussion the motion was stated as follows (new language in italics, deleted language in strikethrough):

4. Departments shall keep records on each transfer student which document any modifications made to graduation requirements. ~~Upon request from the Associate Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs,~~ *Departments shall be prepared to report annually on their decisions to modify each category of the requirements and the information collected shall be reported to the Senate.*

Discussion:

Douglas: I have some real concerns. The 45 upper-level requirements were the ones that were mostly waived in the pilot. The 45 upper-level hours mean something about development of higher-level skills.

Tschumi: We don’t want to lose what makes us significant as a 4-year university.

Eshelman: We trust departments to handle this judiciously. (Anson: But not completely.)

Douglas: 45 % of the hours waived [in the Pilot] were in that area.

Hoffpauir: Biology is a case where the 4-years are not consistent in whether courses are taught at the 2000 or 3000 level. The Biology Department accepted 2000-level transfer courses [as

Minutes, January 28, 2011

meeting a 3000-level requirement] if other four year universities also taught those courses at the 2000-level.

McMillan: In Point 1, Graduation requirements: Math 1302 isn't the requirement. It is a math requirement that can be satisfied by that course. I would like to correct that. The change was accepted as a friendly amendment, so that the last item in Point 1 of Attachment B now reads (added text in italics, deleted text in strikethrough)

Mathematics 1302 & U.S. History/Government.

Groesbeck asked why Comp I and II were not listed as graduation requirements that will continue to apply. Hoffpauir explain that it's because you can't waive those courses. The state requires them.

Jovanovic asked why we are wanting to extend this flexibility to transfer students but not to UALR students who might be caught in some sort of snag after changing majors, for example.

Eshleman said the problem is most pressing for transfer students. Several people have raised the issue of our native students but transfer students more pressing.

Ford added that the Curriculum Task Force is looking at what we require of our own students.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

There was a question about how the changes/waived requirements are handled. Hoffpauir said that the changes to go her and then to Records.

VII. Open Forum

President Eshleman invited comments from senators.

Nickles: 29 Republicans have said they won't vote for any bill with a cost-of-living raise. It takes 75 votes for a bill to pass the House and there are only 98 people in the House.

Faust asked if Nickles was suggesting that people interested in a cost-of-living raise should speak to their representatives. Nickles said he was just giving information.

Tramel said he had a lot of students who had problems because of the new requirement to confirm that they would attend. Students who didn't confirm were dropped from all their classes, and one was dropped even though he had paid (but had not confirmed). One had a change check coming and got dropped anyway.

VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:11 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette Clausen, Secretary

Attachment A: Motion on Promotion and Tenure Passage Revision

That the underlined sentence in the following passage of section 3.B of the university's Promotion and Tenure Guidelines document,

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

shall be replaced by the following:

No administrator, such as the department chair, college dean, associate dean, or assistant dean may serve on the PTC (or college promotion and tenure review committee as well if one exists) to review any promotion and/or tenure case for which he or she will also participate as a reviewer in his or her capacity as an administrator.

Commentary:

Questions have arisen about how to understand this passage from section 3.B of the recently adopted Promotion and Tenure Guidelines Document (endorsed by the Senate, 4/16/2010). After consultation with some of those involved in the original authoring of the Senate document, it seems that the primary intent was to preclude the possibility of someone exercising his/her voice in the recommendation process in more than one place, thereby protecting the distinctness of the recommendations for promotion and/or tenure made by a departmental promotion and tenure committee, the department chairperson, and those made at the college level. However, this intent seems to have been somewhat obscured by the tense of the last phrase of the passage and lack of specificity about the type of review intended (since administrators are responsible for annual performance reviews that are independent of promotion/tenure reviews). This proposed revision seeks to make clear the original intent.

Attachment B: Motion on Departmental Authority to Modify Requirements for Transfer Students

In order to facilitate the progress of transfer students within their majors toward a baccalaureate degree, departments offering undergraduate degrees are hereby authorized to revise graduation requirements for transfer students within the constraints described below.

1. The following graduation requirements will continue to apply:

- Minimum hours (124) and GPA (2.00) required for graduation*
- Minimum hours and GPA required for majors and minors*
- Foreign language competence for BA majors*
- Math 1302 & U.S. History/Government*

2. Flexibility will be permitted on the following requirements provided that the intentions of these requirements are kept in mind and honored:

- 45 upper-level hours*
- 30 hours in residence*
- core requirements**
- major requirements*
- minor requirements*

**While students entering UALR with a high number of semester credit hours (75 or more) in transfer should be given the benefit of a broad interpretation regarding satisfaction of core requirements, the state specified 35-hour core is still applicable.*

3. Departments should keep two broad criteria in mind when considering waivers, substitutions, exceptions, etc., to current policies: (a) Will the student be as ready for graduate study in the discipline? (b) Will the student be as employable?

4. Departments shall keep records on each transfer student which document any modifications made to graduation requirements. Upon request from the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs or faculty senate president, departments shall be prepared to report on their decisions to modify requirements.

5. The authority granted by this motion will continue until the Faculty Senate acts on the recommendations of the Undergraduate Curriculum Revision Task Force and any resulting changes in graduation requirements go into effect.

Commentary:

The reporting on the multi-year pilot project that gave this authority to four departments suggests that transfer students have been served well (authorized via Senate action November 30, 2007, authority extended November 12th, 2010) and that the departments have exercised their judgment conscientiously to preserve the academic integrity of both the university curriculum and their