



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

*Friday, May 6, 2011, 1:00 p.m.*

**Faculty Senate Meeting**

*Ledbetter B & C*

MINUTES

*Present:* CAHSS— Amrhein, Anson, Bailey, Chapman, Clausen, English, Garnett, Giammo, Groesbeck, Vinikas, Yoder. CB—Edison, Funk, Nickels, Watts. CE— Hayn, Hughes, Kuykendal, McAdams, Nolen. CEIT— Anderson, Babiceanu Jovanovic, Tebbets, Tramel, Tschumi. LAW— Aiyetoro, Goldner, Fitzhugh. LIBRARY— Russ. CPS—Collier-Tenison, Driskill, Golden, Rhodes, Robertson, Smith-Olinde. CSM— Douglas, Guellich, McMillan, Scott, Seigar, Tarasenko, Thompson, Wright, Yanoviak. EX OFFICIO— Anderson, Belcher, Eshleman, Faust, Ford.

*Guests Present:* Rosalie Cheatham, Susan Hoffpauir, Daryl Rice, Earl Ramsey, Lars Powell.

*Absent:* CAHSS—Deiser, Estes, Kleine. CB —. CE—. CEIT—. LAW --. CPS – Barnes. CSM— Sims. 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 April 15, 2011, meeting of the Senate were reviewed. The secretary had been informed of and corrected several minor errors.

Robertson moved and Russ seconded that the minutes be accepted as amended. Motion passed on a voice vote.

*III. Announcements*

President Eshleman thanked all the senators for their participation, with special thanks to those who had also served on Senate or Assembly Councils and Committees, and to those whose terms are ending this semester: Amrhein, Anson, Bailey, Chapman, Garnett, Groesbeck, Vinikas, Nickels, Watts, Hughes, Kuykendall, Anderson, Jovanovic, Tramel, Fitzhugh, Goldner, Russ, Barnes, Driskill, Rhodes,

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Robertson, Guellich, Seigar, Sims, Wright, and Yanoviak. There was a round of applause.

Eshleman reminded the Senate of a vacancy to be filled at the first Senate meeting in the fall: since Laura Smith-Olinde has been elected President, a new Vice President will have to be elected. "Be thinking about whether that's the right spot for you."

His last announcement was an exhortation: We have a full agenda with some contentious items – strong feelings and strong convictions are appropriate – and with respect for the process, we will be able to leave today feeling we have done some good business and got it done in a good way.

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

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

Tschumi expressed concern that the legislature had voted that baccalaureate degrees cannot be more than 120 credit hours. He sees this is part of a larger problem, that we are getting away from a noble tradition, to educate citizens. Our forefathers, especially Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, were committed to education as the keystone of democracy. I see us today in a slow but steady process of moving the university to prepare us for a job. There are forces in society that have pushed us in this wrong direction. I object to that 120 hours.

Jovanovic: I am happy to be woken up at 4am and 6am to be warned of a dangerous situation. My cell phone was not called, but the message on my answering machine only said "see voice mail." Phones are hanging up before the message is recorded. My wife had a missed call on her phone, so she called back and the person who answered said "what."

#### *V. Reports*

##### *A. Provost's Report: David Belcher*

President Eshleman introduced Provost Belcher.

Belcher: I will be brief. There is not much to add to the report I gave to the Assembly, except a failure. I had intended to get a recommendation back to the Senate on the disability statement and still hope to have that by early next fall.

I also want to say thank you. I have been attending a parade of leave-takings (retirements etc), and Fred Williams, at his reception, thanked the administration for an overall good working relationship. I want to echo that. Thank you for your good partnership and I wish you godspeed.

Smith-Olinde moved to suspend the rules for a special resolution to recognize Provost Belcher and read the resolution:

Whereas Dr. David O. Belcher has served with distinction since 2003 as Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock; and

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Whereas Dr. Belcher has provided significant leadership in academic and institutional planning leading to new degree programs at the doctoral, masters and baccalaureate levels; and

Whereas Dr. Belcher has encouraged and supported revised roles and rewards for faculty at all academic ranks; and

Whereas Dr. Belcher has encouraged and supported faculty and institutional initiatives leading to increased standards for admission and graduation of students; and

Whereas Dr. Belcher has been an energetic and passionate voice in the community for the quality educational experience offered at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock; and

Whereas, Dr. Belcher is leaving the University of Arkansas at Little Rock to become Chancellor of Western Carolina University on July 1, 2011,

Now, therefore be it resolved by the Faculty Senate of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock that Dr. David O. Belcher be recognized with sincere appreciation for these and his many other accomplishments during his tenure as Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The reading was followed by applause for Provost Belcher. President Eshleman called for a vote on the motion, which passed on a voice vote, and thanked Rosalie Cheatham for her help in crafting the resolution.

### *B. Chancellor's Report: Joel Anderson*

Chancellor Anderson: After David made those complimentary remarks about you, I was really holding my breath to see if there was substance to those remarks. I would like to second those remarks: the tenor of the relations between administration and faculty is really quite positive and that is not something you find everywhere. There's an easy tone, mutual respect and participation. I thank Andrew for his excellent service as Assembly and Senate President as well as for his service as faculty. We will have a reception in a few days for David and Susan so that everyone can say goodbye to the Belchers.

I will report about a couple of things, (1) the shooting that took place in the early morning hours, and (2) the budget.

(1) The shooting: Those are the words I didn't want to hear at 2:30 am: "Joel, there's been a shooting on campus." It turned out to be similar in many respects to the one we had three years ago: Neither shooter nor victim is a student. It began with a brawl at a club on Asher, and the shooter came to campus, vandalized a car and shot the victim. It's not a life-threatening wound. The residence hall assistants handled it well; it was under control pretty quickly. The shooter is identified; police are confident that they will find him – so it's not a good thing but that's the story.

Questions? To address the issue of the messages: we are obliged to send out such messages and the timing may be subject to some judgment calls. All the vice chancellors have been awake since 3am. A big decision was, do we open the campus today or do we close it down. We decided to open. That's basically the story. In some ways it's the world in which we live.

Bunch: Is there a policy about guests staying overnight in the residence halls.

Donaldson: Students are allowed to have guests stay overnight. No policy was violated.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Douglas asked where exactly the shooting had taken place. The Chancellor clarified that it was outside of East Hall.

(2) The budget: Much is up in the air until the Board of Trustees meets on May 20; they will decide on tuition and fees and budgets for next year. The strategy we're on is this: If we get a sufficient tuition increase, we will set some dollars aside for a raise. We are hopeful that as the year goes on, we will get word (as we did last year) that we can go ahead with a 2% raise. It's not an unmixed blessing. If we don't get permission to give raises, we'll be in a position [with the money in reserve] where we could have given raises. We want to do some work on equity and market adjustments as well. We do have money now for promotion increments or advancement [for instructors].

Student Success: we will focus on the priorities for the year that came out of budget hearings. If the Board of Trustees approves, we will increase technology fees. We hope to fund more stipends, higher stipends and health insurance for graduate assistants. We need to fund more custodians. We need money for publicity.

One comment about Student Success: in conversation with PAC [Policy Advisory Council] yesterday, I made the point that one of the most helpful things is for faculty really to own it [i.e., the programs and interventions available to assist students]. For example, when there is a Supplemental Instruction (SI) program in place for a high-casualty course. That's an approach that was developed at the University of Missouri Kansas City about 30 years ago. Not all that many students take advantage of it but I promise you that more students would participate if the faculty member were sincere about promoting it and encouraging students to go. Whether it's that or something else, it helps if the faculty own it.

Plans for Marketing: we hope to schedule a time when we invite each unit to the conference room for 15 minutes, and have them spread out on the table everything they have in terms of print material and information on the web that they use to publicize their programs.

Chancellor Anderson invited questions. There were none.

### *C. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Hiring and Composition: Earl Ramsey and Joe Giammo.*

Ramsey: We were flooded with material; we looked at the last 10 years (2000-2010). Joe has distilled it in table form. (While Ramsey was speaking, Giammo distributed the tables to everyone; they are attached to these minutes [Giammo\_Faculty\_SummaryData.xlsx]). In a rough and ready, general sense: we found no striking trends. Concerning the category non-faculty: we never found out what that meant—we think it means adjuncts and graduate students.

Giammo: In terms of who teaches what, there is not much change during the ten-year period. The only one is from instructor to “non-faculty.” On the next page you see the numbers of people who hold these positions. Again, there is no pattern that we could identify. Looking at race and gender: after 2005, race was not recorded for whatever reason and we couldn't get data on gender for 2002-03

Nolen: did you break out gender by rank?

Giammo: We did not.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Ramsey: We have a recommendation. The future is what is important. I was a little surprised that there were no particular trends – we as faculty are not always clear on details, e.g. classes taught versus number of credit hours. Our recommendation is:

We recommend that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee formulate and forward to the Senate for its consideration a policy that obliges the Provost to report annually to the Senate the composition of the UALR faculty and the distribution of teaching – by class and by SSCH – across all faculty ranks and categories. This report should make clear any trends in faculty hiring.

We aren't wedded to that language. What we want to know is information on departures from the faculty and additions to the faculty.

Aiyetoro: We need to keep data on race because one problem that we continue to face is the accusation that we are a white campus. We can't force people to answer that question [i.e., to check a category for race/ethnicity] but . . . .

Ramsey: I agree with you wholeheartedly. I think it's implicit and tacit in this recommendation. The government continues to change those categories [race/ethnicity]. I think that the information is available and should be included in the report.

Groesbeck: Does "Instructors and Professors" mean full-time?

Giammo: In terms of what I've reported here, yes.

Eshleman: So you found no striking causes for concern?

Giammo: Only the one from Instructor to non-faculty.

Ramsey – We are following straws in the wind. There are isolated cases of pressure to replace retiring tenured faculty with non tenure-track faculty.

Jovanovic: Is there information about part-time faculty?

Giammo: Yes, the first page includes both.

There being no further questions, Eshleman thanked the committee members for their work.

#### *D. Undergraduate Council: Jeanette Clausen*

Clausen: The UGC has met every week since the last Senate meeting and will meet again during exam week to discuss a proposal for a new minor in Race and Ethnicity. New courses and course changes have been approved for several departments (IFSC, CNMG, HIST). The minor in Construction Management was changed to make it a viable option for interested students both within EIT and in other colleges. No proposal for a published policy on final exams (i.e., the number of exams a student can be required to take on one day) because the SGA notified us they would take this issue up again in the fall. The UGC has one resolution to bring to the Senate, on required programming for students on probation, which I will introduce under New Business.

#### *E. Graduate Council: Steven Jennings*

Jennings: In addition to regular business, we reviewed all the existing policies and new policies.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

We have an update of the graduate school admission policy for International Students.

We have approved a policy on requiring continuous registration: graduate students must be continuously enrolled each semester unless they apply for a leave of absence, which will be routinely granted for one or two semesters, but if they don't apply for it, they will be terminated (however, there are ways to be reinstated).

We are working on policies on what constitutes a thesis or dissertation – sometimes there have been essays instead of theses.

It has been tabled for the next academic year.

We are working on a policy for comprehensive exams.

Question: Will there be some one-credit courses students can enroll in?

Jennings: Possibly a kind of continuous registration fee that students can pay to keep them on the books (email, library, access to computer networks, etc.) but that would have to go all the way to the Board of Trustees, so it is still in the discussions stages.

## *VI. New Business:*

Watts moved, and a senator whose name escaped the secretary seconded, to suspend rules so the Senate could vote on the following:

I move that the Faculty Senate approve the graduation of all students who have met the requirements of their respective programs and colleges.

The motion passed on a voice vote.

A. Jeanette Clausen, on behalf of the Undergraduate Council, moved the following:

See: “Attachment A – Academic Probation Programming  
Clausen summarized the motion, which had come to the Senate for discussion in April, but not as a formal motion. She invited questions for Daryl Rice, the originator of the motion.

Anson: How does this plan not involve any increased expense?

Rice: We now have a reduced need for remedial courses, and much of the programming that has already been developed for developmental students is appropriate for freshmen and sophomores on probation as well.

Watts: Is it correct that there were 149 students on probation?

Rice: Yes.

Giammo: What if someone on probation doesn't enroll the next semester. Will they not be required to participate?

Rice: They can be picked up the next semester.

Giammo: proposed that the language be modified by inserting the underlined words after “. . . by the Academic Success Center: beginning the next semester that they are enrolled for at least one hour.” This was accepted as a friendly amendment.

Since there was no further discussion, President Eshleman called for a vote. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Eshleman introduced the next two items by reminding the senators that both had come to the Senate previously for informal discussion. He stated further that the Executive Committee had contemplated whether these two items should go forward together, since they are two distinct resolutions.

B. Richard Ford, on behalf of the Executive Committee, moved the following (no second required; majority vote at one meeting):

See: Attachment B: Health Plan Revision.

Ford: It's been suggested by some that I have some residual political capital and I've decided to burn that up to ensure that I won't be a candidate for any future offices. (laughter)

I move Attachment B. First of all: The resolution concerning Domestic Partners is separate. But what is the cost of such a measure? The Executive Committee asked the chair of Fringe Benefits to meet with us, to come up with a cost-neutral plan – everyone was there; and there were no objections to the general idea of the plan. The Executive Committee asked for a more detailed version that was distributed to this body at the April meeting. A week ago when the Executive Committee was putting together the agenda for this meeting, I made a strong argument to bring both. If you think it hasn't gone through the right process – I take the blame, because I wanted both sides, costs and benefits, to be discussed. Unlike the federal government, UALR doesn't have a printing press. When I was Senate President, I went to budget hearings every year and asked for salary increases for faculty. There are many ways to allocate fringe benefits – you can go with one employee/one allocation; or with different allotments relative to how many dependents the employee has. I've heard many suggestions. One was to make allocations on body mass index (has some merit). My personal favorite is: all Army rangers who have a purple heart should be favored. But assuming a veil of ignorance: we can't do that. The point is: we need to have this discussion. I found out that I can cede some of my time and will do that, first to the chair of Fringe Benefits.

Powell: Thank you, Ford. That was a pretty accurate summary. I was asked to draft this. The feedback I received was very instructive and based on that feedback, as the motion is written, I don't support it. It's not lost on me that an employee with 3 dependents gets \$12000 additional salary. I apologize that some people seem to take the proposal very personally. Our benefits program faces several challenges, one of which is that we have perhaps the most generous program in the state. We have called on the Fringe Benefits committee to weigh in on this subject and of the 13 members we received 5 responses including mine. If the person in your college doesn't want to participate [on the Fringe Benefits Committee], please replace them.

Ford: I now invite chair of the Planning and Finance Committee, Rosalie Cheatham.

Cheatham: When I was asked to do this, at first I demurred but decided there were a couple of points I could make. In my years of involvement with the Senate, I have found that we do have a good relationship with the administration. Recommendations from us are taken seriously. While I support the concerns about extending benefits without finding a way to fund them, I don't think we have had enough discussion for the Senate to weigh in. There should be opportunities for open forums and plans for achieving cost savings. The goal of cost accountability is laudable, but the process so far is preempting two bodies that should be involved. An alternate resolution could be offered in the fall, with perhaps the Fringe Benefits Committee working with the administration, to allow for more thoughtful and thorough deliberation.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Ford: We see today the law of unintended consequences: it wasn't our intention to get Senate attendance by putting this on the agenda but it did that. What I heard: We are not ready. We have accomplished the goal of putting it [the cost side of the benefit] in front of everyone. Therefore, I withdraw my motion.

C. Judith Faust, on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee, moved the adoption of the following resolution (No second required; majority vote at one meeting):

See Attachment C: Domestic Partner Benefits.

Eshleman: The Faculty Senate does not have the authority to make policy on these issues but we can make recommendations.

Faust moved adoption of the Domestic Partner Benefits resolution, and read the text of the resolution to the senators. It is a resolution on which we can and should act. My understanding is that all the system institutions save two have already taken this position. The question came up in our Senate a few years ago, but the time was not ripe. Now it is time for us to affirm that this is the direction that should be taken.

English: I wish to support the motion. This was an interesting discussion. There is much that I hadn't thought about. I assume this would increase the cost to us. But in terms of fairness, we should support it, and I support it.

Jovanovic: I also support the resolution. It's humane. Right now when an employee is hired, there is a commitment to make a contribution. If Ford were to go to Las Vegas and get married tomorrow, the university would have to support his spouse. There are employees working here now who are not able to claim that benefit.

Jennings: Something I learned from one of the Provost's book club discussions is that we might be missing out on some good employees because we don't have this.

Powell: I would like to add that we are discriminating against single people in favor of these other groups -. I feel it's negligent to not address the cost in the resolution. Fairness means different things to different people.

Eshleman: The process here would be a long one. If anything is to happen, the first step would be for campuses to speak up on the matter.

Aiyetoro: The issue before us is not discrimination against singles, but are there groups of people who are not receiving benefits. It is an issue that exists in most health-care policies. Single people generally pay the same or a similar rate as families. The issue is a civil rights issue. I support this issue.

Jovanovic: One more comment on cost: Every year, university employees add spouses and children to the plan. The emphasis on cost has been way outweighed – costs get added every year.

Smith-Olinde: Were this to change, it affects staff members as well as faculty. UALR has about 500 faculty and 900 staff, so it affects a lot of people.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Faust: Let me take a point of personal privilege: Note that in the School of Social Work, we teach our students that it is their ethical responsibility to make social institutions more just and more humane. This resolution is a step in that direction.

The President called for a vote. The motion passed with one dissenting vote.

D. Pete Tschumi, on behalf of the Faculty Governance Committee, moved the following:

See Attachment D: Generic Departmental Gov Doc.

Tschumi: The Constitution mandates that the Faculty Governance Committee come up with a generic governance document for new departments. This document is based on one that Rosalie and Joel wrote and I essentially plagiarized. The Faculty Governance Committee considered whether we want to use some sort of template but ultimately decided not to. So we went back to focusing on just new departments. Last fall Joel, David, and the Faculty Governance Committee met to discuss the process for new/revised documents. The Chancellor prefers that Promotion and Tenure criteria be included in the departmental governance document, while the Provost prefers that P&T be a separate document. As departments revise their governance documents, we hope that his generic doc will be useful to them.

Robertson: I believe there's way too much detail for an example doc. There's language about how long chairs terms are (3 years)

Tschumi: That's only for the new department; they can change this language.

Robertson: Guidance is important, but stating who votes and who doesn't, how long the chair serves, is trying to dictate. More generic language should be used.

Anson: We discussed these issues. What we wanted was a document for when you don't have time to come up with one.

Goldner: If departments don't have an organizational document, the lawyer side of me becomes uncomfortable.

Jovanovic – I was a founding member of Systems Engineering in 1999 and we didn't get a governance document for 10 years – our document kept getting bounced back to us. A document such as this would have been immensely helpful. I beg you to support it.

Smith-Olinde: Let it be noted that Nick begged.

English: I can't argue with Nick as the James Madison but why is the Assembly doing all this?

Tschumi: In this document, Assembly means the faculty; the usage follows Robert's Rules.

Ford: if there were a sunset attached to this, would that make you [Robertson] happier?

Robertson: I'm not sure this actually fixes the problem – instead, maybe say this document is in place if the new department is in place for one academic year.

Eshleman: The language you use is there, except for "one year."

Robertson: We really need to urge departments to move with deliberate speed.

Eshleman: Would you accept the suggestion as a friendly amendment?

Tschumi: No. This document needs to work until the faculty replace it with one that meets their own needs.

Jovanovic: A specific answer to Roby – the faculty handbook states that the normal term for a chair is 3 years.

Anson called the question, seconded by Aiyetoro.

Motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

E. Nickolas Jovanovic, Senator, moves the adoption of the following Sense of the Senate Resolution (majority vote at one meeting):

See Attachment E: Academic Working Hours.

Jovanovic moved, and multiple senators seconded, the resolution Jovanovic briefly reviewed the rationale he had presented last month. Everyone knows that 40 hours is a work week but they don't know what 15 academic hours are. My proposal is to try to chip away at that. We don't encourage students to enroll in 40 hours. We want to talk in terms of work weeks, using terms that families will understand.

Aiyetoro: What do we do about the substitute motion?

Jovanovic: There is no substitute motion yet.

Giammo: I had concerns about the one last month – but the idea is a good one. I support the sense of the senate.

Goldner: At the Law School, if people take more than 15 hours they have to sign an agreement that they will not work more than 20 hours at a job.

Anson: I would prefer to see a minimum of two hours, not three

Jovanovic: Last month it was three, but Susan Hoffpauir's definition of the Carnegie unit put that in a different light. I wrote it in such a way as to imply that instructors have flexibility.

Tschumi moved, and Jovanovic seconded the substitute motion. Yanoviak clarified that the text of the substitute motion would replace Jovanovic's motion.

Watts: I don't know what the substitute motion is.

Tschumi: The first part is what Nick proposed last time, to give an official definition of academic working hours. Parts 2 and 3 are how to implement it. Part 2 explains that advisors will look at what courses students are taking and fill them into the sheet the student signs, to give students the big picture of what they are looking at as far as working hours. Advisors are the only ones who can do that. Part 3 concerns the wording for the syllabus. Faculty can word it as they wish, but put it on their syllabus. You can calculate with x3 or whatever you want. The student is going to be hit each semester with what is expected of them. We have to have a way for it to work. The long-term trend that Watts mentioned of students studying less and less per week is a serious problem that must be addressed. You've got to put in things that continually come back to the students.

Eshleman: I remind the Senate this is making policy.

There has to be discussion on whether to substitute.

Ford: I have to get on my feet in support of Nick, who did a very good job of putting together a resolution. I'm not in favor of more paperwork. We want to encourage faculty to get students to study more. The part I disagree with is: some students in my class can read economics and understand it, but some cannot. We must encourage faculty to communicate with the students. I applaud and support the resolution.

Garnett: I also want to vote in favor of Nick's motion and against Pete's – it's very prescriptive, puts too much on advisors, and is unenforceable. Also many people haven't seen it.

Groesbeck: I have students who can read the assignment in two hours while others need 10 hours for the same thing. Also, students don't read the syllabus. Also students are advised several months before the semester begins and don't remember. The desire is laudable but parts 2 and 3 won't have that much effect.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Tschumi: The argument here is that it won't have much impact and that it's better to do even less. Simply putting forth a resolution will have even less effect. You have to tell students things multiple times. If we do a resolution, how many people will even know about it. Statement on syllabus: the point is to have one. You can write it any way you want to . . . How you word that is up to each faculty member for each course. Advisors are already filing out some kind of sheet and this would just be added. It's the only place for students to see the big picture. If you give them nothing, . . . .

Bunch: I would be more in favor if it were the number of hours times 3. Expanding it to 60 hours is a bit much. I will not support the motion as is.

Tschumi: Why don't you propose an amendment? I am not wedded to 4 hours.

Bunch: Moves an amendment to the substitute motion, changing 4 hours to 3 hours.

By a show of hands, a clear majority favored a change to 3 instead of 4.

Douglas: I teach a freshman course, with many non-traditional students – if we can establish a culture where students understand what is expected - this statement is going in my syllabus this summer. We need a cultural change across the campus.

Faust – I am not in favor of the substitute motion even as amended. The reason is that the original motion is likely to accomplish as much as the substitute. The best thing we could do is eliminate grade inflation.

Watts: Moves to eliminate part two, Yanoviak seconds. Many advisors don't have face-to-face meetings with students and can't be signing stuff.

Eshleman called for a vote on the above. There were 23 votes in favor, and 18 opposed. Part two is gone from the substitute motion.

Next, Eshleman called for a vote on the motion to substitute.

The motion failed on a show of hands also, with 16 in favor and 22 opposed.

Motion to substitute fails.

Anson: Moved to call the question, Collier-Tenison seconded.

Jovanovic's Sense of the Senate motion passed on a voice vote.

F. Jason Kushner, on behalf of the Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee, was to move the following (majority vote at one meeting):

See Attachment F: 2012-2015 Academic Calendar No Break, and Attachment G: 2014-2015 Academic Calendar w Break.

Eshleman announced that Kushner had withdrawn these calendars; the Committee will come back with a recommendation in the fall.

## *VII. Open Forum*

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting  
Yanoviak, on behalf of the Executive Committee, presented Eshleman with a gavel  
symbolizing our appreciation of his leadership. The inscription on the gavel reads:

Andrew S. Eshleman, Ph.D.  
"I preside, therefore I am."

Applause for Eshleman.

*VII. Adjourn*

The meeting adjourned at 3.22 pm.

*Respectfully submitted,*

Jeanette Clausen, Secretary

Total Credit Hours

Year	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor/Lecturer	Non Faculty
2000	1762	999	1022	1686	765
2001	1599	1078	1006	1559	865
2002	1658	1107	1049	1582	856
2003	1644	1207	1174	1656	868
2004	1612	1325	1239	1519	978
2005	1634	1420	1276	1581	1116
2006	1575	1393	1332	1632	1240
2007	1732	1268	1430	1476	1402
2008	1708	1461	1353	1590	1553
2009	1816	1464	1533	1505	1576
2010	1797	1616	1344	1551	1761

Tenured/Tenure Track	Instructor/Lecturer/ Non Faculty
3783	2451
3683	2424
3814	2438
4025	2524
4176	2497
4330	2697
4300	2872
4430	2878
4522	3143
4813	3081
4757	3312

Percentage of Credit Hours

Year	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor/Lecturer	Non Faculty
2000	28%	16%	16%	27%	12%
2001	26%	18%	16%	26%	14%
2002	27%	18%	17%	25%	14%
2003	25%	18%	18%	25%	13%
2004	24%	20%	19%	23%	15%
2005	23%	20%	18%	22%	16%
2006	22%	19%	19%	23%	17%
2007	24%	17%	20%	20%	19%
2008	22%	19%	18%	21%	20%
2009	23%	19%	19%	19%	20%
2010	22%	20%	17%	19%	22%

Tenured/Tenure Track	Instructor/Lecturer/ Non Faculty
60%	39%
60%	40%
62%	39%
61%	38%
63%	38%
61%	38%
60%	40%
61%	39%
59%	41%
61%	39%
59%	41%

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

### **Attachment A-Academic Probation Programming**

As modified at the May 6, 2010 Senate meeting (deleted text in ~~strikethrough~~; new wording underlined).

Motion. Jeanette Clausen, on behalf of the Undergraduate Council ((No second required; majority vote at one meeting.)

That effective fall 2011, freshmen and sophomores with an academic standing of *Academic Probation* or *Probation Continued* ~~who are enrolled in at least one hour in the semester after being placed on academic probation~~ be required to participate in a special program offered by the Academic Success Center beginning the next semester in which they are enrolled for at least one hour. *International Freshmen and International Transfer Students on academic probation* will report to the Office of International Student Services. Student athletes on academic probation will report to the Academic Advisor or their coach in Athletics. *Non-Degree Seeking Students* are exempt from this requirement. A mechanism for waiving the requirement on a case-by-case basis for other students for whom physically reporting to the Academic Success Center is a practical impossibility—for example, students taking all online courses from a great distance from Little Rock—will be implemented.

Students will remain in the program until their cumulative GPA rises above 2.0 or they are academically suspended (after three consecutive semesters on probation).

Program activities will be tailored to fit the needs of the individual student based on the outcome of the intake assessment and the student will be assigned to a mentor. A contract will be signed by the student and the mentor.

**Commentary:** The motion targets freshmen and sophomores on academic probation. (International students report to International Student Services because that office is equipped to address factors specific to them concerning the requirement of remaining in academically good standing. Athletes on academic probation already receive special attention from the Athletics Department.)

In spring 2011, the Academic Success Center already began offering the programming indicated in the motion to students on probation who chose to participate on a voluntary basis. However, students on probation all too often believe they need no additional help, so the number of participants was small. The motion recognizes that at-risk students are not always the best judges of when special intervention is required and adopts a more intrusive stance toward increasing their possibilities for success.

It is important to note that while the programming for developmental students in the Collegiate Success Program includes regular academic advising, the programming for students on probation does not include regular academic advising. If students are undeclared, they will go to the Office of Academic Advising; if they are declared, they will go to their regular department or college advisor.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

The following activities were required of the voluntary participants in Spring 2011 and are illustrative of what will be continued in a program requiring participation:

- Meet with a professional mentor for an initial intake session within the first two weeks of the semester. At this session the student will complete a nationally developed computerized assessment instrument that looks at non-cognitive as well as academic predictors of success (e.g., the Noel-Levitz College Student Inventory), an additional, locally developed self-assessment, and an action plan constructed with the professional mentor. The student will also sign a contract outlining the requirements of the program.
- Meet with the professional mentor two additional times—once around midterm and once between midterm and the end of the semester.
- Attend three workshops offered by the Academic Success Center, enroll in READ 1310: College Study Skills, or participate in a program of supplemental instruction. (Sample topics of workshops include time management, test-taking, listening and memory, communicating with professors, money management, and handling stress. Workshops would be assigned so far as possible to align with the student's needs.)
- Confirm with the professional mentor that he or she has met with his or her regular academic advisor.

UALR eventually needs to implement an early warning and intervention system to provide special assistance to students before they get too deeply into trouble, but if it is to be effective, such a system will require careful design and take considerable time to build and implement. Students on academic probation are already in trouble, but the sort of programming that the Academic Success Center has in place for students required to participate in the Collegiate Success Program (those requiring developmental course work in reading and composition) can be extended quickly to this population and without additional cost. Some of the workshops developed for students in the Collegiate Success Program, for example, are also appropriate for freshman and sophomores on academic probation. Also, the experience and data gained with this program will prove useful in planning for additional initiatives.

Resolution. Richard Ford, on behalf of the Executive Committee (No second required; majority vote at one meeting):

*The Faculty Senate recommends that the University of Arkansas at Little Rock consider revising the current funding policy for group health coverage such that the university's share of costs is distributed equitably among employees. Specifically, we recommend that the university consider first allocating the full cost of each employee's health coverage from the total currently spent on employees' and other beneficiaries' health coverage, and then allocating the remainder to each employee in equal shares that the employee may spend in the "cafeteria plan" on further benefit options.*

**Commentary:**

This resolution suggests an alternative to the current funding arrangement for group health coverage provided by UALR to its employees. The primary purpose is to achieve universal health insurance coverage among UALR benefits-eligible employees.

To achieve this goal, it seeks to amend the current funding mechanism such that it does not discriminate among employees based on the number of their family members covered by the plan. Instead, it will first allocate the full cost of each employee's health coverage from the total currently spent on employee and beneficiary coverage. It will then allocate the remainder to each employee in equal shares such that the employee may spend it in the "cafeteria plan." Potential choices in the cafeteria plan include dependent health coverage, disability insurance coverage, life insurance coverage, or other available benefits.

It will be important to implement this change gradually over time to prevent disruption of current employees' financial arrangements and expectations.

The resolution suggests the importance to UALR staff and faculty of equality in funding the health insurance plan regardless of legal family standing.

The following narrative<sup>1</sup> describes in "round numbers" the financial effects this proposal would have on all parties involved.

**Health Plan Overview:**

***Plan members***

The University of Arkansas System (UA System) contracts with QualChoice of Arkansas (QCA) to administer its self-funded medical insurance plan. The most recent numbers available from UA System indicate 2,733 plan participants from the UALR campus. This includes 1,470 employees or retired employees, 554 spouses of employees or retired employees, and 709 dependents. Retirees and their spouses<sup>2</sup> represent approximately 160 plan members.

***Cost of plan***

Data from fiscal year ending 6/30/2010 show that UALR participants represent approximately 8% of the total participants in the UA System plan. Total premiums paid at the system level (by

---

<sup>1</sup> This analysis was completed at the request of the faculty and staff senate using data provided by the University of Arkansas System office. As this is written for a pending meeting, a few points of clarification about these data remain unanswered. Some of these numbers could change. Numbers presented are rounded to the nearest \$100 per person and the nearest \$100,000 when referring to the plan in aggregate. Comments and suggestions for improving this analysis are welcome.

<sup>2</sup> Retirees and their spouses pay 100% of their premium for health coverage.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting employees and employers) were \$112,900,000. UALR participants accounted for \$9,200,000 of premium.

UALR employees eligible for benefits<sup>3</sup> currently contribute approximately 20% of the health plan premium. The University funds the balance through the compensation budget. This 80% funding is currently available to employees and their covered spouses and dependents.

***Current funding allocation***

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2010, UALR paid \$5,800 per covered employee towards health coverage. This amount was not distributed evenly across employees. The average cost of insuring one person in our plan is \$3,500. Of this, the University pays \$2,800 and the employee pays \$700. Schedules of employee contributions and approximate employer contributions per pay period appear below:

Classic Plan, 9-month employee				
	<b><u>Employee Contribution</u></b>		<b><u>UALR Contribution</u></b>	
Employee Only	\$	40	\$	160
Employee & Spouse	\$	91	\$	309
Employee & Children	\$	71	\$	329+
Family	\$	122	\$	478+

Classic Plan, 12-month employee				
	<b><u>Employee Contribution</u></b>		<b><u>UALR Contribution</u></b>	
Employee Only	\$	30	\$	120
Employee & Spouse	\$	68	\$	232
Employee & Children	\$	54	\$	246+
Family	\$	91	\$	359+

***Proposed funding allocation***

The allocation mechanism specified in this resolution would eventually allocate approximately \$5,800<sup>4</sup> per year to each benefits eligible employee choosing coverage in the medical insurance plan. Of this amount, \$3,500 would fully fund the employee’s health insurance premium. The remaining \$2,300 would be available to purchase additional benefits such as medical insurance for eligible dependents, disability insurance, or life insurance. Amounts not utilized by employees could be redistributed to other employees who wish to purchase additional coverage. This would have the potential to create the same scenario as the current funding mechanism on a voluntary, rather than mandatory basis.

Schedules of current and proposed costs appear on the following pages.

<sup>3</sup> See <http://ualr.edu/humanresources/uploads/2010/02/ClassicSPD.pdf> for eligibility rules and description of coverage.

<sup>4</sup> This number would change over time with fluctuations in the cost of providing health care.

Schedule of Current Costs per Pay Period

	Current Employee Cost		Current Employer Cost		Current Total Cost	
	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month
Employee Only	\$40.43	\$30.32	\$159.57	\$119.68	\$200	
Employee & Spouse	90.87	68.15	309.13	231.85	400	
Employee & 1 Child	71.41	53.56	328.59	246.44	400	
Employee & 2 Children	71.41	53.56	528.59	396.44	600	
Employee & 3 Children	71.41	53.56	728.59	546.44	800	
Employee & 4 Children	71.41	53.56	928.59	696.44	1,000	
Employee + Spouse & 1 Child	121.87	91.40	478.13	358.60	600	
Employee + Spouse & 2 Children	121.87	91.40	678.13	508.60	800	
Employee + Spouse & 3 Children	121.87	91.40	878.13	658.60	1,000	
Employee + Spouse & 4 Children	121.87	91.40	1,078.13	808.60	1,200	
Employee + Spouse & 5 Children	121.87	91.40	1,278.13	958.60	1,400	

Schedule of Proposed Costs per Pay Period						
	Proposed Employee Cost		Proposed Employer Cost		Proposed Total Cost	
	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month
Employee Only	(\$122.22)	(\$91.67)	\$322.22	\$241.67	\$200	\$150
Employee & Spouse	77.78	58.33	322.22	241.67	400	300
Employee & 1 Child	77.78	58.33	322.22	241.67	400	300
Employee & 2 Children	277.78	208.33	322.22	241.67	600	450
Employee & 3 Children	477.78	358.33	322.22	241.67	800	600
Employee & 4 Children	677.78	508.33	322.22	241.67	1,000	750
Employee + Spouse & 1 Child	277.78	208.33	322.22	241.67	600	450
Employee + Spouse & 2 Children	477.78	358.33	322.22	241.67	800	600
Employee + Spouse & 3 Children	677.78	508.33	322.22	241.67	1,000	750
Employee + Spouse & 4 Children	877.78	658.33	322.22	241.67	1,200	900
Employee + Spouse & 5 Children	1,077.78	808.33	322.22	241.67	1,400	1,050

Attachment D-Generic Departmental Gov Doc

Motion. Pete Tschumi on behalf of the Faculty Governance Committee  
(Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting.)

That the Faculty Senate approves the following generic departmental governance document to be used by new departments until they can get approval for their own document.

### **Generic Departmental Governance Document**

(The following document shall be used by departments until they have produced their own document and it has been approved.)

Adopted Month XX, 20YY

- **Definition of Membership**

All faculty of the department, other than lecturers and visiting faculty, who hold more than a half-time appointment in the department, are members of the departmental governance body (hereafter referred to as the Assembly). Faculty who hold an appointment as described above during only one semester of an academic year shall have membership only during that semester. Faculty who qualify for membership shall have all privileges, including voting right, as set forth in this document.
- **General Charge of the Assembly**

The Assembly is charged with the governance for the academic program of the department in a manner consistent with the goals and objectives of the department, college, and the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.
- **Jurisdiction of the Assembly**

The Assembly shall have legislative power over the academic business of the department, including, but not limited to, the following matters:

  8. Curriculum including course and program additions, changes, and deletions.
  9. Degrees offered and degree requirements.
  10. Class scheduling within the parameters of meeting student needs and university requirements.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

11. In addition, the Assembly, in cooperation with the department chairperson, shall recommend personnel policies to be observed within the department and shall perform a monitoring function to ensure that such policies are being observed.

Included in this authority are

1. The authority (within UALR's Procedures and Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure) to review faculty performance, including tenure and promotion, and to make recommendations in this regard, in addition to those recommendations provided by the chair.
2. The authority to recommend the hiring and dismissal of faculty.

E. Recommendations on budgetary priorities concerning the department's discretionary funds.

- **Assembly Meetings**

13. Presiding Officer

The chairperson or his or her designated representative shall preside at all meetings of the Assembly.

14. Schedule of Meetings

A meeting of the Assembly shall be scheduled by the department chairperson no later than the sixth day of classes for both the fall and spring semesters. The department chairperson may also call additional meetings and shall honor requests for called meetings by 25% or more of the Assembly's membership, or three members of the Assembly, whichever is less. A department meeting may be called at any time during the summer or during vacation periods provided a notice of the meeting and the agenda are mailed to the home of each faculty member at least seven calendar days prior to the meeting. Normal rules and requirements apply during the summer and vacation meetings. At the next regular meeting, the chair will summarize actions taken during the summer and/or vacation meetings.

15. Place of Meetings

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Meetings will be held at a place convenient to members of the department, normally on the University campus in close proximity to department offices.

#### 16. Meeting Agenda

Agendas shall be prepared by the department chair for all regularly scheduled meetings of the Assembly and shall be distributed to the members no later than 5:00 p.m. of the day before the meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by any member of the Assembly.

#### 17. Quorum

A quorum of 60% or more of the membership of the Assembly is required in order to conduct business requiring a vote at meetings of the Assembly. Meetings may be held without a quorum for discussion purposes only.

#### 18. Voting Procedures

A simple majority of all members voting on an item of business of the Assembly is required for approval, except where otherwise specified in this document or in Robert's Rules of Order. No proxy voting is allowed. The Assembly may consider a motion on any item of business pertinent to the department. The Assembly may submit recommendations to the department chairperson on items not within the jurisdiction of the Assembly. While the chairperson is not bound to honor the Assembly's recommendations on such items, the chairperson is expected to inform the Assembly of his or her actions. Members of the Assembly may challenge actions of committees of the Assembly through motions submitted at meetings of the Assembly.

#### 19. Rules of Order

The business of the meeting shall be conducted in accordance with the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order unless specified otherwise in this departmental governance document.

#### 20. Meetings Open

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

Meetings of the department are open to anyone who wishes to attend, except when personnel matters are being considered or when student privacy rights must be respected.

21. Record of Meetings

A department Assembly member will be elected or assigned by the chairperson to record minutes of each meeting, which shall be distributed to all members following the meeting. Copies of the minutes shall be maintained in the department office.

22. Voice and Voting Rights

All members of the Assembly shall have voice and vote at meetings of the Assembly. Other persons invited to attend meetings, including lecturers, staff members, and students of the department, have voice without vote.

• **Committees of the Assembly**

Members of committees shall be elected by majority vote of members present and voting at a meeting of the Assembly that was publicized in advance for the purpose of such election. Members of committees shall be elected for a term of one year. Each committee shall select a chairperson. Business of the committees shall be conducted by majority vote of members present and voting. Committee members are expected to attend all meetings of their committees.

The following committees shall function as herein described:

24. Curriculum Committee – The general charge to this committee is the overview of all academic matters of the department. Specific duties include:

1. Review and approval of all course additions, deletions and changes, all program additions and deletions, and all curriculum changes.
2. Other academic matters.

25. Personnel Committee - The Personnel Committee is responsible for monitoring all matters involving personnel including but not limited to the matters as directed below. After adoption of policies on these matters by the assembly, the committee shall continue to evaluate and recommend changes to the Assembly, as warranted.

1. The Personnel Committee shall coordinate and review the development of promotion and tenure criteria and procedures and submit them to the Assembly for consideration. These criteria must be in accordance with Board of Trustee and University policies.

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

2. The Personnel Committee shall coordinate and review the development of detailed criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty and submit them to the Assembly for consideration. These criteria and procedures shall include their application to determining merit raises. These criteria and procedures shall include any specific items needed to accomplish post-tenure review. These criteria must be in accordance with Board of Trustee and University policies.
26. Promotion and Tenure Committee – Due to the varying requirements to participate as a member of a promotion and tenure committee under the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the Assembly shall establish committees as needed to review applications for promotion or tenure. Each committee shall consist of three members, meeting the requirements in the University’s Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, and elected by the Assembly. In the event that there are not enough faculty members eligible under University Promotion and Tenure Guidelines, the Assembly shall create a list of qualified individuals from outside the department. The list shall contain at least one name more than the number of additional members needed and shall be used by the College Dean to select the remaining members.
27. Assessment Committee – The Assessment Committee will recommend goals and means to the faculty for the assessment of student learning outcomes and will oversee their implementation. The committee will provide assessment assistance to faculty as needed and will analyze and report assessment results to the department and to other University officials.
28. Ad Hoc Committees – The Assembly may establish ad hoc committees. The department chair may also establish ad hoc committees, with notice to the department of the membership and assignment of any such ad hoc committee.

- **Department Administration**

30. Chairperson

The department chairperson is the academic leader of the department. As such, the chairperson is expected to provide leadership with the goal of developing and maintaining academic programs of distinctive quality. The chairperson shall allocate

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

available budget and other resources to support and encourage all faculty to seek excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. The chairperson shall ascertain that all students of the department are receiving appropriate advisement. The chairperson shall ascertain that student organizations within the department have chosen faculty members to be advisors in accordance with their by-laws. The chairperson shall evaluate faculty for salary increases, tenure, and promotion in accordance with procedures and criteria approved by the Assembly. The chairperson then shall forward his/her recommendations for tenure and promotion, along with the recommendations for promotion and tenure of the Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Dean. The chairperson shall prepare budget requests to the administration and report such requests to the Assembly. The chairperson shall review class schedules to ensure that all scheduled courses are staffed and shall assist in hiring part-time instructors.

-

### 31. Selection of Department Chairperson

Recommendations to the dean for the department chairperson position shall normally be made by election from among faculty members of the Assembly. The chairperson shall be elected for a term of three years and shall be elected by written ballot by majority vote of Assembly members that was publicized in advance for the purpose of such election.-

The department chairperson must be a tenure-track faculty member within the department.

### 32. Evaluation of Faculty and Staff for Salary Increases

Annual reviews of non-classified personnel shall be conducted in accordance with criteria and procedures approved by the Assembly. The department chairperson shall provide each person a written copy of his/her evaluation, listing strengths as well as weaknesses, and specifically addressing any problems that require correction.

- **Coda**

As a generic departmental governance document, the document is to be used by a new department until it can write and get approved a document of its own. The expectation is that each department will replace this document with a document of its

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting

own designed to meet the specific needs of their department. To approve a replacement for this document requires a favorable vote from a majority of the members present and voting at two consecutive meetings of the department Assembly. The proposed document must then go through the normal review process of the university with approval being at the discretion of the chancellor.

When the department engages in this process it needs to consider some additional matters. One is whether to include a mission statement in the governance document or to keep it as a separate policy statement. A second is whether to include promotion and tenure policy in the governance document or keep it as a separate policy statement. A third is how to amend the governance document. For example, a department might develop a statement such as the one shown below:

Amendments may be proposed by any member of the Assembly through motions submitted at a meeting of the Assembly. Amendments must receive a favorable vote from two-thirds of the members present and voting at two consecutive meetings to become effective. All amendments to this document are subject to review and approval in accordance with the constitution of the University Assembly before they come into effect.

Commentary: The constitution requires the Faculty Governance Committee to create and submit to the Faculty Senate a generic governance document that can be used by a newly created academic unit. This document serves that purpose. It is the Committee's hope that established departments may also find useful ideas that they wish to incorporate into their documents. However, a generic document must be specific whereas a document that could be used as a template for writing general documents would contain lists of possible variations that departments might want to use. So departments are cautioned not to see this document as requiring them to do things as specified here. Departments are free to address governance issues in their own way, consistent with University and Board policy.

This generic document follows a checklist the Faculty Governance Committee created to help us organize our review of documents. This checklist is also available for use by departments and was distributed earlier this academic year. What

Faculty Senate minutes, May 6, 2011, approved at the August 26, 2011 meeting departments do need to do is to be sure to address in some manner all the issues raised in the checklist. That checklist shows the specific items the Faculty Governance Committee expects to see when reviewing documents. To emphasize the department's flexibility again, departments may address these items in a way that best meets their needs, consistent with University and Board policy.

Both the checklist and the generic governance document use the term Assembly to refer to the department faculty acting in their role of self-governance. The use of the word assembly, the term used in Robert's Rules of Order, emphasizes the democratic process that is expected along with the need for transparency and clear rules of operation.

**Resolution. Nickolas Jovanovich (majority vote at one meeting):**

UALR students are encouraged to spend sufficient time outside of classes to master the subject content of their courses. Academic working hours include the time spent in classes as well as the time spent outside of classes on homework. The number of academic working hours can vary widely from student to student, depending on the preparation and ability of the student, the norms of different academic disciplines, and the expectations of individual faculty members. However, an average academic workload can be estimated from the general thumb rule that at least two hours of homework per hour of classes are necessary for an average student to master subject content with average ('C') grades. Thus, the minimum number of academic working hours per week can be estimated by multiplying total credit hours by a factor of three. For example, a full-time student taking 15 credit hours should plan to spend at least 45 academic working hours per week attending classes and doing homework, e.g., reading, writing, studying, etc. Mastering the subject content of courses with above average ('B') or superior ('A') grades may require more time and effort. Finally, since mastery of subject content is the goal, no amount of study time can guarantee academic success--course grades and course credits are awarded for mastery of subject content, not time on task.

UALR academic advisers are encouraged to use the concept of academic working hours during academic advising so that students are aware of the expectations for both class time and homework. Students need to be advised that academic success as a full-time student requires a full-time effort. The concept of academic working hours provides a convenient mechanism for accomplishing this.

UALR faculty members are encouraged to refer to academic working hours in catalog course descriptions, on syllabi, and in class so that students are aware of expectations for both class time, labs, and homework. Students should be informed if a course has expectations that vary significantly from the thumb rule of at least two hours of homework per hour in class.

UALR administrators are encouraged to use the concept of academic working hours to raise student awareness of the expectations for both class time and homework. For example, the description of academic working in the first paragraph above could be published in UALR catalogs and the UALR website, and the student registration system could include, not only total credit hours per semester, but also total academic working hours per semester, on class schedules and billing statements.

