



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Friday, September 28, 2018, 1:00 p.m.

Ledbetter Rooms B & C, Donaghey Student Center

I. Welcome and Roll Call

President Nolen called the meeting to order at 1:03 pm and recognized Past President Wright (standing in for the secretary) to call the roll.

Present: **CALS** -- Al-Shukri, Anson, Barrio-Vilar, Cheatham, Condran, Deiser, Douglas, Heil, Smith, Stone. **CB** --- Hendon, Woolridge. **CEHP** --- Atcherson, Fletcher, Franklin Grover, Otters, Reeves, Robinson, Sedivy-Benton, Vander Putten. **CSSC** --- Flinn, Golden, Jensen, Scranton. **CEIT** --- DeAngelis, Jovanovic, Massey, McMillan. **LIBRARY** --- Macheak. **LAW** --- Cain, Foster. **EX OFFICIO** --- Burton, Nolen, Rogerson, Wright

Absent: **CALS** -- Law, Legrand, Nguyen. **CB** --- Leonard, Vibhakar. **CEHP** --- none. **CSSC** --- Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Giammo, Matson. **CEIT** -- Tramel. **LIBRARY** --- none. **LAW** --- Boles. **EX OFFICIO** --- Dicus (interim SGA president), Faller (SS president)

II. Review of Minutes

President Nolen introduced the minutes for the April 27, 2018 meeting for approval.

Motion passed.

President Nolen introduced the minutes for the August 24, 2018 meeting for approval.

Motion passed.

III. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)

A. R. Woolridge:

I have pulled the data from this semester's sections, the budget, and the tuition estimates looking at the instruction costs and revenues. I did some math and the instruction side of the budget is in pretty good shapes producing on average 78% gross margin, which is the percent of revenue that is above faculty costs. We make 71% gross margin on budget line faculty and 92% gross margin on non-budget line faculty. Those are pretty good numbers, by the way.

These numbers suggest some challenges to certain kinds of cuts. For each non-budget line faculty we cut we lose \$1,573 profit for each student that we don't place in another section. To extrapolate, if we were to cut all non-budget line faculty and not place any students into existing sections, we would have to find another \$22.1M (\$24M in revenue - \$1.9M non-budget line faculty cut = \$22.1M) in budget cuts to cover the lost revenue. At half placement its \$11M in additional budget cuts, and at 99% placement

we have to make \$221K in additional budget cuts. Unless all students are placed, the math does not work, we are worse off with any non-budget line faculty cuts.

This data suggests that in the short-term the majority of the cuts must come from the 68% of the budget that is provides minimal revenue production.

However, we as faculty must also be more fiscally responsible. I am troubled by our recommendation last meeting to ignore course minimums. Minimums have to be enforced, we need to set caps that are at least some multiple of minimums like 2X, and we need to plan multi-section courses with a goal of filling them to 80% of caps. If we have to teach differently to attain those parameters, then I think that is what we have to do that. We also need to review all of our half, or less, full courses that are not multi-section and teach them less frequently in every case that is possible. I know we have reasons for having done what we have done in the past and currently still do, but we must be more fiscally responsible as faculty and departments. We must maximize students in every section.

- B. J. Flinn: I am frustrated over how offices that should talk to each other don't. A senior citizen in my class was dropped for-non payment even though senior citizens don't pay tuition. The student showed a Driver's License to registrar instead of the bursar. Why didn't the registrar communicate with the bursar, where the DL needed to be shown. I'm bothered by the lack of cooperation between these two offices. Even though we won't get revenue from this student, these connections mean something. This student may have relatives that do want to come to UA Little Rock. Now, they might not want to come here.
- C. A Wright: In the chancellor's open forum on budget and on FacFocus as well, a number of folks have raised issues regarding the power interruptions when the university transitions from Entergy's grid to our back-up power. These interruptions are disruptive. How can we make it better? I think the Faculty Senate needs to weigh in.

I move that we suspend the rules to add an item to the agenda and to move to new business to consider it. (Jovanovic seconded.)

Motion carries. See the remainder of the discussion under New Business --- Motion FS_2018_18

- D. N. Jovanovich introduces into the record an email that he wrote to Dean Whitman regarding a quote from Chancellor Rogerson.

"Larry:

Chancellor Rogerson made a statement about STEM programs in a long newspaper interview dated June 10, 2018. While I agree with many of his statements, I disagree with the statement highlighted below. In my opinion, it requires a response from EIT. Here is an excerpt from the interview:

So much of recent academic trends are focused on STEM (science, technology, engineering and math), but Rogerson takes a different view.

"It does not matter what the degree is," he said. "We are trying to take young immature adults and give them an education. Hopefully, they will come out as free-thinking adults ready for the world. I'm a STEM major, but unless you actually commit to getting a Ph.D, you are not really on a better career path than someone who did more liberal arts-based subjects. And we could easily saturate the market with computer science degrees. We love being a broad-based university."

There is a huge difference in career paths for engineering, construction management, or computer science majors compared to English majors.

The starting salaries are high in EIT disciplines, the mid-career salaries are higher, and there are opportunities for advancement into management and executive ranks in industry, or for being involved in a startup enterprise.

For example, the nationwide average starting salary for English majors is about \$36,000 per year, whereas the nationwide average starting salary for engineering or computer science majors is about \$66,000 per year.

The nationwide average mid-career salary for English majors is about \$63,000 per year, which is lower than the nationwide average starting salary for engineering or computer science majors. In contrast, the nationwide average mid-career salary for engineering and computer science majors is about \$110,000 per year.

These STEM career paths for EIT graduates do NOT require getting a Ph.D., or even an M.S., degree. In fact, in most cases, a Ph.D. would not help at all (it could even harm one's chances of advancement, except in academe or in a government or industrial research lab).

The chancellor's statement is potentially very damaging to EIT and to EIT departments and programs. It is hard enough to start new programs and market them without having the administration undercut one of the best selling points for our programs, namely the high salaries and excellent career paths.

I would certainly never claim that salary is the only metric for measuring whether one career is better than another. However, in this particular comparison, the differences are so large that they should not be dismissed without explanation of what other mitigating factors exist.

I hope that you have already responded to the chancellor, or that you will soon do so. I think that the EIT assembly should also respond, except that it would be practically impossible to call an emergency summer meeting of the assembly.

Finally, unlike the chancellor, I do not think that we could EASILY saturate the market with CS degrees. Engineering and CS programs are limited in size, not because small numbers of students are interested in them, but because they are difficult degrees to earn and many students are not prepared well enough to succeed in them.

I hope that a better message about EIT programs is shared with the public soon.

Nickolas S. Jovanovic, Faculty Senator"

I don't know if Larry brought this up. He certainly didn't do it publicly. I don't think it's possible that we could ever saturate the market in computer science degrees. These degrees are hard and not many students can succeed. I'm not against liberal arts degrees. If it were up to me, students would have to get a liberal arts degree then go into engineering (Hear! Hear! from Sen. Anson). But, it's not set up this way. These are the facts. Chancellor Rogerson made these egregious statements in a big, flashy article that has harmed the engineering programs. Don't throw engineering programs under the bus to promote liberal arts.

- E. G. Jensen - I appreciate Sen. Woolridge's comment about the Faculty Senate's recommendation about scheduling and how much adjuncts have contributed. As we move through these budget cuts, we need to be more creative about scheduling. We need to grant chairs and departments more power to deal with scheduling decisions. Part of this is being more relaxed about workload policy. The current policy is antiquated. It goes back to the early 1990s. It has been virtually an end in itself. We're so fixated on 12 IUs that we've restricted chairs in how they assign courses. We shouldn't be shooting for 12 IUs, we should be shooting for more efficiency.

- F. L. Barrio-Villar: I want to talk about energy efficiency. I highly recommend we take a look at how energy is wasted on campus. I teach all my classes in SUA 102. Since the beginning of the semester in August, students are bringing coats because it's so cold. I've contacted physical plant numerous times ... no action has been taken in seven years. In summer, we freeze. In winter, we boil. People are passing out because it's so hot. This problem is easy to take care of, and it would save us money.
- G. N. Jovanovich - I sent out an email listing seven recommendations for budget cutting. Reads the email into the record.

a. **Reduce the number of vice chancellors (VC) to two:**

- Provost and VC of academic affairs
- VC of administrative support

Eliminate all of the other VC and AVC positions; those with faculty credentials would revert to nine-month contracts, like other faculty members.

b. **Reduce the number of deans to three:**

- Dean of Little Rock College - all undergrad programs could be in one college.
- Dean of the Graduate School
- Dean of the Law School

The other deans and deanlets would revert to nine-month contracts, like other faculty members.

c. **Shift all department chairs to 9-month contracts,** like other faculty members. Department chairs are supposed to be faculty members, not administrators, so pay them like faculty members.

d. **All administrators in academic affairs and colleges should teach at least one course per semester.** The chancellor should also teach at least one course per semester. This would reduce the need for NTT faculty, and it might attract students, who might be interested in taking courses from VIP's.

e. **Give priority to units that generate revenue over units that do not generate revenue.** Units that teach courses generate revenue, so they should be the last to be cut. Stop doing across the board cuts to units that generate revenue. Start cutting units that do not generate revenue, and consider increasing support for units that generate revenue.

Many units that are not within the umbrella of academic affairs do not teach any courses, and so they generate no revenue. Some of the work those units do is essential, but many the duties could be shifted from staff members to faculty members. This would save the university money and it would simultaneously amplify the role of the faculty in the governance of the university.

To the extent possible, as many employees as possible should be involved in teaching courses to generate revenue. At the same time, faculty members should step up and take more responsibility for doing the necessary administrative work that keeps the university running.

f. **All UA Little Rock employees making more than \$100,000 should be asked to take voluntary salary reductions of 50% of the salary above \$100,000.** Thus, someone with a salary of \$110,000 would drop to \$105,000, someone with a salary of \$200,000 would drop to \$150,000, and someone with a \$300,000 salary would drop to \$200,000. These employees would still have extraordinarily generous salaries in a poor state such as Arkansas. I chose \$100,000 because that is roughly twice the annual median family income (44K in Arkansas and 58K in the U.S. in 2016). Thus, no one can argue that they "need" to have a higher salary than that because the vast majority of people live on much less than that. This would affect approximately 125 employees out of a total of 1,400 employees, less than 9% of the employees.

- g. **Finally, all units on campus, whether in academic affairs or elsewhere, should attempt to develop of new streams of revenue.** We cannot rely on the administration, the Board of Trustees, ADHE, the legislature, the governor, or existing students to provide all of the resources we need.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

none

V. Announcements

Lawrence Smith: Submission deadline for signature experience awards is Sunday, September 30.

Jovanovic: Question regarding what does “complete” mean.

L. Smith: Jeremy Ecke will send an email to campus to clarify these issues.

VI. Election of Faculty Senate Representative for Faculty Governance Committee

Pres. Nolen: Hearing no nominations, without objection, this item will be postponed until the October meeting.

VII. Election of Administrator to Faculty Appeals Council

Pres. Nolen opens floor to nominations for administrator below the level of dean to serve on Faculty Appeals Council.

N. Jovanovich: Are there administrators below the level of dean? What does this mean?

R. Cheatham: This has always meant Associate or Assistant Deans, but not department chairs

Pres. Nolen: Hearing no nominations, without objection, this item will be postponed until the October meeting.

VIII. Reports

On behalf of the College of Business request, President Nolen moved to reorder the agenda without objection to add a report from the VC of Student Affairs, Mark Allen Poisal, and to move the Executive Committee Report to after the Chancellor’s report.

A. Chancellor’s Report - A. Rogerson

I realize there is uncertainty with the budget cuts. Please reassure students that UA Little Rock is not going to close in January. We have \$180M in net assets, and we are asked to find \$9M. We need to get optimism across campus and to defuse rumors.

N. Jovanovich: Would you commit now that at least 50% of the cuts will come from outside academic affairs?

A. Rogerson: I can’t make that kind of commitment.

I want to respond to your comment on the article. That quote was clumsy and does not reflect my sentiment. We're dealing with a legislature that only wants professional degrees, and we need to convey that liberal arts are important as well.

B. Provost's Report - V. Burton

Last year we had 19 OCDA applications submitted and awarded. This year, given the financial climate, we are letting deans and chairs know that we will be unable to provide resources to cover the workload of faculty on OCDA. Last year we started a review process in our office. We noticed that several OCDA applications were submitted where the person did not have time or resources to fulfill project and so we plan to ask faculty to revise & resubmit OCDA applications where that is the case. We need to do that because the folks above us [in the UA System] do read the OCDA applications.

Faculty excellence awards will be the same amount as last year - \$5,000. With senate approval, the excellence awards will carry on.

Demand is high for the undergraduate mentor awards. Ninety-nine signature proposals were submitted, and we have had great support for this program from external donors.

Chairpersons Council has restarted, coordinated by Christy Drale. It will meet at least twice a year, fall and spring.

Clinical faculty appointments: Requests have come from several colleges to develop a designation for clinical faculty appointments, including in Law and Health Professions. We are working with those colleges on this.

Department visits: Like last year, I plan to visit individual academic units to hear issues and concerns, starting in October. I will be contacting department chairs to arrange these sessions.

C. VC of Student Affairs Report:

MA Poisal: After meeting with Amanda, we decided that it would be useful to have an update on student recruitment. Our enrollment is diverse (high freshman component, high transfer component, students who are returning after time off from classes, combination of undergrad/grad/concurrent). Our focus is on recruiting new students (recent high school graduates). We are considering strategies for better recruiting, particularly digital media - revising publication component to match our digital presence (videos). A new customer resource management system will use multiple types of communication – email with a link to video, email invitation to visit campus and meet with a faculty member. Potential students need to feel engaged and connected. Research indicates that we need 10-12 interactions with potential students over multiple types of connection. As part of this, we are recruiting current students to tell their story about UA Little Rock (We have an online submission form to which you can refer students who may like to give video, provide a quote, etc.). We are working on consistency in using the Unlimited Pathways theme across our communications to differing pools of students we are recruiting. Multiple opportunities for how faculty can be involved in the process: participating in college fairs, speaking to students during campus visits. Amanda and I discussed hosting an information session for faculty to explain the recruitment process and our annual recruitment cycle.

It is important to recognize that our enrollment strategy varies across different subgroups of potential students. We have particular groups focused on traditional student recruiting; student retention; graduate student recruiting; and student enrollment experience.

L. Barrio-Vilar: Want to suggest that we use language that is LGBTQ-inclusive during student recruiting, such as making sure that gender options on application forms are inclusive of trans- or gender non-binary students.

G. Robinson: Also helpful to ask about preferred pronouns

G. Jensen: I want to suggest that we target 2 year colleges with online programs. There are many placebound people in AR that could complete associate degrees and for whom online programs could be a good option. We are often seen as a "last resort" institution. We could instead be the "second chance" institution i.e. market to transfer students. Our strength is that we have always been supportive & understanding of those students and they value us.

MA Poisal: Our ability to be welcoming to transfer students is highly important. We want to look at increasing flexibility in completing degrees for transfer and military veteran students, particularly online options. If we can make sure these students have the best of both worlds, we will have an opportunity.

Cheatham: Do we know which [online] programs can offer in state tuition to out of state students?

MA Poisal: if you are a student from Texas you will have in state tuition regardless of the program.

Cheatham: So we have the same arrangement as Fayetteville? Can we make sure this is more widely known?

MA Poisal: We've been working on talking points we can use in out-of-state recruiting. We get names from states like Texas, California, Illinois with high ACT who are potential recruits. If we can get a few this way, similar to Fayetteville, we can get an out-of-state reputation.

R Cheatham. If there is a way that we can link the scholarship page to dept. web pages, that would be helpful.

A. Sedivy-Benton: We have an almost entirely untapped market in the military community (i.e. Camp Robinson, Jacksonville AFB). We have little presence there, even in terms of recruiting materials. Servicemen and families could be interested in our programs. We are military-friendly but not recognized for that.

MA Poisal: We have work to do on relationship-building with the military bases. And our recruiting materials haven't focused on military students. We are developing that as part of our strategy.

J. Hendon: I was part of an effort to make the campus more military-friendly, but the administration at time did not support it. We lost a military assistance center to ASU. Getting access to the air force base is easy. We've heard excuses for many years. We haven't managed the online programs in a way that makes them military friendly. We haven't been great at

communicating the message about how we are a better option than Webster University and University of Phoenix, which are much more expensive and give less return.

MA Poisal: If the military student affairs group can write a letter...

J. Herndon: Unfortunately that group is now defunct.

N. Jovanovic: We have faculty members who are ex-military which may help in relationship building. We were approached by the military to participate when they created their Education Center, but the UA Little Rock administration was not interested in it. It is not true then that we were not approached or invited. We offer unique programs in construction engineering. Eighty percent of civil engineers end up in construction engineering, but are not educated in construction specifically. There is a significant potential market here. It should be an easy sell to servicemembers.

R Otters: Social work has a lot of military students so it is not like we have no relationship to military. We must be doing something right then. How do we expand on it?

N. Jovanovic: Private liberal arts colleges that want to look more prestigious have increased tuition. Since our 4 year tuition is a bit on the high side compared to other in-state institutions. What is your view on lowering tuition? Would give up some revenue, but it might be good marketing.

MA Poisal: If we lower our tuition, must also lower scholarship money. If we lower tuition, then what's the appropriate scholarship cut? A challenge in this is that we don't want to lower tuition too much to attract students and risk becoming the "K-Mart" for education. Community Colleges in the state with half our tuition rate struggle with enrollment.

D. Executive Committee – Amanda Nolen

1) I sent email to Faculty Senators with a link to eight years of enrollment and graduation data by program. Please take time over the next few weeks to review and comment on the data. I hope that data will generate some discussion. As Faculty Senate, we have purview over curricular matters and how they overlap with enrollment.

2) I am appointing an ad hoc committee on student retention. It will review coordination between faculty and non-faculty units, review student retention models, existing legislation relevant to student retention, and collect data from students and faculty on retention issues. The committee will make a preliminary report to the Faculty Senate in January, with a final report making recommendations on legislation to the Faculty Senate in March. Mike Crow will chair the committee and serve as Faculty Senate liaison to the committee. The committee broadly represents the colleges, first year experience program, and others with expertise in student retention.

3) Following the Chancellor's budget forum, we are following up on organizing meetings concerning budget with the Chancellor. Meetings are being arranged for department chairs, the Planning and Finance Committee as met with him, meeting is forthcoming with the Policy Advisory Committee. Angie Faller (Staff Senate President) is organizing meetings on budget on behalf of the staff.

M. DeAngelis: We have three students on the retention committee. Should we invite others?

A. Nolen: The student representatives include Larry Dicus (President of the Student Government Association) and Diamond Shelman (President of the Graduate Student Association) who can act as connections back to other students for feedback and interaction.

E. Planning and Finance Committee - Rosalie Cheatham

R. Cheatham: Thanks to the chancellor and President Nolen for the willingness to enter into discussion. We've seen change with loosening of travel restrictions. Planning and Finance is going to aggregate ideas for suggested budget cuts. Look at the committee membership and send comments to your representative. Next month, Planning and Finance will report to the Senate on where we stand.

Planning and Finance will also revisit the Workload Policy that we passed some months ago and which has seen no action by the administration.

F. Faculty Governance Committee – Rosalie Cheatham/Andrew Wright (Rosalie Cheatham reporting)

We're meeting this semester to clean up the faculty handbook which was last updated in 2000.

We also plan to meet with the Provost to discuss the governance documents (Rhetoric and Writing, Nursing, CHPR, Information Science, Earth Science and Applied Communication) which were acted on by the Faculty Governance Committee last Fall, so that the departments may revise their documents and return them for approval and signature by the chancellor. Other documents (English, Criminal Justice, Theatre & Art, and Psychology) have been reviewed prior to Fall 2017, but the departments have not returned them to the Faculty Governance Committee to address the committee's concerns.

M.DeAngelis: I was looking on the provost's web site on governance documents (<https://ualr.edu/academics/governance-documents/>) and it appears that all the documents have disappeared. Could the committee look into this and report back to the Senate?

R. Cheatham: That's on our radar. They've been missing for some time, and we have not gotten any response to why they have disappeared.

G. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel (Lawrence Smith reporting)

Report is on the Faculty Senate web site

H. Graduate Council – Karen Kuralt

Report is on the Faculty Senate web site

K. Kuralt – Graduate Council is also focused on the recruiting and retention issue with respect to online, international, and military students. We plan to update policies to make them more welcoming to these students

I. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies – Belinda Blevins-Knabe (Michael DeAngelis reporting)

M. DeAngelis: We have received most data for assessment. We are putting together reports & hopefully will have them up on the website soon.

We are undertaking a review of core courses. Plan to start this in October and will continue through early spring.

IX. Old Business

None

X. New Business

A. **Motion FS_2018_18.** Andrew Wright (Recommendation) Cost-benefit analysis for energy system

Whereas the energy management agreement between UA Little Rock and Energy requires that UA Little Rock switch over to back up generation during peak consumption hours, and

Whereas peak consumption hours will occur when classes are in session, especially on hot days in August and cold days in December, January, and February, and

Whereas the change-over results in a campus wide interruption of power that plunges class rooms, offices, and meeting spaces into abrupt darkness, and

Whereas classes which use technology may require several minutes to restart, consuming irreplaceable class time and providing a poor learning experience for our students, and

Whereas any interruption of power can be damaging to powered equipment such as computers, motors, and power supplies, resulting in damage to these equipment, and

Whereas vacuum systems in particular require special shut down and start up procedures, which will result in damage to those expensive instruments, and

Whereas a piece of equipment that can buffer the power switchover is available, albeit expensive, and

Whereas the decision to fore-go this piece of equipment was made without adequate consultation to determine the likely impact,

Therefore be it resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the chancellor commission a cost benefit analysis to determine whether the costs to the university in lost equipment, class room disruptions, and other expenses out-weighs the cost to buffer the power interruptions during switchover, and

Be it further resolved that the chancellor determine how such a poor decision could be made so that we can avoid such damaging decisions in the future.

The rules were suspended to add FS_2018_18 to the agenda (see Airing of Grievances).

Andrew Wright introduces the motion. N. Jovanovic seconds.

A. Wright: When the power goes out, we lose class time and equipment gets damaged. We need to examine these costs and see if they outweigh the cost of the equipment to prevent them. WE need to look at how we made this kind of decision in the past so that we can make better decisions in future.

N. Jovanovic: Back when I was in the Navy, we had to switch power back and forth on our submarines, all the time. It's ancient technology, and it was ridiculous that we didn't buy the switch-over equipment. I realize this decision was made under the previous administration. But, why was this decision made? Why was there no discussion? How can we avoid this in the future?

M. D'Angelis: The last power outage occurred at 6:20 pm, 20 minutes into the Earth Talk lecture. We had been working with university television to record this lecture. There were about 200 people in attendance, some from the public, our advisory board, and some students when the power went out. It took 20-25 min to get the equipment started back up. Fortunately, our speaker was very gracious and entertained the audience while we scrambled. Now, we have people talking negatively about our image. Something has to change.

S. Atcherson: The university operates an audiology clinic. We train students on clinical procedures. Clients and the public come in with communication/balance disorders. What if the lights go out? People could fall. This is a liability, and the problem extends well beyond the classroom. This impacts research and productivity.

N. Jovanovich: I investigated when this first happened. I talked to Ian Hadden, the professional engineer who was in charge of implementing the Entergy agreement. He told me an economic analysis had been done to show the cost of the switch gear was too much. I asked for analysis so that I could use it as a case study in my class. It was never produced. I don't believe it exists. It would make a legitimate, real life case study, and give us an idea of what went wrong with this analysis. A real cost-benefit analysis depends on all costs be included in study. If the only cost included in the study was the cost of the switch gear itself, then the study is flawed. If the switch gear is too expensive, then we need to get out of the Entergy agreement.

E. Anson: There have been a number of decisions made without faculty input. Think about E-Stem, where we had to make a Freedom of Information Act request to get the contracts. Many administrators come from outside, haven't been here very long and don't talk to the faculty who have been here awhile. Consider the cafeteria fiasco to start the term as a case-in-point.

Pres. Nolen: Does anyone want to argue against the motion?

No further discussion

Motion passes unanimously.

Discussion returns to Airing of Grievances (see above)

B. Motion FS_2018_15. Undergraduate Council (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings - second vote verbatim the first vote, no second required, first vote) Modify constitution to clarify routing of undergraduate program closures

Be it resolved to amend Article III of the Constitution of the University Assembly of UA Little Rock pertaining to the Undergraduate Council as follows (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion):

In academic units organized into departments and colleges and schools, all **proposals for undergraduate curriculum** ~~changes in curricula~~ and degree programs shall be routed to

department, college, or school curriculum committees; to college or school faculties; and to the Undergraduate Council. In academic units not organized into such departments and colleges and schools, routing shall be according to analogous process certified to the Undergraduate Council by the executive vice chancellor and provost. **Proposals for undergraduate program closures that originate as a result of program review or low productivity pursuant to UA Board Policy 620.1 shall be reviewed by program faculty, college or school curriculum committees, and college or school faculties before routing to the Undergraduate Council.** Recommendations of the Undergraduate Council are subject to review by the Faculty Senate upon decision of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate or upon petition signed by five or more senators and delivered to the president of the Faculty Senate within ten (10) calendar days of passage by the Undergraduate Council. Proposals not reviewed by the Faculty Senate or having passed Faculty Senate review shall be routed to the executive vice chancellor and provost, the chancellor, and for new degree programs, to the president, the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Higher Education.

Commentary: Adding the language proposed in FS_2018_15 and FS_2018_16 provides clarity for the process of proper notification and routing for program closures and the role of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils in that process. Those proposals are to follow the same process as a proposal to close a program for any other reason, as specified in UA Board Policy 620.1, "A recommendation for deletion, suspension, or significant expansion or modification of any program made as a result of either type of review [low productivity or substantive evaluation] shall be reviewed by the faculty of the program involved, the administrative head of the college, school, or other unit in which the program is located, the campus governing body, the chief academic officer, and the Chancellor."

On behalf of Undergraduate Council, L. Smith introduces FS_2018_15 (no second required).

L. Smith: The purpose of this motion is to clarify the process when we have program closures initiated pursuant to Board Policy 620.1. When the Provost initiated closures of certificates last year, we feel that the notification process and the opportunity for program faculty to make a case was too abbreviated.

Jovanovic: Were there programs that were closed without notification?

L. Smith: There was confusion about the process that was being used, particularly about the routing of curricular change documents.

R. Cheatham: Is the word 'review' used in the 620.1 policy?

Pres. Nolen: The excerpt from board policy is in the commentary.

R. Cheatham: I'm trying to figure out what we understand 'review' to mean.

A. Nolen: Review as opposed to approve

R. Cheatham: Historically, with curriculum, a negative recommendation doesn't go forward. I would like to see a program have something like recommend/not recommend. They ought to have the option to say "We disagree for these reasons" and to have those comments go forward.

K. Kuralt (chair of graduate council): The department will have the ability to attach comments. It is definitely part of our intent for them to have voice in the process.

Cheatham: Perhaps we can find a way to modify the wording appropriately. I'm concerned that the wording is too vague in terms of the intent of the legislation.

M. DeAngelis read BP 620.1”

“The approval of the Board of Trustees is required for the addition, deletion, suspension, or significant modification of academic programs (a curriculum leading to a certificate, associate degree, baccalaureate degree, specialist degree, or graduate degree).

The Board of Trustees reserves the right to delete programs because of low demand, low productivity, a modification of the role and scope of the campus, or financial exigency (as defined in Board Policy 405.5), or upon the initiative of the President, regardless of a recommendation for such action by the campus. In all such instances, however, the Board shall solicit comments and suggestions from the appropriate campus-wide governance body or bodies, from the Chancellor, and from the President before a decision is made.

Guidelines for proposing new academic programs shall be developed by each campus and approved by the campus governance body, chief academic officer, and Chancellor and submitted to the President. Such guidelines for proposing new academic programs must provide for review of proposed programs by the program or departmental faculty, college, school, or other sub-unit in which the program will be given, the campus governance body, the chief academic officer, and the Chancellor. If the Chancellor approves a proposal, it shall be forwarded to the President, who will report the results of the campus deliberation, along with his/her own recommendations, to the Board of Trustees for action. If the Chancellor disapproves the proposal, it shall be returned to the campus governance body, and further action will be subject to existing policies and procedures.

Two types of review shall be required for all established academic programs:

(1) review of annual report of low productivity programs originating in the office of the chief academic officer of the campus, and

(2) a periodic substantive evaluation of each academic program on a rotating schedule not to exceed ten years.

For the evaluations, each campus shall establish guidelines and criteria which shall be approved by the campus governing body, chief academic officer, and Chancellor and shall be submitted to the President. A recommendation for deletion, suspension, or significant expansion or modification of any program made as a result of either type of review shall be reviewed by the faculty of the program involved, the administrative head of the college, school, or other unit in which the program is located, the campus governing body, the chief academic officer, and the Chancellor. The Chancellor will forward his/her recommendations, along with those of the previous reviewing bodies, to the President who will report the results of the campus deliberation along with his/her own recommendations to the Board of Trustees for action.”

R. Cheatham: If a faculty committee reviews a curriculum proposal to end a program, it should have the ability to say that it recommends or does not recommend that it be ended.

Comment: The final sentence in Board Policy 620.1 indicates that faculty committee recommendations should be forwarded to the President and Board of Trustees along with those of the Chancellor.

A. Nolen: Do we need to define the process in the constitution?

Question: Isn't this something that UGC and GC should determine for themselves?

R. Cheatham: This process has to be defined in Senate legislation. Otherwise, there is no way to put in the record why a program disagrees with the program closure.

Pres. Nolen: The recommendation to the Chancellor will come from the UGC. These meetings have minutes. So, the program's recommendation is recorded.

J. Hendon moves to refer FS_2018_15 and FS_2018_16 to the respective councils to resolve the issue of review versus recommend on the part of the program faculty. Seconded by E. Anson.

A. Wright: When CCFs and PCFs make it through the curriculum process, there are occasions where the implementation is not consistent with the intent of the curriculum change. Faculty Senate has the authority to

interpret its legislation. That authority should pass to the Councils on the issues of legislation that they process. It would be good to formally spell out the authority in the constitution.

Motion to commit FS_2018_15 to the UGC and Motion FS_2018_16 to the GC respectively, with instructions to clarify interpretation of legislation authority, carries.

- C. Motion FS_2018_16.** Graduate Council (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings - second vote verbatim the first vote, no second required, first vote) Modify constitution to clarify routing of graduate program closures

Be it resolved to amend Article III of the Constitution of the Constitution of the University Assembly of UA Little Rock pertaining to the Graduate Council as follows (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion):

Proposals for graduate programs and courses ~~that which~~ originate with program department faculties shall be routed to college or school curriculum committees, to college or school faculties, and to the Graduate Council. In academic units not organized into departments, colleges, or schools, routing shall be according to analogous process certified to the Graduate Council by the executive vice chancellor and provost. **Proposals for graduate program closures that originate as a result of program review or low productivity pursuant to UA Board Policy 620.1 shall be reviewed by program faculty, college or school curriculum committees, and college or school faculties before routing to the Graduate Council.** Recommendations of the Graduate Council are subject to review by the Faculty Senate upon decision of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate or upon petition signed by five or more senators and delivered to the president of the Faculty Senate within ten (10) calendar days of passage by the Graduate Council. Proposals not reviewed by the Faculty Senate or having passed Senate review are routed to the executive vice chancellor and provost and chancellor, and for new degree programs, to the president, the Board of Trustees, and the Board of Higher Education.

This motion was referred to Graduate Council. See discussion under FS_2018_15.

- D. Motion FS_2018_17.** Honors and Awards Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Faculty Excellence Awards Policy

Be it resolved to amend policy 403.8 Faculty Excellence Awards per the mark-up (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion);

The UA **Little Rock** ~~LR~~ Foundation Fund Board in 1988 instituted a series of annual awards to recognize and reward faculty excellence in three specified areas of performance: teaching, research or creative endeavors, and professional and public service. Recognition is accorded at the college level and at the University level. Each award consists of a framed certificate and a cash gift of \$1,000 at the college level and at the university level, **\$5,000** ~~10,000~~ **each** for teaching, ~~and \$5,000 in~~ research or creative endeavors, and public service. **College winners are recognized and University winners are announced at the Faculty Excellence Ceremony each spring.**

I. Nature and Categories of Awards

A. Award for excellence in teaching.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward superior classroom teachers—individuals whose command of their respective disciplines, teaching methodologies, communications

skills, concern for student performance, and commitment to the learning process exemplify the teacher/mentor model. The award is not intended to be a popularity contest. It is designed to distinguish those teachers who maintain high expectations of their students and who ensure academic rigor in their courses.

B. Award for excellence in research or creative endeavors.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward those individuals whose research or creative endeavors have been particularly successful and are so recognized locally, regionally, and nationally. The results of these efforts should have contributed to the expansion of knowledge and/or the quality of life, and/or encouraged additional research.

C. Award for excellence in public service.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward those individuals who have brought credit to the ~~University of Arkansas at~~ **UA** Little Rock through their successful efforts in applying the content or skills of their academic disciplines in service to the community, state, or nation in areas of public interest. This award is designed to distinguish those persons whose achievements in serving the public interest by the application of their disciplinary expertise to problems and issues external to campus have been particularly successful and are so recognized locally, regionally, or nationally.

II. Number and Frequency of Awards

A. Award for excellence in teaching.

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- **The award for excellence in teaching may be shared when the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.**

B. Award for excellence in research or creative endeavors.

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- The award **for excellence in research or creative endeavors** may be shared where the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.

C. Award for excellence in public service.

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- **The award for excellence in public service may be shared when the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.**

D. The term “college/schools” refers to each college or school that has representation in the UA Little Rock Faculty Senate.

III. Selection

A. Eligibility.

- Persons with faculty status as defined in the current faculty handbook, except for the adjunct and visiting categories, holding full-time faculty appointments who have completed five or more full years of service to the University may be nominated; faculty who have administrative responsibilities are eligible if their teaching duties are 50% or more of their

work assignment for the academic year in which they are nominated.

- Faculty members who are otherwise qualified for the teaching award but who are not administratively a part of one of the ~~seven named~~ colleges/schools shall be eligible through the award process of the college/school that offers the courses such faculty teach.
- The most recent five years of accomplishments comprise the record to be documented, presented and reviewed in the selection process.
- Persons may not receive an award of the same category for a period of three years.

B. Nominations.

- Persons considered for awards shall be identified through a process of nomination.
- The nomination process shall be open – i.e., any person may nominate a faculty member for any of the awards.

C. Selection committees – college-level awards.

- There shall be a selection committee within each college/school.
- The size and composition of the committee shall be as follows:
 - A. One representative chosen by the faculty from each department within the college/school.
 - B. One student member.
 - C. One alumni member.
- In colleges/schools which are not organized departmentally, the faculty shall develop a method for faculty representation.
- The manner of choosing the student and alumni members shall be determined by the college/school faculty.
- Individuals who serve as administrators with the title of department chair (or its equivalent) and at higher levels of administration are not eligible to serve on the selection committee.
- Individuals who are nominated for an award may not serve on the selection committee.

D. Selection committee – University-level awards.

- The UA Little Rock Board of Visitors will serve as the external selection committee for the university-level awards.
- ~~There shall be a single external national selection committee composed of seven members.~~
- ~~No member shall be employed by the University of Arkansas at Little Rock.~~
- ~~The Chancellor shall appoint the external national selection committee.~~
- ~~The composition of the committee shall be national in scope and broadly representative of the disciplines in the colleges/schools in the University.~~
- ~~Committee members may be selected from the academic and nonacademic spheres of endeavor.~~
- ~~Committee members shall receive an appropriate honorarium.~~

IV. Procedure

A. Administration of the award process.

Administrative support for the award process shall be the responsibility of the Office of the Provost.

B. Solicitation of nominations.

- Not later than September 30 of each year, the Provost shall advise members of the campus community of the award process and nominating procedure. The timeline and deadlines for

preparation, completion and submission of materials shall be announced as well.

- The Director of Alumni Affairs shall advise the alumni of the University through appropriate alumni publications.
- Information about the awards shall be widely disseminated throughout the community to encourage nominations from the business, professional, and public sectors of the community.

C. Preparation of nomination packets.

- Nominators are responsible for preparation of nomination packets containing information as specified in the attachment, "Preparation and Submission of Nomination Packets." Page limitations are enforced.
- Department chairs or equivalent administrators shall cooperate with nominators in assembling supporting evidence.

D. Submission of nomination packets.

- One copy of each nomination packet for the college-level awards shall be submitted to the college selection committee no later than the date specified in the Provost's announcement.
- One copy of each college-level winner's packet shall be forwarded to the Provost no later than the date specified in the Provost's announcement.

E. Selection committee action.

- College-level selection committees shall meet as necessary in order to complete the selection of the award winners.
- Committee procedures shall be determined by the respective colleges/schools.
- The committee shall review such materials as are submitted in the nomination packet.
- The proceedings of the committees shall be confidential.
- Each college-level committee shall forward one copy of the nomination packets of the winners of the college-level awards to the Provost no later than the date specified in the Provost's announcement

F. The Provost shall forward sets of nomination packets to members of the external ~~national~~ selection committee.

- The members of the selection committee shall advise the Provost of the committee's selections by a date designated by the Provost.
- The proceedings of the committee shall be confidential.
- The announcement of University-level winners shall be made at a suitable University event.

V. Preparation and Submission of Nomination Packets

Nominations must adhere to the following instructions and page limitations to be accepted by the Provost's Office. Place in a single manila folder one copy of each item described below for each nominee. Clearly identify the name of the nominee on the tab of the folder. Please do not use special folders or binders. Submit the folder to the college or school selection committee by the date specified in the annual solicitation for nominations. Department chairs (or equivalent administrators) are expected to cooperate as needed in assembling the required information.

The contents of each packet should be as follows, minimum 12-point font:

1. Table of Contents
2. Letter of Nomination (limited to ~~four~~ **three** pages). Focus on accomplishments during the most recent five year period.
3. Biographical data. (limited to ~~six~~ **five** pages) Please provide in the order listed; ~~a standard curriculum vitae is inappropriate:~~

- Name of nominee and award for which nominated
- Current position (title, rank, department, or unit)
- Number of years in this position
- Number of years at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock **UA Little Rock**
- Degrees held (source and date)
- Employment history (previous positions, years; list most recent first)
- Honors and awards
- Membership in professional and honorary societies (note offices held)
- List of courses taught in each of the five years prior to nomination. Provide the full course title and not just the course number.
- Scholarly and Professional Accomplishments: List of articles and books published and professional accomplishments within the last five years (please provide the complete citation). If there are particularly significant accomplishments before the last five years, those may be referenced in the letter of nomination. Do not submit copies of work(s). The selection committee may request these if desired.
- **Description of the public service activities in each of the five years prior to nomination.**

Only the contents of the packet as specified above will be sent to the members of the **external national** selection committee.

4. Letters of Endorsement: (limited to one page each) Letters of endorsement may be provided from up to **four** ~~six~~ people who can speak to the award criteria. Letters from students who are likely to be subsequently advised or evaluated by the faculty nominee are discouraged. Standard, anonymous student evaluations and individual letters from graduates are appropriate. The perspective or status of the authors of the letters should be clearly identified, either in the letter itself or by the person who prepares the nomination packet as well as their title, e.g., Professor of English, or Alumnus, or Dean of Arts, or Student, etc.

5. (Optional) Personal Statement from the nominee.

Pages exceeding the limits above will not be considered. The total packet requires a Table of Contents and a maximum of **15** ~~16~~ pages (excluding the optional personal statement).

And, Be it further resolved that upon approval, implementation of changes to policy 403.8 will be effective as of August 2018.

Commentary: For the past two years the faculty senate has approved a provision allowing the Chancellor to make minor revisions to the Faculty Excellence Awards. The Honors and Awards Committee recommends revising the policy to accept the changes.

M. Reeves introduces Motion FS_2018_17 on behalf of the Honors and Awards committee (no second required).

M. Reeves summarizes the changes – the stipend for the university awards is reduced to \$5000 for each award: teaching, research & creative endeavors, and public service; the college winners receive \$1000; the Board of Visitors will serve as the selection committee; the awards for teaching and for public service may be shared; the page limits on nomination and biographical data, and overall page limit is reduced from 16 pages to 12 pages.

E. Anson: It seems to me that assessment is wagging the dog. Another concern is the reduction in the page limit. On assessment, why is this language included in the teaching award?:

“The application must include a description of how the applicant has used assessment to improve course content, pedagogy, or degree program outcomes. Applications which do not address this important teaching dimension will not be forwarded to the national selection panel.”

Is this essential?

A. Nolen: That language isn't in the Faculty Senate legislation. Where did you get it?

E. Anson: It's on the web site. Are you saying that language was added to the policy without Faculty Senate action?

Pres. Nolen: The Honors and Awards Committee did not include that language in the motion on the floor, and it is not part of Faculty Senate legislation.

M. Douglas: It seems unusual to me that no instructor has won the teaching award at the university level.

G. Robinson: In my role as chair of CEHP awards committee, it is sometimes difficult to see the context of the credentials because there is no personal statement from the nominee. It creates a circumstance where the nominee must embed this contextual information into the CV or get the referees to embed it into their recommendation letters.

G. Robinson moved to amend to add an optional personal statement (one-page maximum) to the packet for all awards and amend the total page limit to exclude this item. N. Jovanovic seconded.

Motion to amend carries unanimously.

E. Anson: I'm not sure why we reduced the page limit, and moves to amend to change the page limit to 15 pages (excluding the optional personal statement).

C. Drale: We have used a 12-page limit for the past two years since the Chancellor wanted to use the Board of Visitors as the external review committee. The Chancellor was concerned that packets might be overwhelming for that group.

The motion to amend FS_2018_17 to set the page limit to 15 pages (excluding the optional personal statement) carried with some objections.

A. Nolen: Any further discussion on FS_2018_17 as amended?

Question is called.

Motion FS_2018_17 (as amended) carries. Amendments are reflected in the motion in the minutes.

XI. Open Forum

Lawrence Smith added some additional clarifying comments regarding the signature experience solicitation.

XII. Adjourn

President Nolen adjourned the meeting at 3:00.