



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Friday, October 26, 2018, 1:00 p.m.
Student Services Center Auditorium, 1st Floor

I. Welcome and Roll Call

President Nolen called the meeting to order at 1:05 pm.

Present: **CALS** -- Al-Shukri, Anson, Barrio-Vilar, Cheatham, Condran, Deiser, Douglas, Heil, LeGrand, Nguyen, Smith. **CB** --- Hendon. **CEHP** ---Fletcher, Otters, Robinson, Sedivy-Benton, VanderPutten. **CSSC** --- Blevins-Knabe, Craw, Flinn, Giammo, Golden, Jensen, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT** --- DeAngelis, Jovanovic, Massey, McMillan, Tramel. **LIBRARY** --- Macheak. **LAW** ---Foster. **EX OFFICIO** --- Drale, Nolen, Wright

Absent: **CALS** -- Law, Stone. **CB** --- Leonard, Vibhakar, Woolridge. **CEHP** --- Atcherson, Franklin, Grover, Reeves. **CSSC** --- None. **CEIT** -- None. **LIBRARY** --- none. **LAW** --- Boles, Cain. **EX OFFICIO** --- Dicus, Faller, Rogerson

II. Review of Minutes September 28, 2018

Review of minutes postponed until the November meeting. Draft September minutes are on the Faculty Senate website.

III. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)

Tramel: Can anyone explain the work that is happening in the parking garage on the yellow pipes? One has been removed but another remains. A high school student leaving a competition ran into it recently, seems to be causing a problem.

Douglas: We are having a problem with pedestrians ignoring the traffic light on 28th Street. Can Public Safety monitor this situation?

Deiser: Speaking of traffic, the intersection of S. University and University Drive is dangerous. eStem Parents leaving University Plaza are creating a hazard. Perhaps the University could support a change of the traffic light to include a green arrow.

DeAngelis: The new cafeteria arrangement is creating a problem by restricting so much seating only to those who are paying for a meal. Most of the cafeteria seating area is no longer accessible to those not paying for a meal. The problem is being made worse by all the E-Stem students using the

remaining free space in the fast food seating areas. Could we open Ledbetter as an overflow space as a temporary space?

Matson: I want to add that this is another example of a decision that completely disregards the fact that we are primarily a non-residential and part-time student campus.

Anson: Sodexo requested the cafeteria seating change, and Student Affairs approved it.

Anson: I went through the minutes following Dr. Poisal's visit at our last meeting. He outlined a number of strategies. Is anything in particular being done to boost enrollment for the spring semester, but is being held secret? I am asking this as a general question for anyone to answer.

VanderPutten: I have seen that UA Little Rock has received more negative press on military veteran applications. Another example of the unfriendly nature of the campus.

Wright: I've started advising for next semester, and mostly it has been a positive experience. But a new student to the program expressed concern that UA Little Rock won't be in business much longer and wanted reassurance. We are deceiving ourselves if we think the budget uncertainty won't affect enrollment for spring. We want to make sure that faculty and staff are doing positive messaging.

McMillan: One of our majors transferred in from Louisiana and asked if she made a mistake in coming here.

Cheatham: I have five post-bacc student advisees for whom I am unable to create a degree plan because they are not yet in DegreeWorks. And they cannot be added to BOSS until they have a degree plan. This sort of thing contributes to our bad press.

DeAngelis: Lots of suggestions have been made about the budget crisis. But I haven't heard anything from the Chancellor or Cabinet about those suggestions. I call for another Chancellor's Open Forum to discuss the plan before the next Board of Trustees meeting.

VanderPutten: We've had a deafening silence from the Board of Visitors. I want to call for a town hall meeting with them on whether they support the proposed cuts.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

DeAngelis: I wish there was some push back from the administration to the UA System. Why no arguments about how to share resources across the UA System. Why don't we share all our library resources? Why shouldn't every campus have access to all the databases at every campus? Our current system preserves differences between the haves and have nots.

McMillan: An important bright spot for us is that the signature experience awards have all been allocated. We should strongly promote this to generate good press.

Hoerschelmann: Speaking about sharing resources across campuses, the Illinois system does work that way with its libraries...all resources are shared. This is not uncommon in other states.

Wright: What about using student publications as a venue for publicizing signature experiences.? Perhaps a special issue for a student journal?

Matson: Following up on that, we could integrate signature experience more into existing elements of the university. This is something we need to do. We have capstone courses and core courses where these projects could be integrated into the experience we provide students. We are putting a lot of effort into student experience. The signature experience model does not incorporate faculty load at all, and they are labor intensive for the student and faculty mentor. We need to be sure we are getting the most benefit we can from these experiences.

Sedivy-Benton: We are developing branding for the signature experiences now, showcasing the amazing projects going on. Great marketing potential here.

Matson: My point was not to coordinate all the different research expos and showcases, but to coordinate the signature experience with all the other academic initiatives, including Faculty Senate curriculum initiatives.

DeAngelis: I recently asked the Chancellor about where the City of Little Rock is at in all of this. We need a summit of city leaders, university leaders and faculty about the relationship between the city and surrounding communities and UA Little Rock.

V. Announcements

- The Staff Senate Blood Drive will on Wednesday, the 31st from 10 -2 in the Donaghey Student Center Fitness Center. We are hoping to have at least 27 donors.
- Chancellor is not here today but at the UA System Office to receive the E-Stem feasibility report.

VI. Election of Faculty Senate Representative for Faculty Governance Committee

President Nolen opens the floor for nominations for Faculty Governance Committee (serving for a 1-year term)

Sedivy-Benton: I nominate Jim VanderPutten

VanderPutten accepts nomination

No other nominations.

VanderPutten elected as Faculty Senate representatives to the Faculty Governance Committee by acclamation

VII. Election of Administrator to Faculty Appeals Council

President Nolen opens the floor for nominations for an administrator's position on the Faculty Appeals Council

Sedivy-Benton: I nominate Shannon Collier-Tenison

Nolen: I know she has agreed to accept the nomination

No other nominations

Collier-Tenison elected to Faculty Appeals Council by acclamation

VIII. Reports

A. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson

No report

B. Provost's Report – Christy Drale

- I am following up on questions and concerns about power disruptions from Entergy (i.e. the energy curtailment program) that were raised at the September Faculty Senate meeting. What we need is a closed transmission system to prevent the 10 second disruptions. The cost will be between \$750,000 and \$1.25 million, plus we need a \$5 million insurance policy. It is possible to spread the payments out over 10 years, which makes it more feasible for us to install the system. It would take about 9 months to install. David Millay and Steve McClellan are investigating.
- I am working with Rosalie Cheatham to get the ball rolling on reviewing and approving governance documents again. There is a backlog and I cannot promise a quick process, but we are moving forward.
- We have heard a lot of different figures concerning the budget gap and I want to add some clarity. \$9million is the figure from the System auditors say that we need to come up with to close the gap. We will obtain \$3.9 million in the vacant positions that were swept last month, and another \$2 million in unit maintenance budget cuts. Beyond this, the Chancellor has asked Academic Affairs to obtain an additional \$1 million in cost savings. We are expecting to meet this in \$400,000 in restructuring and another \$250,000 in cuts to instructors and visiting faculty positions. Our primary goal is to preserve instruction as much as possible, particularly instructor positions. I am grateful to the Deans Council members for coming to the table with their ideas on how to reach that \$1 million without cutting positions. We have not yet given this list of proposed cuts to the Chancellor, though he knows what we are planning. The plan also still needs to be accepted by the UA System. In broad terms, the added \$1 million in cuts to Academic Affairs include: administrative restructuring, which includes eliminating or reassigning associate deans and chair positions, particularly those that are vacant (\$330,000). Another category for reduction is other salary line reductions (not attached to filled positions): extra labor funds, salary reserve funds, instructional reserve in the Provost's office (\$185,000). A third category are operational reductions, i.e. non-salary cuts beyond maintenance budgets. This includes reductions to equipment matching on grants; a reduction in e-Learning transfers, from \$4 per SSCH to \$3 per SSCH. This will save \$127,000). It also includes a \$250,000 cut to lecturer budget. This cut won't affect e-learning funds, though it does represent a one-quarter cut the lecturer budget. Hence, a few visiting positions will not be renewed next year. No cuts are being proposed to continuing regular instructor positions.

- Why aren't more of the cuts coming from non-academic units? I don't have an answer because those units do not report to me. I can't say where they are overstaffed, etc. It is not accurate to say they will not face cuts. The \$3.9 million sweep to of vacant positions includes a lot of positions in non-academic units. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is reviewing all programs to help identify where we need to realign resources.

DeAngelis: Do you have a specific number on the number of visiting positions that will be cut?

Drale: About \$120,000 including fringe. We plan to cut two visiting positions out of 26

Nolen: What was the process used to identify where visiting positions were cut? Is there an appeals process for units losing a visiting position?

Drale: I asked deans for what they thought they could give up. I let the Deans Council make those suggestions. If there is an appeal, it would need to go to the appropriate dean.

Blevins-Knabe: How reversible are some of these changes?

Drale: Under the right circumstances, cuts could be changed or reinstated. The Institutional Effectiveness Committee is deciding on priorities for funding.

VanderPutten: I'm concerned about some of the visiting positions that are being let go. Our program is losing three. It is unclear to me how the numbers work when we are leaving 74 doctoral students to only two full-time faculty.

Drale: I won't comment on the cuts because the recommendations came from the Dean.

VanderPutten: This looks a lot like retaliation against me for my criticisms of the administration.

Drale: Duly noted.

Cheatham: Are the fringes already in the \$3.9 million for swept positions.

Drale: Yes

Giammo: Summer instruction budget is not being considered for cuts?

Drale: That's right, though we could revisit that to avoid another sort of cut.

Matson: Is there a plan for engaging the academic side for a discussion of the Ruffalo Noel Levitz report [on enrollment at UA Little Rock]?

Drale: I hope so. The flip side to the budget discussion is student recruiting and retention. What struck me was our incredibly low yield rate between admission and registration. One of the things that makes a difference in that time period is contact with faculty. Admitted students want to hear from faculty at that point. This is something Daryl and I are discussing, i.e. about where to best plug faculty into that part of the process. I would welcome any suggestions from you all.

Wright: Who will take the lead on faculty contact with prospective students: Student Affairs or Academic Affairs?

Drale: I don't have a definitive answer. The matter likely would arise to the Cabinet level. Mark Alan Poisal would play a key role for Student Affairs and Daryl Rice for Academic Affairs. I will be involved with that too.

Matson: Seems like it is a bit more than faculty contact to get a student here. I am tired of being told that faculty are responsible for student recruitment and retention. I work my tail off to help all my students. It seems clear that the resources given to Admissions have been given to the wrong place. We are a majority-commuter campus, but resources are in recruiting first time full time freshmen. Those aren't the students we should be going after. We are appealing to E-Stem students, not our students.

Drale: I agree that the faculty are doing their best. We don't need to ignore traditional recruitment, but we should also recruit in markets where we have growth potential. The Chancellor is very much tuned into the Ruffalo Noel Levitz report and the consultants' observations in it.

Anson: The points that the RNL consultant made to us verbally about Student Affairs were very pointed, more so than in the written report.

Drale: Yes

Jensen: We have a good opportunity for us to collaborate more beyond our own units to see how we can help each other. I want to encourage deans to coordinate more interdisciplinary collaboration.

Drale: Unhappy as we may be, it is vitally important we send a positive message to students so they don't feel abandoned.

C. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

Nolen: The Undergraduate Council reports are on the Faculty Senate website. Anything to add to that report Mike?

Tramel: No

D. Graduate Council – Karen Kuralt

Nolen: Graduate Council report is available on the Faculty Senate website.

E. Council on Core Curriculum and Policies – Belinda Blevins-Knabe

Nolen: Council on Core Curriculum and Policies report is available on the Faculty Senate website. Anything to add to this Belinda?

Blevins-Knabe: No

F. Executive Committee --- Amanda Nolen

Nolen: The Executive Committee sent a letter to the Chancellor expressing our concerns about the budget process, particularly cuts that may occur to instructor positions. The memo also makes mention of concurrent enrollment. And it provides recommendations to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee about finding opportunities for reducing costs outside of Academic Affairs.

Wright: I'd like to move to accept the report of the Executive Committee and adopt the recommendations within the report with the exception of the concurrent enrollment item that is up for discussion as a motion under New Business (FS_2018_18).

Motion is seconded.

Cheatham: I would like to speak against the motion. I am happy for us to consider accepting the report, but am against adopting its recommendations. I would like to make a motion to amend the motion to accept the report only.

Wright: This is our last opportunity for the Senate to have a voice before the next Board of Trustees meeting. We should take as strong a stance as we can right now.

Jensen: Clarification: We are simply making a recommendation, no power to implement? We are just seeking then to have input.

Nolen: A motion on the floor to amend the motion from accept the report and adopt its recommendations to simply accepting the report. Any second?

Motion to amend is seconded.

Nolen: Any discussion on the motion to amend?

Matson: "Adopt" sounds like it gives us more power than we have. I don't like "adopt" for the reasons Rosalie mentioned, perhaps endorse or support the recommendations in the report would be better.

Wright: I'm not sure about the difference

Anson: What Andrew is saying we can't hold off for another Senate meeting to make a strong statement. The report includes many of the recommendations we have made before.

Cheatham: My issue is not opposed to adopting. But there are other ideas I would have liked to have folded into this report.

Nolen: The Executive Committee didn't intend for our recommendations to be comprehensive.

Cheatham: We need a better process for developing such lists.

Nolen: Motion is to receive rather than adopt the Executive Committee report.

Motion to amend fails on a voice vote.

Nolen: Back to the original motion to receive the report and adopt its recommendations (excepting the concurrent enrollment recommendation). Any further discussion?

Wright: The cost-center language may be incorrect.

Hendon: I would like to make a friendly amendment to change "cost-center" to "revenue-center"

Nolen: If no objection, we will make that change.

Nolen: Any other comments?

Nolen calls vote on motion

Motion to accept the Executive Committee report and adopt its recommendations (excepting the concurrent enrollment recommendation) is unanimously accepted on voice vote.

IX. Old Business

None

X. New Business

A. Motion FS_2018_18 Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting; no second required). Rescind Faculty Senate legislation pertaining to concurrent enrollment.

Be it resolved that the Concurrent Enrollment legislation passed on 2/5/1999 and amended 4/14/2006 be rescinded with an implementation date of July 1, 2019. (See Appendix A for relevant legislation)

Commentary: Eliminating the Concurrent Enrollment program would allow us to re-invest a large portion of this expense to develop Dual Enrollment programs with high school partners across the state. Dual Enrollment programs allow high-school students to enroll in our courses offered on campus, online, hybrid, or at off-campus locations. This model allows students a head-start in accumulating college credit and generates tuition revenue.

Nolen: If there is no objection, I will reorder the agenda to defer discussion of Motion FS_2018_18 to the Open Forum portion of the agenda.

No objection heard and so agenda is re-ordered.

Nolen: Now moving on to item B on the agenda under New Business (Procedural motion from the Committee on Tenure)

B. Motion. Committee on Tenure (Procedural. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required). Amend a motion previously adopted on April 27, 2018 referring the matter of proposed revisions to the Policy on Tenure to the Committee on Tenure, Faculty Governance Committee, and the Executive Committee, to bring revisions back to the senate in the Fall 2018.

Be it resolved to divide the question as related to proposed revisions to Policy 403.15 in order to consider those brought to the Faculty Senate on October 26, 2018, with the remainder of the proposals to be brought at a later date; and

Be it further resolved to rescind the referral of the matter to the Faculty Governance Committee and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration specifically related to the proposed revisions presented to the Faculty Senate on October 26, 2018.

Nolen: I will invite Andrew Wright to introduce the motion

Past President Wright introduces the motion

Nolen: No second needed

Cheatham: It would have been nice for the Governance committee to have received notice beforehand on this matter.

Wright: Time was a limiting factor here. We will try to do better in the future.

Vote called. Unanimous voice vote in favor.

C. Motion FS_2018_19. Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Promotion and Tenure Policy

Be it resolved to amend policy 403.15 Promotion and Tenure (adopted 1/28/2011, amended by FS_2017_4) per the mark-up in Appendix B (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion); and

Be it further resolved that upon approval, implementation of changes to policy 403.15 will be effective July 1, 2019.

Commentary: These changes address a number of concerns that have arisen since the P&T policy was originally enacted. Some of the changes are either purely grammatical or correct some loose language.

The substantive changes:

Section 1B. adding “internally and...” Since the P&T committee is an internal body, the existing language forbids the P&T committee from reviewing scholarship, which is clearly not the intent.

Section 2. The added line gives pre-tenure tenure-track faculty appeals rights, a matter on which AAUP has “memo-ed” UA Little Rock.

Section 2. The added paragraph makes it clear that a faculty member’s move from one unit to another will not void tenure rights or change rank.

Section 3.B. Only those members of the PTC who support the recommendation are required to sign it.

Section 3.E. In the instance of a rebuttal, all materials will be sent to the provost, not just summary materials.

Section 3.H. The “one-and-only one” rebuttal and appeal are removed. The candidate will be able to rebut each decision and appeal both the dean’s and provost’s decision.

President Nolen invites Andrew Wright as co-chair of the Committee on Tenure to introduce this motion.

Past President Wright introduces the motion and summarizes the substantive changes to the promotion and tenure policy (403.15) that this motion would change.

President Nolen begins a paragraph-by-paragraph consideration of the proposed revisions to Policy 403.15 in Motion FS_2018_19.

Discussion on proposed revisions to paragraph 2 in Section 1.B. (Scholarship): “Scholarship is evaluated internally and externally; scholarship and creative activities must be reviewed by methods accepted by the appropriate discipline. Scholarship may be defined in ways that do not neatly fit into traditional categories, but application of a clear method of review to such work is essential and required within each department.”

Comment: I was wondering about whether we should say “internally and/or externally” rather than “internally and externally.” “Internally and externally” implies that scholarship must be evaluated externally.

Wright: The current standard is that scholarship must be evaluated externally.

Question: Would it be possible to change “and” to “and/or”?

Barrio-Vilar: Having “and” actually works to the benefit of the faculty member.

Blevins-Knabe: Having it as “and/or” gives more flexibility to departments.

Motion is made to change “and” to “and/or”

Motion is seconded

Condran: Needs to be both internal and external review

Barrio-Vilar: It is particularly important at an R3 institution that scholarship record for promotion and tenure be subjected to external review

DeAngelis: Does every program do external review? I don’t think they do. This is effectively mandating changes to departments that do not do external review (such as business).

Wright: The way this has always been interpreted is that scholarship requires peer review. If you put and/or it would imply that internal review alone is sufficient, which would then mean that peer-reviewed scholarship is unnecessary for promotion and tenure.

Jensen: The paragraph goes into more detail about what is meant by “external review.” It does mean peer review exclusively.

DeAngelis: We get a little punchy when we see the word “evaluated” these days. I totally agree that scholarship occurs both within and outside the university. I’m concerned about the term “evaluated”.

Wright: I hate to say “just trust me”, but there is a statement coming later that deals with this concern.

Motion is withdrawn

Blevins-Knabe: I’m concerned that if the phrase “evaluated internally and externally” caused confusion for us, it might be unclear to others as well. We may need to develop clearer language here.

Nolen: We will revisit this in November. If it is not clear, you always have the option of proposing alternative language before this goes live.

Anson: This is simply a general statement that that scholarship is evaluated internally and externally. That’s all it says.

Scranton: Would it be clearer to simply say that scholarship and creative activities must be reviewed? This simply indicates that there is some form of peer review.

Cheatham: Part of the paragraph feels like process rather than defining scholarship. Maybe we can pull this paragraph out altogether. There is risk for someone to read this as a process paragraph, when it is not.

Wright: Senate could recommend to the Committee on Tenure that it review this paragraph in the context of this discussion.

Past President Wright moves to divide the motion to remove Section 1B, referring that section back to the Committee on Tenure for further review.

Motion is seconded

DeAngelis: What are the implications of Section 1B for a department that does not have a clear review process described in its governance document?

Wright: I think what you are raising is that this is much more like a process statement and not a definition paragraph.

Jensen: I don’t see this paragraph as process, but rather setting up the discussion that follows. In some areas like the arts, peer review is not the norm and so there needs to be alternative methods for review.

President Nolen calls for a vote on the motion to divide the question.

Motion to divide the question and to refer the revisions to Section 1B to the Committee on Tenure passes on a voice vote.

Discussion moves on to the third paragraph in section 1.B on scholarship: “Increasingly, ~~at~~ many forms of scholarship involve collaboration. The academic unit ~~shall determine if~~ is encouraged to promote such collaboration within or across institutional and disciplinary lines ~~is encouraged~~. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work.”

Hendon: The word “many” should also be underlined

Giammo: I would like to move an amendment to change the word “promote” to “recommend”

Barrio-Vilar seconds the motion

No further discussion

Motion is approved on unanimous voice vote

Discussion moves on to the last paragraph in section 1.B. on scholarship: “**The Scholarship of Teaching** is not the same as “best teaching practice.” Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching shall engage in publication appropriate to development and evaluation of teaching, teaching technique, curriculum development and related topics, including peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, workshops, and teacher handbooks that contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and teaming. Thus, the Scholarship of Teaching is more than being an excellent teacher. It involves (1) systematic inquiry about teaching, (2) dissemination of the results, and (3) peer review or compliance with other disciplinary practices.”

Jovanovic: I think I understand what is meant by the revision in the last sentence, but the meaning of “disciplinary practices” could be unclear, i.e. referring to punishment or disciplinary measures.

Nolen: We could change this to “or other practices according to their discipline”. Is that acceptable?

Revision to “or other practices according to their discipline” is taken as a friendly amendment.

Discussion moves on to fourth paragraph in section 1.C on service: “Particularly important to a metropolitan university is service to the community. Such activity necessarily incorporates a wide variety of efforts but is defined by the application of the faculty member’s professional expertise to help the community at every level — local, state, regional, national, or international. Typical examples of community service include, but are not limited to, involvement in task forces seeking to solve

community problems; consulting with governmental, business, or nonprofit committees, bodies, or organizations; and program review, coordination, or development.”

Jovanovic: What is a nonprofit committee?

Nolen: It refers to a nonprofit organization’s board

Discussion moves on to the first paragraph of section 2 (“Policies for Promotion and Tenure”): “The probationary period for tenure-track faculty may not extend beyond seven years, unless the faculty member receives approval for suspending the probationary period. During the first six years of the probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request his or her probationary period be suspended in accordance with the current version of the Family and Medical Leave Act. An initial appointment of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in leave of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the probationary period (Board Policy 405.1, IV.A.4). Typically, but not exclusively, an early earlier than usual tenure review ~~occurs~~ may occur when the faculty member has been in a tenure-track or similar position before being hired by UA Little Rock; to avoid confusion, the terms for an early tenure-review should be written into the faculty member’s letter of appointment.”

Cheatham: Does this mean to imply that a faculty member is eligible to come up for early tenure only if it is a part of his/her appointment letter?

Nolen: As a department chair, I would take this as a direction to me to write any terms pertaining to early review for tenure into the offer letter.

Giammo: This is largely there to protect a faculty member who might seek early tenure in case a department chair or Provost changes.

DeAngelis: Do we need to say “UA Little Rock”? Especially since we seem to change our names.

Wright: It is possible someone has edited this to read UA Little Rock.

DeAngelis: I would like to make a friendly amendment to change “UA Little Rock” to “the university”

This change is accepted as a friendly amendment.

Discussion moves on to last paragraph of section 2: “The reorganization of academic departments or units within the campus, or any subset thereof, shall not in any way alter either tenure rights or rank, unless the reorganization is part of retrenchment, initiated pursuant to, and complying in full with, Board Policy 405.5.”

Douglas: Do we have an operational definition for “retrenchment”?

Wright: It is described in Board Policy 405.5

Jovanovic: Both “retrenchment” and “financial exigency” are defined under board policy

Cheatham: I think we should add “financial exigency” to this paragraph

Wright: Since “retrenchment” is contingent on financial exigency, this may not be necessary.

Nolen: It might be appropriate, though, to capitalize the word “retrenchment”.

The word “retrenchment” is capitalized as a friendly amendment

Discussion moves on to the first paragraph of section 3C: “After reviewing the candidate’s dossier and the PTC’s recommendation, the department chair will make an independent recommendation. As discussed, the chair shall not be involved in the PTC process. The chair will meet with the candidate to review the recommendation of the PTC and the recommendation of the chair. At this time, the chair provides a copy of each recommendation to the candidate. After the meeting, the chair will forward the PTC’s recommendation and any minority report(s), the chair’s recommendation, and the candidate’s dossier to the dean.”

McMillan: We had an unusual situation this year in which we did not have enough senior faculty members in the department to consider the tenure and promotion application of one of our faculty. In that case, we needed to have additional members from outside our department to serve on the committee, and the department chair played a role in recruiting that outside member. So the department chair was involved in the committee process in an indirect way. But the proposed language here might appear to then exclude the department chair from being involved in this way.

Cheatham: We could address this by adding the word “review” between “PTC” and “process”

Adding the word “review” so that the alteration reads “As discussed, the chair shall not be involved in the PTC review process” is adopted as a friendly amendment.

Jensen: Rather than say “be involved in”, the meaning would be more clear if we said “serve on”

The change to “serve on” is adopted as a friendly amendment. The alteration in this paragraph should read “As discussed, the chair shall not serve on the PTC.”

Discussion moves back to last paragraph of section 3.B: “The PTC shall present its recommendation in a letter to the chair. All members of the PTC supporting the recommendation shall sign the letter. Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the

committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as attachments to the PTC's letter; a minority report must be signed by the members of the PTC who endorse it."

Matson: This particular change would make it possible to identify those members of the PTC who did not support the candidate. As it is now, the votes of PTC members on an application are confidential.

Nolen: What are you proposing?

Matson: We could keep this paragraph so that everyone must sign the letter, but the tally of any vote would also be included.

Robinson: We had a case in which a committee member who refused to sign. If this happened, would it not stifle the whole tenure process?

Nolen: What was the tenure committee's rationale for this change?

Wright: We felt that in general it is not a good thing to require faculty to sign a document that they disagree with. I am unclear though on why we would require that the vote tallies be recorded.

Nolen: I am hearing that we may need to resolve this by a vote.

Foster: The way the amendment is worded may open faculty on promotion and tenure committees up to being named as defendants in a lawsuit if they haven't signed the letter.

Robinson: As the amendment reads, only those supporting the committee's recommendation are required to sign the letter. Those who do not support it have a choice. So if someone does not wish to be identified as opposed to a recommendation, one can simply sign the letter.

DeAngelis: Is it possible to add language stating that one is not required to sign anything? For instance, consider a person who neither supports the recommendation nor supports a minority finding.

Wright: Part of your duty is that you are expected to participate in the promotion and tenure process, and that includes signing the letter.

Jensen: A similar situation exists when faculty are required to sign their annual evaluation letters.

Nolen: This seems to be another matter where the language needs additional consideration from the Committee on Tenure. How do we want to proceed?

Giammo: One thing to think about is leaving the language as is, but asking the chair of the committee if a member refused to sign a letter.

Nolen: If there is no objection, we will refer section 3B back to the Committee on Tenure for further consideration.

Hearing no objection, section 3B is referred back to the Committee on Tenure.

Discussion moves back to the second paragraph of section 3C: “After receiving the chair’s decision, the candidate has five business days to initiate his or her absolute right to a rebuttal (sec III. H.). The candidate shall suffer no negative consequences for submitting a rebuttal.”

DeAngelis: Could we amend “his or her” to “an”? We don’t need the pronouns

Giammo: A better phrasing would be “the candidate has an absolute right to initiate a rebuttal within five business days”

Nolen: If there is no objection, we will change that to “the candidate has an absolute right to initiate a rebuttal within five business days”

No objection is made and so the change is considered a friendly amendment.

Discussion moves on to second paragraph of section 3D: “When a CRC exists, it reviews the candidate’s dossier, the PTC’s recommendation and any minority report(s), the chair’s recommendation and the candidate’s rebuttal (if any); it then makes an independent recommendation to the dean (who will not serve on this committee) and provides a copy to the applicant. All members of the CRC shall sign the recommendation who endorse it. Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as an attachment to the report of the committee; a minority report must be signed by the members of the CRC ~~that~~ who endorse it.”

Wright: Given our discussion earlier on signatures of PTC recommendation letters, it would make sense to refer the same provision in this paragraph to the Committee on Tenure for clarification.

Nolen: Without objection, the revisions recommended in the second sentence of the second paragraph of section 3D (“All members of the CRC shall sign the recommendation who endorse it”) shall be referred back to the Committee on Tenure for clarification.

Hearing no objection, the sentence reading “All members of the CRC shall sign the recommendation who endorse it” is referred back to the Committee on Tenure.

Discussion moves on to the first paragraph of section 3E: “If the candidate initiates a rebuttal after the chair’s decision, the dean will forward the rebuttal to the CRC before it begins deliberations. After reviewing the candidate’s dossier, all recommendations (those of the PTC, department chair, and CRC), and the candidate’s rebuttal (if any), the dean will make an independent recommendation to the provost.”

Anson: The paragraph makes the assumption that each college has a CRC. Should we add the term “where applicable” to clarify?

Wright: This would apply to other places in the tenure and promotion policy where the “where applicable” qualifier is missing.

Nolen: Without objection, we will add a “where applicable” qualifier to references to a CRC in this policy as a friendly amendment.

No objection is heard and so the amendment is made.

A dangling “the” is found in the third paragraph of section 3.F. This is struck, with no objection being heard.

Discussion moves on to the first paragraph of section 3H: ~~“The candidate may submit one — and only one — rebuttal after receiving a decision from the chair or the dean. The rebuttal is directed to the next administrator in the review process.”~~

Jensen: Has anyone sat down to figure out if it would be possible within the time constraints of a tenure process for more than one rebuttal to take place?

Wright: The Committee on Tenure’s rationale is that allowing only one rebuttal puts the candidate in a very difficult position of knowing at what point in the process s/he should rebut (e.g. after department’s decision, after dean’s decision, or after provost’s decision).

Jensen: I’m fine with the fairness of it, but I’m worried about it being possible to hear multiple appeals in the available time to make these decisions.

Nolen: Is someone proposing an amendment here?

Jensen: I’m just raising the question. If Andrew (Wright) reassures me it will work, I am satisfied.

Wright: Andrew cannot give you that assurance that it will work in the available timeframe. We should probably send this back to the Committee on Tenure to investigate this more carefully.

Nolen: If there is no objection, we will refer this section back to the Committee on Tenure.

Wright: We are going to have the exact same issue with respect to the changes to the appeals policy, so we should refer back both the section on rebuttals and the section on appeals (3I).

No objection is heard and so these sections are referred back to the Committee on Tenure for further investigation.

President Nolen calls for a vote on accepting the motion (FS_2018_19) as amended and excluding sections to be reviewed again by the Committee on Tenure.

Motion carries unanimously on voice vote.

D. Motion. Committee on Tenure (Procedural. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required). Amend a motion previously adopted on April 27, 2018 referring the matter of proposed revisions to the Annual Review Legislation to the Committee on Tenure, Faculty Governance Committee, and the Executive Committee, to bring revisions back to the senate in the Fall 2018.

Be it resolved to divide the question as related to proposed revisions to the Annual Review legislation to consider those brought to the Faculty Senate on October 26, 2018, with the remainder of the proposals to be brought at a later date; and

Be it further resolved to rescind the referral of the matter to the Faculty Governance Committee and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration specifically related to the proposed revisions presented to the Faculty Senate on October 26, 2018.

Past President Wright introduces the motion

Nolen: Question is to amend the motion passed at the April Faculty Senate meeting to divide the question and rescind the referral. Any debate?

No debate

Motion carries unanimously on voice vote

E. Motion FS_2018_20. Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Annual Faculty Review

Be it resolved to divide the question on annual review referred to the Committee o Tenure from the April 27, 2018 Executive Committee Report and amend Annual Review Policy (adopted 4/20/1990, amended by FS_2017_4) as per the mark-up in Appendix C (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion).

Commentary: The change to the first paragraph makes it clear that these procedures apply to all faculty, rather than just tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The remainder of the changes are cosmetic. For instance, the annual review will inform post-tenure review, in addition to other matters. The post-tenure review policy was approved after the annual review policy, and the annual review policy was never updated to reflect the new policy.

Past-President Wright introduces the motion. The changes in the first paragraph are intended to open the process of annual review to non-tenure track faculty, who previously had no entitlement to participate in annual review. The second main change is to make clear that annual review should inform any post-tenure review process. A third change is to remove the UA System President from the process for approving annual review procedures. A fourth change is to change the due date for annual review materials to the second week of classes in the spring to allow enough time for faculty to return to campus and settle into the semester. The final change is to drop a reference to any particular section to the Faculty Handbook since this handbook is under revision and the section identifiers may change.

Discussion moves to consider the particular changes proposed to the annual review policy on a paragraph-by-paragraph basis:

I. Annual Faculty Review

An annual review of the performance of all full time faculty members ~~each tenured and tenure-track faculty member~~ shall be made on the basis of assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures required herein. ~~Faculty not in tenure-track positions shall be evaluated by procedures adopted by each unit (department).~~

Foster: Would this include visiting faculty?

Wright: It was not intended to do so. The Committee on Tenure did not discuss that point at all.

Nolen: what do we want to do? Include or leave out visiting faculty?

Anson: I would say leave it as is. Some visiting faculty are here for years, and so they should be evaluated like everyone else.

Nolen: Unless we have a motion to do otherwise, we will leave it as is. The annual review policy will remain silent on whether visiting faculty are included.

The annual review of each faculty member shall provide the primary basis for the chairperson's recommendations relating to salary, promotion, granting of tenure, successive appointment, non-reappointment, post-tenure review, and dismissal. Furthermore, this review is to provide guidance and assistance to all faculty in their professional development and academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

Detailed criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty shall be recommended by the faculty and chairperson of each academic unit; these criteria and related procedures must be submitted to the dean or director, the Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor; ~~and the President~~ for approval. All procedures for annual reviews adopted by each unit shall include provision for, and details for implementation of, the following:

1. No later than 30 days after the beginning of the first appointment of each faculty member, the chairperson shall advise him or her in writing of the criteria, procedures, and instruments currently used to assess performance;
2. No later than September 1 of each year, each faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the review schedule, criteria, procedures, and instruments to be used that year;
3. No later than ~~January 15~~ the end of the second week of classes in the spring semester of each year, each faculty member shall submit to the chairperson any materials desired to be considered in the annual review;

DeAngelis: Referring to the section on the chairperson informing each faculty member of the criteria and procedures for annual review within 30 days in writing, does this happen in practice? Should we remove the phrase “in writing”?

Matson: I think we should leave it.

Nolen: This may not be the way it works for everyone now, but it does make clear what is expected and what is proper.

Nolen: Any other debate?

B. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Each faculty member shall render service to the University by the standards of the UALR Faculty Handbook, ~~including Section V: Faculty Responsibilities~~, and shall behave in a professional and ethical manner.

Friendly amendment is posed to change “UALR” to “University”. Amendment is accepted.

Matson: There is nothing in the language of the annual review policy that precludes a department chair from setting an earlier due date for annual review materials than the second week of January. It says “no later”. It would not be a violation for a chair to set an earlier date.

Wright: Since this is University policy, a faculty member could argue that under University policy s/he until the second week of January to submit annual review materials, regardless of a department’s policy.

DeAngelis: I’m wondering if it would be possible in some years for the second week of the spring semester to come late enough to interfere with the Provost’s deadline for receiving annual review results.

Nolen: We would hope that the Provost's office will anticipate this and set its deadlines accordingly.

Matson: Our department does make the due date earlier

Nolen: Do I hear any amendments or objections to the motion?

Motion FS_2018_20 as amended is approved on unanimous voice vote

XI. Open Forum

Nolen: I would like to draw your attention to New Business item A. This has significantly changed as a motion since it was put on the agenda last week.

Nolen reads revised motion:

Be it resolved that the Concurrent Enrollment legislation passed on 2/5/1999 and amended 4/14/2006 be rescinded with an implementation date of July 1, 2020; and

Be it further resolved that UA Little Rock will not enter into new concurrent enrollment agreements between now and July 1, 2020.

Commentary: Currently, the Concurrent Enrollment Program is under-resourced such that it creates an undue strain upon the faculty and has little infrastructure for assessment of courses included in the general education core thus failing to ensure quality. These issues can be remedied with the infusion of resources and a redesign of the program. The program will be included in the comprehensive review of resource allocation conducted by the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) in Spring 2019. The recommendations from the IEC will inform the argument for the overall essentiality of the program in advancing the mission of the university.

Eliminating the Concurrent Enrollment program would allow us to divert our attention and resources to develop robust Dual Enrollment programs with high school partners across the state. Dual Enrollment programs allow high-school students to enroll in our courses offered on campus, online, hybrid, or at off-campus locations. This model allows students a head-start in accumulating college credit and will generate tuition revenue.

Nolen: I will open this to Executive Committee members for comment first.

Matson: I do not support the first part of this motion. We should consider first the Institutional Effectiveness Committee's report.

Anson: Concurrent enrollment was always an idiotic idea.

Matson: I don't think having a definite date to rescind is a good idea. The motion should say that after the IEC review, we should determine the future of concurrent enrollment.

Cheatham: The real question is whether we want to offer courses where we have some control over the process. I'd prefer that we not imply something we haven't made a decision on. We should study the matter first, then take action.

Herndon: It seems that I saw a report that we don't get many, if any, of these students going on to UA Little Rock. Is that correct Dr. Drale?

Drale: Yes

Herndon: So we don't get any benefit from something that costs us a lot.

Blevins-Knabe: It is fine by me to study it further. There is a cost in terms of assessment with concurrent.

Jovanovic: I'd like to know what the costs are.

Finzer: I can provide that information

McMillan: I'd like for us to think about what pool of students we want to focus our resources on. Concurrent enrollment takes a lot of extra time, and I don't know that we got any of those students.

Matson: In our department, our director of first year writing does a lot of traveling. It takes a lot of resources. But we should fold this into everything else that is going on before risking alienating some people. Concurrent students count in our enrollment count. Enrollment going down looks bad to everybody. It affects athletic scholarship money, which depends on total enrollment counts.

Cheatham: It is true that we don't have a large number of concurrent students that come to UA Little Rock. We have a pool of well-qualified students though and haven't done a good job at recruiting them into programs.

Nolen: Just to be clear, the Institutional Effectiveness Committee is reviewing concurrent enrollment.

VanderPutten: This is a luxury we can't afford.

Wright: I have a hard time seeing concurrent enrollment as being cost effective. If we continue, there has to be oversight by the faculty. The current program as it is being run violates faculty control over the curriculum.

Jensen: Someone tell me why we are still here?

Douglas: Many of the teachers don't want to teach these courses either.

Anson: Is it a worthwhile program, regardless of whether it makes money?

Jovanovic: There is no incentive for students to do AP courses when concurrent courses are an option.

Finzer: Competition with AP is an issue.

Robinson: With change in provost can we consider faculty workload policy again?

XII. Adjourn

President Nolen adjourns the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

Appendix A: Concurrent Enrollment Legislation (1999 & 2006)

February 5, 1999 - Faculty Senate of UA Little Rock passed the following:

“Under state law UALR may concurrently admit qualified high school students to its academic programs as part-time students.

To be eligible to apply for High School Concurrent (HC) enrollment, the applicant must meet the requirements of:

- a. *Completion of* at least 50% of the state-recommended college preparatory courses* with a minimum GPA of 2.5*; or
- b. minimum overall high school GPA of 3.0; or
- c. minimum 21 ACT composite score

Individual university departments may restrict enrollment into specific courses based on:

- a. acceptable score on departmentally-approved placement or proficiency test; or
- b. acceptable subscores on the ACT in the specific substantive areas, e.g., math, English, or reading; or
- c. permission of the department chair or instructor”

[Note: Asterisks were in the original legislation text.]

April 14, 2006 - Faculty Senate amended the 1999 legislation with the addition of the following:

“All courses offend[sic] in any concurrent enrollment program shall be approved by the UALR curriculum review process. All faculty teaching in the concurrent enrollment program shall be approved by the appropriate UALR department and be provided an orientation to UALR procedures with respect to Faculty Handbook responsibilities, instructional procedures, and materials prior to teaching the course.”

Appendix B: Policy 403.15 Promotion and Tenure

1. Faculty Roles

For the university to achieve its mission, faculty must remain committed to teaching, scholarship, and service. Faculty members are expected to make contributions in each area, although some variation in emphasis is appropriate. The university recognizes that the contributions of individual faculty members to the mission of the university shift according to the faculty member's talents, the needs of departments and colleges, and the character of diverse academic disciplines. Pursuant to faculty governance principles, faculty members, thus, need to determine responsibilities—teaching loads, scholarship agenda, and service commitments—in consultation with the chair of their department. (Note: In this policy, chair will be used to cover chair, head, and director; department will be used to cover all academic units that form a college, including department, division, and school.) It is the responsibility of chairs to mediate the needs of their departments with the university mission and trends in the department's discipline.

In addition to contributions in teaching, scholarship, and service, the university expects that faculty will adhere to the ethical standards of the university and their respective disciplines as well as manifest standards of civility, professionalism, and collegiality.

1. A. Teaching

The nature of effective teaching may vary across disciplines, but certain qualities are universal: ~~respect for students, faith in student abilities~~, a focus on student learning and a commitment to student success. Equally important, faculty should view themselves as role models who convey the values of their disciplines and initiate students into their professions. In the pursuit of excellence in teaching, faculty members should remain current in their disciplines and in pedagogical strategies. ~~They should consider teaching a continual process of improvement and growth.~~

The documentation of excellence in teaching takes many forms. One approach is through the preparation of a teaching portfolio. The content and format may vary by discipline and individual philosophy, but information about both teaching effort and teaching quality over time should be included. Standard products for the promotion and tenure dossier may include the following:

1. Statement of teaching philosophy and pedagogical strategies;
2. Teaching history including teaching loads, summary of courses taught and modes of instruction in each course;
3. Materials from individual courses – syllabi, exercises, projects, exams, websites, multimedia products, video of lectures;
4. Summary of advising, consultation, and supervision of students at all levels—pre-college, undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral;
5. Curriculum design, development, and administration;
6. Measuring student learning and instructional effectiveness through course, program, and core assessment activities and outcomes;
7. Professional development activities related to teaching;
8. Student course evaluations compiled and interpreted to give the data contextual meaning;
9. Peer evaluations;

10. Self-evaluations; and
11. Awards.

Evidence of specific curriculum design and development, where appropriate, ~~should~~ may be included in the dossier. Faculty who are using technology, problem-based learning, service learning, multicultural learning, study abroad, or other special approaches and tools to enhance student learning are especially encouraged to present these aspects of course design (even experimental use) with an explanation of how the curriculum ~~conforms~~ contributes to or extends principles of “best practice.”

1. B. Scholarship

Scholarship is defined as a systematic, focused attention on a question, problem, or idea, characterized by expertise, originality, analysis and significance. Scholarship results in products that are shared with appropriate audiences within the academy and the wider community.

Scholarship is evaluated internally and externally; scholarship and creative activities must be reviewed by methods accepted by the appropriate discipline. Scholarship may be defined in ways that do not neatly fit into traditional categories, but application of a clear method of review to such work is essential and required within each department.

Increasingly, ~~all~~ many forms of scholarship involve collaboration. The academic unit ~~shall determine if~~ is encouraged to promote such collaboration within or across institutional and disciplinary lines ~~is encouraged~~. Candidates must be careful to document the extent and form of their contributions to collaborative work.

In this document, scholarship is a broad term that embraces a range of contributions faculty members might make to their respective disciplines: Scholarship of Discovery, Scholarship of Creativity, Scholarship of Application, Scholarship of Integration, and Scholarship of Teaching.

The Scholarship of Discovery is systematic inquiry or investigation designed to validate and refine existing knowledge and to generate new knowledge. At its core, this scholarship involves studies that use quantitative or qualitative methodologies to make significant contributions to knowledge. Primary empirical research, historical research, theory development, methodological studies and philosophical inquiry are all representative of this form. Typically, this scholarship is documented through peer-reviewed publication of articles or books; publication in law reviews or journals; papers presented at state, regional, national, or international meetings; grant awards; or recognition by professional organizations as a scholar in a particular area.

The Scholarship of Creativity entails developing or performing original works of art, literature, music, film and theater. It may also include the creation of new forms of electronic or digital media. Typical examples are production or scenic design of plays; writing, directing, or acting in plays; choreography and dance performance; creation and exhibition of visual arts such as painting, sculpture, and photography; musical composition and performance; direction or production of film and video; creative writing; and creation of websites, virtual reality programs, and multimedia communication tools. In all cases, however, there are accepted forms of peer review to determine the quality and significance of faculty work, from juried or invitational art shows to publication. These conventional procedures must be part of the evaluation of faculty achievement.

The Scholarship of Application is the use of professional expertise or information in the process of solving social or community problems. It should not be confused with service or citizenship. Service activities typically benefit a particular group, organization, or community; the Scholarship of Application can potentially benefit many organizations. The Scholarship of Application must include a mechanism whereby the quality and influence of the contribution can be evaluated. This is most easily demonstrated when an artifact is created encompassing the work, e.g., a report, a training manual, a program evaluation, a video, or a website. Some activities include peer review; for example, the report written for a task force is reviewed by members of the task force as well as other agencies and institutions. In cases where this is not so, the department should initiate an alternative review process, such as sending the work to experts in the field to evaluate its significance, rigor, and impact. In all cases, the product of the scholarship of application must be subject to some form of peer review.

The Scholarship of Integration ~~Scholarship of Integration~~ involves synthesis across theories or across academic fields. As academics tackle social, economic, and technical problems, a need often exists for faculty members with broad and multidisciplinary perspectives to see connections across the unique perspectives of a theory or discipline.

~~The Scholarship of Integration~~ The Scholarship of Integration may result in a traditional academic product such as an article, book, or presentation. It also may take the form of a product or patent. As in other areas, appropriate forms of external review must be used to determine the merit of such products.

The Scholarship of Teaching is not the same as “best teaching practice.” Tenure-track faculty seeking advancement based on excellence in the Scholarship of Teaching shall engage in publication appropriate to development and evaluation of teaching, teaching technique, curriculum development and related topics, including peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, workshops, and teacher handbooks that contribute to the theoretical base of knowledge about curriculum or effective teaching and teaming. Thus, the Scholarship of Teaching is more than being an excellent teacher. It involves (1) systematic inquiry about teaching, (2) dissemination of the results, and (3) peer review or compliance with other disciplinary practices.

1. C. Service

Faculty members are expected to provide service to the university, their profession or discipline, and the public.

Service to the university is critical to the carrying out of the university’s mission. Examples of such service include, but are not limited to, membership ~~and~~ or leadership of unit committees or task forces; advising student organizations; involvement in faculty governance; coordination of programs, labs, and technical support; and recruitment.

Service to the profession is also expected, especially as faculty members develop their careers.

Professional service includes activities such as serving on committees for a professional organization; planning a conference or event; contributing to the production of a professional journal; and reviewing manuscripts, grants, programs, or textbooks.

Particularly important to a metropolitan university is service to the community. Such activity necessarily incorporates a wide variety of efforts but is defined by the application of the faculty member’s professional expertise to help the community at every level — local, state, regional, national, or international. Typical examples of community service include, but are not limited to, involvement in

task forces seeking to solve community problems; consulting with governmental, business, or nonprofit committees, bodies, or organizations; and program review, coordination, or development.

Service to the community is a form of citizenship; it should not be confused with the Scholarship of Application, which develops new solutions to problems (as opposed to the application of existing discipline-related knowledge), benefits a single or small group of organizations (as opposed to having broad application), is not disseminated to disciplines (as opposed to publication in journals or on websites), and is not externally evaluated (as opposed to the peer review of artifacts).

To assess excellence in service, faculty accomplishments may include the following:

1. Administrative duties such as chair, director, and program coordinator;
2. Committee/special project participation (academic unit, college, university, system; for example, assessment and recruitment projects);
3. Discipline-related community involvement;
4. Working in ~~and~~ or with professional organizations;
5. Relating discipline expertise to the community; and
6. Development of cooperative ventures between the university and community.

1. D. Professional Performance

In the case of faculty with non-teaching appointments, evaluation may include evidence of the following: performance in the areas of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties; ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility, or leadership; cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels; efforts at self-improvement; innovations in program implementation; development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties; initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems; ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing. Evidence used to evaluate professional performance generally includes supervisors' evaluation, clientele evaluation, peer-evaluation, and self-evaluation.

2. Policies for Promotion and Tenure

The probationary period for tenure-track faculty may not extend beyond seven years, unless the faculty member receives approval for suspending the probationary period. During the first six years of the probationary period, a tenure-track faculty member may request his or her probationary period be suspended in accordance with the current version of the Family and Medical Leave Act. An initial appointment of one-half year (academic or fiscal) or less will not be included in the probationary period. If more than one-half of any year is spent in leave of absence without pay status, that year shall not apply toward the probationary period (Board Policy 405.1, IV.A.4). Typically, but not exclusively, an early earlier than usual tenure review ~~occurs~~ may occur when the faculty member has been in a tenure-track or similar position before being hired by UA Little Rock; to avoid confusion, the terms for an early tenure-review should be written into the faculty member's letter of appointment.

The process of tenure review, as delineated in departmental promotion and tenure documents, must be completed before the end of the probationary period, consistent with Board Policy 405.1. Faculty dismissed prior to the completion of the probationary period are still entitled to the rebuttal and appeal process delineated below.

Promotion to a higher rank requires qualifications or performance of the activities and accomplishments identified by the department significantly above those required at the applicant's current rank as well as evidence of potential for continued achievement.

The applicant shall be informed of the outcome at each level of administrative review.

The rules and standards regarding promotion and tenure decisions shall not discourage faculty members from developing and expressing divergent views. Mere expressions of opinions, however strongly expressed, however controversial such opinions may be, shall not constitute cause for denial of promotion and tenure. Disagreement is essential for intellectual, academic, and social growth; however, the fair exchange of ideas must involve respectful expression of views and the consideration of multiple points of view.

Decisions on promotion and tenure shall not be based on lifestyle, political affiliations, or religious convictions. At any point, the candidate may withdraw from the review process by sending a letter to the person responsible for the next level of review. For example, if the candidate wishes to withdraw after the chair's recommendation, he or she sends a letter to the dean. Throughout the entire process, confidentiality of information must be maintained.

The reorganization of academic departments or units within the campus, or any subset thereof, shall not in any way alter either tenure rights or rank, unless the reorganization is part of retrenchment, initiated pursuant to, and complying in full with, Board Policy 405.5.

3. Procedures for Awarding Promotion and Tenure

The procedure for recommending promotion and tenure begins at the department level (see Board Policy 405.1, III and IV.A). (Note: If the college or school does not have departments, the promotion and tenure document for the college and school will typically establish a committee that serves the function of the department in the review process, including providing tenure-track faculty by providing an opportunity to review recent successful tenure applications.) This evaluation of promotion and tenure applications is based on written departmental guidelines that are consistent with these rules and established by the department and approved through administrative channels. The departmental recommendation is particularly important because it evaluated the candidate's dossier against the standards of the discipline.

Departmental promotion and tenure documents must be consistent with guidelines established in college, university, and the University of Arkansas System. These documents must also be consistent with applicable laws. When there is a conflict, the law or higher level policy will be enforced.

The granting of tenure requires documented evidence of sustained achievement, as well as evidence of potential for sustained tenure accomplishment over an entire career.

3. A. Process before Tenure

Departmental, college, university, and system-wide written criteria for promotion and tenure decisions shall be presented to the faculty member at the beginning of employment (see Board Policy 405.1).

In preparation for promotion and tenure, the chair may assign the tenure-track faculty member with a mentor. The mentor will provide guidance on developing a research agenda and building a dossier. All faculty of the department are similarly encouraged to support tenure-track faculty by providing an opportunity to review recent successful tenure applications.

A mid-tenure review by the departmental Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC), the department chair, and the employee is mandatory. The review, typically completed by May 15 at the end of the third year in rank, will follow procedures delineated in the departmental and college policies. After the review has been completed, the PTC will send a report to the chair. The chair will meet with the faculty member to answer questions about the review and then forward the report with a cover letter to the dean.

3. B. Recommendation of the Departmental Promotion and Tenure Review Committee (PTC)

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

The department's promotion and tenure document should define a mechanism for supplementing the PTC when it has less than three members at the appropriate rank. (For example, if the PTC must vote on a candidate's promotion to professor, the PTC would need at least three members on the committee at the rank of professor.) If there is no mechanism for adding members, the faculty of the department, in consultation with the chair, will provide the dean with a list of at least four names, from which the dean will select the remaining members. Typically, the chair of the PTC should be a member of the academic unit.

The PTC shall present its recommendation in a letter to the chair. All members of the PTC supporting the recommendation shall sign the letter. Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as attachments to the PTC's letter; a minority report must be signed by the members of the PTC who endorse it.

3. C. Recommendation of the Chair

After reviewing the candidate's dossier and the PTC's recommendation, the department chair will make an independent recommendation. As discussed, the chair shall not be involved in the PTC process. The chair will meet with the candidate to review the recommendation of the PTC and the recommendation of the chair. At this time, the chair provides a copy of each recommendation to the candidate. After the meeting, the chair will forward the PTC's recommendation and any minority report(s), the chair's recommendation, and the candidate's dossier to the dean.

After receiving the chair's decision, the candidate has five business days to initiate his or her absolute right to a rebuttal (sec III. H.). The candidate shall suffer no negative consequences for submitting a rebuttal.

3. D. Recommendation of the College Review Committee (CRC)

A college may develop written criteria, policies, and procedures for promotion and tenure through its governance structure consistent with this policy. Such criteria may include a college promotion and tenure review committee (CRC), which will advise the dean on recommendations about reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Colleges shall have procedures ensuring that a faculty member abstain from vote on a CRC if a candidate from his or her department is undergoing review and the faculty member on the CRC has served on the PTC. No faculty member may vote in the same case as a member of both the PTC and the CRC.

When a CRC exists, it reviews the candidate's dossier, the PTC's recommendation and any minority report(s), the chair's recommendation and the candidate's rebuttal (if any); it then makes an independent recommendation to the dean (who will not serve on this committee) and provides a copy to the applicant. All members of the CRC shall sign the recommendation who endorse it. Significant minority opinions may be identified but need not be attributed to individual members of the committee. Separate minority reports may be written and submitted as an attachment to the report of the committee; a minority report must be signed by the members of the CRC ~~that~~ who endorse it.

3. E. Recommendation of the Dean

If the candidate initiates a rebuttal after the chair's decision, the dean will forward the rebuttal to the CRC before it begins deliberations. After reviewing the candidate's dossier, all recommendations (those of the PTC, department chair, and CRC), and the candidate's rebuttal (if any), the dean will make an independent recommendation to the provost.

After receiving the dean's decision, the candidate has five business days to initiate either a rebuttal, if he or she did not do so after the chair's decision (see 3,H.), or an appeal (see 3,G), but not both.

If the recommendation is positive, the dean informs the candidate. If the candidate does not initiate a rebuttal, the dean forwards his or her recommendation (~~allowing summary materials~~) to the provost: with the candidate's completed application forms, statement, curriculum vita, letters of evaluation (annual reviews, peer reviews, and letters from external evaluators, when appropriate), and the recommendations of all prior review levels. The remainder of the applicant's dossier shall be retained in the dean's office until the review process is complete. If needed for their decisions, the provost and chancellor may request the complete dossier be forwarded.

If the recommendation is negative, the dean shall meet with the faculty member to review the recommendation.

If the candidate initiates a rebuttal after the dean's decision, the dean forwards the ~~summary materials~~ candidate's dossier and the rebuttal to the provost.

If the candidate initiates an appeal at this point, the dean forwards the appeal to the chair of the Faculty Appeals Committee (FAC). The dean will provide the FAC with access to the candidate's dossier, including the summary materials. When the FAC has completed its deliberations, the chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings to the provost with a copy to the dean. At this time, the dean forwards the summary materials to the provost.

3. F. Recommendation of the Provost

After reviewing the candidate's summary materials, the rebuttal (if any) and the appeal (if any), the provost will make an independent recommendation to the chancellor and inform the candidate of the recommendation.

After receiving the provost's decision, the candidate has five business days to initiate an appeal, if he or she did not do so after the dean's decision (see 3. G.).

If the candidate initiates a rebuttal or appeal after the dean's decision, the provost considers it in arriving at his or her decision.

If the candidate initiates an appeal at this point, the provost forwards the appeal, the ~~summary materials~~, and the rebuttal (if any) to the chair of the FAC. The dean will provide the FAC ~~with~~ access to the candidate's dossier. When the FAC has completed its deliberations, the chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings and summary materials to the chancellor. The chair of the ~~PFAC~~ also provides a copy of the committee's findings to the provost.

At this time, the provost forwards the summary materials, the rebuttal (if any), and the findings of the FAC (if any) to the chancellor.

3. G. Recommendation of the Chancellor

After reviewing the summary materials, the rebuttal (if any), and the appeal (if any), the chancellor will make an independent recommendation to the president and inform the candidate of the recommendation.

3. H. Rebuttal

~~The candidate may submit one — and only one — rebuttal after receiving a decision from the chair or the dean. The rebuttal is directed to the next administrator in the review process.~~

The candidate may submit a rebuttal even if the decision of the chair or dean is positive. The purpose of a rebuttal is to provide the candidate with an opportunity to correct errors made in the preparation of his or her dossier, critique perceived misinterpretations of the dossier or provide context that might alter the recommendation at subsequent levels of review. The rebuttal is in letter form. However, the candidate may include limited supporting materials that bear direct relevance to earlier decisions. The supporting materials are considered part of the rebuttal and are forwarded with the letter.

~~The A rebuttal is not an appeal; it does not prompt a reconsideration of decisions by previous reviewers. It is, rather, an opportunity to provide a supplement to the record that is considered at subsequent levels of review. A rebuttal may occur at each level where a recommendation is made.~~

Rebuttal after Chair's Decision. To initiate the option of rebuttal at this point, the candidate must notify the dean within five business days of receiving the chair's decision and provide a copy of the notification to the chair. Within ten business days of receiving the chair's decision, the candidate must submit the rebuttal to the dean. The dean forwards the rebuttal to the CRC before that committee begins deliberations. The rebuttal is also forwarded with the summary materials to each subsequent level of campus review.

Rebuttal after the Dean's Decision. To initiate the option of rebuttal at this point, the candidate must notify the provost within five business days of receiving the dean's decision. The candidate also provides a copy of the notification to the dean. Within ten business days of receiving the dean's decision, the candidate must submit the rebuttal to the provost. The rebuttal will be forwarded to the chancellor with the provost's recommendation.

3. I. Appeal to Faculty Appeals Council (FAC)

The candidate has the option of submitting ~~one and only one~~ an appeal to the Faculty Appeals Council. ~~The appeal may be initiated after a negative decision by either the dean and/or provost. If the dean's decision is negative and the candidate does not initiate an appeal, he or she reserves the right to appeal after the provost's decision, providing that decision is also negative.~~

The appeal is in letter form. However, the candidate may include limited supporting materials that bear direct relevance to earlier decisions. The supporting materials are considered part of the appeal and are forwarded with the letter.

Appeal after the Dean's Decision. To initiate the option of appeal at this point, the candidate must notify the provost within five business days after receiving the dean's negative decision. The candidate also provides a copy of the notification to the dean. Within ten business days of receiving the dean's decision, the candidate must submit the appeal to the provost. The provost forwards the appeal to the chair of the Faculty Appeals Council upon completion of the FAC's deliberations; the chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings to the provost.

Appeal after the Provost's Decision. To initiate the option of appeal at this point, the candidate must notify the chancellor within five business days after receiving the provost's negative decision. The candidate will also provide a copy of the notification to the provost. Within ten business days of receiving the provost's decision, the candidate must submit the appeal to the chancellor. The chancellor forwards the appeal to the chair of the FAC. Upon completion of the FAC's deliberations, the chair of the FAC forwards the committee's findings to the chancellor.

Appendix C: Annual Review

I. Annual Faculty Review

An annual review of the performance of all full time faculty members ~~each tenured and tenure-track faculty member~~ shall be made on the basis of assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures required herein. ~~Faculty not in tenure-track positions shall be evaluated by procedures adopted by each unit (department).~~

The annual review of each faculty member shall provide the primary basis for the chairperson's recommendations relating to salary, promotion, granting of tenure, successive appointment, non-reappointment, post-tenure review, and dismissal. Furthermore, this review is to provide guidance and assistance to all faculty in their professional development and academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

Detailed criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty shall be recommended by the faculty and chairperson of each academic unit; these criteria and related procedures must be submitted to the dean or director, the Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor; ~~and the President~~ for approval. All procedures for annual reviews adopted by each unit shall include provision for, and details for implementation of, the following:

4. No later than 30 days after the beginning of the first appointment of each faculty member, the chairperson shall advise him or her in writing of the criteria, procedures, and instruments currently used to assess performance;
5. No later than September 1 of each year, each faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the review schedule, criteria, procedures, and instruments to be used that year;
6. No later than ~~January 15~~ the end of the second week of classes in the spring semester of each year, each faculty member shall submit to the chairperson any materials desired to be considered in the annual review;

...

B. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Each faculty member shall render service to the University by the standards of the UALR Faculty Handbook, ~~including Section V: Faculty Responsibilities~~, and shall behave in a professional and ethical manner.