



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
 Friday, November 16, 2018, 1:00 p.m.
 Ledbetter Rooms B & C, Donaghey Student Center

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Faculty Senate President Nolen call the meeting to order at 1:02 pm

Secretary Craw takes the roll

Present: **CALS** -- Al-Shukri, Anson, Barrio-Vilar, Condran, Deiser, Douglas, Heil, LeGrand, Smith, Stone. **CB** --- Hendon, Vibhakar, Woolridge. **CEHP** --- Atcherson, Franklin, Grover, Otters, Reeves, Sedivy-Benton. **CSSC** --- Craw, Flinn, Golden, Jensen, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT** --- DeAngelis, Jovanovic, Massey, Tramel. **LIBRARY** --- Macheak. **LAW** --- Boles, Cain, Foster. **EX OFFICIO** --- Dicus, Drale, Nolen, Rogerson, Wright.

Absent: **CALS** – Cheatham, Law, Nguyen. **CB** --- Leonard. **CEHP** --- Fletcher, Robinson, VanderPutten. **CSSC** --- Blevins-Knabe, Giammo. **CEIT** -- McMillan. **LIBRARY** --- none. **LAW** --- none. **EX OFFICIO** --- Faller.

President Nolen introduces Dean Kumpuris, chairperson of the UA Little Rock Board of Visitors

Kumpuris: First of all, I want to thank you. I wanted to bring you an update on the E-Stem issue. I have some encouraging news and ideas on how to go forward in a way that will benefit both E-Stem and UA Little Rock. The foundation and 5 individuals commissioned a study by Dale Boyette to evaluate implementation of our agreement with E-Stem. Boyette took 4 months to interview UA Little Rock and E-Stem staff and faculty and to review our contract with them. The resulting report has been distributed and we have had several meetings with E-Stem since then. We are not where we need to be yet, but we are making progress. E-Stem, hopefully by January, will take over the former art space in University Plaza as a place for young people to congregate and have their meals. They plan to renovate this space. Over the short run, we will still have two schools (UA Little Rock and E-Stem) on the same campus but that have no relationship. This will not work to the benefit of either E-Stem or UA Little Rock. The original Memorandum of Understanding with E-Stem called for 9th and 10th grades to be at another location across the street, while 11th and 12th grades are on the UA Little Rock campus. We are trying to follow this model. In terms of a long-term solution, there are lots of ideas out there. The Faculty Senate's proposal to integrate 12th graders is in the right direction. We are looking for a solution that distinguishes this school as a lab for innovation in education. No one in the United States has a high school as integrated into a university as this one. We can find a solution for 10th and 11th graders to have a

traditional education without interfering with the UA Little Rock campus. For the high school seniors, we should aim to provide opportunities that integrate them into the UA Little Rock campus. If it hadn't been for the Faculty Senate's plan and willingness for the faculty to work with E-Stem on innovative programs for its high school seniors, we would not be in a position to negotiate over moving E-Stem to another facility. Lots of people want this plan to succeed. That's a good thing. Thank you for your work and for coming forward with a possible solution. We have a real opportunity here.

Anson: Could you clarify where the E-Stem students will move for their meals?

Kumpuris: Into the old art space in the shopping center [University Plaza]. They have their own architects to do the renovation

Matson: So are the people at E-Stem willing to consider moving the 10th and 11th graders off campus?

Kumpuris: In principle yes. They understand that the MOU did not call for these students to be on the UA Little Rock campus originally. We are not sure how this will happen yet. Board of Visitors is coming up with possible solutions.

Matson: The move to shopping center will take place when?

Kumpuris: Hopefully by January. This is a temporary solution and we still need a permanent fix. But it also represents a big step forward.

Franklin: The noise and disruption from E-Stem in the breezeway at speech and audiology in the university plaza is a significant problem, both for our classes and our speech therapy lab. Will this get worse?

Rogerson: They are going to use the backdoor into the Art space so they won't need to cross through the breezeway. We are also talking about additional walls to reduce noise.

II. Review of Minutes (9/28 & 10/26)

Motion is made and seconded to approve the September 28 minutes, as amended by Tramel

Craw: Just want to make a note on the minutes. My goal is to paraphrase the discussion that occurs rather than record remarks verbatim. If you would like your remarks recorded exactly, please feel free to provide me with a copy of your remarks to enter into the minutes.

Motion is approved on unanimous voice vote.

Motion is made by Sen. Tramel to approve the October 26 minutes. Motion is seconded by Sen. Barrio-Vilar.

Motion is approved on unanimous voice vote.

III. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)

Wright: I am feeling less grievous today after hearing Dr. Kumpuris. In general terms though, we are all concerned about enrollment. I am concerned about some things I observed at our most recent Discover Days event. Much of the arena seemed to include non-academic units and programs that are of less immediate interest when recruiting students. I am concerned that we are keeping many programs from participating in Discover Days, favoring some units over others. It seems to me that the programs that are our best foot forward should be made most visible at this event. Faculty need to pay some more attention to how Discover Days is managed, there are things we can do better.

Woolridge: We have an opportunity to improve our enrollment by recruiting graduate students. The opportunity is to use our connections with universities regionally and nationally who have our degree at an undergraduate level but don't have a graduate degree. Our goal will be to get faculty at those schools to recommend our graduate degree at UA Little Rock for those students.

The goal is to increase enrollment from these sources to our program by ten students in the first twelve months. The goal in the second year would be to recruit twenty students. Our current capacity limitation would limit us to an ongoing 20 students per year. If accomplished and using graduate tuition rates and additional state appropriations (i.e., \$13,073 per student per year), the first year revenue increase would be \$130,072, the second year would be \$392,206, and then an ongoing revenue stream of \$522,941.

We believe we need one thing from administration to help us begin this process. We need permission to provide some incentive to these students who want to attend. Our current thinking is that if we can tell these faculty and students that out of state tuition will be waived, then we believe we can craft a value proposition that we can sell. We look forward to a positive reception from the administration that will permit us to initiate this recruitment as soon as possible.

In addition, we met with our international students [in the business school] to understand how we can better serve them. We found out that one easy thing we could do to help them was to change our program requirements to include a high-impact activity that could include an internship. We already require a high-impact experience but by including this requirement and listing the internship in the catalog for the program, we enable them not to have to take a class along with the internship. This in turn allows them to keep the money they earn instead of having to give it to us for internship course tuition. We may lose tuition on this one course but if it lets us recruit more students then it will pay back in short order. I bring this up because other programs may have the same opportunity to help their graduate students.

The other thing we learned from our international students is that they are recommending their friends and family attend UCA when they come over for their undergraduate studies. UCA has created a positive, open, easy environment for international students and I believe that we would be wise to review what UCA is doing and implementing some of their programs and processes. If we create a deal where we were to waive out-of-state tuition, then each additional student that we recruit pays back \$20,470 per year. I also believe that they have a much higher likelihood of graduating in four years, which helps our graduation rates. That additional revenue would quickly payback any upfront investment that is required. Assuming we set a goal of twenty students for our first year and then double that number each of the next three years, we would have an additional 300 students providing additional annual revenue of over \$6 million.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

Barrio-Vilar: I'd like the calendar committee to consider moving a fall break to October rather than Thanksgiving week. All my students express the need for an earlier fall break. Having it now is counterproductive for them. I have a lot of students under stress because they are exhausted, which supports a case for an earlier Fall break.

Dreiser: Plus students are taking off on Thursday and Friday on the week before Thanksgiving now.

Nolen: Do I hear a motion to suspend rules to consider this matter?

Matson: So moved

Barrio-Vilar: Seconded

Barrio-Vilar makes a motion that a fall break be scheduled in October; that this break be at least two days off from classes; that we suspend the current fall break we now have during Thanksgiving week; and that this change be implemented by Fall 2021.

Nolen: I would like to suggest the motion be addressed to the Calendar Committee

Barrio-Vilar: Yes, that is appropriate

Anson: I am against this as a policy. My students see the extended Thanksgiving break as chance to catch up.

Nolen: This is simply a motion to refer the issue to the Calendar Committee for consideration.

Douglas: This is not the first time the Calendar Committee has considered the issue of an October fall break. Trying to fit in a fall break of this nature creates a scheduling nightmare, considering that some courses meet only once a week.

Barrio-Vilar: I am hearing that it may be difficult to schedule, but not impossible.

Nolen: I hear that we want to refer this matter to the Calendar committee. Do I have a motion for this?

Motion to refer this matter to ask the Calendar Committee to investigate and report on the feasibility of an October fall break is made and seconded.

Scranton: I would urge the Calendar Committee to consider when students begin to "crash and burn" during the semester in deciding on the best time to plan a fall break.

Smith: Do we have data to compare student performance with October fall breaks and Thanksgiving fall breaks?

Wright: A better approach might be for Faculty Senate to mandate a fall break in October as a standing instruction to the Calendar Committee rather than going back and forth between fall break or no fall break. We need to decide this as an issue and be done.

Wright moves to amend the motion to request that the Calendar Committee report back to the Faculty Senate with recommended legislation on implementing a standing instruction from the Faculty Senate that an October fall break be included on the academic calendar going forward.

Amendment to the motion was accepted without objection.

Motion as amended passes on a voice vote.

V. Announcements

No announcements

VI. Reports

A. Executive Committee – Amanda Nolen

Nolen: The executive committee aimed to write and distribute its memo on E-Stem quickly after the Boyette Report was released so that it could have maximum impact on the discussion happening between the Board of Visitors, Chancellor, and E-Stem representatives.

Nolen: Can I have a motion to suspend the rules to consider adoption of this memo?

Sen. Anson moves to suspend the rules.

Past-President Wright seconds the motion

Motion to suspend rules to consider adoption of the Faculty Senate's E-Stem motion passes unanimously

Nolen: Can I have a motion to adopt the Executive Committee's memo on E-Stem?

Motion to adopt the memo is made and seconded

Wright: I wanted to call attention to one important point in the memo that we especially wanted to highlight: the issue of teacher candidate placement. The Boyette Report recommended that we petition ADE [Arkansas Department of Education] to waive the licensure requirement for supervisors of education. We felt that even contemplating such a waiver would be damaging to UA Little Rock's education programs and wanted to make it clear that the Faculty Senate is against such a proposal.

Nolen: I concur. Even considering such a waiver could jeopardize placement of UA Little Rock-trained teachers with area school districts.

Motion to adopt the E-Stem memo passes on unanimous voice vote

B. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson.

Rogerson: I want to echo Dr. Kumpuris' remarks. Good job to the Faculty Senate on the timely delivery of its memo. It made for a very different meeting with E-Stem, one that was much more productive.

Budget: My thank to everyone who participated in the open forums on the budget and who offered suggestions on finding \$9 million in cuts we needed to make. The main issue that concerned the Board of Trustees were two key risk indicators from the UA System auditors that were in the red: our budget and our enrollment. Both were seen as by the auditors and trustees as posing significant risks to the campus. Until we turn around enrollment, we will need to continue to consider ways of cutting expenses. I worked with the auditors and all the trustees before the meeting to brief them on our plans for addressing the

budget situation. They were happy and reassured by what we are doing. We weren't even called up to the table for discussion. They are confident now that we are on a solid footing and were quite comfortable with what we presented.

Signature Experience: Awards have been made, and I am very gratified to see its success. It is why students will come here and go on to our graduate programs. We already have \$50,000 in donor money for next year.

Enrollment: We are trying to get something done on enrollment in the short run. Charles Donaldson and Preston Slayden are thinking about coming back short term to help us turn this around. Hope to have an announcement confirming this next week.

Downtown campus: Downtown space is amazing and will open in December. I hope everyone comes to the holiday housewarming on December 3rd, 4:30-6:30. This is a space you will be very proud of. Great event space for us, such as for community lectures. It was renovated entirely with donor money, and our rent on the space is covered for 2 years by the Donaghey Foundation.

Nolen: with the announcement that E-Stem students will be moving to the University Plaza space, do you have any update on how to reclaim the dining hall space taken by Sodexo?

Rogerson: This was a decision made by Mark Allen Poisel. The situation might need another memo from the Faculty Senate to spur action. This is not a big matter, just a negotiation with Sodexo. It is on my radar.

Wright: The budget issue has been traumatic for campus and you. Really want to thank you for your openness on this process. Looks like we weathered it well.

Rogerson: Thanks go to Christy Drale as well in terms of saving the instructor positions.

C. Provost's Report – Christy Drale

Program reports to the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC): I know there is a lot of anxiety, time crunch and workload. I want to say two things: IEC heard this and pushed deadline by a week (to 12/17). I want to remind everyone that the reason we have this crunch is because we want these reports to be part of the planning process for next year's budget process. In order to have some input, we need to get the reports done in the fall so we can make recommendations before the budget process starts. Our initial budget goes to UA System office in April. We are determined to make it work. Second, I want to reiterate that the reason for doing this is so everyone has a chance to provide input. The process began with the HLC steering committee as it was building the assurance argument for our reaccreditation self-study. We did not have a convincing argument that we aligned budget and planning with institutional priorities, which is criterion 5 in HLC accreditation standards. Thus, going forward we need to identify priorities and what programs most strongly support those priorities. This is an opportunity for everyone to have a voice in this process. I appreciate the efforts of everyone in this, how seriously it is being taken.

Chief academic officers meeting at the UA System office: A discussion is emerging about adopting a common course numbering system for public universities across the state. Florida has a similar system. The UA System believes that this will pass in the state legislature eventually and wants to get ahead of it.

Michael Moore wants a workgroup on what this would look like and how to manage it. The tricky part will be defining common interest codes. None of this will be easy. We can make recommendations for participants in the workgroup by December 15th. Please let me know if you have suggestions.

Blackboard: We have had problems with getting corporate support in resolving our campus Blackboard issues. The UA Little Rock campus had the worst case of this within the UA System. We have toyed with the idea of looking at new vendors when our contract with Blackboard comes up for renewal in a couple years. But the move from Banner to WorkDay means this may not be the best time to also change our course management system. The UA System seems to be thinking about waiting until after the transition to WorkDay is complete done before reconsidering Blackboard, so we will probably have Blackboard at least 3-4 more years.

Student recruitment: Thank you to everyone for their ideas on student recruitment. Good ideas have come forward from many sources. What are our recruitment goals? We don't really have recruitment goals, beyond getting more students. We haven't done the analytical work on potential programs and students to target. I want deans to identify potential areas for program growth, and populations that would be good places to find students for those programs. One of the most frustrating approaches is a shotgun approach that targets everyone with everything. Given limited resources we can't afford to be inefficient in recruiting. I am encouraging deans to look at market research and data on growth potential. Then we can partner with communications and student affairs to invest in those growth areas.

Wright: I looked at Florida's common numbering system. Based on that, it seems that this sort of system would not affect course content, but would provide a way to give programs a common prefix across campuses.

Drale: We want to start with the easy stuff, such as core courses, to find a starting place and areas where courses tend to be similar across campuses. We are not talking about changing anyone's course content.

Wright: Engineering programs would have the same prefix, etc.?

Drale: We haven't worked that out yet. This is something for the workgroup to consider.

Wright: Having common numbers for particular courses is not what Florida does, just common prefixes across programs. It sounds like we are talking about something different.

Douglas: Any discussion about the ACS system?

Drale: Updating ACS would be part of this process.

Jovanovic: Regarding the IEC reports. This is personal for me since I started some of these programs. Since 2013 I have written four program self-studies, I don't have it in me to write two more self-studies for the same programs again. It seems that there is no awareness of the personal cost and effort that goes into maintaining accredited programs. Taking that content and then putting things into a different format for the IEC is asking too much.

Franklin: Speech and Audiology belong to a joint program with UAMS. They offered resources to help with preparing our IEC report, but they even seem overwhelmed by what IEC has asked.

Drale: Resources are available in Blackboard. She should contact Erin Finzer directly for support.

D. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

Nolen: The Undergraduate Council’s report is on the website. Mike [Tramel], anything to add?

Tramel: The math dept provided a draft Memorandum of Understanding on math core courses that satisfy the new language on the math requirement. Everything else is in the report

DeAngelis: Would you elaborate on the discussion of MOU at undergraduate council?

Tramel: It is still in draft form. There is an issue with math 1401. Andrew can explain the problems that the engineering faculty uncovered.

Wright: The new language for math core courses is “any math course that has college algebra as pre-requisite.” The MOU sets out all the courses in the math dept that have prerequisites of college algebra, trigonometry and pre-calculus, the approved math core courses. Right now, calculus has trigonometry as its pre-requisite. The math dept is looking at adding pre-calculus as pre-req to calculus and amending the language of math core courses to be “any math course that has an approved math core course as pre-requisite,” rather than just college algebra.

E. Graduate Council – Karen Kuralt

Nolen: The Graduate Council’s Report is on the Faculty Senate website. Anything to add from Jim Grover on behalf of the Graduate Council?

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

Nolen: The Council’s report is on the website. Does anyone from the committee with anything to add?

DeAngelis: A renewal decision is still pending for the social science courses. We are waiting to get their assessment data

VII. Old Business

None

VIII. New Business

- A. Motion FS_2018_21.** Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, no second required) Fall 2018 graduates

Be it resolved that those applicants completing all requirements for various degrees in the 2018 Fall Semester shall be approved for graduation. (see ualr.edu/facultysenate for a list of candidates for graduation, current as of 11/16/2018)

Nolen: A list of the graduates is on the Faculty Senate website.

Motion passes on unanimous voice vote.

- B. 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 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. Written comments from the reviewing committees will be attached to the closure proposals and travel with the proposals as they move through the review process. 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.

Commentary: Similar to Motion FS_2018_15, the proposed revision provides clarity for the process of proper notification and routing for graduate program closures and the role of the Graduate Council 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.”

Nolen: This motion is coming back to us from Graduate Council. Sen. Grover, would you like to introduce the motion?

Grover: No, you go ahead.

Pres Nolen introduces the motion

DeAngelis: Is this for any type of program closure, i.e. program elimination as well as suspension?

Nolen: It is specifically for program closures owing to the academic retrenchment process

Deiser: So we are adding deletion?

Nolen: Yes

Wright: If a program is going to be suspended, would it go through any other process? Deletion is one thing but suspension is another. Is this intended to be both deletion and suspension, or just deletion?

Nolen: Would “program closure” include both deletion and suspension?

Wright: It should go into the record that our intent is for “program closure” to mean both deletion and suspension.

Grover: This is directed to programs that are closing. Suspension is different from closing and deletion. This legislation tries to clarify the process.

Nolen: If we intend this to include suspension, we need to make it clearer

Wright: This legislation is intended to address circumstances in which a program’s closure is initiated by someone external to the program. That makes it different from the case where the program itself chooses to suspend or close itself.

Grover: I have no objection to modify the language so it is clear that it includes program suspension.

Matson: Would it be appropriate to make an amendment to add in parentheses after the word “closures” the words “suspension or deletion”?

Nolen: Any objection to this amendment?

Deiser: Why not use the same language as in board policy?

Wright: Were you objecting and we need to debate? The commentary on the motion seems to address this.

Amendment is accepted without objection.

Pres. Nolen calls for a vote on the motion as amended.

Motion passes on unanimous voice vote.

C. 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: If the Constitution is amended then the Undergraduate Council will establish a process dealing with program reviews as referenced in Board Policy 620.1. The Undergraduate Council process will address any recommendation for deletion, suspension, or significant expansion or modification of any program made as a result of a review. The process will include language to address notifications from faculty or the Provost Office of a pending deletion, suspension, or significant expansion or modification of any program. The process will provide a notification procedure to allow time for accumulation of data and documented commentary relating to the notification that can be presented to the Undergraduate Council. The Undergraduate Council will then include the documentation with a Program Change Form and process it as an agenda item with recommendation to the Provost Office. The intent of the new process will be to give ample time for faculty to have notification, review, and significant commentary relating to a program review.

Sen. Tramel introduces the motion.

Pres. Nolen reads the motion

Anson: Can we make the same amendment to add in parentheses “suspension or deletion” after the word “closures”?

Amendment is accepted without objection.

Tramel: Our main concern arises because closures can come from either faculty or the Provost office. We

want to make sure that there is commentary from all faculty on campus when program closure comes from the Provost or someone else external to the program. It has been pointed out that programs may close after its faculty have left, but in that event other faculty outside of the program may want input into keeping the program in some fashion. This motion gives faculty a right to due process over program closures.

Nolen: The faculty already have that authority, this motion just clarifies it

Matson: Is there a reason why we don't want the same language as in the Graduate Council language?

.

Tramel: We didn't want to make it too specific.

Flinn: Was there a reason for not including the written comments provision found in the Graduate Council legislation?

Tramel: We didn't want to write procedure into the constitution. Our main thing is that we want commentary, We will send that with the program change form, like any other program change.

Matson: It seems like we should decide between the approach in the Graduate Council legislation and the Undergraduate Council legislation so that they are the same.

Nolen: Are you offering an amendment

Matson: Yes. I move an amendment to add the sentence about written commentary that appeared in the Graduate Council legislation [Motion FS_2018_16] to this motion from the Undergraduate Council

Nolen: Any objection?

Wright: We should debate this

Motion to amend is seconded.

Discussion begins on motion to amend

Wright: I agree with Mike [Tramel] that in general the constitution should deal with authority rather than with process. That way, we do not have to amend the constitution in order to change process if we discover the process doesn't work well. Having the two different sentences is probably a good thing since it gives each the chance to decide its own way of doing things, and we don't want to overly constrain either one.

Jovanovic: By including this sentence about written commentary for Graduate Council but not for Undergraduate Council opens the possibility that the UGC will just not do it. The question is, do we trust UGC to do this. Why require it of the GC but not the UGC?

Anson: I do think these comments should travel with the proposal. Requiring this constitutionally seems

like the best way to assure this. That should not be an option.

Matson: Last year there were program closures and the commentary to the press was that we followed the process and that faculty were consulted. But in practice it was very superficial contact and so we should be explicit about what process is used to close programs.

Nolen: The motion is to add the line “Written comments from the reviewing committees will be attached to the closure proposals and travel with the proposals as they move through the review process” to motion FS_2018_15.

Motion to amend passes on unanimous vote.

Motion FS_2018_15 as amended carries on unanimous vote

- D. Motion FS_2018_22.** Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings - second vote verbatim the first vote, no second required, first vote) Modify constitution to allow Graduate and Undergraduate Councils to interpret their own curricular changes.

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

Graduate Council: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, and subject to that body’s authority, the UALR Graduate Council shall review, interpret, and recommend action on new graduate courses, programs, and degrees and consider other matters related to graduate work at UALR. This Council shall report all of its actions promptly to the faculty.

Undergraduate Council: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, and subject to that body’s authority, the UALR Undergraduate Council shall review, interpret, and recommend action on all general undergraduate academic policies except for the duties delegated to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies; it shall review, interpret, and recommend approval or disapproval of curriculum proposals and degree programs. The council shall report all of its actions promptly to the faculty.

Commentary: In the event that there is a lack of clarity or confusion over the implementation of curriculum or program changes, this small modification (adding the word “interpret”) asserts the authority of these councils to interpret these changes.

Pres. Nolen introduces the motion

Jovanovic: Don’t the Graduate and Undergraduate Council’s already have the power to interpret their own policies?

Wright: The term “subject to this body’s authority” implies a limited delegation of authority from the Senate to each of the Councils. Matters under the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils may at times reach the Senate through appeal. This motion does not delegate further authority to the Councils, but rather clarifies their authority to interpret their own decisions.

Jovanovic: Does everyone agree that this is what the language means?

Flinn: Isn’t it implied that a Council has the power to interpret its own decisions? Does this mean that the councils can change curriculum?

Tramel: We’ve had some cases in the past where it wasn’t clear we had authority to interpret decisions we have made.

Wright: The council would only-be able to interpret once curriculum and program changes have been fully approved.

Motion carries on unanimous voice vote.

- E. 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 November 16, 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 November 16, 2018

Pres. Nolen introduces the motion

Past Pres. Wright discusses background on motion.

Wright: This is a procedural motion is to divide the question to allow us to consider a portion of the proposed revisions to our tenure policy made at the Faculty Senate's April 2018 meeting.

Motion is passed on unanimous voice vote

- F. Motion FS_2018_23.** Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Revision to Policy 403.15 Promotion and Tenure related to external review.

Be it resolved to amend policy 403.15 Promotion and Tenure per the mark-up in Appendix B (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion);

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

Commentary:

Exclusivity: The documents which govern promotion and tenure are the Board Policy (405.1), the university P&T policy (403.15), college governing documents (if any), and departmental documents. The approval process for such requirements are elucidated in BP 405.1. Standards, processes, and requirements which have not followed that approval process should not be used in evaluating candidates. However, in recent years, this has not been the case, and the argument which has been advanced is that any evidence which the approver considers necessary can be sought. The exclusivity clause proposed here would explicitly forbid such malpractice, and provides a powerful statement that can be used at each level of review, rebuttal, or appeal.

External Review: The committee feels that an R3 institution should require external

review of scholarship in the promotion and tenure process, as a normal practice for those institutions.

However, the 1994 instructional load policy for the institution has not been updated as required by the Roles and Rewards document passed by the Faculty Senate on 4/20/2007, and resources and facilities to conduct scholarship have not been uniformly allocated.

So, in practice, UA Little Rock has not been operating as an R3 institution across all departments. Some departments have been able to perform more scholarly activity, and the committee wanted to enable those departments to include external review in their governing documents. For departments that have a higher teaching load or fewer resources, the committee believes that it would be inappropriate to require a review against a standard that is not realistic.

Over time, as the institution moves towards a more consistent footing as an R3 institution, this question can be revisited. When the instructional load policy has been revised, this issue should be reconsidered.

Pres. Nolen introduces motion

Past Pres. Wright discusses commentary on motion.

Wright: Commentary was not available in time to include it on the agenda.

Wright reads commentary

Discussion begins with the proposed revisions to the first paragraph to Policy 403.15 on 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, F-[Change approved at 10/26/18 senate meeting] 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. The grants of authority set forth in this policy exclusively delineate the items that may be considered during the promotion and tenure process. These rules shall be applied employing the maxim of *Ejusdem generis*, i.e., when a general term is coupled with non-exhaustive specific examples, the specific examples define and limit the scope of the general term.

Boles: I object to the inclusion of this revision. It is important for units to have flexibility to adopt procedures consistent with their governing documents. I would strike the last sentence on *Eiusdem generis*. It doesn't seem to make much sense here.

Silverstein: I am on the tenure committee and disagree with Sen. Boles. An important goal here is to maximize the flexibility of university-level standards for the colleges. I completely agree with Sen. Boles that we need flexibility. That said, given the Board of Trustee's amendments to Board Policy 405.1, it is critical that we set certain parameters. Without rules telling colleges that they cannot go beyond what is listed in university policy, there is danger of abuse. The last sentence is particularly needed because the issue of how to interpret a non-exhaustive list was part of the debate with the Board of Trustees on Board Policy 405.1. Our policy needs to include both flexibility and to provide interpretive guidance.

Matson: I want to agree with Sen. Boles. The statement that is proposed to be added to our policy seems to be self-contradictory.

Jensen: As a non-lawyer, I find these sentences incomprehensible.

Matson: We need to phrase this in everyday language

Anson: The way to fix this is to put the whole thing in Latin. What this is saying is that these categories are general, but there is no exhaustive list of examples.

Scranton: It sounds as if we have dispute over two terms: categories and examples. Is a list of examples exhaustive or not? Illustrative or not?

Wright: I hate to revise on the fly, but it sounds like grants of authority delineate the categories, but when a general term or category is linked to a non-specific item....

Scranton: Is a list illustrative or exhaustive?

Silverstein: First, it is critical that the language be couched in legal terms since it could be litigated. We need the legalistic language so it is clear to the UA Counsel's office. Second, the two sentences are not in conflict when it comes to the legal rules for interpretation for documents such as this. The first sentence says that what is delineated in this document is exclusive, but we often legislate using general terms where we don't want to delineate every sub-category of the term. We then offer specific examples that are related to a general term. What we are proposing here is that when examples are paired with a general term, the specific examples will help to define the scope of the general term. We want to include this language in our legislation because the Counsel's office disputed this particularly way of reading and interpreting non-exhaustive lists paired with general terms.

Jensen: I don't remember any legal terms in the Counsel's document. If the UA System lawyers are upset, why don't they clean up their own document first?

Wright: We are getting into vaporiousness. The specific examples provide a non-exhaustive list that clarify or give scope to the meaning of the general term.

Barrio-Vilar: I understand what you are trying to achieve here, but I still think the language is too legalistic, i.e. useful to lawyers, but not useful to faculty. The language needs to reflect terminology that faculty understand. An incoming faculty member needs to understand the guidelines for tenure.

Matson: The concept in the second sentence is important and we need it, but we could put it another way?

Smith: Is it possible to include a footnote that provides the Latin or legal language that Josh would like

to satisfy the Counsel's office?

Boles: What I'm hearing in our conversation about *Eiusdem generis* is slightly different from the meaning of the phrase. We have lawyers here disagreeing about the meaning of this particular phrase. We don't need to import a legal construction here that is limiting rather than expansive.

Wright: It seems like this is a time to divide the question to send the last sentence back to the Committee on Tenure.

Matson: Both sentences

Nolen: Could we fix the first sentence now

Sen. Barrio-Vilar makes a motion to replace the word "items" in the first sentence of the proposed addition with the word "categories".

Motion is seconded.

Motion to amend passes on unanimous vote.

Wright: I don't think the Senate can revise the second sentence now.

Scranton: In the event of a disagreement between Senate and UA Counsel, we can fall back on the Latin.

Nolen: I hear that we want to move the Latin maxim into a footnote and expand it to say that in the event there is a question of interpretation, *Eiusdem generis* is the standard to use. This will need wordsmithing but we can refer it back to the Committee on Tenure with that charge.

Silverstein: Two things: when it comes to Board Policy 405.1, that won't be changed again. All of our recommendations were rejected, and so board policy is not going to change. The Counsel is not going to change their mind about this. Second, we could just drop the Latin phrase. It is there to clarify the legal meaning, i.e. to indicate that the normal interpretation of contract applies rather than the alternative way that the counsel's office is interpreting.

Nolen: This is an appropriate discussion for the Committee on Tenure

Wright: The motion is to divide the question and refer this sentence to the Committee on Tenure. The nature of this discussion is sufficiently technical and has significant consequences, so it makes sense for the Committee on Tenure to take time with this rather than trying to wordsmith it in the Senate.

Motion to refer this statement back to the Committee on Tenure for further consideration passes on voice vote.

Discussion begins on proposed revisions to Section 1.B. of Policy 403.15:

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. **[Proposed changes to this paragraph were referred back to the Committee on Tenure at the 10/26/18 senate meeting.]**

An external review of the employee's scholarship may be required only if procedures for external review have been established in the department's approved promotion and tenure policy. These policies must include provisions for the selection of evaluators within the candidate's field at peer institutions who hold academic rank at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. The evaluators must be independent of both the candidate and the administration.

Barrio-Vilar: I disagree with the idea that external review should be optional. If we want to be an R3 institution, we should require external review. If we are willing to give up R3, then we can leave it up to units. The problem with making it an option to units is that we are giving the university an opportunity to not encourage scholarship as much as we should. Without a requirement for external review for all units, units could be pressured to do less research.

Sedivy-Benton: Nowhere in this language do we hear about how we are defining who our peer-institutions are.

Deiser: A problem may occur if a tenure review committee cannot find a scholar at a peer institution who can review a tenure candidate's scholarly work.

Woolridge: Are we under threat of losing our R3 status?

Nolen: As far as I know, we are not.

Woolridge: If we don't need to require external review, we should not. In the College of Business, external review is not a standard part of our tenure process.

Wright: We may be close to losing our R3 status. If we are truly an R3, we need to require external review.

Woolridge: If the standard for an R3 is based on the number of doctoral students, but not external review, then why require external review for everyone?

Barrio-Vilar: It matters for attracting doctoral students to campus.

Scranton: I have a question about the word "independent" in the last sentence. Our usual process is for the candidate and chair to come up with a list of evaluators. So would the term "independent" prohibit this practice?

Jensen: It seems the gist of this is that units can do this, but the last two sentences don't seem suggestive but forcing. The word "must" is problematic. Something like "policies should include external review" might be enough. The word "independent" is highly problematic for smaller units.

Matson: We could say "the department's procedures should determine the selection of appropriate reviewers..." That is, set it up so that the department decides on the process.

Smith: Following up with Peggy's remark, we might use a phrase like "free of conflict of interest"

Wright: The executive committee had stronger language on drawing reviewers from peer institutions. The Committee on Tenure left it out because of our not having the resources to do R2 and R1 scholarship. A department list that mostly included reviewers at R2s and R1s might result in reviewers who unfairly judge someone at an R3. The term "independent" is sufficiently broad that departments can interpret it as they need to.

Anson: I don't like telling departments what to do. We can leave this out and leave it to departments to decide. Trust them.

Barrio-Vilar: I'm not sure we need to throw out these two sentences. We want to state it so that departments come up with guidelines on how to identify potential reviewers. In recent cases in our department, one thing that we do is to remind external reviewers about the course load faculty here hold in order to keep their expectations in check.

Nolen: Does the term "external review" mean external to the university?

Wright: Yes

Matson: I would like to move that we strike the last two sentences of the proposed addition and replace with: "These policies should include provisions for the selection of appropriate evaluators within the candidate's field."

Motion to amend motion FS_2018_23 is seconded.

Anson: We should just drop the last two sentences. This is a matter that should be left up to departments to decide.

Condran: I don't want us to forget the original question here.

Steinbach [co-chair, Committee on Tenure]: Listening to the discussion here, I must confess I am surprised that the notion of independence should not be included in the university rule. We should not allow departments to adopt a process that allows them to select reviewers who are non-independent. As for the remainder of this addition, it serves the interests of a tenure candidate to have reviewers who are peers, but it is not so critical that this be spelled out in a university-level policy.

Jensen: The issue is in the interpretation. We had a difficult time in Rhetoric and Writing finding reviewers because the guidelines kept change. Leave it to the department to develop guidelines that are appropriate to the field.

Woolridge: Our unit does not have a Ph.D. program so we should not be bound by the same standards as in other units.

Wright: I have seen colleagues seek to choose more difficult reviewers for some tenure candidates than for others. We need a backstop at the University level to prevent abuse.

Matson: Such problems have not been at the department level but higher up in the administration.

Wright: I disagree

Silverstein: I think it would make sense to refer this back to the Committee on Tenure and allow the committee to take another stab at this language.

Motion to amend passes (voice vote, non-unanimous)

Barrio-Vilar: I would like to make a motion that we vote on whether or not to require external reviewers. Should external reviewer be required?

Barrio-Vilar moves that motion FS_2018_23 be amended at lines 71 and 72 to read “An external review of the candidate’s scholarship must be required following the procedures established in the department’s approved promotion and tenure policy.”

Motion is seconded

Woolridge: I would like to see us exclude units without doctoral programs from a requirement for external review of tenure candidates.

Condran: We should look at what our peer institutions do before making a decision

Vibhakar: It is critical that departments have flexibility in determining their own standards.

Smith: Where does the decision get made that we should be an R3 institution? I don’t know that this falls to the faculty.

Nolen: It definitely falls to the faculty.

Wright: The decision was made in 2007 in the Faculty Roles and Rewards study

Smith: So what is the debate on?

Wright: Resources

Smith: Is it up to the department to decide this for themselves, or can we say that external review is for the benefit of the university as a whole?

Matson: I don’t think a desire to have external review has much to do with a productive research environment.

Anson: History does not have a PhD program, but we do require external review

Scranton: Not being discussed is the fact that most departments require peer-reviewed publications. The departments know their fields. Should departments be mandated to fit a one-size fits all approach?

Motion to amend fails (non-unanimous voice vote)

Discussion begins on Section 3 of Policy 403.15:

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. An external review of the employee's scholarship may be required only if procedures for external review have been established in the department's approved promotion and tenure policy. 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.

Scranton: We should change the word "employee's" to "candidate's"

Replacing "employee's" with "candidate's" is adopted without objection.

Motion to add the sentence on line 259 as amended passes on unanimous voice vote.

IX. Open Forum

Nolen: I want to direct your attention to a document on the faculty senate website that describes the proposed criteria for post-tenure review and annual review. Please consider this over the next 6 weeks. Feel free to send questions and comments to the Executive Committee. We want to get this done in a timely manner.

Wright: Could you just walk the Senate through the main issues?

Nolen discusses how the post-tenure review criteria are proposed to change.

Silverstein: The Committee on Tenure is also working on these criteria. I presume the executive committee will be working with the Committee on Tenure on this to provide for unit flexibility. While we agree that there should be flexibility, the question is about what should be considered “unsatisfactory”

Wright: I haven’t heard many comments about the process for a parallel review by the chair or committee. If anyone has a problem with that, this is a good time to raise it.

Silverstein: I’m not saying hell no, but heck no for now

Douglas: I have a question at the beginning. Does saying “opportunity” imply we can opt out?

Wright: Is there another way to do this?

Condran: I look forward to these discussions in January

Silverstein: In the law school, the usual process is for the dean to do the review alone.

X. Adjourn

Meeting is adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Appendix A. Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock

Article III. The Faculty Senate

Councils and Committees of the Faculty Senate

Graduate Council: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, and subject to that body's authority, the UALR Graduate Council shall review, interpret, and recommend action on new graduate courses, programs, and degrees and consider other matters related to graduate work at UALR. This Council shall report all of its actions promptly to the faculty.

In reviewing proposals, the Graduate Council shall consider the current policies and criteria of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock and those of the University of Arkansas system and the Board of Higher Education.

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. Written comments from the reviewing committees will be attached to the closure proposals and travel with the proposals as they move through the review process.**

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.

The Graduate Council shall be composed of one representative from the Ottenheimer Library faculty, three representatives qualified for graduate faculty status elected from each college and school represented in the Faculty Senate, and three graduate students appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly for one-year terms from nominations submitted by the Graduate Dean, the coordinators of graduate programs, and graduate student organizations. Elected representatives shall serve staggered three-year terms.

Undergraduate Council: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, and subject to that body's authority, the UALR Undergraduate Council shall review, interpret, and recommend action on all general undergraduate academic policies except for the duties delegated to the Council on Core Curriculum and Policies; it shall review, interpret, and recommend approval or disapproval of curriculum proposals and degree programs. The council shall report all of its actions promptly to the faculty.

In reviewing curriculum matters, the Council shall consider current policies and criteria of the

University of Arkansas system and the Board of Higher Education.

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.

The Undergraduate Council shall be composed of one representative from the Ottenheimer Library faculty, two full-time faculty members elected by the full-time faculty from each college or school offering undergraduate work and represented in the Faculty Senate, and five undergraduate students, one of whom must be taking a course or courses at night. The student representatives are appointed by the Student Government Association for one-year terms and are selected to represent the broadest range possible of academic areas. The elected representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms. The associate vice chancellor for educational programs and a representative from the Office of the Registrar shall be ex officio members without vote.

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, F-[Change approved at 10/26/18 senate meeting] 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. The grants of authority set forth in this policy exclusively delineate the items that may be considered during the promotion and tenure process. These rules shall be applied employing the maxim of *Ejusdem generis*, i.e., when a general term is coupled with non-exhaustive specific examples, the specific examples define and limit the scope of the general term.

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. 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. **[Proposed changes to this paragraph were referred back to the Committee on Tenure at the 10/26/18 senate meeting.]**

An external review of the employee's scholarship may be required only if procedures for external review have been established in the department's approved promotion and tenure policy. These policies must include provisions for the selection of evaluators within the candidate's field at peer institutions who hold academic rank at or above the rank to which the candidate aspires. The evaluators must be independent of both the candidate and the administration.

Increasingly, ~~an~~ many forms of scholarship involve collaboration. The academic unit shall determine if is encouraged to promote **[Changes approved at 10/26/18 senate meeting]** 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.

...

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. An external review of the employee's scholarship may be required only if procedures for external review have been established in the department's approved promotion and tenure policy. 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.