FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Friday, January 25, 2019, 1:00 p.m.
Ledbetter Rooms B & C, Donaghey Student Center

I. Welcome and Roll Call

Faculty Senate President Nolen calls the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m.

Secretary Craw calls the roll

Present: **CALS** -- Anson, Barrio-Vilar, Cheatham, Deiser, Douglas, Heil, LeGrand, Smith, Stone. **CB** --- Hendon, Leonard, Vibhakar, Woolridge. **CEHP** --- Fletcher, Franklin, Grover, Otters, Reeves, Robinson, Sedivy-Benton, Vander Putten. **CSSC** --- Craw, Flinn, Giammo, Golden, Jensen, Matson, Scranton. **CEIT** --- DeAngelis, Jovanovic, McMillan, Tramel. **LIBRARY** --- Macheak. **LAW** ---Boles, Cain. **EX OFFICIO** --- Drale, Nolen, Rogerson, Wright.

Absent: **CALS** – Al-Shukri, Condran, Law, Nguyen. **CB** --- none. **CEHP** --- Atcherson. Robinson, VanderPutten. **CSSC** --- Blevins-Knabe. **CEIT** -- Massey. **LIBRARY** --- none. **LAW** --- Foster. **EX OFFICIO** --- Faller, Dicus.

II. Review of Minutes (11/16)

Motion is made and seconded to approve minutes of the November 16, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting.

Motion carries on voice vote.

President Nolen recognizes Chancellor Rogerson to give his report earlier than indicated on the agenda so that the Chancellor can meet another obligation at 1:30.

Chancellor Rogerson distributes a handout that summarizes the budget cuts made in order to meet the $9 million shortfall (Appendix E).

Rogerson: The handout is the same handout I gave to the Board of Trustees. In general,

the Board of Trustees and auditors were receptive to this budget plan. I got no questions from the Board of Trustees about it. And the budget shortfall did not get mentioned in the press. The budget matter is not on the Board of Trustee's agenda for their next meeting.

Chancellor Rogerson distributes a handout with the schedule for the new UA Little Rock Downtown center (Appendix F).

We had a very successful grand opening event for the new downtown center. The event was packed; we estimate that 150 people attended. The event generated lots of interest and excitement. The downtown center is open to the public. We are hoping to use the space on Saturdays for non-credit courses through extended education. And we plan to hold a "fun" lecture for the general public every Wednesday. We are looking for volunteers to provide lectures.

We have commissioned Entergy to help solve the problem with power interruptions as we switch over from their grid to our generators. Entergy is beginning with a study that will result in a cost estimate and that should take about 3 months to complete. We hope to have the problem solved within 6 months.

IEC committee has been extremely busy. All the reports (240) have come in. The committee will meet in a retreat this weekend to put information together into a report that will show what the scoring was, give comments to justify how scoring was derived. The report will be released to the campus on February 1 and will be posted on Blackboard. We will have an open forum on February 6 at the University Theater to discuss the IEC report and to discuss budget and enrollment matters. The IEC report is not intended to be an action report. Rather, it is a first attempt at assessing what is valuable about our campus going forward. It is just a first shot. The goal is to better understand what we want to promote about us going forward.

Jovanovic: In the budget reduction detail, were departments notified about which positions were eliminated? In our department, we have had several faculty leave. It is not clear on what positions we lost and which we kept. Several positions that were canceled may be crucial for our programs. It is possible that eliminating faculty lines will put accreditation of some of our programs in jeopardy.

Rogerson: I never intended for this list to be ironclad. We are working through the Provost to identify crucial hires. We approved 15 searches last week, and are looking at others. You will need to make your case to the Provost. It is not the case that we are never hiring anyone again.

Cheatham: On FacFocus, some people asked if we could time the power interruptions to avoid interrupting classes.

Nolen: I also noticed that the power interruptions affect the elevators. I experienced this in Dickinson Hall, which was alarming.

Rogerson: My wife also made the same remark and raised it with me.

Leonard: Lots of access points to our buildings don't work for disabled students, including the business building's access point. And the one at the Disability Resource

Center is also not working. For a recent diversity meeting we had to prop the door open so people in wheelchairs could get into the building. We need to work on accessibility. I am not sure where to take this issue. I've mentioned it at other meetings and nothing has happened. I want to bring this to your attention.

Rogerson: I suggest you write straight to me about this and I will make something happen. I have directed Facilities Management to make necessary repairs to bathrooms and doors.

III. Announcements

Nolen: March 7 will be Faculty and Staff night at the Jack Stephens Center men's basketball game. Faculty and staff get two free tickets; season ticket holders will get free concessions

Robinson: Diversity Week will be March 25 – 29th. Events will include lunch and learns, movies, and lecture. I'd like to encourage faculty to let us know of opportunities to collaborate with class events.

IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)

Wright: In the Committee on Tenure's discussion on annual review of faculty, the topic of annual review and feedback for academic administrators came up. There is no consistency in whether or how faculty have input on administrator evaluation across. Maybe Faculty Senate needs to think about guidelines for the evaluation of academic administrators.

Wright: A second topic came up from at least one department chair. The Faculty Handbook says minutes of the Dean's Council must be shared with department chairs. But some chairs say this is not happening. I want to bring this to the Senate's attention.

Robinson: Back in the 1980s, faculty here were unionized. I'd like to suggest this is a time for us to seek out extra protection through a union, given the changes being implemented by the Board of Trustees. Recently, a faculty member in our department was terminated without cause or notice. This person was Terminated by email that said it was "for convenience." We are at risk. Is it appropriate to make a motion at this point? I want to ask the executive committee to look into unionization.

Nolen: We would need to suspend the rules.

Robinson moves to suspend the rules to allow consideration of a motion

Motion to suspend rules is seconded

Motion to suspend rules passes on unanimous voice vote.

Robinson: I would like to move that the topic of unionizing for UA Little Rock employees be taken up by the executive committee, with a report back to the Senate at its March meeting.

Motion is seconded.

Discussion begins on motion

Franklin: It was my wife who was terminated. She worked for 7+ years and served on the Faculty Senate. She was employed by UAMS, but worked on this campus under a joint appointment. We may want to think about how we reach out to the UA System. The modification of Board Policy 405.1 now puts us at more risk and gives us less clout.

Cheatham: I want to say that we were never a unionized campus. There were discussions at some points but it never actually came to pass.

Jovanovic: There was a NLRB-recognized union vote on campus and it passed, but it was never recognized. It never became an active membership organization.

Scranton: The main positive result of that action was to get more transparency on the university budget. It resulted in the planning and finance committee in the Senate. Our experience has been that we should challenge rottenness, with a union or not.

Franklin: Along the lines of an appeal, and maybe law school faculty can clarify this, but this situation is that there was no appeal process on this dismissal.

Wright: There have been changes in benefits happening at the system level without faculty consultation. Unionization puts us in a position to negotiate our benefits and may be a good reason for us to unionize in order to strengthen our bargaining position.

Nolen: I invite folks to submit what they know about the history of unionization on our campus for the executive committee to consider.

Jovanovic: One problem with the prior vote was that it would mean joining the Arkansas Teachers Federation (NEA). Lots of faculty felt a better affiliation would be with the American Association of University Professors. It would involve the union having a staff person and legal counsel that represented us, which will cost money. Faculty need to be willing to pay dues to support this. Since we are a right to work state, the administration doesn't have to recognize a union, but it can still be a good advocacy organization for the faculty. But we need to be willing to pay dues.

Nolen: The issue on the floor is to refer the matter to Executive Committee, not whether we should unionize.

Motion passes on voice vote

V. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)

Barrio-Vilar: I want to express my disappointment with a minor change made at the fall semester's graduation ceremony. It used to be that before the national anthem was played that an announcement was made that invited international students and colleagues to join in singing the anthem if they wished. It made me feel welcome. Not hearing it anymore

disturbs me. It's a matter of helping everyone feel included. I don't know who is responsible for this, but would like to encourage this statement be reinstated.

Anson: I have a question and a grievance. When will E-Stem not be here? We were promised they would be moving but it hasn't happened yet.

Nolen: The report from Dean Kumpuris suggested it would have happened by now. But as I understand it, some details are still being worked out. But it will still happen. The space they are moving to needs a lot of repairs and they are working out who will pay. I am assured there is still action that will occur, but not in January.

Anson: My grievance is about the web registration process. It causes lots of complications for students, and especially non-degree-seeking students. The whole registration system is tied to degree programs. Maybe we can borrow UCA's system.

Jovanovic: To Laura's [Barrio-Vilar's] point, I think the statement was added during the Bush administration. I don't know why it was removed though. As to my grievance, for some reason students are required to vacate their dorm rooms before the semester is finished. They need to leave by 5 pm by the day of the last final exam. That isn't reasonable for a student with a 3:00-5:00 final. And shouldn't a graduating senior be able to stay until graduation ceremony. It is not friendly to tell people to move out before their campus business is finished.

VI. Reports

A. Executive Committee – Amanda Nolen

Nolen: We are looking at ways to build relationships with Staff Senate, working with Staff Senate President Angie Faller. Faculty-Staff night at the Stephen's Center is one idea. In addition, we are investigating the possibility of conducting a campus climate survey with Staff Senate. We hope that this study will obtain data on climate across gender, rank, race, disability, and other categories. The chancellor has been supportive of this idea. We have discussed with Cindy Bennett at the Survey Research Center the possibility of carrying it out this fall. If you have interest in working on this or expertise in campus climate issues, survey design, or sampling, please let us know.

Jensen: Could we include issues of food and shelter insecurity for students?

Nolen: This survey focuses on faculty and staff, but we can raise this when we prepare a student survey.

B. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson

See II. Review of Minutes above

C. Provost's Report – Christy Drale

Drale: My primary goal last semester was protecting our instructional staff

during the budget process, which we have done. I want to talk about my three priorities for this semester:

i) Enrollment: how academic affairs can take a proactive role in improving our enrollment.

ii) Budget and workforce stabilization: Lots of stress factors at UA Little Rock, but instability in our budget and workforce tops the list. I want to get to a point where we are not experiencing constant turnover.

iii) Successful HLC accreditation visit in February 2020

Accreditation: We had planned to have a second draft of our assurance argument by December 2018. But we still have not finished the first draft. Still, I am confident we will have it completed by our deadline in December 2019. We are moving more slowly because we realized we have a lot of deficits in meeting HLC's criteria. HLC lays out vie criteria we have to meet. But we are noticing that we are not hitting some of the sub-criteria. So we are addressing those deficits as we notice them. The really big deficit was criterion 5, which requires that we have a process for tying institutional priorities to our planning and budgeting process. As you know, we didn't have that so we had to figure out how to address it. This took an enormous effort to create a process that would let us evaluate units and functions to see if they are in alignment with our priorities. This is the purpose behind the IEC process we have generated. We are in much better shape than we were a year and a half ago. We have addressed most of the red items on the heat map we showed at University Assembly in August. I want to give a shout-out to Erin Finzer and Brian Berry for their efforts on this project.

Enrollment Management: I have asked the deans to work with chairs and faculty to identify what faculty feel are particular growth areas, and the likeliest student markets for those areas. We are trying to take a more proactive approach. If we are going to have any self-determination in this process, we need to have faculty input.

Retention: Under Daryl Rice's leadership, we will repeat the early alert system again this semester using the midterm grade portal. Will have new software for this in the fall, CRM Advise. We are setting up training for that to make it easier to enter early alerts and track outcomes. Daryl has worked with the Senate's *ad hoc* student retention committee. Stay tuned for that.

Reviewing programs for termination: We need a process for deciding how we will transform programs so they are viable if we are going to keep them. A program needs 6 graduates per year, assessed over 3 years, to keep it on the books. A list of programs at risk has been distributed to deans to do creative thinking about how to manage them.

Faculty workload policy: No one more than I has a vested interest in the proposed revised faculty workload policy since I chaired the committee that drafted it. I am still committed to it and would like to get it implemented. With our current instability I think we need to take a look at where we are, When I first pitched this to the Chancellor, the question was if this would require more resources. I analyzed current workload and determined that the new workload policy would come out about the same in terms of courses per semester per faculty member. The new policy assumes a typical standard of 3 courses per semester per faculty member. Average on campus is 3.1 per faculty per semester. Need to go back and update the analysis.

Wright: Can the Senate get the program viability study?

Drale: Yes

Flinn: My sense after running the nonprofit leadership studies program is that often interdisciplinary programs get lost in favor of marketing majors.

Craw: It is worth noting that the nonprofit sector is a key area for local economic growth

McMillan: We need to make permanent hires for leadership positions that are filled with an interim appointment.

Drale: Yes, we want to focus on this.

Cheatham: I am glad we have the workload policy on the agenda.

D. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel

No report --- hasn't met yet

E. Graduate Council – Karen Kuralt

No report --- hasn't met yet

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

Report is on the website

G. Governance Committee – Rosalie Cheatham

Cheatham: We are working on revisions to the Faculty Handbook. There will be some parts that require Senate action. We are completing the draft work. Finding a way to make the handbook searchable is one of our challenges. We are planning to have a version similar to the student catalogs that is searchable with links to policies. We are also working on governance documents. We hope that by the end of the month we will be back on schedule on reviewing governance documents.

VII.   Old Business

   A. Motion FS_2018_16. Graduate Council (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings
   - second vote verbatim the first vote, no second required, second 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 (suspensions or deletions) 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 introduces motion (motion does not require second)

Motion passes on voice vote.

B. **Motion FS_2018_15**. Undergraduate Council (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings - second vote verbatim the first vote, no second required, second 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 (suspensions or deletions) 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. 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 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

Nolen introduces motion (motion does not require a second).
Motion passes on voice vote.

C. **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, second 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.

Nolen introduces motion.

Motion passes on voice vote.

VIII.   New Business

A. **Motion FS_2019_1.** Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Revision to Policy 502.6 as it relates to TOEFL scores.

Be it resolved to amend policy 502.6 International Student Requirements 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 502.6 will be effective as of August 2019.

Commentary: The proposed revision lowers the required TOEFL IBT score from 71 to

61. In doing so it lowers the minimum scores from 21 to 19 on the English and Reading sections of the ACT, the SAT minimum score from 510 Critical Reading and 490 Writing to a minimum of 330 on the SAT Evidence-based Reading and Writing (ERW) section.

Mark Funk, chair of the Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee, introduces this motion.

Funk: The admissions department informed us that currently international students can demonstrate English proficiency in one of several ways,. One of those is an ACT of 21, which is higher than the standard for Arkansas natives, which is an ACT of 19. Therefore, it seems reasonable to lower the standard for international students to an ACT of 19. Another way is with a TOEFL score of 71 or higher. Every other university aside from UA Fayetteville sets their standard at 61 or higher. We evaluated the academic performance of students we have admitted who had a TOEFL between 61 and 71 and their academic performance is not significantly different from that of other international students.

Nolen: would like someone in the Senate to make a motion to consider

Motion is made and seconded.

Wright: I should have caught this in executive committee, but technically this motion should seek to amend existing faculty senate legislation rather than amending policy. Policy 502.6 is an enactment of Senate legislation.

Nolen: Without objection, we will make that change in the motion.

Jovanovic: The biggest problem I have with international students is their English proficiency. There seems to be a problem of students taking courses before they have an adequate level of language proficiency.

Funk: We are seeking to set minimum standards for the University. Programs can set higher standards if they wish. It is also possible for programs to set particular standards for written English proficiency and for oral English proficiency.

Robinson: I need clarification: how is an international student defined? Who is required to take the TOEFL? What if English is the international student's native language? And what about American students who have English as a second language? Do they have to take TOEFL?

Comment: Students from English speaking countries are exempt.

Cheatham: I think it is problematic to expect programs to set higher or different standards from the University standard. We are talking about admissions standards. We also need to make clear that the admissions standard we are debating here

pertains to undergraduate students, not graduate students.

Wright: That is correct. I'm mostly confident that this applies only as an undergraduate admissions standard.

Cheatham: The minutes need to be clear that we are amending an undergraduate admissions standard.

Nolen: And there are programs that set higher admissions standards than the University standards.

Cheatham: We want to avoid doing anything that will disadvantage international students. We admit students to the University, and we may have students seeking to come here for a specific program who then face an additional barrier in being admitted to the program they want. We have had problems in the past with being seen as unfriendly to international students and we don't want to reinforce that.

Sedivy-Benton: Another consideration is that some programs have an external accrediting body that influences their admissions standards.

Barrio-Vilar: In recruiting international students, it is in the program's best interest and student's best interest that we be clear about our expectations on English ability.

Giammo: It is a fair concern to be clear in our expectations with student applicants. If there are additional requirements for a particular program beyond the University requirements, it should be apparent to the student at the time of application.

Franklin: The importance of English proficiency may vary quite a bit from program to program.

Douglas: Is there still a test of spoken English?

Barrio-Vilar: It is part of the TOEFL.

Motion passes on voice vote.

B. **Motion**. Executive Committee and Tenure Committee (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 403.3

in order to consider those brought to the Faculty Senate on January 25, 2019; and

Be it further resolved to rescind the referral of the matter to the Faculty Governance Committee for consideration specifically related to the proposed revisions presented to the Faculty Senate on January 25, 2019.

Nolen: This is a procedural motion to re-consider an issue from the April 2018 meeting. We are also dividing the question.

Matson makes the motion

Motion passes on voice vote.

C. **Motion FS_2019_2**. Executive Committee and Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Revision to Policy 403.3 Annual Review Policy.

   1. **Be it resolved** by the Executive Committee and the Committee on Tenure to modify the Annual Review Policy (403.3) (approved 4/20/1990, modified by FS_2017_4) per the mark-up in Appendix C (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion); and

      Be it further resolved that upon approval, implementation of changes to policy 403.3 will be effective as of July 2019.

   2. **Be it resolved** by the Committee on Tenure to amend FS_2018_25 to revise items 9 through 11 as indicated in the mark-up in Appendix C (indicated in red).

Commentary: The Executive Committee and the Committee on Tenure considered proposed changes to Policy 403.3 Annual Review of Faculty and have brought language that is agreed upon by both committees (indicated by black underlined text). In addition, the Committee on Tenure is bringing additional language to add to the jointly agreed upon language (indicated by red underlined text).

Matson introduces part 1 of the motion

Discussion begins on the proposed revisions to section 1.A.4 to the Annual Faculty Review Policy described in Appendix C:

4. ~~Peer evaluation;~~ Each academic unit shall establish procedures to provide its faculty

> the opportunity to participate in the annual review of their peers. Except as set forth in this policy, no particular system of peer review is prescribed. Academic units are encouraged to develop a peer review system that is consistent with the unit's faculty resources, the particular expertise of the unit's faculty members, and practices within the discipline.

Wright: This section is being added as clarification.

Angela Hunter: Not all units are single discipline units. We may want to broaden the term we us. Perhaps we should we use the term "relevant disciplines" in the last sentence, or similar wording that makes clear that some units include more than one discipline.

Wright: I think we would need to think about that carefully. There might be unintended consequences. Might be better to refer that question back to the tenure committee.

Flinn: A good example is the Sociology and Anthropology Department.

Matson: Your unit can set up a procedure that is separate for sociologists and for anthropologists.

Flinn: I just want it to be clear that this policy allows units to develop separate processes to review faculty in differing disciplines.

Wright: Item c addresses this matter below.

Giammo: What we want is to evaluate people based on their discipline. What if a department shrinks and there is only one person left who is associated with a particular discipline?

Jovanovic: I just want to ask if this annual review policy will also apply to non-tenure-track faculty?

Nolen: Yes, we decided that it would in last fall.

Silverstein: There might be a simple fix that addresses Angela [Hunter]'s concerns: change "practices within the discipline" to "practices within the discipline or disciplines comprising the unit."

Wright moves that we refer the question that Angela [Hunter] brought to the tenure committee and the executive committee for study and further consideration.

Motion is seconded.

Jovanovic: Is this a motion to refer a part of the motion to committee? If so, is it in order?

Wright: No, it is a motion to refer a question to committee, not the language in the motion

Nolen: At a future date then, the tenure or executive committee may report back to the Senate with a proposed revision to the policy that addresses Angela Hunter's question.

Motion to refer the question to committee passes on voice vote.

Nolen calls for a motion to approve the amendment to the introduction of section 1.A.4 [described above]

Hendon: Do we want to instead discuss each section and then vote to approve the whole thing?

Nolen: No, but we can do it *in seriatim* if that is the will of the Senate.

Matson: There are so many different matters in this motion that it might be better for us to consider it paragraph by paragraph.

Nolen: It would be better for us to approve each piece of the proposed changes on its own so we can then put it aside as we consider the next piece.

Nolen calls vote on motion to approve the amendment in the introduction to section 1.A.4

Motion passes on voice vote.

Discussion moves on to proposed revisions to section 1.A.4.a in Appendix C:

a. <u>Solely by way of illustration, a unit might choose to create a separate peer review committee. Alternatively, a unit might allocate the peer review process to the unit's promotion and tenure committee. A unit might also decide to have all full-time faculty participate in the peer review process for members of that unit.</u>

Jensen: I am confused by this section. What is the purpose this clause?

Silverstein: I participated in drafting this language and think that this clause is very important. We all have different disciplinary practices. This clause states explicitly that units can adopt their own practices.

Jensen: Didn't we say that in section 4.0?

Jovanovic: My concern is that this might be read as indicating there are only three choices.

Anson: But it says "Solely by way of illustration…"

Cheatham: I just need to say that any kind of illustration should not be parallel. Illustrations should be in commentary or a footnote. Otherwise illustrations are seen as the main alternative ways of doing things, especially as administrators turn over. I'd like to see this clause deleted or moved to a footnote.

Wright moves that we change this clause (I.A.4.a) to a footnote to the previous section [I.A.4.0], to be added after the word "system"

Jensen seconds

No discussion

Motion passes on voice vote

Discussion moves on to proposed revisions to section 1.A.4.b in Appendix C:

b. Faculty participating in the peer review process shall provide feedback to the chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed. This feedback may take the form of a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service, or it may take some other form, such as feedback regarding specific performance tasks. Examples of the latter include a review of a published article or a review of a peer's teaching based upon a classroom visit.

Cheatham: The first sentence implies the full involvement of the faculty rather than a committee. Is there willingness to modify the language to clarify that individual faculty involvement is not required?

Matson: Perhaps we can borrow the language used above.

Cheatham moves to strike the first part to the sentence and replace it with "feedback from the peer review process will be provided to the chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed." And to move the sentence starting "Examples…" to a footnote, after the word "tasks".

Anson seconds.

Wright: Both of the last two sentences [starting with "This feedback may…] should be in the footnote.

Nolen: Amendment is now to include both of the final two sentences as a footnote

Motion to amend is approved.

Motion is approved to accept section 1.A.4.b as amended.

Discussion moves on to proposed revisions to section 1.A.4.c

c. If an academic unit forms a peer review committee, the following principles govern:

    i. Membership eligibility for annual review committees shall be defined by each academic unit. The composition of these committees should represent the diverse composition of the unit in gender, race, and academic interests when possible.

    ii. If a representative committee of faculty from within the unit cannot be formed, then the department chair or equivalent shall form the committee with eligible and representative faculty across the college following approved procedures to develop a pool of eligible faculty from both within and outside UA Little Rock.

Jensen: Section i will be difficult to fulfill for small departments, and especially burdens faculty of color and female faculty with committee work. I would like to suggest we say that annual review committees should reflect the diversity of the faculty and leave it at that.

Barrio-Vilar: Yes, as it reads now, people of color and female faculty get burdened with more committee service.

Jensen: I move that we change the wording of the second sentence in i to read "As much as possible, the composition of these committees should represent the diversity of faculty within the unit."

Barrio-Vilar seconds

Motion to amend part i passes

Cheatham: I'm not clear on what circumstances would prevent a department from being unable to form an annual review committee.

McMillan: We have had this experience with evaluating some young faculty. In some units you may have only one or two tenured faculty and a lot of instructors and so you need people from outside the department to do an annual review.

Giammo: This provision (ii) is really intended to address the circumstances of departments with small numbers of tenured faculty.

Nolen: To clarify, the intent of this clause (ii) is to address circumstances where I may, for instance, be the only educational psychologist in my unit.

Wright: Julie [Flinn] brought this up, and Sociology and Anthropology may be a good example. Without this clause, you could cross disciplines within a unit for a faculty member's annual review, rather than seeking outside people in the same discipline but in other units on campus who might be more appropriate as evaluators.

McMillan: As another example, a geographer in another department teaches courses in our unit, and it might be appropriate for us then to participate in his/her annual review.

Flinn: I understand the concern here, but my concern is, who makes the determination that a committee is representative? Shouldn't this be defined in a governance document? And the governance document should make clear how that is determined. Who decides that an annual review committee is not representative?

Jensen: For me, the word "representative" is a problem. It can get misconstrued when following the word "diversity."

Jensen moves to delete the word "representative" from ii

Wright seconds

Motion to amend passes

Cheatham: Going back to Julie Flinn's question, shouldn't it be up to the chair to decide that there is not an appropriate group of faculty to evaluate a person?

Nolen: This is something that should be addressed in a governance document.

Cheatham: But this gives the chair total power in forming the committee.

Matson: We could change the language to be less specific.

Matson moves an amendment to ii to say "department procedures should specify processes for cases where there are not enough faculty to form a committee."

Nolen: "If a committee of faculty from within the unit cannot be formed, then the unit will follow approved procedures to form the committee."

Cheatham: I'd like to move to refer this back to committee to rework the language

Giammo: How about "The unit's governance document shall include procedures for developing a pool of eligible faculty if a committee from within the unit cannot be formed."

Nolen: Matson, will you accept this language as your amendment?

Matson agrees to revise her motion to amend ii to say "The unit's governance document shall include procedures for developing a pool of eligible faculty if a committee from within the unit cannot be formed."

Motion to amend ii passes

Motion is made to approve section I.A.4.c as amended

Giammo seconds

Motion passes

Discussion begins on proposed revisions to I.A.6 in appendix C:

6. Prior to the chairperson's making a recommendation in any year, the following shall occur:
   a. A meeting between the chairperson and faculty member to discuss all issues relating to the review,
   b. The providing to that faculty member a copy of the chairperson's tentative recommendation(s), and
   c. Reasonable opportunity for the faculty member to submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review.
   d. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, or service), the chairperson shall provide a written recommendation for improvement and, when appropriate, a commitment of resources to be part of the subsequent year's annual evaluation.
   e. The faculty member and chairperson shall acknowledge that this meeting has transpired by signature.

Hendon: I'd like to move that we refer this whole matter back to committee for re-consideration.

Wright: The entire motion?

Hendon: Yes

Nolen: We have a motion to refer this motion back to Committee on Tenure and Executive Committee.

Motion to refer this motion back to committee is seconded.

Wright: Without Senate input, it is not clear what the committees can do with the motion. Without Senate input, the same motion will come back.

Woolridge: Can we change the approach so we are not wordsmithing as we move through this motion so we don't have to sit here and discuss each word in a multi-page document.

Nolen: That would change everything.

DeAngelis: It might be more productive for the committee to solicit input via email over the next few months and then return with a revised motion.

Nolen: I might remind everyone that we talked through these issues at the November meeting

and so we have already had several months to review this and solicit input.

Anson: A time comes when you have to do something. We've been through this, the committee has been through this, and now we have to do our job.

Matson: There is also a reason why we don't use email in order to try to resolve these issues.

Craw: It would be a mistake to return this to committee without at least discussing the differences in language proposed by the Executive Committee and that proposed by the Tenure Committee.

Comment: I don't have time to discuss these matters over email. The time to do this work is now, on a Friday between 1 and 4 p.m.

DeAngelis: I just feel like we should have something closer to work that is complete before we consider it. Why doesn't everyone who have an interest in this matter participate in the committee work beforehand so that we can have these matters settled before coming to the full Senate?

Barrio-Vilar: Because that's what we do in these meetings

DeAngelis: But it's not productive.

Matson moves to call the question.

Wright seconds motion to call the question.

Motion to call the question passes on voice vote.

Motion to refer back fails on voice vote.

Motion is made to accept revisions underlined in section d

Motion is seconded

Barrio-Vilar: With respect to resources, perhaps we should amend this to say "when appropriate and if available".

Vibhakar: What happens if resources are not available? We are in an environment where resources are tight.

Leonard: We shouldn't rate someone as unsatisfactory if we don't give them the appropriate resources to work with.

Comment: But we do it anyway.

Cheatham: I want to be sure that this section is not taken to mean that the chair makes the recommendation alone and without regard to the peer review process. Should we perhaps amend this to say that the chair shall provide a written recommendation for improvement that is informed by the peer review process.

Cheatham moves that the motion be amended in section d to say "the chair shall provide a written recommendation for improvement that is informed by the peer review process."

Motion is seconded.

Giammo: This change would make it sound like the chair cannot give an unsatisfactory rating unless the peer review committee agrees.

Cheatham: It was not intended to say that. I just want to be sure the peer evaluation gets incorporated here.

Douglas: It seems to me that Board policy holds that these two evaluations, the chair's and the annual review committee's, are done independently of each other. They don't see each other's documents. It is not until later that they would come together to inform an evaluation and a remediation plan.

Nolen: That would not be consistent with University policy. So if what you are saying is true, it would mean the University is not adhering to Board policy.

Douglas: Can we ask University counsel?

Silverstein: I have the statute in front of me. It is very generic. It just says assessment by peers has to be part of the process. There is nothing that says it needs to be separate and independent.

Angela Hunter: Peer evaluation has to be made fully available to the chair and dean, by board policy.

Cheatham withdraws motion to amend.

Motion to accept d is approved on voice vote.

Motion to accept section e is made and seconded

Motion to accept section e is approved on voice vote.

Discussion moves on to proposed revision of I.A.8 in appendix C:

8.   The following documents shall be available to each faculty member: all writings used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member including any writings relating to the peer evaluation.

Leonard makes a motion to accept this revision

Anson seconds

No discussion.

Motion to accept the revision in I.A.8 is approved on voice vote

Discussion moves on to proposed revision of I.A.9 in appendix C:

9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service).

Motion to accept the underlined revision in section 9 above is made and seconded.

Silverstein: We have now reached the point where the language between the Executive Committee and the Tenure Committee differ.

Nolen: Yes. Procedurally, we will consider first the language in 9, 10, and 11 where we agree, and then we will consider the additions proposed by the Tenure Committee.

Motion is approved on voice vote.

Discussion moves on the proposed revision of I.A.10 in appendix C:

10.   The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

Leonard makes a motion to accept this revision.

Anson seconds

No discussion.

Motion to accept is approved on voice vote.

Discussion moves on to proposed revision to I.A.11 in appendix C:

11. Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-tenure Review
    a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories, then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years' materials to assess overall performance.
    b. If the departmental tenure committee determines the individual is overall unsatisfactory, then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated. If the department tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's overall performance shall be deemed satisfactory
    c. The unit's operating procedures should specify the scope of materials for review, the voting procedures, and the method of voting.

Woolridge: In our college, if you are not publishing you are not qualified to teach. Saying two out of three is a problem to us because underperformance in a single area like research could mean an overall performance problem.

Jensen: Does this proposal prevent a department from developing a more stringent policy?

Wright: Yes

Woolridge: But in our unit, if you don't publish, you can't be teaching.

Woolridge moves to amend the motion to change section a from "unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories" to "unsatisfactory in 1 out of the 3 categories."

Motion to amend section a is seconded.

Silverstein: First, this is an area where tenure and executive committees disagree. Second, the tenure committee did consider going to a 1 out of three standard if it was over three years. Our concern though was that this would allow a person to be referred for review for poor performance in service alone, and service is an area that is too ambiguous and prone to manipulation. There was some sympathy to the idea of adopting a 1 out of 3 standard if it were restricted to teaching and scholarship. It might be worth referring this back to committee for further consideration.

Barrio-Vilar: We could change it to allow a unit to refer a faculty member for review for poor performance in either teaching or in scholarship, excluding service.

Anson: So if I hear you right, if a person has one bad year in publishing, they are gone?

Woolridge: No. But we do have a set of rules that if they don't publish over an extended period of time, it is a problem.

Sedivy-Benton: Is it possible that I get unsatisfactory in something like service because I overachieved in scholarship? We can't always be perfect in all three categories. Are we trying to tell units how to evaluate, or do we trust the units to decide what is best. I feel like we are over-reaching. My suggestion is to let units and departments establish their own standards.

Robinson: I agree with Amy Sedivy-Benton. Maybe we should say that if a faculty member is unsatisfactory in 1 out of 3 categories, the matter *may* be referred to the departmental tenure committee.

Giammo: I'd be very uncomfortable with a standard that refers someone to the tenure committee for review if they are unsatisfactory in only one area in a given year.

Nolen: And such a standard would disproportionately affect women faculty, faculty with disabilities, etc.

Wright: The units themselves can still set their own standards on what level of performance is satisfactory and unsatisfactory. I urge that we vote against the amendment.

Silverstein: Can we show the Committee on Tenure's language?

Nolen: Let's not complicate the question right now

Wright moves to call the question

Motion to call the question is approved

Motion to amend section (a) fails.

Motion to approve section (a) is approved.

Discussion moves on to part (b)

Jovanovic: The motion is unclear since in many departments there is no standing tenure and promotion committee.

Nolen: The tenure committee would be formed in the same way as if the person were coming up for tenure and promotion review.

Cheatham: My concern is how we will direct departments to create language in their governance documents to state what constitutes "overall unsatisfactory."

Nolen: We don't direct promotion and tenure committees on their criteria in general.

Cheatham: We are telling them though that they need to know what those criteria are. But we haven't directed this yet.

Nolen: We set this out in part 9.

Cheatham: so should we refer to 9 here?

Wright: Basically this section directs committees themselves to set criteria for evaluating faculty referred to them for review.

Giammo: A tenure review committee acting in this circumstance might determine that a faculty member was not overall unsatisfactory based on 3 years of assessment, but in the next year if s/he is reviewed again might decide a faculty member was overall unsatisfactory.

Cheatham: I just think we are making things difficult for departments.

Nolen: This says that the chair cannot deem someone as overall unsatisfactory. Only the department tenure committee can rate someone as overall unsatisfactory.

Wright: The chair under this policy cannot given an overall unsatisfactory evaluation.

Giammo: The chair does not give an overall rating under this policy. The chair only evaluates the individual three components.

Leonard moves that the revisions to (b) be accepted

Anson seconds

Barrio-Vilar: We should add a period at the end of (b)

Without objection, the motion is amended to add a period to the end of (b).

Motion to accept b passes

Discussion moves on to (c)

Leonard moves to accept section (c)

Anson seconds the motion.

Cheatham: Using the word "should" is not appropriate for governance language. We should change "should specify" to "shall specify."

Cheatham moves to amend the motion to change "should specify" to "shall specify."

Motion to amend is seconded.

Motion to amend is approved.

Leonard moves to approve section (c) as amended.

Motion to approve is seconded.

Motion passes to accept c as approved

Comment: We have a motion on the agenda [FS_2019_3] we need to address today that we have not gotten to yet. Members of the Graduate Council have been very patient in waiting for their turn on the agenda so they can present the motion.

Wright moves to table the discussion on the remainder of Motion FS_2019-2

Motion to table is seconded

Motion to table is accepted

D. **Motion FS_2019-3. G**raduate Council (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Revision to Policy 509.19: Graduate Credit Earned by Undergraduates.

   Be it resolved to modify Policy 509.19: Graduate Credit Earned by Undergraduates to revise the 4+1 Early Entry Program description per the mark-up in Appendix D; and

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

   Commentary: As currently written, the policy restricts early entry into select graduate programs to UA Little Rock undergraduate students. Consequently, students enrolled in undergraduate programs at UAMS are not eligible for early entry into joint graduate programs. If approved, the only "select graduate program" that UAMS students would be able to apply to for early entry would be the PharmD/MBA program, because faculty from the two institutions have already worked out the joint credit arrangement. This program might be seen as a pilot, opening the door for other cross institutional early- entry programs between UA Little Rock and UAMS between our university and others in the U of A system.

   Karen Kuralt: The College of Business and UAMS offer a joint PharmD/MBA program.

UAMS offers early entry into this program. At the end of last semester, the College of Business brought a program change form to Graduate Council to that if approved would allow early entry into the joint program. Unfortunately, the policy we adopted for early entry programs restricts entry to UALR undergraduate students. We are proposing to add two words to Policy 509.19 to extend eligibility to UAMS students.

Motion is made to accept the proposed change.

Motion is seconded

Nolen: Thank you for very to Graduate Council for your patience.

Motion is approved on voice vote.

Wright makes a motion to bring FS_2019_2 off the table and onto the floor.

Motion is seconded.

Motion to un-table is approved.

Discussion resumes on Motion FS_2019-2

Nolen introduces additions to section 1.A.9 suggested by the Committee on Tenure [proposed addition in italics]:

9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service). *Notwithstanding any of the other provisions in this policy (403.3), performance of a faculty member may be found unsatisfactory in any category (teaching, research and creative activity, or service) only when the performance in that category demonstrates professional incompetence.[1]*

[1] In other words, the minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service) are the minimum criteria for performance that is not professionally incompetent.

Giammo: The proposed revision is not clear on what is meant by "professional competence". A person who teaches well but doesn't come to class is competent, but is still not satisfactory.

Silverstein: Failing to show up would be job abandonment. The standard for losing tenure should be incompetence. Each department gets to define incompetence in its own way.

Nolen: The BoT does define incompetence in terms of mental incapacity. My question is whether the Committee on Tenure is redefining incompetence.

Wright: The Committee on Tenure did not consider medical incompetence to be the same as professional incompetence.

Nolen: Are we then asking units to define incompetence? Is that in the spirt of annual review?

Anson: Has this been moved yet? I want to call the question

Leonard moves to accept the tenure committee's proposed addition to section 9

Motion is seconded

Anson moves to call the question
Motion to call the question is seconded

Motion to call the question is approved.

Motion to accept tenure committee's addition to section 9 is rejected.

Discussion moves on to the proposed addition of the Committee on Tenure to section 11a [proposed addition is in italics]:

a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories *in two consecutive years [2] or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year*, then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years' materials to assess overall performance.

   [2] The categories in which the individual is unsatisfactory can be different in the two consecutive years.

Leonard moves to accept the Committee on Tenure's addition to section 11a
Motion to accept is seconded

Silverstein: The Committee on Tenure fervently believes that unsatisfactory in two out of three categories in one year is not sufficient to trigger a post-tenure review process. Unsatisfactory in three out of three in a given year should be required to trigger post-tenure review.

Matson: But the consequence in this case is referral for review of a faculty member to the tenure committee, not dismissal. A faculty member who is rated as unsatisfactory in two out of three categories by the chair would then be evaluated by a tenure committee.

Leonard moves to call the question.

Motion to call the question is seconded.

Motion to call the question is approved.

Voice vote is held.

Jovanovic moves for Division of the Assembly.

    Ayes: 8
    Nays: 18

Motion to accept the proposed addition to 11a by the Committee on Tenure fails.

Discussion moves on to the proposed addition to section 11.c by the Committee on Tenure in Appendix C:

c. *To determine that an individual is overall unsatisfactory, the departmental tenure committee must, at minimum, determine that the individual was unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories in two consecutive years or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year.*

Jovanovic moves to accept the addition of section c from the Committee on Tenure.
Motion is accepted.

Jovanovic: If you all want to do the dirty work of helping administration fire us, go ahead. I suggest more protection by adopting the Committee on Tenure's language.

Wright: I was hoping to avoid making a long statement, but the way the system lawyers approached this, about firing faculty, is the wrong way to look at this policy. We should focus instead on post-tenure review as opportunity for faculty to get appropriate feedback and to correct performance before it becomes too late. We should not turn this into a debate about firing faculty. If we make it impossible to get on post-tenure review, we essentially make it impossible to remediate faculty.

Silverstein: I agree this is both about academic freedom and tenure and about faculty productivity and development. But on what side do we want to err? We are never going to get the balance exactly right. But we should seek first to protect tenure and academic freedom. I also don't believe the Committee on Tenure's proposed changes make it impossible to fire faculty.

Leonard moves to call the question

Wright seconds the motion to call the question.

Motion to call the question is approved.

Voice vote unclear.

Nolen calls for division of the assembly

    Ayes: 13
    Nays: 10

Motion to adopt 11.c as recommended by the Committee on Tenure passes.

Discussion moves on to the proposed addition from the Committee on Tenure to section 11.d in Appendix C:

d. *The chairperson's evaluation of unsatisfactory in a category may be appealed to the departmental tenure committee. If the departmental tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's performance in the category is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's performance in that category shall be deemed satisfactory.*

Leonard moves to accept the Committee on Tenure's proposed addition in 11.d.

Motion is seconded.

Matson: I'm not sure I understand it. Isn't this redundant?

Wright: This would provide a way for a faculty member to appeal an unsatisfactory rating in a particular category to the tenure committee.

Jovanovic: I see this as an additional protection. If you get an unsatisfactory from a chair, it gives you a way to launch a formal appeal to the tenure committee.

Barrio-Vilar: But this almost makes the chairperson's evaluation moot.

Jovanovic: No, it gives the tenure committee a veto over the chair's evaluation.

Smith: Would this apply to evaluation of tenure-stream faculty or to all full-time faculty?

Nolen: It applies to all full-time faculty.

Silverstein: A tenure committee is a more appropriate appeals committee than a peer review committee because a peer review committee might have untenured members who are more vulnerable to pressure from a chair.

Motion is made to call the question.

Motion to call the question is seconded.

Motion to call the question is approved.

Motion to adopt section 11.d is approved.

Discussion moves on to the proposed revision from the Committee on Tenure on 11.e in appendix C:

e. *For a departmental tenure committee to determine that an individual's performance in any category is unsatisfactory, a minimum of sixty percent of the committee must vote in favor of a finding of unsatisfactory performance in that category.*

Wright moves to accept the revision proposed by the Committee on Tenure in 11.e.

Cheatham seconds.

Matson: I am against this motion. This provision is too detailed and intrusive to the department.

Jovanovic: I'd like to commend the Committee on Tenure for doing their best to protect faculty. None of this prevents faculty from being fired.

Jovanovic moves to amend the proposed revision in section 11.e. from "a minimum of sixty percent" to "a minimum of two-thirds."

Tramel seconds.

Nolen calls for a vote on the motion to amend.

Voice vote is held.

Nolen calls for division of the assembly

Ayes: 11
Nays: 15

Motion to amend fails

Wright calls the question on the proposed revision in 11.e
Leonard seconds the motion to call the question.

Motion to call the question is approved.

Voice vote is held.

Nolen calls for division of the assembly.

Ayes:15
Nays: 10

Motion to accept the Committee on Tenure's revision in 11.e. is approved

Discussion moves to the proposed revision of the title of section 11 from the Committee on Tenure (proposed revision in italics):

Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category, Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-tenure Review

Wright: I move we change the title in 11 as suggested by Committee on Tenure
Motion is seconded.

Motion is accepted on voice vote.

Wright moves to call the question on FS_2019-2

Motion to call the question is seconded.

Motion to call the question is approved.

Motion FS_2019_2 as amended passes [see Appendix G for the motion as amended].

IX.   Open Forum

No discussion

X. **Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 4:46 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 502.6 International Student Requirements

Requirements
…
4. Proof of English Language Proficiency for Undergraduate/Post-Baccalaureate International Students

Applicants whose native language is not English must submit proof of English language and academic skill proficiency before admission to UA Little Rock. All other admission criteria must be met. Students may satisfy the English language requirement in one of the following ways:

- A score of at least ~~525 (paper-based) or 71 (iBT)~~ 61 iBT earned within the last two years on the Test of English as a Foreign Language Internet Based-Test (TOEFL iBT) (UA Little Rock Code is 6368); or
- A score of at least 6 on the IELTS earned within the last two years; or
- Completion of Composition I and II at a regionally accredited post-secondary U.S. institution with a grade of C or better; or
- Attendance at a U.S. school for the past six years; or
- Successful completion of the UA Little Rock Intensive English Language Program through the final level; or
- An official ACT score of at least ~~21~~ 19 on both the English and Reading sections of ACT earned with the last five years; or
- An official SAT score of at least ~~510 Critical Reading and 490 Writing~~ 330 SAT ERW; or
- Citizenship of an exempt country: Canada (except Quebec), Ireland, United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, or the Commonwealth Caribbean.

Appendix C: Policy 403.3 Annual Review Proposals from Executive Committee and Committee on Tenure

Executive Committee Proposal:

I. Annual Faculty Review

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

...

    4. ~~Peer evaluation;~~ Each academic unit shall establish procedures to provide its faculty the opportunity to participate in the annual review of their peers. Except as set forth in this policy, no particular system of peer review is prescribed. Academic units are encouraged to develop a peer review system that is consistent with the unit's faculty resources, the particular expertise of the unit's faculty members, and practices within the discipline.

        a. Solely by way of illustration, a unit might choose to create a separate peer review committee. Alternatively, a unit might allocate the peer review process to the unit's promotion and tenure committee. A unit might also decide to have all full-time faculty participate in the peer review process for members of that unit.

        b. Faculty participating in the peer review process shall provide feedback to the chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed. This feedback may take the form of a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service, or it may take some other form, such as feedback regarding specific performance tasks. Examples of the latter include a review of a published article or a review of a peer's teaching based upon a classroom visit.

        c. If an academic unit forms a peer review committee, the following principles govern:
            i. Membership eligibility for annual review committees shall be defined by each academic unit. The composition of these committees should represent the diverse composition of the unit in gender, race, and academic interests when possible.
            ii. If a representative committee of faculty from within the unit cannot be formed, then the department chair or equivalent shall form the committee with eligible and representative faculty across the college following approved procedures to develop a pool of eligible faculty from both within and outside UA Little Rock.

...

    6. Prior to the chairperson's making a recommendation in any year, the following shall occur:
        a. A meeting between the chairperson and faculty member to discuss all issues relating to the review,
        b. The providing to that faculty member a copy of the chairperson's tentative recommendation(s), and
        c. Reasonable opportunity for the faculty member to submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review.
        d. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, or service), the chairperson shall provide a written recommendation for

43	improvement and, when appropriate, a commitment of resources to be part of the subsequent
44	year's annual evaluation.
45	e. The faculty member and chairperson shall acknowledge that this meeting has transpired by
46	signature.
47	...
48	8. The following documents shall be available to each faculty member: all writings used in or
49	resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member including any writings relating to
50	the peer evaluation.
51	
52	9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category
53	(teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service).
54	
55	10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on
56	teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.
57	
58	11. Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-tenure Review
59	a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories,
60	then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the
61	previous three years' materials to assess overall performance.
62	b. If the departmental tenure committee determines the individual is overall unsatisfactory,
63	then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated. If the department tenure committee
64	does not determine that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, then
65	the faculty member's overall performance shall be deemed satisfactory
66	c. The unit's operating procedures should specify the scope of materials for review, the
67	voting procedures, and the method of voting.

68   Committee on Tenure Proposed Substitution for items 9, 10, and 11 (Red text
69   indicates where the CoT has added text to the Exec. Cmte's proposal:

70	
71	9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category
72	(teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service). Notwithstanding any of the other
73	provisions in this policy (403.3), performance of a faculty member may be found
74	unsatisfactory in any category (teaching, research and creative activity, or service) only when
75	the performance in that category demonstrates professional incompetence.[1]
76	
77	10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching,
78	scholarly and creative activity, and service.
79	
80	11. Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category, Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-tenure Review
81	a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of the 3 categories
82	in two consecutive years[2] or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year, then the matter is
83	referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years'
84	materials to assess overall performance.
85	b. If the departmental tenure committee determines the individual is overall
86	unsatisfactory[3], then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated. If the
87	departmental tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's overall

88 performance is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's overall performance shall be
89 deemed satisfactory.
90 c. To determine that an individual is overall unsatisfactory, the departmental tenure
91 committee must, at minimum, determine that the individual was unsatisfactory in 2 out
92 of the 3 categories in two consecutive years or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year.
93 d. The chairperson's evaluation of unsatisfactory in a category may be appealed to the
94 departmental tenure committee. If the departmental tenure committee does not
95 determine that the faculty member's performance in the category is unsatisfactory, then
96 the faculty member's performance in that category shall be deemed satisfactory.
97 e. For a departmental tenure committee to determine that an individual's performance in
98 any category is unsatisfactory, a minimum of sixty percent of the committee must vote
99 in favor of a finding of unsatisfactory performance in that category.
100 f. The unit's operating procedures should specify the scope of materials for review, the
101 voting procedures, and the method of voting.
102

103
104

105 [1] In other words, the minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching,
106 scholarly and creative activity, and service) are the minimum criteria for performance that is not
107 professionally incompetent.
108 [2] The categories in which the individual is unsatisfactory can be different in the two consecutive
109 years.
110 [3] In the evaluation of an overall unsatisfactory, the department tenure committee is not constrained to
111 uphold or reject the chair's evaluation in each category, but rather forms an independent assessment of
112 the individual's performance.

113
114

Appendix D: Graduate Credit Earned by Undergraduates

4+1 Early Entry Program

Description: Exceptional UALR **and UAMS** undergraduate students may apply and be accepted to select graduate programs and begin working toward their graduate degree while completing their baccalaureate degree. The 4+1 early entry program will allow participating students to combine their undergraduate studies with related graduate-level work. Additionally, it will enable them to complete their graduate degree in a shorter amount of time than the traditional path.

Admissions Requirements:
- Undergraduate students may apply and be accepted any time after completing 75 or more hours of undergraduate coursework. However, at least 90 hours of undergraduate coursework must have been completed by the time the first graduate course is taken.
- All applicants must have at least a 3.2 overall GPA.
- All applicants must complete an application for and be accepted into the desired graduate program and the UALR Graduate School.
- All applicants must complete an Early-Entry Program form and have it approved by the graduate coordinator and the Graduate School. This form must be approved before the student begins graduate coursework. Failure to obtain prior approval negates the ability to "double count" courses. Specific programs may have more rigorous admissions criteria. The student should contact the desired program to determine these requirements before applying.

Graduate Credit:
- Once accepted into a graduate program, students can take up to 12 hours of graduate coursework, which will count towards both the baccalaureate degree and the graduate degree. Individual graduate programs may allow fewer graduate hours to be taken at the undergraduate level; students should check with their prospective program to determine these limits.
- Students must finish their baccalaureate degrees before they complete 15 hours of graduate coursework.

Program Restrictions:
- To ensure that they follow the proper degree plan, students must meet with a graduate-level advisor upon acceptance to the 4+1 program to map out the graduate courses they will take.
- Accepted students will have provisional status in the graduate program, pending the award of their baccalaureate degree.

    If, at the end of his/her baccalaureate degree, a 4+1 student has failed to meet the Graduate School admission requirement of a 3.0 overall undergraduate GPA with no grades below a B, she/he will be dismissed from the graduate program.
- Students accepted into the 4+1 program will be subject to the same policies as traditionally matriculated graduate students.
- The 4+1 program may not be used in conjunction with the credit reservation program; therefore, no graduate courses taken before admission to the 4+1 program may be applied to a graduate degree.

Appendix E: Chancellor's Budget Reduction Handout

University of Arkansas at Little Rock
FY19 Budget Reduction Items
As of October 17, 2018

Completed Expense Reductions:	Fall 2018	
Eliminated Empty Positions	3,907,859	(1)
Spring Lecturer Budgets	250,000	(2)
1st Quarter Lapsed Salaries	229,360	(3)
10% Maintenance Holdback	1,457,109	(4)
UALR Works Reduction	250,000	(5)
Discontinue Campus Shuttle Service	200,000	(6)
Scholarship Savings	1,000,000	(7)
Total Completed Expense Reductions		7,294,328

Planned Expense Reductions	Spring 2019	
Additional Lapsed Salaries	750,000	(8)
Fringe Benefits Savings	500,000	(9)
Energy Adjustments	50,000	(10)
Total Planned Expense Reductions		1,300,000

Planned Expense Reductions & New Revenues	Fall 2019	
Elimination of UALR Works	150,000	(11)
Administrative Restructuring & Other Salary Reductions	515,000	(12)
Visiting Faculty & Operation Cutbacks	322,000	(13)
New Housing Revenue	235,000	(14)
Total Planned Expense Reductions		1,222,000

Total Completed and Planned Expense Reductions and New Revenues		9,816,328

See attached for explanation.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock
Budget Reduction Detail

1. **Eliminated Empty Positions:** The University eliminated 35 faculty positions and 52 non-faculty (staff) positions that were previously in the approved budget. An important step in downsizing to match our falling enrollment.

2. **Spring Lecturer Budgets:** Reduced the lecturer budget for the Spring semester ($250K for this semester and carried through into salary reductions for Fall 2019. Current tenured and tenure-track faculty will now teach these classes.

3. **Lapsed Salaries:** Lapsed salaries are amounts on budget salaried position that were not filled for a period of time as a results of the employee's delayed employment, separation, reassignment, sabbatical leave or unpaid leave of absence. On a quarterly basis, the university pulls these unobligated amounts from the budget. There were $229,360 in lapsed salaries during the first quarter of FY19. Additional lapsed salaries will be realized in Spring 2019 (see 8 below)

4. **Maintenance Holdback:** The University reduced all maintenance budgets (amounts for everything other than salaries) by 10%. This yielded savings of $1,457,109. Certain expense categories for items like utilities, insurance, legal expenses, system charges and ERP expenses are not included in this reduction. This is a permanent reduction.

5. **Reduction of UALR Works:** This program is a form of work-study allowing students to earn up to 20h of employment. The program was started using State dollars in FY16 modeled after the federal work-study program. This is budgeted for $400,000 annually and by phasing out, it will save $250,000 in the current fiscal year and an additional $150,000 in the Fall 2019.

6. **Discontinue Campus Shuttle:** The campus shuttle service was launched as a safety measure but had turned into more of a taxi service on campus so is being eliminated. Campus police are now providing any requested escorts during the evening hours after classes. Permanent saving of $200,000.

7. **Scholarship Savings:** The only advantage of a drop in enrollment is savings in scholarships awarded. The university was able to reduce its institutionally funded scholarship budget by $1,000,000. Assuming enrollment stays flat for 2019/20, this savings will continue.

NOTE – the above actions have been carried out this Fall and the amount to permanent, expense reduction totals $7,294,328.

8. **Additional Lapsed Salaries:** See "3" above. It is conservatively estimated that the University will have an additional $750,000 in lapsed salaries in the remaining 3 quarters of FY19. Since these savings were not budgeted, they represent a reduction that applies to the $9 million shortfall.

9. **Fringe Benefits Savings:** With the reduction in positons stated in "1" above, there will be at least $500,000 in fringe benefits that will be realized later this year.

10. **Energy Adjustments:** The University had implemented set back schedules in certain non-

classroom buildings that should produce a $50,000 savings, at a minimum.

11. **Elimination of UALR Works**: See "5" above. This is eliminating the remainder of the UALR Works program ($150,000)

12. **Administrative Restructuring and Other Salary Reductions**: In addition to continuing the $250,000 reduction in lecturer budget (adjunct faculty, item 2), a range of administrative changes are being made. For example, eliminating an associate dean, reducing management and marketing chairs, and trimming $50,000 from Provost's Instructional Reserve. Total savings $515,000.

13. **Visiting Faculty and Operation Cutbacks**: The University will not renew its subscription to Civitas (software for student progress) and will instead utilize our new data warehouse that was recently implemented, and performs a similar function. Two visiting faculty positons will not be renewed in 2019/20 and operational reductions include reducing equipment matches in external grant proposals.

14. **New Housing Revenue**: Beginning Fall 2019, 50 incoming athletes will be required to live in campus accommodation for two years. This will generate $235,000 for our auxiliaries.

NOTE – when completed – planned expense reductions total $9,816,328

UA LITTLE ROCK Downtown

UA Little Rock Downtown, located at 333 President Clinton Avenue, is designed to engage the community, to facilitate conversation and to address regional issues and solutions through programs to evolve with the changing needs of central Arkansas.

The UA Little Rock Downtown facility comprises two distinct spaces, a museum-quality room housing the Joe Jones Mural "The Struggle of the South," and a multi-purpose room looking out on President Clinton Avenue suitable for receptions, lectures, and meetings. The two spaces are separated by doors.

Due to the historic and sensitive nature of the Joe Jones mural, events that make use of the reception rooms must clarify their purposes when applying to reserve the Downtown space. UA Little Rock seeks to maintain a respectful and educational learning space in the Mural Room; therefore, if a proposed use of the Reception Room will be potentially light-hearted or unrelated to the themes of the Mural Room, the doors to the Mural Room must be closed. Events that demonstrate a need or a synergy with the themes of the Mural Room may use the entire space— examples might be a lecture on artistic archival research or a class in Arkansas History.

Capacity—UA Little Rock Downtown's reception room holds 80 guests for classroom settings and 200 guests for other events.

Parking—The nearest parking spaces at the CALS Plaza Parking Garage right next door (entrance on Rock Street) For more information on parking please visit: https://www.rivermarket.info/parking-transportation

Priorities of Use—The following activities will receive equal weighting in their requests for reserving the space.

	MON	TUES	WED	THUR	FRI	SAT
8a-11a	Half-day or	Meetings for UA Little Rock and local business groups (open doors/no services)				Community, Careers, and Extended Education Classes
11-1p	All-day Meetings	Open to the public				
1p-4p	by reservation (closed to the public)	Open to the public, including school groups				
4-9p *6-7p	Community, Careers, and Extended Education Classes	*UA Little Rock Downtown Program- Faculty Lectures	Receptions (one-time events)			

DIRECTOR: ROSS OWYONG   rlowyoung@ualr.edu

Appendix G: Motion FS_2019_2 AS AMENDED AND ADOPTED

Motion FS_2019_2 [AS AMENDED]. Executive Committee and Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Revision to Policy 403.3 Annual Review Policy.

1. **Be it resolved** by the Executive Committee and the Committee on Tenure to modify the Annual Review Policy (403.3) (approved 4/20/1990, modified by FS_2017_4) per the mark-up in Appendix C (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion); and

   Be it further resolved that upon approval, implementation of changes to policy 403.3 will be effective as of July 2019.

2. **Be it resolved** by the Committee on Tenure to amend FS_2018_25 to revise items 9 through 11 as indicated in the mark-up in Appendix C (indicated in red).

   Commentary: The Executive Committee and the Committee on Tenure considered proposed changes to Policy 403.3 Annual Review of Faculty and have brought language that is agreed upon by both committees (indicated by black underlined text). In addition, the Committee on Tenure is bringing additional language to add to the jointly agreed upon language (indicated by red underlined text).

Appendix C: Policy 403.3. Annual Review Proposals from Executive Committee and Committee on Tenure

I. Annual Faculty Review

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

…

4. ~~Peer evaluation~~. Each academic unit shall establish procedures to provide its faculty the opportunity to participate in the annual review of their peers. Except as set forth in this policy, no particular system [1] of peer review is prescribed. Academic units are encouraged to develop a peer review system that is consistent with the unit's faculty resources, the particular expertise of the unit's faculty members, and practices within the discipline.

   a. Feedback from the peer review process will be provided to the chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed [2].

   b. If an academic unit forms a peer review committee, the following principles govern:

      i. Membership eligibility for peer review committees shall be defined by each academic unit. As much as possible, the composition of these committees should represent the diversity of faculty within the unit.

      ii. The unit's governance document shall include procedures for developing a pool of eligible faculty if a committee from within the unit cannot be formed.

…

6. Prior to the chairperson's making a recommendation in any year, the following shall occur:

a. A meeting between the chairperson and faculty member to discuss all issues relating to the review;

b. The providing to that faculty member a copy of the chairperson's tentative recommendation(s), and

c. Reasonable opportunity for the faculty member to submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review.

d. If the faculty member receives an unsatisfactory rating in any category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, or service), the chairperson shall provide a written recommendation for improvement and, when appropriate, a commitment of resources to be part of the subsequent year's annual evaluation.

e. The faculty member and chairperson shall acknowledge that this meeting has transpired by signature.

…

8. The following documents shall be available to each faculty member: all writings used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member including any writings relating to the peer evaluation.

9. Each unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service).

10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

11. Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category, Overall Unsatisfactory Rating and Post-Tenure Review

a. If the chairperson evaluates the individual as unsatisfactory in 2 out of 3 categories, then the matter is referred to the departmental tenure committee who will review the previous three years' materials to assess overall performance.

b. If the departmental tenure committee determines the individual is overall unsatisfactory, then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated. If the department tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's overall performance is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's overall performance shall be deemed satisfactory.

c. To determine that an individual is overall unsatisfactory, the departmental tenure committee must, at minimum, determine that the individual was unsatisfactory in 2 out of 3 categories in two consecutive years or in 3 out of the 3 categories in one year.

d. The chairperson's evaluation of unsatisfactory in a category may be appealed to the departmental tenure committee. If the departmental tenure committee does not determine that the faculty member's performance in the category is unsatisfactory, then the faculty member's performance in that category shall be deemed satisfactory.

e. For a departmental tenure committee to determine that an individual's performance in any category is unsatisfactory, a minimum of sixty percent of the committee must vote in favor of a finding of unsatisfactory performance in that category.

f. The unit's operating procedures shall specify the scope of materials for review, the voting procedures, and the method of voting.

[1] Solely by way of illustration, a unit might choose to create a separate peer review committee. Alternatively, a unit might allocate the peer review process to the unit's promotion and tenure committee. A unit might also decide to have all full-time faculty participate in the peer review process for members of that unit.

[2] This feedback may take the form of a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service, or it may take some other form, such as feedback regarding specific performance tasks. Examples of the latter include a review of a published article or a review of a peer's teaching based upon a classroom visit.