



## FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Agenda Friday, March 29,  
2019, 1:00 p.m.  
Ledbetter Rooms B & C, Donaghey Student  
Center

### **I. Welcome and Roll Call**

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

Secretary Craw calls the roll

*Present:* **CALS** – Al-Shukri, Anson, Barrio-Vilar, Cheatham, Deiser, Heil, LeGrand, Nguyen, Smith, Stone. **CB** --- Felan, Hendon, Leonard, Woolridge. **CEHP** --- Fletcher, Grover, Otters, Riley, Sedivy-Benton, VanderPutten. **CSSC** --- Craw, Flinn, Golden, Jensen, Matson. **CEIT** --- DeAngelis, Milanova, Tramel. **LIBRARY** --- Macheak. **LAW** ---Boles, Cain. **EX OFFICIO** --- Drale, Nolen, Rogerson, Wright.

*Absent:* **CALS** –Condran, Douglas Law. **CB** --- None. **CEHP** --- Franklin, Reeves. **CSSC** --- Belvins-Knabe, Giammo, Scranton **CEIT** – Jovanovic, McMillan. **LIBRARY** --- None. **LAW** ---Foster. **EX OFFICIO** --- Faller, Dicus.

### **II. Review of Minutes (February 22, 2019)**

Sen. Cheatham moves to accept the Senate's February 22 minutes as presented.

Sen. Anson seconds the motion.

Motion to accept the minutes passes.

### **III. Announcements**

Natalie Snow (Criminal Justice): Take Back the Night Event on Wednesday, April 10 in Ledbetter Hall. Community organizations and law enforcement will be participating. I have flyers you can distribute in your classes if you like.

Nolen: Saturday, April 13 will be the Out of the Darkness campus walk for suicide prevention. For the second year in a row, the Faculty Senate has challenged the Staff Senate on who can raise more money at this event. Staff Senate won the trophy last year and I would like for Faculty Senate to win it back from them this year.

DeAngelis: The Sustainability Committee will be hosting an Earth Day event on Monday, April 22nd from 10:00 to 2:00. The event includes tours of the campus garden and free document shredding and disposal.

#### **IV. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)**

Wright: The Senate voted to receive the Institutional Effectiveness Committee report in February. It seems to me that we should vote to adopt the report's recommendations rather than just receiving them. I would like to add an item on the agenda to adopt the IEC's recommendations.

Nolen: We will add that to New Business.

Anson: I don't know if these are new topics or grievances. First, when will the construction at Stabler Hall end? Second, I noticed that the upcoming year's calendar calls for Monday-Wednesday-Friday classes to meet the week after Thanksgiving, but not Tuesday-Thursday classes, creating a sort of Dead Week before finals. Was this intentional? I am happy to see that.

Nolen: I will look into this.

Barrio-Vilar: I have safety concerns about the demolition work happening at Stabler Hall. The work is limiting access to the English Department for people with disabilities.

DeAngelis: Has there been any movement to revisit the idea of creating a day care center on or near campus? Lots of our students are parents.

Sedivy-Benton: This would be timely since the city is trying to do more in promoting day care. There might be some synergy on this matter.

Anson: We used to have a campus day care center. The Education School and Psychology Department worked with the center for education research.

Angela Hunter: There is an ad hoc group, Trojans with Children, working on the day care issue. We are looking for grants and other solutions to get some ideas on solving this problem.

#### **V. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)**

## **VI. Reports**

### **A. Executive Committee – Amanda Nolen**

Nolen: In keeping with the University Assembly Constitution, the Executive Committee conducted a Census of the faculty to apportion representation on the Senate. In consultation with deans and unit heads, we obtained the following counts of full-time faculty by college:

CALS: 119

CEHP: 100

EIT: 55

COB: 41

CSSC: 80

Law: 28

Library: 9

432 total (net increase of 11 full-time faculty compared to 2017).

Nolen: This morning, the Executive Committee distributed a memo to the Faculty Senate concerning the dining situation in the Donaghey Student Center. The memo calls for a reconfiguration of the dining area and calls for healthier and a la carte dining options.

Past-President Wright moves to adopt the dining memo

Cheatham asks to amend the memo to also call for all the doors in the dining area to be re-opened.

Without objection, the amendment to the memo is adopted.

Motion to adopt the dining memo as amended passes.

Nolen: In the next month, the Executive Committee will work with the Governance Committee to apply new tenure, promotion, and annual review guidelines to the generic governance document. In addition, we will develop guidance on the procedure for external review for units that want to use external review in promotion and tenure.

Nolen: In January, the Senate charged Executive Committee with investigating the feasibility of launching a faculty union. We researched various resources in this investigation, including The National Council of Higher Education, the National Education Association, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) (Faculty Forward Initiative), the American Federation of Teachers. We also reached out to Sean Huss, president the Arkansas chapter of the American Association of University Professors

(AAUP), and Cathy Koehler, president of the Arkansas Education Association. The three largest unions are SEIU, NEA, and AFT. There has been a lot of movement over the past ten years to unionize in higher education, but this has mostly focused on adjunct and contingent faculty and graduate students. Most full time faculty are not part of a union. Benefits include advocacy and representation on bargaining. Unions also advocate on higher education to legislatures. University of Arkansas policy is vague on collective bargaining. The guidance we found states that the Board of Trustee does not have authority to collectively bargain with unions. That power is reserved for the legislature. So that raises a question of whether and how a union could bargain on behalf of the faculty. The most direct advice I have heard from others is that faculty in the UA System have not laid the groundwork yet in coalition building needed to make a union work.

Executive committee is not making a recommendation since that was not our charge. It is worth discussing, but may not be a panacea. We also need to be realistic that unionizing comes at a cost. It may threaten the authority of the Faculty Senate and its partnership with administration. I recommend we continue to work on shared governance.

#### **B. Chancellor's Report – Andrew Rogerson**

Rogerson: On the daycare matter, a donor has funded a study on launching a pre-k education facility near campus. The donors are interested in seeing this happen, and it is in coordination with Michael Poore and the City of Little Rock. If it were successful, it would be open to children of faculty, staff and students.

I wanted to make sure we don't forget some of the good things we do. Last year we graduated 2062 students, including 109 doctoral students and 384 masters or graduate certificate students. We produce the highest percentage of doctoral students in the state relative to our total student body. We are a driver of economic development in this city. Only 14% of our degrees were associate degrees.

At the assembly, I plan to offer a draft enrollment plan, a draft retention plan, and a plan for reorganizing Student Affairs.

DeAngelis: Arkansas Tech is awarding associates degrees to bachelor-degree students along the way. This might be appealing to many students.

Anson: Emphasis should be on recruitment in the enrollment plan

Hendon: Could you give us an update on the Institutional Effectiveness Committee report?

Rogerson: We held a cabinet retreat during which we looked at 61 programs who scored below a 2 on the IEC ratings. We made decisions on which one needed more data and examination. Ten programs have been given to the Provost to look at. We are planning to do these evaluations in these in bunches of ten programs each. We are also using the IEC

reports to guide the restructuring of Student Affairs.

Hendon: Are you planning on talking about this at assembly?

Rogerson: Yes

Robinson: Regarding day care, UAMS is also looking at providing day care. Maybe we can collaborate with them on this.

### C. Provost's Report – Christy Drale

Drale: Since 2017, we have had 25 interim administrative positions. Nine of these have been fully resolved, five searches are under way, and eleven are unresolved. We hope that the five ongoing searches will result in hires. Three of these searches are dean's searches, plus an upcoming search for the College of Business dean (Dean Wayland is expected to retire in December). I will be posting information about the searches on the Provost Office website. The CSSC and COB Dean searches will be external and the CALS and graduate school dean searches will be internal. We hope to fill these by July 1. I am more confident about this for the internal searches. We decided on making a search internal or external based on surveys of the faculty, and I honored those votes in these decisions. For graduate school dean, we decided we need to act quickly, so we decided to make that search internal. For the COB dean search, we have fewer chairs who could serve as Dean and so we decided that we need to look outside of UA Little Rock. Law School Dean Terri Beiner is chairing the CSSC dean search committee, Ann Bain (CEHP Dean) is chairing the CALS dean search committee, and Deborah Baldwin will chair the COB search committee,

We are planning to do evaluations for university administrators this year. The last time we did these evaluations was in 2015. The Chancellor's office will administer surveys for the vice-chancellor evaluations, and the Provost's office will administer surveys for academic affairs personnel. We are aiming to distribute questionnaires to faculty by the end of April.

Daryl Rice has completed a draft of his retention report. The report identifies sixteen areas of university operations that affect retention, including tutoring, advising, and admissions. The report lists sixty-four action items. We plan to discuss our preliminary decisions on this report at the University Assembly.

We plan to get going on approving unit governance documents, but I just haven't been able to get to them yet. It is still on my list though. I will try to get to them by end of April.

Robinson: One of our Ph.D. students was denied a key to her office and building recently. Does this reflect a change in policy, i.e. the Provost's Office will no longer approve keys for students?

Drale: We won't issue keys to one person with the intention of distributing those keys to others. If the student has an office and is conducting university business there, we will issue keys. But I want to avoid issuing keys to a person who does not have total control over them.

Barrio-Vilar: Are there any updates on the campus climate survey that you planned on conducting?

Drale: I believe that is something coming from the Diversity Council.

Nolen: We are in the process of developing a student climate survey. I'm putting together people to participate in the process. A faculty/staff climate survey is still in the works.

Cheatham: Once we get the information about the dean's searches, could you send it to the faculty?

Drale: Yes

#### **D. Undergraduate Council – Mike Tramel**

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

Tramel: Be advised that we have revised the curriculum change form and instructions.

#### **E. Graduate Council – Karen Kuralt**

Nolen: The Graduate Council's report is on the Faculty Senate web page.

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

Nolen: The Core Council's report is done but not yet visible on the Faculty Senate website. We will try to fix that. Mike DeAngelis, anything to add?

DeAngelis: No.

#### **G. Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee - Rene Shroat Lewis (Appendix A)**

Nolen: At the November meeting, the Senate voted to ask the Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee to investigate the feasibility of a fall break and make a recommendation on

the matter.

Rene Lewis: I want to thank Malissa Mathis and John Leonard. We have reviewed the academic calendars to consider two fall break options: a split break (a Thursday-Friday October break and a Wednesday-Friday Thanksgiving break) and a full one-week break in November at Thanksgiving. We recommend that the Faculty Senate approve a one-week break in November for these reasons:

- 1) A Thursday and Friday Thanksgiving break does not benefit students taking Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday classes
- 2) A split break also requires an earlier start to the semester, and so bleeds into administrative meetings in the week before classes.
- 3) Little Rock School District and North Little Rock School District take all of Thanksgiving week off, so the split break burdens faculty who have children in school
- 4) A split break doesn't give enough time for student athletes and out of state students to travel
- 5) In a split break Mondays and Tuesday classes during Thanksgiving week are poorly attended.
- 6) According to the Student Government Association (SGA), most professors cancel classes on Monday and Tuesday during a split break, which might cause problems with ADHE.
- 7) SGA supports a full week break in November

Barrio-Villar: Why did the committee investigate a Thursday-Friday October break rather than a Monday-Tuesday October break?

Lewis: We asked the student representative on the committee, and that person preferred Thursday-Friday to Monday-Tuesday.

Tramel: I asked my students, and they want the whole week in November so they can work and earn money.

DeAngelis: My students also unanimously support a full week in November, mostly for child care reasons (accommodating the LRSD/NLRSD school schedules). We need to be sure to pick dates that are most friendly to students.

Matson: I have some qualms about using student preference data. Seems very random. My students were complaining about not having an October break when other campuses in Arkansas do. We need to consider what they do. Fayetteville does a Monday-Tuesday October break.

Barrio-Villar: My students also say they want an October break. We should be able to allow students with children to bring those children to class on days when UA Little Rock is in session but the LRSD/NLRSD are not.

Rene Lewis: Does university insurance cover children? Might pose a liability issue for the university to allow students to bring children to class.

Anson: Rather than pay attention to Fayetteville, we should pay attention to what's going on in Central Arkansas. UCA does take a week-long break in November. Moreover, we should respect the wishes of SGA since they represent the student body.

Hendon: If we consider a split break, we should do Monday-Tuesday in October rather than Thursday-Friday. Also, I have never had a colleague tell students they can take off on Monday or Tuesday of Thanksgiving week.

DeAngelis: Any formal response from students should come from SGA and they support a week Thanksgiving break.

Wright: I think I have four points now. Under a split break, the semester would need to start earlier. I wanted to mention that official policy on number of days in the semester is now in the credit hour policy. Board of Trustees policy was rescinded, and there is no ADHE policy. We need to follow actual policy and not legendary policy. Moreover, we are making a lot of anecdotal claims. If we are going to use student learning as a criterion, we should try to measure it. Finally, when my students came to a year with October break, it threw them off. It was less an issue of whether the break was split or consolidated, it was the change that happens every year. Changing the nature of the break is what is disruptive to students.

Craw: Can we incorporate both breaks into the calendar?

Lewis: We haven't investigated that.

Barrio-Villar: I want to thank the Calendar Committee and helping us consider these issues.

DeAngelis: At what point do calendars need to be set?

Lewis: We are not looking at fall 2019. That calendar is already set. We have a full week Thanksgiving break this coming fall. The calendar for academic year 2020-2021 has also been approved, but the break could be altered.

DeAngelis: What is the deadline for adopting a calendar?

Mathis: I'd like to see us adopt a 3 year calendar that we don't go back and revise.

Finzer: Can you talk about the financial aid implications for the calendar?

Mathis: We currently have 22 dates we have to insert into the system. Every time we make a change, all these dates also need to change. It takes a lot of time and effort. The fact that



our calendars change often also does not look good for HLC accreditation. They would like us to adopt a policy and stay consistent with it.

Cheatham: Just to make clear, the recommendation is to keep the calendar as it is now?

Mathis: Yes

Cheatham: I just want to make sure the minutes reflect that.

Deiser: Keeping a week-long break in the fall add some consistency since we have a similar week-long break in the spring.

Lewis: One problem is we can't move Thanksgiving

Matson: I think it is important to keep the current calendar. But next time we revisit this we should seriously consider a fall break. SGA is not a representative body, in the sense of representing the whole student body. We need to address this more systematically in the future. For now though, we should not be changing an already approved calendar.

Nolen: What data would be persuasive?

Barrio-Villar: A campus wide survey. SGA representatives speak for themselves, not the students

Nolen: What kind of response rate would be convincing for this body? My point is that if the input of the SGA, the elected representative body for the students is not sufficient, I am not certain that a survey could be convincing either. The SGA reps are on these committees as representatives for the student body.

We need to bring this report to a close. You have heard the recommendations from the Calendar Committee. Is there a motion anyone would like to take at this time? [No motion is made.] Hearing none, we will conclude the report and the Fall Break for 2021 will remain in November.

#### **H. Governance Committee - Rosalie Cheatham/Andrew Wright**

Cheatham: The Governance Committee has distributed its draft revision of the faculty handbook. Some of the formatting in this document may appear to be odd. Note that this document is a compilation of policies and NOT a new policy. The committee has worked over three years to review all the relevant policies and make sure they are accurate. It has been a daunting task to update a document last adopted in 2000. The task is complicated because some policies change frequently. Want to produce a document that is accurate as of end of spring 2019. Then we recommend that Senate update the faculty handbook every two years.

Cheatham moves to suspend the rules so the Senate can consider a motion to adopt the faculty handbook proposed by the Governance Committee.

Tramel seconds motion to suspend the rules

Motion to suspend the rules passes.

Cheatham moves to adopt the faculty handbook, including revisions made later in this academic year.

Motion is on behalf of the governance committee (no second needed).

Wright suggests that the motion be to publish rather than adopt the faculty handbook.  
Revision is accepted.

DeAngelis: Just to understand, you are suggesting the handbook be distributed as a paper document?

Cheatham: We are proposing a printed version and an updateable online version.

DeAngelis: We need to find a way to make it easy to use

Cheatham: There is a table of contents.

DeAngelis: I'm concerned about dead links in an online version

Cheatham: We share those concerns. The purpose of the two-year review is to monitor changes in policy and in the links on the document.

Wright: One more comment: It has been 18 years since a handbook update, and with HLC accreditation review coming up we need to go forward quickly.

Anson moves to call the question

Nolen calls for a vote.

Motion to publish the faculty handbook passes.

Nolen: Update on Stabler Hall. Current work will be completed by May 15. But there will be some additional epoxy coating work that will go through June 30.

## **VII. Old Business – None**

## **VIII. New Business**

Wright moves to suspend rules so the Faculty Senate can consider adopting recommendations made in the Institutional Effectiveness Committee (IEC) report.

Motion to suspend the rules passes.

Wright moves that the Senate adopt the executive committee's memo on the IEC report.

Hendon: Could we review that memo?

Nolen: The Executive Committee distributed this memo at the February Faculty Senate meeting.

Nolen reviews the Executive Committee memo.

Anson seconds the motion to adopt.

Hendon: Nothing in the IEC recommendations that says faculty will not have ownership over faculty matters like single-person programs. However, we should note that single-person programs signal a larger organizational problem. That is why IEC recommended that all such programs be reviewed.

Wright: That is the recommendation of the Executive Committee as well, i.e. that these programs be reviewed for resourcing.

Hendon: IEC was not trying to take any authority from the Senate.

Anson moves to call the question.

Nolen calls for vote

Motion to adopt the Executive Committee memo on the IEC report passes.

Nolen: Need to add another item to New Business. Tom Tudor pointed out that Faculty Appeals Committee is short an administration member. Jeff Connelly is willing. I need a motion to suspend rules to consider approving a member for the Faculty Appeals Committee.

Wright moves to suspend the rules to consider a motion to appoint Jeff Connelly to the Faculty Appeals Committee.

Barrio-Villar Seconds

Motion to suspend rules passes.

Motion is made and seconded to appoint Jeff Connelly to the Faculty Appeals Committee.

Cheatham: Just to clarify, will Jeff serve a one-year term or a two year term?

Nolen: He will serve through the end of this academic year.

Motion to elect Jeff Connelly passes.

- A. Motion FS\_2019\_7.** Senator Macheak on behalf of the Library Faculty (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, second required.) Place a constitutional amendment on the University Assembly agenda (Collections and Archives to Ottenheimer Library)

**Be it resolved** that the Constitution of the Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock be modified to replace “Collections and Archives” with “Ottenheimer Library”.

Commentary: As a result of a reorganization, the library has moved out from Collections and Archives and is now under Academic Affairs.

Macheak moves motion FS-2019-7

Motion is seconded.

Nolen: Ottenheimer Library plans to move from Collections and Archives back into Academic Affairs. For that to happen, the University Assembly must approve the move. This motion places this matter on the University Assembly agenda.

Macheak: This move will put as all back together again.

Cheatham: We need legislation to allow someone to make administrative changes in title in the handbook and policy, rather than debating it in Senate or in the University Assembly.

Nolen: I look forward to receiving that legislation from you.

Motion FS\_2019\_7 passes.

- B. Motion FS\_2019\_8.** Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Commendations for the UA Little Rock Women’s Soccer Team and Women’s Basketball Team

**Be it resolved** to commend the UA Little Rock Women’s Soccer team with letters of distinction, and

**Be it further resolved** to commend the UA Little Rock Women’s Basketball team with letters of distinction, and

**Be it further resolved** to present the awards to both teams at the April University Assembly meeting.

Commentary: The UA Little Rock Trojans Women’s Soccer and Basketball teams each won their respective Sun Belt Championships and advanced on to the NCAA Tournament.

Nolen introduces this motion.

Wright: When this appears on the Assembly agenda, this will have a longer preamble.

Motion passes.

**C. Motion FS\_2019\_11.** Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Placement and Transfer of Credit Policy

**Be it resolved** to modify Policy 517.1 (as amended 4/2017) as follows (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion)

**Policy 517.1 Placement and Transfer of Credit**

**Policy Designated Transfer Degree**

A “designated transfer degree” is an Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, or Associate of Arts in Teaching – or any future associate degree program approved by ADHE--that includes a 35-hour state core curriculum.

The core will be transferred according to the core transfer policy and courses will be transferred according to the course transfer policy. Any additional credits that are not assigned by those two policies shall be awarded as general lower level elective credit up to 60 credit hours.

Core Transfer Reciprocity

....

~~5. A “designated transfer degree” is an Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, or Associate of Arts in Teaching – or any future associate degree program approved by ADHE--that includes a 35-hour state core curriculum.~~

**Be it further resolved** that with approval, implementation of changes will be effective July 1,

2019.

Commentary: In April 2017, the Faculty Senate revised Policy 517.1 to restrict the transfer of credit. Implementation was postponed to AY 2019-2020 in subsequent senate action (8/2017). The proposed revision creates a provision for students to be able to transfer in credit as part of a completed degree that might not otherwise be credited under the previously approved course transfer policy language.

Nolen introduces motion.

Nolen: This policy will sunset soon. We are seeking to make it permanent.

Mathis: What credits are not being transferred? The only ones not transferring are D's.

Nolen: We are talking about the transfer of Ds. Under this policy, students can transfer these courses in as general lower-level elective undergraduate credit.

Mathis: We have had a limit of 6 hours of pass-free transfer credits. This legislation would increase that. This might be a problem for associate degree seekers.

Nolen: True, but we still have a GPA requirement, which would naturally cap the number of D's a student could bring with them. Again this is restricted only to students who are transferring in a completed degree.

Motion passes.

**D. Motion.** Executive 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 Annual Review of Faculty Policy 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 March 29, 2019; and

**Be it further resolved** to rescind the referral of the matter to the Faculty Governance Committee and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for consideration specifically related to the proposed revisions presented to the Faculty Senate on March 29, 2019.

Matson introduces the motion and moves it.

Nolen: This is a procedural motion in order to bring back to the Senate the matter of revision

to the annual review policy (FS\_2019\_10).

Wright: We need to note that this is also coming back from the Committee on Tenure.

Motion to divide question and rescind the referral passes.

**E. Motion FS\_2019\_10.** Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Revision to Policy 403.3 Annual Review of Faculty Policy.

**Be it resolved** to modify the Annual Review of Faculty policy (403.3) (approved 4/20/1990, modified by FS\_2017\_4, FS\_2018\_20, and FS\_2019\_2.), item I.A.5 to limit the use of student evaluations of courses as the sole basis for evaluation of teaching as per the mark-up in Appendix B (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion);

**Be it resolved** to modify I.B of the same policy to reference the list of evidence, qualifying activities, and artifacts from the Promotion and Tenure policy (403.15) to be used in evaluating teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service ; and

**Be it further resolved** that upon approval, implementation of changes to Policy 403.3 will be effective July 1, 2019.

Commentary: [Comments on student evaluations of teaching in Appendix B.]  
Currently there are lists of evidence, qualifying activities, and artifacts in both the Annual Review policy (403.3) and the Promotion and Tenure policy (403.15). This raises the potential of one policy being amended independently of the other, thus creating a scenario where an item may be appropriate for use in annual review but not promotion and tenure. By maintaining one list of items used for the evaluation of teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and service ensures alignment between annual review, promotion, and tenure.

Matson introduces the motion

Nolen: This motion has two parts: Limiting the role of student evaluations in teaching (SET) in the teaching component of annual review, and revising the types of evidence considered as appropriate to evaluating teaching.

Motion FS\_2019\_10 passes.

**F. Motion.** Executive Committee (Procedural. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Rescind a motion previously adopted on April 27, 2018 referring the matter of proposed revisions to Policy 403.3 pertaining to post-tenure review to the Committee on Tenure, Faculty Governance Committee, and

the Executive Committee.

**Be it resolved** to rescind the referral of post-tenure review to the Committee on Tenure, Faculty Governance Committee, and the Executive Committee for consideration.

Commentary: The executive committee concludes that no changes are required to the existing post-tenure review language in Policy 403.3 as passed in November 1998 in order to comply with recent changes to UA Board Policy 405.1. This action does not preclude any of the mentioned committees from bringing additional revisions to this policy.

Matson introduces this motion

Nolen: The post-tenure review policy is already in compliance as written. This was the basis for the referral and we are just rescinding the referral to committee here.

Wright: One comment. If we do want to make changes to the post-tenure review policy, we will have the fall semester to do it. We don't have to rush through it and risk making bad policy.

Cheatham: We should try to get things cleaned up before April so it can be incorporated in the handbook.

Nolen: That is a separate issue.

Motion passes.

**G. Motion FS\_2019\_16.** Faculty Governance Committee. (Legislation. Majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Annual Review Policy (403.3) (approved 4/20/1990, modified by FS\_2017\_4, FS\_2018\_20, and FS\_2019\_2.)

**Be it resolved** to modify the Annual Review Policy (403.3) as follows:

**I. Annual Faculty Review**

An annual review of the performance of all full-time faculty members shall be made on the basis of assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures required herein. It is the responsibility of the department chair to review the performance of adjunct faculty, visiting faculty, and lecturers according to requirements and guidelines established by the voting faculty as provided in the department's approved governance document.



**Be it further resolved** that upon approval, implementation of changes to Policy 403.3 will be effective July 1, 2019.

*Commentary:* This change is needed in order to assure departmental authority and responsibility for review of Adjunct and Visiting Faculty and Lecturers.

Cheatham introduces the motion on behalf of the Governance Committee.

Nolen describes the motion.

Motion FS\_2019\_16 passes.

**H. Motion FS\_2019\_17.** Faculty Governance Committee. (Legislation. Majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Biennial Faculty Handbook Review

**Be it resolved** that the Faculty Handbook be reviewed and updated biennially in spring, odd-numbered years by the Faculty Governance Committee and that any needed modifications be recommended to the Faculty Senate for approval.

*Commentary:* This legislation assures that the Faculty Handbook will remain current.

Cheatham introduces the motion on behalf of the Governance Committee.

Cheatham: Our aim in this motion is to have a record that the Faculty Handbook should be updated every two years.

Wright: I don't see this as legislation. This is more like a charge to a committee. I'd like to say for the record that the motion's label should be changed to indicate this as procedure rather than legislation.

Nolen: Is there any objection to changing this motion from legislation to procedure?

De Angelis: What happens if legislation and the Faculty Handbook contradict each other? Which source takes precedence?

Cheatham: Legislation always takes precedence. But hopefully the Faculty Handbook will change to reflect new legislation and policy. I would like to see an implementation date embedded in legislation.

Wright: Most of our legislation that includes a citation date and implementation date that answers this question.

Leonard: I might disagree with Andrew.

Nolen: The constitution says the Governance Committee has authority over the handbook and is required to update it promptly and regularly.

Motion passes.

- I. **Motion FS\_2019\_9.** Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Clinical Faculty definition.

**Be it resolved** to adopt the following definition for “clinical” as a modifier for full-time non-tenure track faculty as follows:

The “clinical” modifier may be applied to the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor only. The primary application of this modifier is for instruction of practical skills for professional programs often leading to licensure and related administrative service. Delivery of instruction may occur on campus, online, or in field-based settings appropriate to the discipline. The faculty member must be practicing in a clinic or client-based environment. Faculty holding this modifier are not eligible for the granting of tenure. Like other non-tenure track full-time faculty, a clinical faculty position may be a long-term, promotable appointment, with the possibility of renewable multi-year contracts. Candidates must hold an appropriate terminal degree or be qualified based on experience. Licensure or certification may also be a requirement appropriate to the discipline. Departments will determine the criteria for appointments and promotion through each rank. Advancement to each rank will be accompanied by an appropriate increase in salary.

*Commentary:* A Clinical faculty at any rank would not be expected to have a commitment to scholarship and research. This modifier would be for full-time, non-tenure track positions with a commitment to teaching and administrative service (i.e., clinical supervision, clinical instruction, and program coordination). Faculty in a clinical faculty position would be held to expectations defined in the Faculty Roles and Rewards II Non-Tenure track (Policy 403.23) – General Principles and Criteria for Advancement specifically related to Teaching and Service.

Matson introduces the motion on behalf of the Executive Committee.

Nolen: The aim of this legislation is to get consistency across the system in how we use the term “clinical faculty.” Board policy references the term “clinical faculty” but does not define it. We are basing the definition in this motion on what UA Fayetteville has done.

Boles: Does this legislation preclude clinical faculty from being on tenure-track?

Nolen: Clinical faculty are not considered tenure-track under Board policy.

Boles: This policy would contradict what our accrediting body requires.

Matson: The law school dean has been part of this conversation.

Drale: The law school does refer to some tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty as clinical faculty. This legislation creates an alternative track or appointment type to the typical research-oriented tenure-track appointment.

Boles: This would then re-designate tenure-track faculty who are clinical in the law school?

Drale: It would re-designate them as assistant or associate professor.

Hendon: We may want to amend this language so that the term “clinical” can also modify instructor and senior instructor positions.

Nolen: I can accept that as a friendly amendment.

Cheatham: Is the intent of the language we are using to indicate that clinical faculty will not serve term appointments?

Matson: The board’s language restricts it to faculty under contract.

Cheatham: Board policy indicates that clinical appointments may be longer than one year but not longer than five years.

Nolen: Since clinical faculty are non-tenure-track, they are included in this.

Cheatham: So someone can reappointed after five years?

Nolen: Yes, a multi-year contract might be renewed.

Cheatham: So my question is are we going to include all this language in our policy?

Nolen: No that this is addressed in the general policy on non-tenure-track faculty.

Cheatham: I just want to be sure about how we are interpreting board policy for the handbook.

Drale: Appointments at the instructor level are all year to year, even though we don’t do a new personnel action form every year. This legislation makes it possible to appoint someone to a true 5 year appointment, which is of particular importance to the law school so they can provide evidence of security of employment for certain non tenure-track faculty.

Wright: My understanding is that because of board policy we cannot appoint someone to a 6 or more year term. The intent of this is not to create seven or eight year terms since that would contradict board policy.

DeAngelis: Just to clarify, the “University Professor” and “Distinguished Professor” roles, are those considered modifiers that signify a new rank? If so, should we include “clinical” as a possible modifier to those roles?

Nolen: Those are considered to be honorifics and not ranks.

Motion FS\_2019\_9 passes

**J. Motion FS\_2019\_13.** Faculty Governance Committee. (Legislation. Majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required) Adjunct Faculty definition

**Be it resolved** to adopt the description for Adjunct Faculty in Appendix C.1.

*Commentary:* The Adjunct modifier is defined and furthermore assures departmental authority for initiating the process for hiring adjunct faculty and responsibility for verifying and archiving requisite credentials.

Cheatham introduces the motion on behalf of the Governance Committee.

Wright: When we seek the Chancellor’s signature on this, we need to note that this will be a new policy, not an amended policy. The Faculty Senate has never formally defined the term “adjunct faculty.”

Cheatham: The 2000 Faculty Handbook did define “adjunct faculty” and was accepted as approved policy.

Wright: If the Senate takes up new policy, it's taking it up as if new policy is being considered approval.

DeAngelis: "Lecturers are evaluated" should say "Adjunct Faculty are evaluated"

Cheatham: Yes, this was a cut and paste error. It should read “Adjunct Faculty are evaluated...”

Motion FS\_2019\_13 passes.

**K. Motion FS\_2019\_14.** Faculty Governance Committee. (Legislation. Majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Visiting Faculty definition

**Be it resolved** to adopt the description for Visiting Faculty in Appendix C.2.

*Commentary:* The Visiting modifier is defined and furthermore assures departmental authority for initiating the process for hiring Visiting faculty and responsibility for verifying and archiving requisite credentials.

No discussion.

Motion FS\_2019\_14 passes.

**L. Motion FS\_2019\_15.** Faculty Governance Committee. (Legislation. Majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Lecturer definition

**Be it resolved** to adopt the description for Lecturer in Appendix C.3.

*Commentary:* The Lecturer modifier is defined and furthermore assures departmental authority for initiating the process for hiring lecturers and responsibility for verifying and archiving requisite credentials.

Cheatham introduces the motion on behalf of the Governance Committee

Jensen: Is the term “lecturer” truly a modifier?

Cheatham: It is a category

Jensen: Then why is it referred to in the commentary as a modifier?

Nolen: That is an error and not part of the legislation.

DeAngelis: The definition indicates that lecturers do not teach more than 2 3-hour courses per semester. Are there waivers or exceptions for that?

Drale: We do make exceptions to this. The most common case is where a lecturer is teaching a course that has a laboratory. We try to avoid other cases that exceed two courses so that it does not appear that we have a person teaching a full time load without benefits. So we consider exceptions on a case by case basis.

Motion FS\_2019\_15 passes.

**M. Motion FS\_2019\_12.** Graduate Council (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Proposed changes to academic clemency policy for graduate students.

**Be it resolved** to modify the Policy for Academic Clemency for Graduate

Students (adopted 5/2017) as per the mark-up in Appendix D (underline indicates addition, strikethrough indicates deletion); and

**Be it further resolved** that upon approval, implementation of changes to the Policy for Academic Clemency will be effective July 1, 2019.

Commentary: Requiring master's students to sit out for two years keeps them out the entire length of time it would take for a full-time student to complete the degree. During that time, many may lose momentum and choose not to return to school. At a time when enrollment is vital, we would like for these students to be able to come back if their life circumstances have changed. Secondly, the Graduate School has received some applications where even if the student were to be granted clemency, the student's GPA would still be below the "good standing" mark, making it impossible for them to be readmitted. We do not want to see abuses of this policy, however, so we want to require extra work and consideration for a student to be granted more than 2 semesters of clemency.

Karen Kuralt introduces the motion on behalf of the Graduate Council.

DeAngelis moves to bring this motion to the floor.

Cheatham seconds the motion.

Cheatham: I remember the matter of academic clemency coming up when I served as chair of Undergraduate Council. In those discussions, I remember learning that it was a rule or best practice in academia that disruption period needed to be at least two years rather than one year.

Kuralt: Our research did not find anything prohibitive to it being a one-year period.

Motion FS\_2019\_12 passes.

#### **IX. Open Forum**

No discussion is heard.

#### **X. Adjourn**

Meeting is adjourned at 3:33 p.m.

Appendix A - Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee







### Fall 2021 with November Break (Approved)

July						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31
31	1	2	3	4	5	6

August						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

September						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

October						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

November						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

December						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

First Term	Second Term	First Day-Class	Consultation Day	Final Exams
Break	Commencement	Break	Final Exams	Final Exams

### Fall 2021 with October Break (New)

July						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31
31	1	2	3	4	5	6

August						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

September						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

October						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

November						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

December						
Su	Mo	Tu	W	Th	Fr	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

First Term	Second Term	First Day-Class	Consultation Day	Final Exams
Break	Commencement	Break	Final Exams	Final Exams

## Appendix B

### I. Annual Faculty Review

An annual review of the performance of all full-time faculty members shall be made on the basis of assigned duties and according to criteria and procedures required herein.

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

...

#### A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

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

...

5. Each academic unit shall establish procedures for student evaluation of teaching. The purpose of student evaluation of teaching is to provide students with a voice in curriculum development and implementation.

a. Student evaluations of teaching may not be the sole basis for evaluation of teaching.

b. The items included in the instrument administered to students to evaluate teaching must be

approved by the department, college, or university faculty.

c. The data resulting from a faculty member's student evaluation of teaching must be made

available to that faculty member in a timely manner and are confidential. These data may only

be made available to those involved in performance evaluation (faculty member, chairperson,

peer evaluation committee, promotion and tenure committee.).

...

#### B. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

...

Evidence, qualifying activities, and artifacts to be used in evaluating teaching, scholarly or

creative

activity, and service are defined in the Promotion and Tenure policy (403.15).

~~1. Evaluation of Teaching or Professional Performance~~

~~Teaching: Although difficult to evaluate, teaching performance must be given high priority.~~

~~Important measures for good teaching are influence exerted on students and the mastery of the field.~~

~~Teaching is defined in terms of providing for student learning in a variety of ways, including~~

~~classroom or clinical instruction, team teaching, supervision of independent study or research,~~

~~thesis or dissertation supervision, multi-disciplinary teaching activities, student advisement,~~

~~course preparation, curriculum design and development, use of creative teaching strategies and technologies, etc. Evidence used to evaluate teaching generally include student evaluations, peer evaluations, self-evaluation, and other materials.~~

~~Professional Performance (In the case of faculty with non-teaching appointments):  
Evaluation~~

~~may include but is not limited to evidence of the following: performance in the areas of professional responsibility and effectiveness in carrying out assigned duties; ability and willingness to accept additional responsibility and/or leadership; cooperation in dealing with personnel at all levels; efforts at self-improvement; innovations in program implementation; development of special projects, resource tools, and/or the use of creative techniques in the performance of duties; initiative and resourcefulness in solving unit problems; ability to communicate effectively orally and in writing. Evidence used to evaluate professional performance generally includes supervisors' evaluations, clientele evaluation, peer evaluation, self-evaluation, and other materials.~~

## ~~2. Evaluation of Scholarly or Creative Activities~~

~~Scholarly or creative activities are defined in terms of those activities and work products that contribute to the professional growth of the faculty member and the faculty member's academic discipline. Evidence used to evaluate scholarship may include research, academic publications, grants, contracts, papers presented at professional meetings, membership on editorial boards of professional journals, service as a manuscript referee, fellowship awards, and instruction materials preparation (textbooks, video tapes, lab manuals, etc.). In fields where it is appropriate, performance, concerts, exhibitions, and other creative endeavors are considered under the rubric of scholarship. An essential element of judging scholarly or creative activities is peer review.~~

## ~~3. Evaluation of Academically related Service Activities~~

~~Service shall be evaluated in terms of service to the public, the university, or the profession and may include activities such as discipline-related community service, work on college or university committees, department service, administrative service, recruitment,~~

~~in-service~~

~~education, working with professional organizations, and participation in professional meetings.~~

~~The University has identified public service as an important objective.~~

*Commentary* regarding student evaluations of courses:

Student evaluations of courses are used regularly at this institution to provide evidence of teaching quality in annual reviews, promotion and tenure decisions, and teaching award decisions. They are sometimes included in the calculus for merit raises. Teaching is a complex set of behaviors and conditions that cannot be assessed in a single outcome measure. The reductive nature of student evaluations creates a misleading metric that can (at best) describe a student's experience in the course; an experience complicated by that student's prior experiences and expectations. We are proposing to limit the use of student evaluations of courses on the grounds that there is systematic misinterpretation and misuse of the student evaluation data and on the grounds the evaluations disproportionately penalize women faculty.

Proper use and interpretation of student evaluations of teaching are important given the impact these data have on faculty careers. However, principles for interpreting interval data in general and teaching

evaluations specifically are generally ignored by both faculty and administrators leading to over-interpretation of small differences in evaluation scores. Measurement theory reminds us that means are estimates of true scores (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2018). An instructor's true score lies within a range of scores that is a function of the number of observations and the standard error present in that measurement. In addition, differences between two means may not be statistically meaningful and any interpretation of a difference should not be made without appropriate statistical tests of significance.

Because the misinterpretation of scores from these evaluations is so widespread, we recommend the following guidelines if these data are to be included in personnel evaluations including annual review, promotion, tenure, and merit raises.

- Combine means across items and courses as they are more reliable in the aggregate;
- Provide confidence intervals to represent the range of scores in which the true score falls;
- Comparison means should be provided for context. Comparison means can be a departmental mean or a mean across similar courses; and
- Statistical tests should be conducted and reported to determine if differences between means are statistically significant.

Failing to follow these guidelines undermines standard measurement principles and renders student evaluation data meaningless (Boysen, et al., 2014; Boysen, 2015; Greenwald, 1997; Lawrence, 2018).

However, even following the recommended measurement principles, gender bias in student evaluations represents a form of inequality facing women faculty across academia (Bennett, 1982; Boehmer & Wood, 2017; Gutierrez y Muhs, et al., 2012; MacNell, et al., 2015; Morgan, 2016; Nargundkar & Shrikhande, 2014; Reid, 2010; Rosen, 2018). Assumed societal expectations for gendered roles is evident in the results of empirical studies examining bias in student evaluations of teaching. The demonstrated bias is not based on behaviors of the instructor, but of actual bias on the part of the students and their expectations for gendered behaviors of the instructors. Regardless of the performance of the instructor, students rate women instructors more harshly than men. This suggests that women have to work harder than men to receive comparable ratings thus amplifying institutional inequalities based on gender. Therefore, using student evaluations of teaching as a primary tool to evaluate faculty teaching for the purposes of annual review systematically disadvantages women faculty across this campus.

## References

Bennett, S. (1982). Student perceptions of and expectations for male and female instructors: Evidence

- relating to the question of gender bias in teaching evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(2), 170-179. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.74.2.170
- Boehmer, D. & Wood, W. (2017). Student vs. faculty perspectives on quality instruction: Gender bias, "hotness," and "easiness" in evaluating teaching. *Journal of Education for Business*, 92(4), 173-178. doi:10.1080/08832323.2017.1313189
- Boysen, G. A. (2015). Uses and misuses of student evaluations of teaching: The interpretation of differences in teaching evaluation means irrespective of statistical information. *Teaching of Psychology*, 42(2), 109-118. doi:10.1177/0098628315569922



- Boysen, G. K. (2014). The (mis)interpretation of teaching evaluations by college faculty and administrators. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39, 641-656. doi:10.1080/02602938.2013.860950
- Cohen, R., & Swerdlik, M. (2018). *Psychological Testing and Assessment*. New York City: McGraw Hill.
- Greenwald, A. (1997). Validity concerns and usefulness of students ratings of instruction. *American Psychologist*, 52(11), 1182-1186.
- Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y., Gonzalez, C., & Harris, P. (2012). *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Lawrence, J. (2018). Student evaluations of teaching are not valid: It is time to stop using SET scores in personnel decisions. *American Association of University Professors*. Washington D.C. Retrieved from [https://www.aaup.org/article/student-evaluations-teaching-are-not-valid#.XIva\\_ihKipc](https://www.aaup.org/article/student-evaluations-teaching-are-not-valid#.XIva_ihKipc)
- MacNell, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A. N. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40(4), 291-303. doi: 10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4
- Morgan, H. K., Purkiss, J., Porter, A., Lypson, M., Santen, S., Christner, J., Grum, C. & Hammoud, M. (2016). Student evaluation of faculty physicians: gender differences in teaching evaluations. *Journal of Women's Health*, 25(5), 453-456. doi: 10.1089/jwh.2015.5475
- Nargundkar, S. &. (2014). Norming of student evaluations of instruction: Impact of noninstructional factors. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 12(1), 55-72. doi:10.1111/dsji.12023
- Reid, L. (2010). The role of perceived race and gender in the evaluation of college teaching on RateMyProfessors.com. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 3(3), 137-152. doi:10.1037/a0019865
- Rosen, A. (2018). Correlations, trends and potential biases among publicly accessible web-based student evaluations of teaching: A large-scale study of RateMyProfessors.com data. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(1), 31-44. doi:10.1080/02602938.2016.1276155

## Appendix C Faculty Governance Committee

### C.1 Adjunct Faculty

Certain individuals whose education and professional experience enhance the teaching, research, or service programs of UALR may receive fixed term appointments as adjunct faculty with appropriate academic rank: adjunct distinguished professor, adjunct professor, adjunct associate professor, adjunct assistant professor, or adjunct instructor. Such adjunct faculty are normally:

- (a) employed by an organization other than UALR and do not receive compensation or salary from UALR;
- (b) paid from grant funds administered through UALR;
- (c) employed on a temporary basis to fill a University-funded position; or
- (d) employed primarily (more than 50 percent) in a nonacademic capacity by UALR.

An adjunct faculty position may not be used to circumvent a tenure decision or to extend the probationary period of a nontenured faculty member.

Adjunct faculty appointments are made for a specified period (e.g., one semester or one year), and neither the University nor the individual has a commitment on renewal.

Adjunct faculty are

hired by the department chair / unit head according to criteria and procedures determined by the department faculty as specified in the unit's approved governance document. It is the responsibility of the chair to assure that official credentials (transcripts and resume) conform to the department's requirements and that these credentials are archived. Lecturers are evaluated following guidelines provided in UA Little Rock's annual review policy. Unless the terms of appointment specify otherwise, UA Little Rock policies on promotion, tenure, on-reappointment, leave, and Off-campus Duty Assignments do not apply to adjunct faculty. The procedures pertaining to matters of dismissal during a term of appointment, as outlined in this Handbook, do apply to adjunct faculty.

Adjunct faculty have voice, but not vote in the University Assembly and in official meetings of the college, school, and department. Colleges, schools, or departments may (consistent with the University Assembly's Constitution and Board of Trustees' Policy) authorize them voting status by specific action on other matters. Depending on the source and terms of financial support, adjunct faculty may be eligible for certain fringe benefits. If so, these are specified in the terms of the appointment.



## C.2 Visiting Faculty

Visiting appointments are used to bring individuals to the UA Little Rock campus for special purposes and varying periods of time. These appointments are identified by the ranks of visiting distinguished professor; visiting professor; visiting associate professor; visiting assistant professor; or visiting instructor.

Visiting faculty are not eligible for tenure consideration but may be eligible for certain fringe benefits. These are specified in the terms of the appointment.

Visiting faculty have voice but not vote in the University Assembly and in official meetings of the college or school and department. Colleges, schools, or departments may (consistent with the University Assembly's Constitution and Board of Trustees' Policy) authorize them voting status by specific action on other matters.

Recommendations for the appointment of visiting faculty originate in the department according to criteria and procedures determined by the department faculty as specified in the unit's approved governance document. It is the responsibility of the chair to assure that official credentials (transcripts and resume) conform to the department's requirements and that these credentials are archived and are submitted through regular channels on the standard appointment form. Visiting faculty are evaluated following guidelines provided in UA Little Rock's annual review policy.

### C.3 Lecturer

The rank of lecturer includes the designation of part-time faculty of the university, employed to expand or enrich the university's offerings. Lecturers have faculty status, but do not teach more than two three-hour courses per semester.

Lecturers' primary responsibilities are to the teaching functions in their assigned classes, and they are expected to perform all duties directly relating to their classes, including keeping appropriate class records and consultation with their students. However, lecturers are not required to perform other duties normally associated with full-time faculty status, such as participation in general campus advisement or service on committees, except by mutual consent.

Lecturers have voice but no vote in the University Assembly and in official meetings of the college or school and department. Colleges, schools, or departments (consistent with the University Assembly's Constitution and Board of Trustees' policy) may authorize voting status for lecturers by specific action on other matters.

Lecturers are hired by the department chair / unit head according to criteria and procedures determined by the department faculty as specified in the unit's approved governance document. It is the responsibility of the chair to assure that official credentials (transcripts and resume) conform to the department's requirements and that these credentials are archived. Lecturers are evaluated following guidelines provided in UA Little Rock's annual review policy. UA Little Rock's general policies on promotion, tenure, non-reappointment, fringe benefits, retirement, leave, and off-campus duty assignments do not normally apply to lecturers. The UA system and UA Little Rock procedures pertaining to matters of dismissal during a term of appointment, as outlined in the Faculty Handbook, do apply to lecturers. Lecturers also have the right to present matters to the appropriate university appeals and grievances committees. Lecturers should consult the [Handbook for Part-Time Faculty](#), available in the Office of the Provost and in the deans' offices.

## Appendix D Academic Clemency for Graduate Students

Any UA Little Rock Graduate School student who has previously attended UA Little Rock and whose attendance at UA Little Rock or any institution of higher education has been interrupted for a period of at least ~~two~~ one years may qualify for academic clemency providing he or she meets all of the criteria specified below and was not dismissed for non-academic reasons. Under this policy a Graduate School student may apply to have Graduate School grades and credits earned at UA Little Rock previous to the separation removed from his or her grade point average. Approval of a request for clemency requires the signature of the student's Program Coordinator and the Graduate School Dean.

After re-entering UA Little Rock following a separation of at least ~~two~~ one years from any institution of higher education, a graduate student may request academic clemency at the Graduate School. The student shall specify the term(s) for which clemency is desired. The request will be forwarded, along with appropriate permanent record information, to the student's Program Coordinator for approval. The coordinator shall forward the request to the Graduate School Dean.

Clemency shall cover all credits earned during the semesters (i.e. Spring, Summer, Fall) for which clemency is requested. ~~A Graduate School student may request clemency for up to two entire~~ semesters. If more than two semesters of credit are needed to return the student to good academic standing, a special petition must be filed with the Graduate School. The student's complete record will remain on the transcript with the added notation of academic clemency received. Any petition for academic clemency must be requested and granted prior to the awarding of a degree. Once the degree is awarded, the record is closed and the academic clemency policy cannot be invoked. Academic clemency may be approved only once. For purposes of degree requirements, a student who receives clemency must follow the provisions of the Graduate Catalog in effect at the time of re-enrollment.