



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
 April 30, 2021
 1:00 PM until adjournment
 Synchronous Online

- I. Welcome and Roll Call (1:05 PM)
 Present – CHASSE: Baylis, Blevins-Knabe, Cheatham, Condran, Groesbeck, Hamilton, Heil, Matson, Mitchell, Nahrwold, Scheidt, Scranton, Smith, Tate ; CBHHS – Atkins, ten Bensel, Golden, Hendon, Leonard, Ruhr, Teague, Woolridge ; CSTEM – Baillie, DeAngelis, Deng, Kattoum, LeGrand, Milanova, Pidugu, Ray, Turner, Woolbright ; LIBRARY – Macheak ; LAW – Boles, Cain, Woodmansee ; EX OFFICIO – Drale, Bain, Nolen, Wright, DeKay

 Absent – CBHHS: Jones, Sadaka, Solomon; EX OFFICIO: Henslee
- II. Review of Minutes from March 19, 2021
- III. Announcements
 DeKay: SGA elections close this evening; new administration TBA
 Hamilton: SGA mural will be dedicated in lobby of Ottenheimer
 Baillie: Survey to gauge connections/networks between faculty; please participate
- IV. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit) Hendon: Blackboard Inc. update disruptive
 DeAngelis: New Faculty Workload policy has been released without appropriate notification by administration:
<https://ualr.edu/facultysenate/files/2021/04/FacultyWorkload-Policy-11-2020.pdf>
 DeAngelis: Requesting an audit for Fall 2021
 Wright: Anti-grievance thank you to Chancellor Drale for standing up on behalf of students and campus re: State recent legislation
- V. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit) None
- VI. Reports
 - A. Executive Committee - Amanda Nolen, President of Faculty Senate
 - Diversity Council link/tool is available. It is a lens through which to evaluate policies per DEI. I will make it available to all incoming committees in the next academic year.
 - AIGC is bringing to us an update to policy per previous referral.

- On-line Campus and recent tensions between On-campus courses owing to increasingly blended model of pedagogy. E-learning policies conflicting/chafing with on-campus offerings and faculty control of curriculum
Working w/Dr. Montague, Director of e-Learning, I will establish an ad hoc committee over the summer to work out policies and coordination between campuses.

B. Chancellor's Report – Christy Drale, Chancellor

Projecting to break even on FY 2021 budget; 3rd quarter report to be filed end of May

Reality is we are not breaking even owing to Covid-19

FY2022 summary budget will be submitted next week

How will balance be achieved? Budget is a projection; what is planned

1) Projecting 6% decline in enrollment

C-19 makes projections tenuous. Current enrollment figures not good, but anticipate students waiting longer than usual

Uptick in new students; decline in continuing student registration

2) Budget for what will *not* be spent Lapsed

salaries \$2.25 million Maintenance;

Less \$1.5 million???

CARES monies provide a cushion

Appropriate use; pandemic has depressed residence hall dollars

If budget is submitted next week, what about all new business/concerns?

Funding will be re-distributed/moved around; not a static scenario

Faculty DEI Fellow; draft shared with FS for responses

Looking for coherent united effort to implement strategic plan and address specific instances. Solution to creating new admin position

Phase 4 Campus re-opening plan

State legislature has passed laws making modified protocols Covid-19 impossible

Going to take some time to process all implications of recent legislation and determine what our options are

Intend to open campus in a welcoming and celebratory

Silverstein: Which bill are we discussing?

Clarified

Hamilton: Will signage and shields be removed

A: Signage will need to be removed but not safety equipment

Hendon: Has our Affirmative Action Plan been updated; last version was 2001

From HR standpoint, plan is essential and must be updated to avoid being in conflict with DEI initiatives

A: Will check

Hendon: Some DEI initiatives have been in conflict with law; avoid becoming a test case

A: Understood; all policies must be consistent and up-to-date

Hendon: Cautionary; refer to Supreme Court 2020 ruling

Leonard: Status of Dean search

A: Defers update to Provost Bain

Teague: Do you anticipate social distancing this fall?

A: No; need to be able to use classrooms to capacity

Matson: Positive incentives for vaccination and mask-wearing?


A: Quite probably, to the degree modest encouragement is in line with law

Hendon: Information concerning incentives for vaccinations and what can or cannot be incentivized

Nahrwold: Will vaccinations be offered at campus health center?

A: Yes

C. Provost's Report – Ann Bain, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

- Thanks for Virtual Commencement
- Departmental Award for Student Success and Retention announced this month; stay tuned
- Lists honorary titles for Distinguished and University Professor, + rank & tenure, promotions.
- Video “We [] Our Students” faculty awards
- Money/funding update: On-line teaching will move to Dean's office; will improve deans' understanding of where money is

Dr. Berry update on CB Dean search

- Committee reviewing applicants now; have 42 submissions, 75% “viable”
- Working on shortlist for interviews

Bruce Smith has worked out chart showing IUs for Spring 2021

Milanova: How will the report be made available from Deans? A:
Contact your dean(s)

D. Undergraduate Council - Joe Felan, Chair Report submitted; no presentation

E. Graduate Council - Laura Ruhl, Chair Report submitted

- Ruhl: Onboarding process for international grad students has been studied with eye to improve support

F. Core Council - Belinda Blevins-Knabe, Chair Report submitted; contact chair(s) with questions

G. Student Government (SGA) and Graduate Student (GSA) Associations – Pres. Landon DeKay and Pres. Natalie Snow

DeKay: Thanks to all for hybrid commencement

- Joint Resolution concerning counseling services and C-19 related issues
- Increase support for UA Little Rock counseling services

- SGA elections concluding this evening; expect new resolutions and changes to constitution

Hamilton: Strong support for resolution. Consequences of C-19 on students mental well-being are just beginning to become visible

H. Calendar & Schedules Committee – Rene Shroat Lewis, Chair

Lewis shares [report](#)

- Request to push Monday/Wednesday bloc proposal for 1 year
- Request “dead hour” proposal be deferred for 1-2 years; unclear what students will want in terms of course modalities
- Rationales presented

Nolen: Referrals have come from Executive Committee; Senate must weigh in

Nolen introduces motion to suspend the rules to discuss two deferral referrals/proposals

Passed

- 1) Postpone dead hour proposal; fails to pass
- 2) Motion to create free hour by eliminating 3:05-4:20 courses M, W, F; Passes
- 3) Motion to postpone elimination of 50 minute classes on MWF; Recommitted to Calendar Committee; deadline November 2021

I. Faculty Governance Committee – Rosalie Cheatham, Chair

Report on [Governance](#) documents (completed, in-progress, not submitted) and Faculty Handbook [updates](#)

- Motion to suspend rules; motion to accept updates. Passed.

J. Honors & Awards Committee – Lindsey Baertlein & Chelsea Bradley, Co-Chairs

Bradley reports

Proposing [two new faculty awards](#)

Nahrwold: Will these awards allow for self-nomination?

A: Yes; same as Fac. Exc. awards

K. Faculty Professional Development Committee – Heidi Skurat Harris, Chair

Harris reports on [audit](#) of student course evaluations on-campus

L. Committee on Tenure – Rob Steinbuch, Chair

Steinbuch presents: No changes necessary

VII. Old Business

VIII. New Business

- A. **FS_2021_08 Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, no second required) Spring and Summer 2021 Graduates**

Be it resolved that those applicants completing all requirements for various degrees in the 2021 Spring and Summer Semesters shall be approved for graduation. (see ualr.edu/facultysenate for a list of candidates for graduation, current as of 04/30/2021). **Passed**

- B. **FS_2021_09 Student Government Association (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings of the Faculty Senate - second vote verbatim to the first vote, no second required, first vote.) Modify Student Representation on Senate Committees**

Be it resolved to revise Article III of the Constitution of the Assembly, to include GSA representation as part of the student representation for the Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee, Academic Technology and Computing Committee, Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee, Athletics Committee, Building and Grounds Committee, Library Committee, and the Planning and Finance Committee. The revisions are as indicated in Attachment A (strikethrough indicates deletion; underline indicates addition); and

Be it further resolved that if approved this will go into effect retroactively July 1, 2021. **Passed**

- C. **FS_2021_10 Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting, no second required.) Approve the 2024-25 Academic Calendar**

Be it resolved to approve the AY 25 academic calendar as shown on ualr.edu/facultysenate. **Passed**

- D. **FS_2021_11 Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting, no second required.) Approve the 2025-26 Academic Calendar**

Be it resolved to approve the AY 26 academic calendar as shown on <https://ualr.edu/facultysenate/>

- Debate on start date and “creep” in terms of uncompensated work/time
- Motion to refer back to committee; 2nd; passed

- E. **FS_2021_12 Committee on Tenure (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting, no second required.) Overall Unsatisfactory and Post-tenure Review (Policy 403.3).**

Be it resolved to amend the Policy on Annual Review (403.3; 3/2019, 10/2018, 4/2017, and 4/1993) as it pertains to Section I.11 Unsatisfactory and Overall Unsatisfactory and Section II Post-tenure Review as indicated in Attachment B (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion); and

Be it further resolved that if approved, implementation of the changes will go into effect immediately.

Commentary: The Committee on Tenure is returning to the senate with revised language for 403.3 as a result of a referral from the October senate meeting: “The Senate refers to the Committee on Tenure both the FS_2020_02&04 and the proposed language from the Executive Committee presented at the April 2018 senate meeting and grants them the authority to negotiate with the Chancellor to bring back revised language before the end of this academic year.”

Proposed Amendments to FS_2021_12 from Senator/Past President Wright (See Attachment C to view proposed changes *in situ*):

Amendment 1. Be it resolved to amend the Committee on Tenure’s motion to move the following from 11.d to 6.f: “If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving the chairperson’s final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson’s evaluation shall be sent to departmental tenure committee. The departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category.”

Amendment 2. Be it resolved to amend the Committee on Tenure’s motion to move the following from 11.a to 6.g: “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 year’s materials to assess overall performance.”

6

Amendment 3. Be it resolved to amend the Committee on Tenure’s motion to move the following from 11.d to 6.h: “The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level.”

Amendment 4. Be it resolved to amend 11 to read “11. ~~Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category and Overall Unsatisfactory~~”

Amendment 5. Be it resolved to amend the Committee on Tenure’s motion to move the following from 11.d to 11.c: “For a category evaluation to serve as a basis for a finding of overall unsatisfactory performance, the chairperson and the tenure committee must agree with respect to that category.”

Amendment 6. Be it resolved to exchange the order of 11.b and 11.c; and **be it further resolved** to renumber the resulting section 11 based on prior motions.

Commentary: Section 11 in FS_2021_12 as presented by the Committee on Tenure attempts to address the procedure following a single “Unsatisfactory” rating in the course of an annual review as well as the procedure leading to and “Overall Unsatisfactory” that would potentially lead to post-tenure review. The amendments presented do not change any of the text presented by the Committee on Tenure, but moves the text related to a

single “Unsatisfactory” rating to the section that is devoted to the process of Annual Review (Section 6) and thus leaves Section 11 to be entirely focused on defining the process that leads to an “Overall Unsatisfactory” rating.

Steinbuch: Brief recap of process; “stylistic changes” made to review process; vetoed; asked by Chancellor to look at conflict between provisions.

Robust debate.

- Wright: Amendment 1 proposed; passed
- Wright: Amendment 2 proposed; passed
- Wright: Amendment 3 proposed; passed
- Wright: Amendment 4 proposed; passed
- Wright: Amendment 5 proposed; tabled
- Wright: Amendment 6 withdrawn
- Wright: Previous question called; 2nd by Leonard; passed

F. FS_2021_13 Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting, no second required.) Revise Academic Offenses Policy (501.13)

Be it resolved to amend the Academic Offenses Policy (501.13; 8/2018) as shown in Attachment D (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion); and

Be it further resolved that upon approval, implementation of the changes will go into effect July 1, 2021.

Commentary: Senate Policy 501.13 has evolved over time. Consequently, it makes references to functionaries or processes that do not reflect accurately what is the implementation of the policy. Moreover, through experience, the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (AIGC) has identified points that require elaboration or explanation.

While not complete, the following are the first steps in resolving these issues (Attachment C). For convenience’s sake, line numbering has been inserted and notes explaining the changes (additions or deletions) are referred to by line numbering.

Sherwin introduces; explains process in revising/clarifying policy and that grade appeal component will be proposed in AY2021-22.

Explains further the definition of Duplicity as: “To offer for credit previously submitted work without specific advance approval of the professors involved.”

Addresses other changes and clarifications with rationale for each.

Passed (w/one amendment)

G. FS_2021_14 Faculty Governance Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting, no second required.) Degree Plan Policy (503.7)

Whereas the current Degree Plan Policy, 503.7 is an excerpt from the 2010

Undergraduate Catalog and was not approved by the Faculty Senate; and **Whereas** the degree plan language in the catalog does not reflect current requirements for undergraduate students seeking a baccalaureate degree; and **Whereas** the matter of a Degree Plan Policy was referred to the Faculty Governance Committee,

Therefore, be it resolved to approve the following language to serve as the Degree Plan Policy (503.7).

Policy 503.7 Degree Plan

A baccalaureate, degree-seeking, student is required to declare a major(s) no later than by the completion of 60 credit hours. Majors can be changed during a student's UA Little Rock career, but after the completion of 60 credit hours, a degree-seeking student must have a declared major. Plans should be completed as soon as possible, or, in any event, no later than by the completion of 60 credit hours. Declared majors, in consultation with their academic advisors, must complete a degree plan, detailing the program the student should pursue to complete graduation requirements. Those students transferring to UA Little Rock with 60 or more credit hours must declare a major upon admission to the University and have an appropriate degree plan created. The degree plan shall include hours completed, course substitutions, waivers allowed, courses still needed, and other requirements for the degree.

Students enrolled in associate degree programs are required, in consultation with a program advisor, to create a degree plan as soon as possible, but no later than after the completion of 30 credit hours.

Be it further resolved that if approved, implementation of the changes will go into effect immediately.

Wright/friendly amendment: Student request to declare a major must be approved by the appropriate program faculty or designee. Inert after 1st sentence above.

Passed

H. FS_2021_15 Faculty Governance Committee (Legislation. 3/5 Majority vote at two meetings of the Faculty Senate - second vote verbatim to the first vote, no second required, first vote.) Revise UA Little Rock Constitution Article IV, Department, School, and College Governance to address interdisciplinary programs.

Whereas the curriculum is within the legislative authority of faculty, and

Whereas some programs and courses may appropriately be interdisciplinary in content, and

Whereas such interdisciplinarity requires input and evaluation of all curricular changes and proposals from faculty in the academic disciplines related to or participating in the course(s) or program(s), and

Whereas interdisciplinary course(s) or program(s) may not relate to only one academic college or campus,

Therefore the UA Little Rock Faculty Senate adopts the following language for inclusion in Article IV of the Assembly constitution.

Responsibilities for colleges and schools are as follows:

...

3. In reviewing the curriculum, policies and procedures of academic programs involving faculty members from multiple academic units, multiple colleges, or multiple institutions, all faculty members participating in the program shall have an appropriate role in governing the program.

For purposes of approving new programs and / or changes in existing programs an *ad hoc* committee shall be convened composed of all of the elected graduate or undergraduate curriculum committee representatives from the academic units participating in the program.

When convened, the committee shall select a chair who shall assume responsibilities of facilitating and completing the normal curriculum process, including signing any requisite forms and notifying collegiate faculty in each college involved in the interdisciplinary change(s). If three or more objections are received within the notification window, each college curriculum committee shall convene and consider the concerns expressed and report them for consideration by the Undergraduate or Graduate Council.

Passed

G. FS_2021_17 Executive Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting, no second required.) Rescind Outstanding Referrals

Be it resolved to rescind all outstanding referrals to the standing committees and councils of the Faculty Senate for Academic Year 2020-2021.

Passed

IX. Open Forum

Virtual toast to all members for year's work.

DeKay: Recommendation to Chancellor to provide campus transit for students requiring accommodation and for safety

X. Adjourn: 5:18 PM

ATTACHMENT A: Article III, Committees

Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee: The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee hears specific grade appeals and hears, on appeal and referral, cases involving certain academic offenses. The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee comprises fifteen (15) faculty and three (3) faculty alternates to be appointed each May annually in the spring by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly and seventeen (17) students and three (3) student alternates to be appointed each May no later than the beginning of the fall semester. Twelve (12) voting and two (2) alternate undergraduate students will be appointed by the Student Government Association and five (5) voting and one (1) alternate graduate students will be appointed by the Graduate Student Association. The term of office begins with the fall semester and continues for twelve months.

The purpose of the committee is twofold: (1) it affords the student an opportunity to appeal a grade if he or she feels the grade was inequitably awarded in that it violated a faculty member's own specified grading standards, and (2) it affords a student a hearing in cases where disputes over alleged cheating, plagiarism, collusion, or similar actions cannot be resolved (where the student does not admit that he/she violated an academic offense standard or that the student admits that he/she did violate an academic offense standard and the dean of students/designee refers the case for sanctioning).

Students and faculty members are urged to make all attempts possible to resolve a grievance before initiating formal appeal. The administrative officer shall assign two faculty members and two students to hear academic offenses by rotation according to alphabet if possible.

For information on the operating policies of this committee see the Academic Integrity and Grievance Policy.

Academic Calendar and Schedules Committee: This committee shall recommend to the Faculty Senate the academic calendar, schedules, and schedule policy, and shall present academic schedules to the Senate. Normally, these calendars and schedules, in draft form, originate in the Registrar's Office, and are forwarded to the committee for its approval before being submitted to the Faculty Senate. When questions arise, the committee shall, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, interpret the calendar and schedules.

The committee shall consist of one full-time faculty member from each college/school represented in the Faculty Senate to be appointed by the Committee on Committees, the vice president of the Faculty Senate, the chair of the Undergraduate Council or that person's designee, the registrar or that person's designee, the executive vice chancellor and provost or that person's designee. In addition, the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one student to the committee ~~two students appointed by the Student Government Association~~ shall serve as members. Appointed faculty members shall serve two- year staggered terms and students shall serve one-year terms.

Academic Technology and Computing Committee: This committee shall be concerned with University computing services policies that affect academic programs and the general interest of UALR. This committee serves as a formal communication channel for the faculty and students with Information Technology Services. The Vice Chancellor of Information Services shall keep the committee informed on issues, policies, and resource allocations affecting the academic community via technology and computing at the university level. On an annual basis the committee shall review Information Technology Services' policies as they affect the academic community. This review should include examining the impact of resource allocation of new technology to the learning process in a benefit/cost framework. In addition, the committee will consult with the Vice Chancellor of Information Services concerning budgets, both current and future, projected and actual expenditures. The committee shall furnish a report of their review and budget conference to the Faculty Senate by March 15 of each year.

The Academic Technology and Computing Committee shall consist of two full-time faculty members from each college or school including the library to be named by the Committee on Committees. In addition, the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one student to the committee ~~two students shall be named by the Student Government Association.~~ The Vice Chancellor of Information Services and the executive vice chancellor and provost or their designees shall serve as ex officio members without vote. Any faculty member holding a position of "faculty in residence" within Information Technology Services may serve as a voting committee member during their appointment to such post. The terms of the two students shall be one year, while the terms of the appointed faculty members shall be two-year staggered terms.

Admissions and Transfer of Credit Committee: On behalf of the Faculty Senate, this committee shall be responsible for establishing and maintaining appropriate standards for admitting students to UALR and accepting transfer credit. It shall recommend policies to the Faculty Senate in the areas of its responsibility. It also shall hear appeals from applicants for admission and from students concerned with transfer credit.

The committee shall consist of one full time faculty members from each college/school represented in the Faculty Senate, including the Collections and Archives and excluding the Bowen School of Law, to be appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly, the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one student ~~two student members appointed by the Student Government Association,~~ and, as ex officio without vote, the administrative officer in charge (or designee) of the Office of Transfer Student Services, University College, and the Office of Testing services, and, as ex officio with vote, the Director of Admissions (or designee), and the Registrar (or designee). The Director of Admissions' designee shall coordinate processing of materials for the committee All other members shall serve a one year term.

Athletics Committee: This committee shall consider matters pertaining to the intercollegiate athletic program and shall be advisory in nature with respect to the relationship of athletics to the academic purposes of the University. These matters may include, but are not limited to, the monitoring of academic progress and eligibility of student-athletes, scheduling of athletic events,

allocation of scholarships, recruitment of student-athletes, the adding and dropping of sports, NCAA and conference rules and changes, and other matters related to intercollegiate athletics.

The committee shall be composed of ten full-time faculty members to be appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly, representation by at least one voting member from each academic college or school (with the exception of the Bowen School of Law) and no more than two members from each academic college or school (including the Bowen School of Law). The Committee on Committees shall also appoint two staff members to the committee. The Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one ~~two~~ students to the committee. The faculty and staff members shall serve two-year, staggered terms, and the student members shall serve one-year terms. The director of athletics, registrar, and the advisor for student-athletes shall serve as ex officio members without vote.

A Faculty Athletics Representative (FAR) will be appointed by the chancellor with advice from the Athletics Committee. The FAR will serve for a three-year term and may be reappointed for subsequent three-year terms. The FAR will serve on the Athletics Committee as an ex officio member with vote.

Buildings and Grounds Committee: The purpose of this committee shall be to insure protection of the natural and aesthetic environment of the UA Little Rock campus consistent with reasonable growth and development of the campus. The committee shall promote beautification of the campus through a continuous review of landscaping, building and signage appearance, and campus roads and paths. The committee shall recommend on plans for new campus construction, and shall recommend to the chancellor steps that should be taken to preserve the natural environment and beauty of the campus. The committee shall periodically review the campus master plan.

The committee shall consist of one member from each college or school represented in the Faculty Senate, including Collections and Archives, appointed to two year, staggered terms by the Committee on Committees; two members of the staff senate, selected by the staff senate to two year, staggered terms; the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one student to the committee ~~two students appointed by the Student Government Association~~ to one-year terms. The administrator in charge of planning buildings and grounds shall serve as an ex-officio member without vote.

Faculty Professional Development Committee: The purpose of this committee is to review and make recommendations concerning policies and procedures involving the enhancement of the research, teaching, and service functions of the University. The committee is concerned with faculty improvement workshops and other activities and conditions designed to recruit, improve, and retain a highly productive faculty. This committee shall make recommendations to the Faculty Senate concerning research policies of a general nature and methods of encouraging research activity. Under the authority of the executive vice chancellor and provost, it shall award the faculty research grants. The committee shall consist of one member from the Collections and Archives faculty, two-full time faculty members from each college or school represented in the Faculty Senate to be named by the Committee on Committees to staggered terms of two years

each and as ex-officio members, the designee appointed by the executive vice chancellor and provost.

Library Committee: This committee shall be concerned with library policies that affect the academic programs and general interests of UALR, and serve as a formal communication channel between the faculty and the library. The director of the library shall keep the committee informed on issues and policies affecting the library and its publics as such issues and policies come into being. The committee shall review library policies as formulated by the library faculty on an annual basis and furnish a report of that review to the Faculty Senate by March 1 of each year.

The Library Committee shall consist of one full-time faculty member from each college or school, including the library and the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils to be named by the Committee on Committees. In addition, the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one student to the committee ~~two students shall be named by the Student Government Association.~~ The director of the library shall serve as ex officio member without vote. The terms of the two student members shall be one year; all other members shall serve two-year staggered terms.

Planning and Finance Committee: This committee exists for informational and advisory purposes only. While recognizing that the responsibility for the budgetary and planning process rests with the chancellor and administration, this committee shall assist in these areas by reviewing proposed plans that have an impact on the academic mission of the University, such as revenues and revenue projections, budgets and budget projections, faculty and staff fringe benefits such as health insurance and retirement benefits, and the relationship of academic and capital planning to finance and budget matters.

The committee shall work with the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration to review existing university reports, to make suggestions for changes to reports, and to provide input into developing reports that would be of greater interest to faculty or easier to understand. The committee shall report to the Faculty Senate concerning the UALR financial statement and shall endeavor to produce other reports to show the use of funds by the university and changes in the Annual Budget Book. In reporting on the UALR financial statement the committee shall include such information as the amount of reserve funds and the total endowment. From the committee, a few faculty representatives shall attend the University level budget hearings and all academic budget hearings at or above the college level.

The committee may make recommendations to the Faculty Senate, which may make recommendations to the chancellor. In circumstances where time does not allow deliberation and action by the Faculty Senate, the committee may make its recommendations directly to the chancellor, providing a copy (or report of oral recommendations) to each member of the Faculty Senate. To further facilitate significant involvement of the committee with the above processes, the committee shall select three of its faculty members to be on a subcommittee, which shall be available throughout the year for planning and finance matters. The subcommittee shall report to the committee.

The committee shall consist of one member from the Collections and Archives faculty, two full-time faculty members from each college or school represented in the Faculty Senate (one of whom must be a member of the Faculty Senate at the time of appointment) to be named by the Committee on Committees, the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, the administrator responsible for budgeting and planning, the vice chancellor for finance and administration, and the vice chancellor for university advancement as ex-officio members of the committee. In addition, the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Association shall each appoint one student to the committee ~~two students appointed by the Student Government Association~~ shall serve as members. Appointed faculty members shall serve two-year staggered terms and students shall serve one-year terms.

Honors and Awards Committee: This committee shall, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, select the recipients of specified University-wide honors and awards. This committee also shall advise the chancellor on the awarding of honorary degrees. In such matters, members of the committee shall act with the utmost confidentiality and discretion. Membership of the committee shall consist of two undergraduate students appointed by the Student Government Association, one graduate student appointed by the Graduate Student Association, and two faculty members from each of the colleges, one Graduate School representative and two alumni appointed by the Committee on Committees of the Assembly. All members shall serve two year, staggered terms.

Student Research and Creative Works Committee: The mission of this committee is to promote, support, and extend undergraduate and graduate research, scholarship, artistry, and other forms of creative activities at UALR, as well as to encourage research collaboration between faculty and students. In this capacity, the committee shall maintain policies related to university-financed student publications and inform the Faculty Senate as appropriate. The committee shall consist of one member from the Collections and Archives faculty and two full-time faculty members from each college or school represented in the Faculty Senate with an undergraduate program to be named by the Committee on Committees to staggered terms of two years each; one undergraduate student named by the Committee on Committees to a one year term from nominations by the Undergraduate Research Committee; and, as ex-officio members (without vote), the editors and advisors of university-financed student publications, one student affairs representative, and the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School or designee.

ATTACHMENT B: Annual Faculty Review (Policy 403.3)

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.

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, nonreappointment, post-tenure review, and dismissal. Furthermore, this review is to provide guidance and assistance to all faculty in their professional development and academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

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

1. No later than 30 days after the beginning of the first appointment of each faculty member, the chairperson shall advise him or her in writing of the criteria, procedures, and instruments currently used to assess performance;
2. No later than September 1 of each year, each faculty member shall be informed in writing by the chairperson of the review schedule, criteria, procedures, and instruments to be used that year;
3. No later than the second week of classes in the spring semester of each year, each faculty member shall submit to the chairperson any materials desired to be considered in the annual review;
4. 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 system¹ 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 reviewed².

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

- 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.
- 5. Each academic unit shall establish procedures for ~~S~~ 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.).
- 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.
- 7. As long as a faculty member is employed by the University and for at least three years thereafter, the following documents shall be maintained: annual review forms, summaries of annual discussion between the chairperson and faculty member, recommendations, and all other writings used in or resulting from the annual reviews of that faculty member;
- 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.

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.

11. Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category

- 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. If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving the chairperson's final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson's evaluation shall be sent to the departmental tenure committee. If the departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category. The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level. For a category evaluation to serve as a basis for a finding of overall unsatisfactory performance, the chairperson and the tenure committee must agree with respect to that category. ~~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.

B. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Each faculty member shall render service to the University by the standards of the UALR Faculty Handbook and shall behave in a professional and ethical manner. Each faculty member shall be evaluated based on his or her achievements with respect to assigned duties and the areas of teaching (or professional performance for faculty members with non-teaching appointments), scholarly or creative activity, and academically-related service.

Competency in teaching (or professional performance) is a minimum criterion for satisfactory annual review. However, each unit (department) may allow flexibility in identifying the relative importance of each area. In addition, off-campus duty assignments, and research, and administrative assignments shall be taken into account when establishing individual criteria for a specific review period.

The programmatic learning outcomes data collected from an individual faculty member shall not be used in annual reviews for that person.

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).

II. Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is a mechanism to ensure that the university can maintain a faculty capable of fulfilling the university's mission effectively. It should encourage productivity, reward exceptional performance, and offer correction of unsatisfactory performance without changing the due process or substantive rights of faculty ~~as enumerated in the current UA Little Rock Faculty Handbook.~~

~~Annual review is conducted for all faculty. Criteria, standards and procedures are specified in policies set forth by the trustees, UALR administration, faculty senate, and academic units. The reviews, as provided for in section I of this policy, are used for determining salary increases, promotion, tenure, and assisting faculty in professional development. Faculty also have appeal processes as outlined in departmental governance documents and the UA Little Rock Faculty Handbook.~~

~~Annual reviews for tenured faculty will be used for post-tenure review. Academic units will define overall unsatisfactory performance for tenured faculty. If a tenured faculty member receives two unsatisfactory reviews in sequence or three such reviews in five years, If, after the annual review and faculty appeal processes are completed, a faculty member receives a final overall evaluation of unsatisfactory, as provided for in section I of this policy, then the faculty member departmental tenure committee group charged with peer review, the chair and the dean shall prepare a professional development plan supported by appropriate resources. The plan must be developed within 30 days of the final overall evaluation of unsatisfactory and must contain measurable objective benchmarks identifying what is necessary to attain meaningful progress and, separately, satisfactory performance. The plan shall cover up to three years with the possibility of a one-year extension. During the time period of the professional development plan, progress toward successful completion of the plan will become part of the annual review process for the faculty member.~~

~~If, in the next annual review following an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member receives a satisfactory rating in at least 2 of 3 categories, the professional development plan will be considered successfully completed.~~

~~If, in the second annual review following an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member fails either to attain on "overall satisfactory performance" rating or to demonstrate "meaningful progress" in remediating the overall performance deficiencies, as both are defined in the professional development plan, the faculty member may be issued a notice of dismissal as specified in the UA Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, Non-Reappointment and Dismissal of Faculty.~~

~~If the faculty member receives two additional unsatisfactory reviews during the professional development plan period, the department chairperson with majority vote of the departmental group charged with peer review, and the dean, initiates the process for terminating with cause the tenured faculty member as specified in the UA Little Rock Faculty Handbook.~~

FS_2021_12 CLEAN COPY of SECTIONS I.11 AND II (if approved):

11. Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category

- 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. If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving the chairperson's final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson's evaluation shall be sent to the departmental tenure committee. The departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category. The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level. For a category evaluation to serve as a basis for a finding of overall unsatisfactory performance, the chairperson and the tenure committee must agree with respect to that category.
- 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.

II. Post-Tenure Review

Post-tenure review is a mechanism to ensure that the university can maintain a faculty capable of fulfilling the university's mission effectively. It should encourage productivity, reward exceptional performance, and offer correction of unsatisfactory performance without changing the due process or substantive rights of faculty.

Annual reviews, as provided for in section I of this policy, are used for determining salary increases, promotion, tenure, and assisting faculty in professional development.

If, after the annual review and faculty appeal processes are completed, a faculty member receives a final overall evaluation of unsatisfactory, as provided for in section I of this policy, then the faculty member departmental tenure committee, the chair and the dean shall prepare a professional development plan supported by appropriate resources. The plan must be developed within 30 days of the final overall evaluation of unsatisfactory and must contain measurable objective benchmarks identifying what is necessary to attain meaningful progress and, separately, satisfactory performance. During the time period of the professional development plan, progress toward successful completion of the plan will become part of the annual review process for the faculty member.

If, in the next annual review following an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member receives a satisfactory rating in at least 2 of 3 categories, the professional development plan will be considered successfully completed.

If, in the second annual review following an overall unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member fails either to attain on “overall satisfactory performance” rating or to demonstrate “meaningful progress” in remediating the overall performance deficiencies, as both are defined in the professional development plan, the faculty member may be issued a notice of dismissal as specified in the UA Board of Trustees Policy 405.1 Appointment, Promotion, Tenure, Non-Reappointment and Dismissal of Faculty.

Attachment C: Wright Amendment to FS_2021_12

Sections 6 and 11 reflecting the amendments proposed by Past President/Senator Wright:

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.
 - f. If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving the chairperson’s final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson’s evaluation shall be sent to departmental tenure committee. The departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category.
 - g. 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 as specified in 11.
 - h. The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level if the chair finds the faculty member unsatisfactory in one or more categories.
11. Overall Unsatisfactory Rating in a Category
 - 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. ~~c.~~ 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. b. 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. ~~If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving Tthe chairperson's final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson's evaluation shall be sent to~~ may be appealed to the departmental tenure committee. ~~If tThe departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category. The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level. For a category evaluation to serve as a basis for a finding of overall unsatisfactory performance, the chairperson and the tenure committee must agree with respect to that category. 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.

CLEAN COPY of SECTIONS I.6 AND I.11 WITH WRIGHT AMENDMENTS (if approved):

- 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.
 - f. If a faculty member objects within 30 days of receiving the chairperson's final evaluation of unsatisfactory in a single category, then the chairperson's evaluation shall

be sent to departmental tenure committee. The departmental tenure committee shall make an evaluation independent of the chairperson for that category.

- g. 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 as specified in 11.
- h. The evaluations of both the chairperson and the tenure committee shall be sent to the next level if the chair finds the faculty member unsatisfactory in one or more categories.

11. Overall Unsatisfactory

- a. 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. For a category evaluation to serve as a basis for a finding of overall unsatisfactory performance, the chairperson and the tenure committee must agree with respect to that category.
- 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. 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.
- d. The unit's operating procedures shall specify the scope of materials for review, the voting procedures, and the method of voting.

1 **ATTACHMENT D: Academic Integrity and Discipline**

2

3 The University has developed certain regulations to make possible an orderly academic 4
environment where all members of the community have the freedom to develop to the fullest 5
extent.

6

7 Academic dishonesty cannot be condoned or tolerated in the University community. Such
8 behavior is considered a student conduct violation, and students found responsible for
committing

9 an academic offense on the campus, or in connection with an institution-oriented or sponsored 10
activity, or while representing the University or academic department, will be disciplined by the 11
University.

12

13 Students may not gain undue advantage over their classmates by deceptive or dishonest 14 means.
Throughout their education students should be impressed with the facts that cheating, 15 duplicity,
unauthorized reproduction of classroom materials, and plagiarism are morally degrading 16 and that such
practices seriously interfere with learning and intellectual development. It is a 17 responsibility of
instructors to make every effort to prevent dishonesty, protect honest students, 18 and take appropriate
action in instances of dishonesty. It is the responsibility of the student not 19 only to abstain from
cheating, but in addition, to avoid the appearance of cheating and to guard

20 against making it possible for others to cheat. Courtesy and honesty require that any ideas or 21
materials borrowed from another must be fully acknowledged. It is the obligation of each student 22 to
report all alleged violations of academic integrity to the instructor, as well as the responsibility
23 of all instructors to report all alleged violations of academic integrity to the *Office of the Dean of 24
Students*.

25

26 Students may not reproduce, in whole or in part, classroom lectures or study materials 27 presented
by a professor without specific approval in advance by the professor. Publication of any 28 such material
shall only be with the express consent of the professor.

29

30 The determination that a student's work was the result of dishonest action can be considered 31 in the
instructor's evaluation of that work and in the determination of the course grade. In addition, 32
disciplinary action will be taken by the appropriate University official (representative from the 33 Office
of the Dean of Students) or by the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee.

34

35 **Definition of Academic Offenses**

36

37 The following list identifies categories of offenses that are subject to grade penalty and 38
disciplinary action. This list is not intended to be exhaustive.

- 39
- **Cheating on an examination or quiz:** To give or receive, to offer or solicit
information

40 on any quiz or examination. This includes the following classes of dishonesty: (a)
 41 copying from another student's paper; (b) use during the examination of prepared
 42 materials, notes, or text other than those specifically permitted by the professor; (c)
 43 collaboration with another student during the examination; (d) buying, selling, stealing,
 44 soliciting, or transmitting an examination, or any material purported to be the unreleased
 45 content of a coming examination, or the use of such material; (e) substituting for another
 46 person during an examination or allowing such substitution for oneself; (f) bribery
 of any 47 person to obtain examination information.

48 • **Plagiarism:** To adopt and reproduce as one's own, to appropriate to one's own use and
 49 incorporate in one's own work without acknowledgment, the ideas of others or passages 50
 from their writings and works. This includes self-plagiarizing, the presentation of one's
 51 previously published work as novel and without proper acknowledgement.

52 • **Collusion:** To obtain from another party, without specific approval in advance by the
 53 professor, assistance in the production of work offered for credit to the extent that the 54 work
 reflects the ideas or skills of the party consulted rather than those of the person in 55 whose name
 the work is submitted.

56 • **Duplicity:** To offer for credit ~~identical or substantially unchanged~~ work in two or more
 57 courses, without specific advance approval of the professors involved.

58

59 Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee

60 This committee is a Faculty Senate committee. To see its makeup and purpose, see the
 61 Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock,
 Article III. 62 It provides the members of hearing panels. The AIGC shall follow these
 procedures for

63 conducting academic offense hearings. The procedures shall be distributed to all members of the
 64 committee by the associate vice chancellor for academic affairs. Reasonable deviations from the
 65 time frame or procedures will not invalidate a decision unless the deviations cause
 significant 66 prejudice to the student.

67 There are two types of procedures: one for students enrolled in a course and one for 68
 students who are not enrolled in a course. In either case, students are encouraged to consult
 the 69 Student Rights and Privileges Regarding Academic Offenses.

70

71

72 **Steps Toward Redress for Academic Offenses**

73

74 A. Academic Dishonesty Procedures for Students Enrolled in a Course

75

76 These procedures are applicable when a student is enrolled in a course, and an instructor
 suspects 77 the student of cheating, plagiarism, collusion, or similar activity, and when the suspicion
 is 78 supported by substantial facts or evidence.

79

80 The instructor is responsible for notifying the student in writing of the specific allegations within

81 five class days (class days are counted as defined in the Student Handbook) of identifying the
 82 offense, (using the Allegation of Academic Offense Form), delivering this form by ~~mail, by~~
 83 email employing the university email address, and preferably by an additional method, ~~or in~~ 84
~~person;~~ also, the instructor is responsible for retaining a copy of the form, and for forwarding
 one 85 copy each to the relevant department chairperson and to Office of the Dean of Students.

86
 87 Upon receipt of the notice form, the student is responsible for contacting the instructor for the
 88 purpose of arranging a conference; both parties are then responsible for cooperating as necessary
 89 to conduct the conference within five class days of the student's receipt of the notice. The
 90 purposes of this conference are:

- 91 • to ensure that the student is aware and understands the specific violation
 and the
- 92 substantiating evidence; and,
- 93 • to ensure that the student has ample opportunity to present to the
 instructor his or
- 94 her position and explanation.

95
 96 If the student admits to academic misconduct or the instructor still believes a violation occurred,
 97 a grade penalty can be imposed. Regardless of the outcome of this conference, the instructor is
 98 responsible for immediately notifying the Office of the Dean of Students of the results.

99
 100 If the instructor and student reach agreement that the student is responsible for the violation, a
 101 grade penalty may not be imposed until the student has met with the representative of the Office
 102 of Dean of Students and ~~and unless~~ the student has failed to file a formal appeal by the official
 103 deadline for filing, ~~or has signed an informed decision waiver of the right to appeal, after~~
 104 ~~conference with the representative of the Office of the Dean of Students.~~ If no formal appeal or
 105 waiver has been filed by the student at the expiration time of the allowable period, the
 instructor 106 may immediately impose a grade penalty.

107
 108 A grade penalty may be imposed only by the instructor. It is recommended that if a student is
 109 found to be responsible for the violation, the instructor will consider the individual
 110 circumstances, nature or severity of the offense, similar class violations, etc., before assessing the
 111 grade penalty. Grade penalties for consideration for academic offenses are:

- 112 • a grade of *F* in the course,
- 113 • a grade of *F* on the examination, project, etc. ,
- 114 • a grade adjustment,
- 115 • no credit for material presented.

116
 117 If the conference's outcome is that the instructor continues to believe with objective cause that
 118 the student is responsible of an academic offense, and yet the student maintains a position that
 119 they are not responsible, then grade penalty may not be imposed until one of the two following
 120 conditions has been met:

- 121 • Either 10 class days have passed since the student's receipt of the
Allegation
- 122 Form, and no official appeal or waiver of rights to a hearing (Disciplinary
123 Alternative Form) has been filed by the student; or
- 124 • The student has filed an appeal within the prescribed 10 class days, and
has
- 125 pursued the University's judicial appeals procedures to the maximum possible 126
 extent desired, and has been ultimately determined through and by those
 means to 127 be responsible-of the offense.

127 The student shall schedule a meeting with the representative of the Office of the Dean of
 128 Students after meeting with the instructor. Subsequently both the student and the representative
 129 of the Office of the Dean of Students are responsible for cooperating as necessary to conduct the
 130 conference no later than five class days from the date the student met with the instructor.

131 The purposes of this conference will differ, as will responsibilities pertinent to it, depending
 132 upon whether the student acknowledges responsibility regarding the academic offense.
 133 Therefore, two categories follow:

- 134 1. In a case wherein the student has acknowledged responsibility for the academic
 135 offense to the instructor and also maintains that position after conference with the
 136 representative of the Office of the Dean of Students, and the offense warrants a
 137 severe penalty such as expulsion or suspension, the representative of the Office of
 138 the Dean of Students will, within three class days, refer the case to Academic
 139 Integrity and Grievance Committee. If the offense does not warrant a severe
 140 penalty such as suspension or expulsion, the representative from the Office of the
 141 Dean of Students will elect one of two options:
 - 142 a. the representative from the Office of the Dean of Students, with
 143 agreement of the student, may opt to directly impose disciplinary sanction,
 144 provided due process conditions have been met in the student's interest; or
 - 145 b. the case may be referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance
 146 Committee for disposition.
- 147 2. In a case wherein the outcome of the instructor/student conference is that the
 148 student does not acknowledge responsibility for the academic offense, the
 149 representative from the Office of the Dean of Students will review the following
 150 information with the student: the specific violation and evidence, student's rights
 151 and privileges, appeal procedures, ~~operating policies of the Academic Integrity~~
 152 ~~and Grievance Committee~~, disciplinary proceedings, etc.

153 After this review, if the student changes their position and acknowledges responsibility, the
 154 representative from the Office of the Dean of Students will immediately notify the instructor and
 155 the relevant department chairperson.

156 If the student continues to maintain their position that they are not responsible for the
 157 violation, the representative from the Office of the Dean of Students will offer to assist the
 158 student in writing a statement of appeal; Support for writing of the appeal may not be offered by
 159 the same person designated to serve as the representative of the university at the appeal hearing.
 160 The student is responsible for delivering the appeal statement to the representative of the Office
 161 of Dean of Students, who receives it on behalf of the university. ~~†This formal written statement~~
 162 ~~of appeal, when it is delivered to the representative of the Office of Dean of Students chairperson~~
 163 ~~of the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee, constitutes the student's initiation of the~~
 164 ~~University's judicial appeals procedures. The student is responsible for delivering the appeal~~
 165 ~~statement to the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson or designee.~~ This
 166 delivery must take place no later than 10 class days from the date of the student's initial receipt
 167 of the Allegation Form or within 10 class days of the meeting with the instructor.

170 Regardless of the outcome of the conference between the representative of the Office of
 171 the Dean of Students and the student, the representative of the Office of the Dean of
 Students is 172 responsible for immediately notifying its results to the instructor and to
 the relevant department 173 chairperson.

174 The student's conferences with the instructor and with the representative from the Office
 175 of the Dean of Students are mandatory steps prerequisite to the filing of an official
 appeal. The

176 intent of this guideline is to ensure that all reasonable efforts have been made to resolve
 the 177 outcome of the academic offense allegation before the matter is brought to
 the Academic 178 Integrity and Grievance Committee.

179 The Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee chairperson or designee is
 responsible

180 for immediately notifying the following persons, upon receipt of a student's appeal in
 regard to 181 allegation of academic offense: the relevant instructor, the department
 chairperson, and the 182 representative from the Office of the Dean of Students.

183 The student has the right to attend classes until the appeal is resolved. The student may
 184 not withdraw from a course while an allegation of academic dishonesty in that course is
 being

185 considered. If the student withdraws from a course after receiving notification of an
 allegation of 186 academic dishonesty, the student will be reinstated, pending final
 adjudication of the allegation.

187 At the conclusion of the consideration process:

- 188 ● If academic dishonesty is found and a grade of "F" in the course is assigned, then 189
 the failing grade will be recorded and remain on the student's transcript.
- 190 ● If academic dishonesty is found and a penalty less than a grade of "F" for the
 191 course is assigned, then the student may continue in the course or withdraw from 192
 the course at that time as long as it is before the final withdrawal date indicated in
 193 the academic calendar.
- 194 ● If academic dishonesty is not found, the student may continue in the
 course or 195 withdraw from the course at that time.
- 196 ● If academic dishonesty is not found, and the student was prevented from
 197 withdrawing from the course because the deadline passed during the consultation
 198 and appeal process, the student is eligible for the same opportunity to withdraw
 199 from the course they would have had at the time they were accused
 including any
 200 refund of tuition.

201

202 If the consideration process is not completed before the end of a semester, a temporary grade not
 203 affecting the student's GPA will be submitted until the adjudication process is completed. The
 204 student may re-take a course in which a grade of "F" is assigned as a penalty for academic
 205 dishonesty. However, in such cases, the original grade of "F" will not be replaced but instead be
 206 included in the calculation of the student's cumulative GPA along with the subsequent grade 207
 received.

208

209 B. Academic Dishonesty Procedures for Students Not Enrolled in a Course and Students
 210 Representing an Academic Department or the University in a University-Oriented or Sponsored
 211 Activity On or Off Campus

212

213 When an instructor on his or her knowledge or on information given by a student believes that a
 214 student has behaved dishonestly, he or she should immediately notify the Office of the Dean of
 215 Students of the suspicion of cheating, plagiarism, collusion, or the like. On receiving the
 216 notification of the alleged academic violation, the representative from the Office of the Dean of
 217 Students shall investigate, consult the involved instructor(s), and summon the student(s) for a
 218 conference within five class days. No action shall be taken until the student has been informed of
 219 the violation, has been given an opportunity to present his or her defense, and has been notified
 220 of his or her right to appeal the case or have a hearing before the Academic Integrity and
 221 Grievance Committee. In a case of academic dishonesty in which the student admits
 222 responsibility and the offense does not warrant suspension or a severe sanction, the matter may
 223 be handled by the representative from the Office of the Dean of Students, and a lesser
 224 disciplinary action (sanction) imposed.

225

226 In such cases, the fundamentals of due process shall be followed. This administrative route may
 227 be taken when all of the following hold:

- 228 1. responsibility is admitted by the student(s) involved;
- 229 2. accused student(s) request this administrative route;
- 230 3. the student is made aware of the disciplinary action that will be imposed; and 231
- 231 4. the representative from the Office of the Dean of Students can deal with the
 232 case
 233 objectively.

234

234 In a case of academic dishonesty where the student may be suspended, a severe sanction is
 235 warranted, or the student maintains that he or she is not responsible for the violation, the case
 236 will be referred within five class days to the chairperson of the Academic Integrity and
 237 Grievance Committee.

238

239 Procedures for Academic Offenses Referred to the Academic Integrity and Grievance
 Committee

- 240 1. The chairperson or designee, on receiving a written appeal or referral from the
 241 representative from the Office of the Dean of Students, will convene a hearing panel 242
 242 within 15 class days to consider whether the student is responsible for the violation and
 243 when necessary, the appropriate disciplinary action (sanction).
- 244 2. The student and the instructor will be notified in writing at least 10 class days before the
 245 date set for the hearing of the nature of the complaint and of the date, time, and place the
 246 case is to be heard. They shall also be notified that, should either party choose not to

247 appear, the hearing will proceed as scheduled. For the purpose of this section, the day
248 after the date of mailing of the letter of notification shall be the first day of the 10-day
249 delay period. The committee shall, when possible ~~must~~ hear the case within 15 class days
250 of the time the appeal or referral was filed. The determination of the date, time and place
251 of the hearing will include consideration of the student's and instructor's
schedules and of 252 their convenience, but in the interest of fairness, reasonable speed
shall be the
253 watchword.

254 3. The student and the instructor will be notified that each can bring witnesses in his or
her
255 behalf, that each will have a reasonable opportunity for confronting witnesses appearing
256 against him or her, that each has the right to be present during all phases of the
hearing, 257 and that each may bring to the hearing two non-participating
representatives.

258 4. At least five class days before the ~~committee panel convenes~~ is convened, the student
and
259 the instructor must submit to the representative from the Office of the Dean of Students
260 all the information that each feels is pertinent to the appeal ~~or referral~~. This information
261 must be in writing, ~~and~~ supported in detail, and include a copy of the syllabus (if
262 applicable). The material ~~it~~ should specify what additional evidence, witnesses and/or
263 legal counsel the student or instructor will bring to the scheduled meeting. Copies of this
264 information will be distributed to all involved parties. Materials submitted less than five
265 class days before the appeal hearing will not be disseminated to, be reviewed by,
or may 266 be referenced by either the instructor or the student during the appeal.

267 5. Legal counsel is permitted at academic offense hearings. Legal counsel serves in a non268
participatory capacity and is restricted to the role of advisor.

269 6. A hearing panel will be selected from the AIGC to consider the appeal. A panel chair will 270
be chosen from among the faculty members present at the hearing panel. A panel to hear
271 appeals for academic offenses consists of the chairperson and three members; of this
272 number, one must be a faculty member and one must be a voting student member. A
273 representative from the Office of the Dean of Students ~~may~~ also attends the hearing on
274 behalf of the university. The Faculty Senate/Assembly president and the Student
275 Government Association president or the Graduate Student Association president may
276 appoint temporary committee members during the summer months to hear cases in an
277 emergency and only after the associate vice chancellor has made all attempts to
contact 278 committee members and alternates.

279 7. The only persons present at meetings of this committee shall be members, the student,
the
280 instructor, designated observers, non-participating representatives, and witnesses actually
281 testifying before the committee. With prior notice to the hearing panel, any of the parties
282 involved in the hearing, the student, the instructor, or witnesses, may appear via
283 synchronous technology rather than in person. All proceedings shall be recorded.
284 8. Written statements by witnesses in lieu of personal appearance should not be
allowed 285 except in rare instances.

286 9. During the process of making a determination of responsibility for the alleged
violation
287 or in determining the appropriate disciplinary action (sanction), the hearing panel shall
288 consider only that information which (a) has been presented during the hearing and had
289 been submitted previously in a timely manner, and (b) is relevant to the alleged
violation.

290 10. A decision shall be reached by a majority of the panel members.

291 11. If the hearing panel finds the student is responsible for the violation, the instructor
will
292 determine the appropriate grade penalty based on a recommendation from the panel, and
293 the panel will determine the appropriate disciplinary sanction. In such case, the panel
294 chair may request the representative from the Office of the Dean of Students to open the
295 student's file to see if there is a prior disciplinary record. If the panel finds the student is
296 not responsible for the violation, the instructor will treat the student accordingly; in any
297 case, no disciplinary sanction or grade penalty shall be imposed until the appeal
deadline
298 has expired. The administrative officer will maintain all records during the appeal delay
299 period and on the expiration date will forward all records to the Office of the Dean of
300 Students for filing and appropriate administrative action and notify the instructor to
301 impose the penalty.

302 12. The administrative officer shall notify in writing and deliver within five class days of
the
303 hearing to the appropriate persons (the student, the instructor, and the representative
from
304 the Office of the Dean of Students) the decision and determination of the case, the
305 disciplinary sanction imposed, and the right of the student, the instructor, or the
306 representative from the Office of the Dean of Students to petition for appeal. The Appeal
307 Procedures and Instructions shall accompany the letter. A grade penalty cannot be
308 appealed.

309 13. If the disciplinary sanction imposed was suspension or expulsion, the administrative
310 officer shall notify the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor in
311 writing of the hearing panel's decision and the determination of the case, reasons for the
312 decision, sanction imposed, and verify that all involved parties have been notified of
their 313 right to petition for appeal in accordance with the University's Procedures
and
314 Instructions.

315
316 ...
317

Explanations for Requested Changes/Modifications to Policy 501.13

Initiated: AIGC Panel AY 2020-2021

Background:

Senate Policy 501.13 has evolved over time. Consequently, it makes references to functionaries or processes that do not reflect accurately what is the implementation of the policy. Moreover, through experience, the Academic Integrity and Grievance Committee (AIGC) has identified points that require elaboration or explanation.

While not complete, the following are the first steps in resolving these issues. For convenience-sake, line numbering have been inserted and changes (additions or deletions) will be referred by line numbering.

Note:

1. The italics for reference to Dean of Students in the first paragraph is thus because it is a hyperlink on the web.
2. Modifications end midway. A note [STOPPED HERE] was inserted into the lined and unlined versions for reference.
3. The new language on self-plagiarism is included in the policy in italics.

Lines

51 Senate requested that AIGC re-visit duplicity to distinguish it more clearly from possible overlap with self-plagiarism:

- The distinction thus focusses on instructor permission to submit any work in multiple classes. Scope of overlap is addressed in Plagiarism and selfplagiarism.
 - Theoretically, a student could receive permission from different instructors to submit the same paper/assignment more than once. This then nullifies duplicity. Failure to acknowledge work that has been previously published (as defined by the instructor) would result in self-plagiarism but not duplicity.
- 81 Days between processes are key to judicious and swift response throughout this policy and the grade-appeal process as well. However there appears to be confusion as to how days are counted. By referring to the student Handbook, the goal is to decrease confusion. Specifically, “class days” is defined as:
- Monday-Saturday
 - Not between semesters: the clock stops ticking after the deadlines for submitting grades and resumes at the beginning of the first day of classes in the next semester. Semesters include: Fall, Spring, Summer (1, 2 and 4).
- 82-84 Two changes were to reflect the more electronic world in which we live. The university email is considered an official and legitimate form of communication. Instructors are encouraged to adopt two methods of communication to increase the likelihood of the safe delivery of communication. However, specifying this delivery may not be responsive to either instructor or student realities.
- 101-102 the structure of the language does not clearly indicate that even if the student accept responsibility, they must still meet with the Dean of students and the appeal timeframe must pass – before a grade penalty may be imposed.
- 153 This deletion reflects that there is no such official document. Any policies as they pertain to the student would be subsumed in the aforementioned information.
- 160-163 This support is important to aid students. However, it does create an appearance of impropriety or conflict of interest if the same person who helps the student then appears on behalf of the university at the panel when the student may feel betrayed. Alternatively, the faculty member may feel blind-sided when the representative who has guided them through the process is the same one who crafted the student narrative. The simplest solution is to separate out the roles. This has been implemented recently in the Dean of Student Offices. By including it in the policy the expectation is made explicit.
- 165 The documentation does not get delivered to the Chairperson of the AIGC. The policy was corrected to reflect the accurate and correct process. 166 “Judicial process” was deleted as it does not have role here.
- 169 This was inserted to clarify that the clock starts from either event. 258 The AICC is not convened but rather a panel (a portion of the AIGC.)
- 260 Unnecessary and confusing verbiage.

261 Inclusion of the syllabus, by both parties, establishes what each side understood to be the operating document for the class. It grounds the expectations that both employed for functioning.

264-266 This time frame s is necessary so the instructor, student and the panel have an opportunity to review materials in a timely manner. It ensures that all parties have

33

an opportunity to review the material and minimizes the likelihood of an unfair process. The Integrity documentation alludes to it (See Student Rights and Privileges #4: *Present witnesses, question University witnesses and persons testifying against him or her, and to review statements submitted; and #5: Have an opportunity to review the information to be submitted at the hearing in advance to prepare a defense.*)

274 Standardizes the language and establishes which of the members of the Dean of Student's Office attends and in what role. There are possibly two functionaries from the Office of Dean of Students: The person who represents the University in the allegation and possible – though definitely a different – person who may help the student craft their narrative of defense.

289 This inserted to reiterate that materials must be submitted previously. Otherwise, the sentence implies that new material may be presented in the hearing which would be prejudicial to either party as their right to review material before the panel has been violated.