



FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
January 29, 2022
1:00 PM until adjournment
Synchronous Online

Convene: 1:00 PM

- I. Welcome and Roll Call
Attending: CHASSE – Anson, Barrio Vilar, Baylis, Blevins-Knabe, Cheatham, Condran, Groesbeck, Hamilton, Harris, Matson, Mitchell, Scheidt, Scranton, Smith; CBHHS – Atkins, ten Bensel, Golden, Hendon, Knight, Leonard, Ruhr, Sadaka, Solomon, Staley, Woolridge; CSTEM – Baillie, Deng, Hardeman, Kattoum, Milanova, Pidugu, Ray, Sharma, Woolbright ; LIBRARY – Macheak ; LAW – Boles, Cummings, Woodmansee ; EX OFFICIO – Drale, Bain, Nolen, Wright, Shahan

Absent: EX OFFICIO – Chamberlain
- II. Review of Minutes from October 29, 2021 and November 19, 2021
Passed
- III. Announcements
Barrio-Vilar: ATLE Office and Learns + other programs; please join!
ATLE has [lending library](#) with link and GA delivery
- IV. Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)
 - Richard Woolridge: Payroll error from 1.5 years past “corrected” this week without notice and to disadvantage of a faculty member
 - Rob Steinbuch: Concerned about normal order in respecting senate committee purview. Need to preserve democratic processes and not act under emergency status
 - John Hendon: Faculty concerns over loss of enrollment need to be addressed and not sidelined
 - Karen Leonard: Concerned with process re: Tenure process. Concerned over loss of democratic process.
 - Brian Mitchell: Standing request to provide report on pay equity issues; will there be a report?
- V. Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)
 - Andrew Wright: Annual reviews submitted to Faculty Success; concerned about that system. Senate has passed categories for review and FS does not reflect legislation.
 - Faculty Success: Annual review process has policies re: confidentiality. FS has been using

confidential data without consent in violation of policy. Should be investigated.

- Barrio-Vilar: Public invitation to Chancellor, Provost and other members engaged in Academic matters to attend African American II class. Want invitees to witness the logistics faculty face in conducting f2f and synchronous teaching.
- Rob Steinbuch: Problem of language to accurately denote modality definitions.
- Joanne Matson: Also invites administrators to attend Rhetoric and Writing classes offered in mixed modalities to see what the realities and possibilities are.

VI. Reports

a. Executive Committee - Amanda Nolen, President of Faculty Senate

- Address comments on “democratic” process re: tenure review legislation and committees. Normal order is for Senate to refer matters to committee. Motion by past presidents is their prerogative as senators. Will elucidate implementation.
 - Committee on Tenure is subordinate to Senate.
 - Purview is necessarily limited
- Student complaint re: honors (specifically Latin honors)
 - Redirected to GC and UGC to review policy
- Ad Hoc Disability Statement postponed to February
- Faculty Honors and Awards Committee referral; motion to be brought to February
- Senate Exec Committee proposed move to on-line for January; was not accepted
- SEC brings motion to Senate to delay modalities implementation date
 - Wright motion
 - FS 2021-15
 - AVC Finzer: Concern that Fall is already being prepared.
 - Wright: Senate legislation should be aligned with definitions in use; what are the differences?
 - AVC Finzer: Presented models to Chancellor; selected models similar to UAMS and UA-F
 - Nolen: Proceed with implementation date; Senate can amend in response to Chancellor feedback

b. Chancellor’s Report – Christy Drale, Chancellor

- Shared video featuring community partners and value of relationship with UA Little Rock as well as interviews with three students with Board of Trustees. Well-received.
- Please participate in Strategic Vision survey. Building block in developing SV.
- Re: enrollment picture. Down 9+% from one year ago, but higher than in fall.
 - Absolutely focused on enrollment; need to hear individual commentary
- Work Day has delayed budget preparations.
- Re: pay equity, summary document in addition to spreadsheet on Blackboard.
 - Based on data, no evidence of discrepancies, but please report to Provost if you have experienced to the otherwise.
- Will look at remote work issues.

- c. Provost's Report – Ann Bain, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor
 - Chancellor's report to BOT was very positive.
 - Higher Ed Legislative Sub-committee invited Dean Berry and two students to present to great effect.
 - Faculty Excellence Awards will have virtual attendance option.
 - Jumpstart Teaching awards will be announced shortly. Presentations will be shared virtually. Info next week.
 - Learning Commons is now open in Ottenheimer Library
 - Thanks to those serving on Strategic Planning subcommittees
 - Will speak with Brian Kelch and Workday Students to set up townhall meetings
 - Will meet with Chancellor re: below-median salaries and proposals for remedy

- d. Undergraduate Council – Zac Hagins, Chair
Report posted/no commentary
- e. Graduate Council - Laura Ruhl, Chair
Report posted/no commentary
- f. Core Council - Belinda Blevins-Knabe, Chair
Report posted/no commentary

VII. Old Business
N/A

VIII. New Business

- a. **Motion FS 2022_1 Senators Anson, Cheatham, and Wright** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting. Second required.) Annual Review Policy (403.3) – Overall Unsatisfactory

Be it resolved to modify Annual Review Policy (403.3; Rev. 3/2019, 10/2018, 4/2017, and 4/1993) Section I as indicated below (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion), and

Be it further resolved that the implementation date for these changes to policy will begin in Spring 2023.

Wright introduces with legislative history of Annual Review at UA Little Rock.

- Presents argument for legislation. Explains origins for elements in legislation.

Nolen invites Anson and Cheatham to speak.

- Policy implementation effort emanating at unit level to determine excellence and criteria
- Gives the authority to academic units to control criteria.

Open for debate

- Woolridge: Bar is too low in all motions; will vote no. Makes it too difficult to terminate faculty. Does not believe BOT will accept legislation. Will damage campus and will lead to elimination of tenure at campus.

- Leonard: Motion to refer to Tenure Committee to review and properly evaluate the issues and return motion in March.

- 2nd Blevins-Knabe
- Matson speaks against motion to refer. There is no policy at present and is dangerous for all faculty without tenure.
- Hamilton: Speaks against referral. More democratic by deciding this in full Senate.

Motion defeated

- Hendon: Motion to amend (a) to 2 out of 3
 - Baillie 2nd
 - Debate proposed amendment

Passes 28/12

- Wright calls previous question; Matson 2nd
 - Motion passes 27/10

Section I. Annual Faculty Review

...

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

...

11. Overall Unsatisfactory Rating for a Tenured Faculty Member and Post-tenure Review

- a. “Overall unsatisfactory performance” occurs when a faculty member’s annual performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory in teaching, scholarship and creative works, and service according to the academic unit’s criteria (section I. A.9). Before making a determination of overall unsatisfactory, the chairperson must take into consideration the faculty member’s assigned workload and evidence of relevant, documented efforts and outcomes within the context of that workload.
- b. If there is a determination of overall unsatisfactory performance, then post-tenure review (section II) will be initiated.
 - c. If the faculty member is not rated overall unsatisfactory, then the faculty member is overall satisfactory.
 - 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 may be appealed 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.~~

JOINT MOTION Wright moves FS_2022_2 and FS_2022_3

- o Introduces motions and rationale

- Cheatham 2nd (2:12:30 marker)

b. **Motion FS_2022_2. Senators Anson, Cheatham, and Wright** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting. Second required.) Annual Review Policy (403.3) – Section II Post-tenure Review

Be it resolved to modify the Annual Review policy (403.3) section II as indicated below(underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion), and

Be it further resolved that the implementation date for these changes to policy will begin in Spring 2023.

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 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 the approved 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 criteria for 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 the faculty member is determined to be overall unsatisfactory (see section I. A. 11), the departmental 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 overall 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 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.

- c. **FS_2022_3 Senators Anson, Cheatham, and Wright** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting. Second required.) Annual Review Policy (403.3) – Section II Probationary Period, Failing to Meet Overall Satisfactory

Be it resolved to modify the Annual Review policy (403.3) section II as indicated below (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion), and

Be it further resolved that the implementation date for these changes to policy will begin in Spring 2023.

Section II

...

If the faculty member receives ~~two~~ one additional overall unsatisfactory reviews (see section I. A. 11) during the professional development plan period, and fails to demonstrate meaningful progress in remediating overall performance deficiencies, 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.

Commentary: Revisions to the UA Board of Trustees Policies (405.1, Section V.A.9) states the following: “If, in the next annual review following an **overall** unsatisfactory performance rating, the faculty member fails either to attain an **overall** satisfactory performance rating or to demonstrate meaningful progress in remediating the overall performance deficiencies, the faculty member may be issued a notice of dismissal on twelve months’ notice as provided for in this policy, and subject to the procedures contained in Section IV.C.”

- Debate (closed 2:28:20)
Joint motion passed 21/24

Wright introduces Motion FS_2022_4 and rationale

- 2nd Hendon

D. **Motion FS_2022_4 Senators Anson, Cheatham, and Wright** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting. Second required.) Annual Review Policy (403.3) – Section I

Be it resolved to modify Annual Review policy (403.3) as indicated below (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion), and

Be it further resolved that the implementation date for these changes to policy will begin in Spring 2023.

Section I. Annual Faculty Review

Pursuant to ACA 6-63-104, 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, reappointment, post-tenure review, and dismissal. Furthermore, this review is to provide guidance and assistance to all faculty in their professional development and academic responsibilities in the areas of teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service.

A. Procedures for Annual Faculty Evaluation

Detailed criteria and procedures for annual evaluation of faculty shall be recommended by the faculty and chairperson of each academic unit; these criteria and related procedures must be submitted to the dean or director, the Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Chancellor 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 end of the¹ 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 system² 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.

¹ This was added in FS_2018_20.

² 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.

- a. Feedback from the peer review process will be provided to the chairperson regarding the performance of those reviewed³.
- 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 approved 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 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 may submit a written response to be forwarded to each subsequent level of review within ~~ten~~ thirty business days of the meeting in 6.b.
 - 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.

³ This feedback may take the form of a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and service, or it may take some other form, such as feedback regarding specific performance tasks. Examples of the latter include a review of a published article or a review of a peer's teaching based upon a classroom visit.

- f. If the faculty member believes that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from annual review violates their rights under established university policy, they may submit a written appeal to the dean. This written appeal may request consideration of the evaluation by the dean, based on specific, articulated concerns. The dean shall make the determination on the annual review. This determination should be informed by the department's approved criteria.
 - g. ~~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.~~
 - h. ~~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.~~
 - i. ~~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.~~
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 academic unit shall establish minimum criteria for satisfactory performance in each category (teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service). If an academic unit does not have approved criteria, the criteria defined in the generic department governance document shall be used.
 10. The chairperson shall provide at a minimum a rating of satisfactory/unsatisfactory on teaching, scholarly and creative activity, and service. The chairperson shall consider the annual review committee's evaluation when assessing annual performance.
 - 11.⁴

B. Criteria for Faculty Evaluation

Each faculty member shall render service to the University by the standards of the University⁵ 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

⁴ See motion FS_2022_1 for changes to section I.A.11.

⁵ This was changed in FS_2018_20.

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).

- Friendly amendment to 6.f (missing subject “they”)
 - Accepted
- Boles moves amendment to 6.c: “10 business days” to “30 days”
- 2nd Barrio-Vilar

Motion passed 24/2

- Boles moves to refer question of FS_2202_4 to Faculty Governance Committee
- Re: structural differences in terms of chairs, heads, directors, etc. for appeal at unit levels.
 - FGC to respond at March meeting
- 2nd Barrio-Vilar
- Passes; question referred

- E. Motion FS_2022_5 Senators Anson, Cheatham, and Wright** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting. Second required.) Annual Review Policy (403.3) – Modify “chairperson”
- Wright moves
 - 2nd Macheak
- Motion passed

Be it resolved to change the term “chairperson” to “chairperson or equivalent” throughout the Annual Review policy (403.3) sections I and II.

Commentary for Motions FS_2022_1, 2, 4, and 5:

System Counsel, on behalf of the System President, recommended rejection of FS_2021_12 on several grounds related to the determination of overall unsatisfactory performance. In particular, section 11 was deemed to over-ride the chair’s evaluation by the faculty of the department.

ACA-6-63-104 specifies the requirement and conditions where faculty must undergo Annual Review, as well as the purpose of this review:

- (a) The president and chancellor of each state-supported institution of higher education in Arkansas shall work with the campus faculties to develop a framework to review faculty performance, including post-tenure review. The framework should be used to develop processes and procedures at each institution to ensure a consistently high level of performance of the faculty at Arkansas’ publicly supported institutions of higher

education. The effects of the review process of faculty performance should include rewarding productive faculty, redirecting faculty efforts to improve or to increase productivity, and correcting instances of substandard performance. The framework developed by each institution shall be reported to the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education, the Joint Interim Oversight Committee on Education Reform, and the Department of Higher Education no later than December 1, 1998, and shall be implemented on the respective campuses no later than January 1, 2001

(b) Pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, each state-supported institution of higher education in Arkansas shall conduct a rigorous, consistently applied, annual review of the performance of all full-time faculty members. This review shall include assessments by peers, students, and administrators and shall be utilized to ensure a consistently high level of performance and serve in conjunction with other appropriate information as a basis for decisions on promotion, salary increases, and job tenure. The evaluation by students and administrative staff, shall be applicable to all teaching faculty, full-time, part-time, and graduate teaching assistants and shall include an assessment of the fluency in English of the faculty member or graduate teaching assistant. This review shall not be used to demote a tenured faculty member to a nontenured status.

(c)(1) Each college and university shall continually make efforts to identify any English fluency deficiencies of the teaching faculty and shall take reasonable measures to assist deficient faculty members in becoming proficient in English; however, the responsibility of acquiring the level of English proficiency required for the faculty member's teaching, research, or service assignments rests with the faculty member.

(2) Each college and university shall have a process for addressing concerns raised by students concerning language proficiency problems of faculty members.

(d) The department shall be responsible for monitoring the evaluation process and shall report its findings to the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board and to the Legislative Council by August 1 of each year.

(e) Each state-supported institution of higher education shall require full-time faculty members of the college of education and related disciplines to work collaboratively with the accredited public schools in this state, and such faculty involvement shall be included as part of the annual review of the faculty as required by subsection (b) of this section.

In particular, the goal of the review "... should include rewarding productive faculty, redirecting faculty efforts to improve or to increase productivity, and correcting instances of substandard performance." The law further states that "This review shall not be used to demote a tenured faculty member to a nontenured status." In UA Little Rock policy prior to the revisions to Board Policy 405.1, the process of annual review could initiate an improvement plan in post-tenure review, the results of which could transition a faculty member from tenured status to untenured status (dismissed from the university).

The revisions proposed in this motion amend existing policy (including policy that counsel and chancellor have expressed uncertainty regarding the state of approval), to bring policy in line with State Law, Board Policy, and the UA Little Rock constitution.

The UA Little Rock faculty senate proposes wording adapted from the UA Fayetteville approved

policy to respond to System counsel's stated concerns:

“III. B. Annual Review for All Faculty at the Rank of Assistant Professor and Above ...
13 Except for non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, a faculty member claiming that an evaluation or recommendation resulting from the annual review process violates their rights under established University personnel regulations, policies, or practices, has recourse through written appeal to the dean. This written appeal may request reconsideration of the evaluation by the dean, based on specific, articulated concerns. The dean shall make the final determination on the annual review. For non-reappointment, dismissal, tenure, or promotion decisions, other University policies and procedures are applicable.”

The overall unsatisfactory rating resulting from post-tenure review that leads to dismissal may be appealed to the Faculty Appeals Council, per the UA Little Rock constitution:

“All appeals and grievances involving faculty are made to the Faculty Appeals Council. This includes but is not limited to appeals and grievances about **dismissal**, tenure, promotion, salary, fringe benefits, working conditions, and discrimination based upon race, sex, or physical handicap.”

Lindsey Baertlein, Honors and Awards Committee presents

Passed 22/0

E. **FS_2021_19** Honors and Awards Committee (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting. No second required.) Expansion of Faculty Excellence Awards

Be it resolved to revise the Faculty Excellence Awards Policy (403.8; Rev. 2018) and add two new award categories: Excellence in Early Career and Excellence in Social Justice. Revisions are in Attachment B (underline indicates addition; strikethrough indicates deletion); and

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

Commentary: When the UA Little Rock restructured the academic colleges, the number of academic colleges was reduced from five to three. Accordingly, the opportunities for faculty to be rewarded for excellence was reduced as well. By expanding the Faculty Excellence Awards, more faculty become eligible to participate in the program.

At the September 24th meeting, the Faculty Senate referred this legislation back the Honors and Awards Committee to address two concerns: 1. Modify revised awards categories to accommodate “lateral” faculty hires or faculty who are not early career, but have been at the university less than the requisite 5 years; and 2. Address the page limit discrepancy in Section V. The Preparation and Submission of Nomination Packets. To address the first issue, the committee changed the name of the new award from “Early Career” to “Rising” with the eligibility requirement that the faculty will have been at the university at least 1 year but less than 5 years. To address the second issue, the committee clarified the total page number of the packet to be 13 pages which corresponds with the required packet elements.

President cedes chair to Vice President Joanne Matson
Robert Steinbuch, Chair, Committee on Tenure presents

F. **Motion FS_2022_6** Committee on Tenure (Recommendation. Majority vote, no second required)

Be it resolved that a representative of the Tenure Committee participate in any discussions between representatives of the faculty senate and/or Executive Committee and the UA System office regarding the UA-Little Rock annual review policy; and

Be it further resolved that Joshua Silverstein be the representative of the Tenure Committee.

Fails 7/19

IX. Open Forum

Adjourn: 4:56 PM

ATTACHMENT A: FACULTY EXCELLENCE AWARDS

Policy 403.8 Faculty Excellence Awards

The UA Little Rock Foundation Fund Board in 1988 instituted a series of annual awards to recognize and reward faculty excellence in three specified areas of performance: teaching, research or creative endeavors, and professional and public service. Recognition is accorded at the college level and at the University level. Each award consists of a framed certificate and a cash gift of \$1,000 at the college level and at the university level, \$5,000 each for teaching, research or creative endeavors, and public service. College winners are recognized and University winners are announced at the Faculty Excellence Ceremony each spring.

I. Nature and Categories of Awards

A. Award for excellence in teaching.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward superior classroom teachers—individuals whose command of their respective disciplines, teaching methodologies, communications skills, concern for student performance, and commitment to the learning process exemplify the teacher/mentor model. The award is not intended to be a popularity contest. It is designed to distinguish those teachers who maintain high expectations of their students and who ensure academic rigor in their courses.

B. Award for excellence in research or creative endeavors.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward those individuals whose research or creative endeavors have been particularly successful and are so recognized locally, regionally, and nationally. The results of these efforts should have contributed to the expansion of knowledge and/or the quality of life, and/or encouraged additional research.

C. Award for excellence in public service.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward those individuals who have brought credit to the UA Little Rock through their successful efforts in applying the content or skills of their academic disciplines in service to the community, state, or nation in areas of public interest. This award is designed to distinguish those persons whose achievements in serving the public interest by the application of their disciplinary expertise to problems and issues external to campus have been particularly successful and are so recognized locally, regionally, or nationally.

D. Rising faculty award for excellence.

This award is to recognize, encourage, and reward the contributions of any full-time faculty demonstrating exceptional promise in teaching, research or creative endeavors, or public service during their first five years at UA Little Rock.

E. Award for excellence in social justice.

This award recognizes a faculty member's commitment to the broad concept of social justice through teaching, public service, and research or creative endeavors. Social justice is the view that everyone deserves equal economic, political, and social rights and

opportunities. Social justice workers aim to open the doors of diversity, equity, and inclusion for everyone, particularly those in greatest need.

II. Number and Frequency of Awards

A. Established faculty aAward for excellence in teaching.

- There may be one award in each college/school⁶ of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- The award for excellence in teaching may be shared when the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.

B. Established faculty aAward for excellence in research or creative endeavors.

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- The award for excellence in research or creative endeavors may be shared where the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.

C. Established faculty aAward for excellence in public service.

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- The award for excellence in public service may be shared when the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.

D. Rising faculty award for excellence..

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- The award for excellence in early career may be shared when the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.

E. Award for excellence in social justice.

- There may be one award in each college/school of the University annually.
- There shall be one University-level award annually. The University-level awardee shall be chosen from the college/school-level award winners.
- The award for social justice may be shared when the achievements being recognized result from joint efforts.
- The award will recognize outstanding accomplishments and general impact in any or all of the areas of teaching, service, and research or creative endeavors.

Specifically:

- Teaching – Development and implementation of effective strategies for teaching that advance the understanding of underrepresented groups in the

⁶ The term “college/schools” refers to each college or school that has representation in the UA Little Rock Faculty Senate.

field of instruction and/or for advancing the education of students from underrepresented groups in the nominee's field of instruction to include (but not be limited to) activities such as classroom instruction, direct or independent study, thesis and dissertation, and mentoring.

- Research/Creative Endeavors – New knowledge or creative work that advances the understanding of underrepresented groups in the nominee's field of study and/or has the potential to improve the quality of life among underrepresented groups in the nominee's field of study.
- Service/Outreach – Activities that promote the professional and/or academic advancement of underrepresented groups in the nominee's field of study; contributions to diversity and equal opportunity in the university through activities such as recruitment and mentoring of faculty and students; activities which promote the well-being of underrepresented communities in the nominee's field of study.

III. Selection

A. Eligibility.

- Persons with faculty status as defined in the current faculty handbook, except for the adjunct and visiting categories, holding full-time faculty appointments who have completed five or more full years of service to the University may be nominated for any of the awards except for the rising faculty award for excellence and the award for excellence in social justice; faculty who have administrative responsibilities are eligible if their teaching duties are 50% or more of their work assignment for the academic year in which they are nominated.
- Faculty members who are otherwise qualified for the teaching award but who are not administratively a part of one of the colleges/schools shall be eligible through the award process of the college/school that offers the courses such faculty teach.
- The most recent five years of accomplishments comprise the record to be documented, presented and reviewed in the selection process.
- Eligibility for the rising faculty award is limited to persons holding full-time faculty appointments who have completed at least one year and less than five years of service to the University; tenured faculty and senior instructors are ineligible for the early career award.
- Eligibility for the social justice award is limited to persons holding full-time faculty appointments who have completed at least one full year of service to the University.
- Persons may not receive an award of the same category for a period of three years.

B. Nominations.

- Persons considered for awards shall be identified through a process of nomination.
- The nomination process shall be open – i.e., any person may nominate a faculty member for any of the awards.

C. Selection committees – college-level awards.

- There shall be a selection committee within each college/school.
- The size and composition of the committee shall be as follows:
 - A. One representative chosen by the faculty from each department within the college/school.
 - B. One student member.
 - C. One alumni member.
- In colleges/schools which are not organized departmentally, the faculty shall develop a method for faculty representation.
- The manner of choosing the student and alumni members shall be determined by the college/school faculty.
- Individuals who serve as administrators with the title of department chair (or its equivalent) and at higher levels of administration are not eligible to serve on the selection committee.
- Individuals who are nominated for an award may not serve on the selection committee.

D. Selection committee – University-level awards.

- The UA Little Rock Board of Visitors will serve as the external selection committee for the university-level awards.

IV. Procedure

A. Administration of the award process.

Administrative support for the award process shall be the responsibility of the Office of the Provost.

B. Solicitation of nominations.

- Not later than September 30 of each year, the Provost shall advise members of the campus community of the award process and nominating procedure. The timeline and deadlines for preparation, completion and submission of materials shall be announced as well.
- The Director of Alumni Affairs shall advise the alumni of the University through appropriate alumni publications.
- Information about the awards shall be widely disseminated throughout the community to encourage nominations from the business, professional, and public sectors of the community.

C. Preparation of nomination packets.

- Nominators are responsible for preparation of nomination packets containing information as specified in the attachment, “Preparation and Submission of Nomination Packets.” Page limitations are enforced.
- Department chairs or equivalent administrators shall cooperate with nominators in assembling supporting evidence.

D. Submission of nomination packets.

- One copy of each nomination packet for the college-level awards shall be submitted to the college selection committee no later than the date specified in the Provost’s announcement.
- One copy of each college-level winner’s packet shall be forwarded to the Provost no later than the date specified in the Provost’s announcement.

E. Selection committee action.

- College-level selection committees shall meet as necessary in order to complete the selection of the award winners.
- Committee procedures shall be determined by the respective colleges/schools.
- The committee shall review such materials as are submitted in the nomination packet.
- The proceedings of the committees shall be confidential.
- The committee shall prepare for each college-level winner a one-page letter of support to be included in the nomination packet.
- Each college-level committee shall forward one copy of the nomination packets of the winners of the college-level awards to the Provost no later than the date specified in the Provost’s announcement

F. The Provost shall forward sets of nomination packets to members of the external selection committee.

- The members of the selection committee shall advise the Provost of the committee’s selections by a date designated by the Provost.
- The proceedings of the committee shall be confidential.
- The announcement of University-level winners shall be made at a suitable University event.

V. Preparation and Submission of Nomination Packets

Nominations must adhere to the following instructions and page limitations to be accepted by the Provost’s Office. Place in a single manila folder one copy of each item described below for each nominee. Clearly identify the name of the nominee on the tab of the folder. Please do not use special folders or binders. Submit the folder to the college or school selection committee by the date specified in the annual solicitation for nominations. Department chairs (or equivalent administrators) are expected to cooperate as needed in assembling the required information.

The contents of each packet should be as follows, minimum 12-point font:

1. Table of Contents

2. Letter of Nomination (limited to three pages). Focus on accomplishments during the most recent five year period.
3. Personal statement (Optional; One page maximum)
4. Biographical data. (limited to five pages) Please provide in the order listed:
 - Name of nominee and award for which nominated
 - Current position (title, rank, department, or unit)
 - Number of years in this position
 - Number of years at UA Little Rock
 - Degrees held (source and date)
 - Employment history (previous positions, years; list most recent first)
 - Honors and awards
 - Membership in professional and honorary societies (note offices held)
 - List of courses taught in each of the five years prior to nomination. Provide the full course title and not just the course number.
 - Scholarly and Professional Accomplishments: List of articles and books published and professional accomplishments within the last five years (please provide the complete citation). If there are particularly significant accomplishments before the last five years, those may be referenced in the letter of nomination. Do not submit copies of work(s). The selection committee may request these if desired.
 - Description of the public service activities in each of the five years prior to nomination.

Only the contents of the packet as specified above will be sent to the members of the external selection committee.

5. Letters of Endorsement: (limited to one page each) Letters of endorsement may be provided from up to four people who can speak to the award criteria. Letters from students who are likely to be subsequently advised or evaluated by the faculty nominee are discouraged. Standard, anonymous student evaluations and individual letters from graduates are appropriate. The perspective or status of the authors of the letters should be clearly identified, either in the letter itself or by the person who prepares the nomination packet as well as their title, e.g., Professor of English, or Alumnus, or Dean of Arts, or Student, etc.

Pages exceeding the limits above will not be considered. The total packet requires a Table of Contents and a maximum of ~~15~~ **13** pages (excluding the optional personal statement).