# FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
February 25, 2022
1:00 PM until adjournment
Synchronous Online

Convene 1:03 PM

I.  Welcome and Roll Call
Present: 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 – Cummings ; EX OFFICIO – Drale, Bain, Nolen, Wright

Absent: CBHHS – Ten Bensel; CSTEM – Baillie, Kattoum; LAW – Boles, Woodmansee; EX OFFICIO –Shahan, Chamberlain

II.  Review of Minutes from November 19, 2021
          Passed 26/0
III.  Announcements
IV.  Airing of Grievances (2 minute limit)
   - Cheatham: Overpayment/payback issue for faculty members
   - Leonard: Why all the accounting errors? Who is being held to account TIAFF issue
   - Anson: Mask mandate and in-class instruction; midsemester change unfair to faculty who opted for f2f w/masks
V.  Introduction of New Topics (2 minute limit)
     N/A
VI.  Reports
     a.  Executive Committee - Amanda Nolen, President of Faculty Senate
          1.  Annual Review legislation have been signed and will move on to System office
          2.  Report from Faculty and Prof Dev Comm report on student evals
              Will be subject for Open Forum

     b.  Chancellor's Report – Christy Drale, Chancellor
          1.  Discussion of mask mandate policy update

a) Understand concerns; confluence of different factors
   (1) Declining rate of infection and hospitalizations
   (2) New CDC guidelines imminent
   (3) System Office and BOT advising chancellors and campuses to ease restrictions
       (a) Guidance rather than required
   (4) No good time to implement
b) Revisiting flexible work policy; committee looking at reintroducing some remote work options and criteria
c) DEI Fac Fellow Beavers bringing in Heather McGhee, author, The Sum of Us on 13 April 2022
   (1) If you are interested in joining Diversity Councli please notify
d) Round 2 of Campus Values survey coming out Monday 28 Feb 2022
   (1) Results to be shared

Discussion

- Anson: Feel betrayed that decision to only rec masks reached without consulting. Can classes be moved on-line?
  o A: Probably not, but ask Provost; all campuses moving to rec not req
- Matson: Is the value of shared governance on the list of values? Appears that there is no regard for that in terms of teaching, curriculum, scheduling, etc. Faculty concerns, experience, and expertise dismissed.
- Beavers: If you have concerns or issues that you want me to bring to Chancellor, please let me know.
- Barrio-Vilar: Has the System office relayed any concerns about faculty becoming ill, lawsuits, etc.
  o A: Cannot speak for system
- Nolen: Can you respond to pay issues?
  o A: Have made an inquiry but need to inquire further. Understand that this was result of system audit; may be related to Workday (with apologies for the frequency of that excuse).
- Cheatham: Understand that faculty were told to repay immediately.
- Leonard: Re: staff turnover: Is pay improving, hiring, is there discrimination against applicants over 40 years of age?
  o A: Not aware of age discrimination but if that has occurred a complaint should be filed. Still struggling to hire.
- Mitchell: Was climate survey by Diversity Council circulated with all faculty and students?
  o A: Yes.
- Mitchell re: Covid—will students still be required to report illness and to quarantine?
  o Decker: Yes. Protocols remain in place.

c. Provost's Report – Ann Bain, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor
   1. AACU Institute on Truth, Reconciliation, and Racial Healing

a) Will be held on March 11
2. New certificate initiatives
3. Ac Aff Teaching and Planning Comm
   a) Teaching plans
4. Invites AVC Finzer to speak on common course numbering
   Finzer: Have held Meetings with various groups
   (1) Started 3 years ago based on Florida model
   (2) Asked to reconcile codes with other institutions
   (3) Effort to make more friendly for transferring students
   (4) Concerned with appropriate faculty input, etc. (see 1:52)
   (5) Intend to slow down and focus just on course numbering, not alpha codes

Discussion
- Smith: Will course coding be on micro level (CCFs, PCFs)?
  - A: No; will be on institutional level
- Matson: Issue of alpha codes; Florida system not comparable; courses belong to area, not departments.
- Edwards: What about when courses have similar names/subjects but at different levels?
  - A: Will be difficult and take a lot of time; will not force false equivalencies
- Hamilton: What is the point of having reps from each university if they cannot make decisions or have real say? Timelines seem unreasonable given all the prevailing circumstances. Decision makers must hear outside viewpoints.
  - A: Expressed same view in committee call this morning; technical implementation cannot take precedence
- Harris: Administration trying to balance stuff from above and stuff from below. What say do faculty really have in the matter of course numbering?
  - A: As a liaison, no campus has been working with faculty.
- Nolen: All non-UA Fayetteville faculty are similarly concerned.
  - A: UAF chosen because of size of catalogue, but faculty there are also not keen on this project.


Chat commentary:
- Hagins: In an *Inside HigherEd* article on Workday Student and Ohio State's decision to pull out of its implementation, the author noted that "University leaders want to offer Amazon-level cloud-based personalization to every student, explaining courses they should consider based on what they've previously taken, for example, or managing dozens of iterations of class registration preferences based on prerequisites and graduation year." Is this our goal as well? To tell students "You've taken 'ACOM 1300' and 'HIST 2311'. Other students who have taken these courses have also taken…"? What does such a system say about the personalization of advising and treating learners as individuals instead of giving them a cookie-cutter education?
  - A: Not a goal; Workday does not have that capacity.
- Harris: I wish these decisions were data-driven and based on research. And if they are, I would like the research and data to be more transparent.
  - A: Project One for small group; not the full UA System office.

- Woolridge: As an IT person, this is really bad. There is a way better technology implementation that may actually achieve the desired goal at a fraction of the cost. We are ignoring a better option.

    d. Undergraduate Council – Zac Hagins, Chair
       1. Get changes for next catalogue year in now.
    e. Graduate Council - Laura Ruhl, Chair (no commentary)
    f. Core Council - Belinda Blevins-Knabe, Chair (no commentary)
    g. Faculty Development Committee – Heidi Skurat Harris and Sarah Clements, Co-Chairs (Recommendations in Attachment A)
       1. Harris presents formal recommendations:
          a) Set of standard questions then options
          b) Faculty level input
          c) Modifying and/or deleting questions
          d) List of procedures
          e) Qs and Responses to be weighted equally and fairly

Motion to receive report by acclamation; will discuss in open forum

VII. Old Business N/A

VIII. New Business

IX.
    A. FS_2022_7 Academic Transfer and Credit Committee (Legislation. Majority vote; no second required). Admissions of First-time Freshmen

Leonard: Motion to consider

Be it resolved to revise the Admissions of First-time Freshmen (Policy 502.2; Rev. FS_2020_16, FS_2013_3) to include a test optional pathway for prospective incoming first-time freshmen with a HSGPA of 3.5 or better (Attachment B; underline indicates additions, strikethrough indicates deletions); and

Be it further resolved that if approved this revision would be implemented immediately.

Mark Funk presents
- ACT and SAT are not actually optional; used for financial aid
- 2020 report based on 10 years of data; shifted away from ACT, altered required GPA
- Looked success of students admitted in Fall 2021 with respect to GPA
- Appeals Review Process

Discussion
- Matson: Can you explain how 3.5 was established? What happens to students below that GPA?
  - A: Through appeals process admitted everyone with 3.5 and above
- M: Do you have data for all students admitted (not just appeals) with GPA 2.5-3.5?
- Wright: Skepticism
  - A: 3.25 is 50 percentile in HS rank, but depends on size and location if schools
- Nolen: What threshold do main competitors use?

- o A: Question of student support resources provided by school
- Matson: Examples from other campuses; ASU test flexible/3.0, Henderson 2.5/test optional, etc.

- Funk: Extending holistic review is wholly appropriate
- Decker: Update on current applications and admissions; if 2.75 or higher, 175 students could be admitted today and other projections
    - o Covid-19 and test fatigue are factors
    - o Cannot promise 600 new registrations just by changing policy today; but test blind policy with significantly higher GPA than competitors cannot help

Barrio-Vilar Movement to amend to 3.0 GPA
2nd Matson
Leonard: Call previous question
Passed 21/3

Leonard: Call previous question
Passed 21/3
- Henslee: Have we looked at the debt impact on the students who don't make it out of the first year? My concern is that many of our scholarships require test scores. If we don't address that, we are funneling these students into Federal Loans.
    - o Funk: Request Senate guidance/charge for holistic review
Nolen: Please return in March or April with proposed recommendation based on data.

X.  Open Forum - Student Evaluation of Teaching
- Silverstein: Recommendations are great, but applicability across university not possible.
    - o Should be able to include or exclude questions based on relevance, with prior notice and rationale given to unit head.
- Hendon: Similar concern. Many exceptions to standard set of questions for all faculty. Slightly less so when contained within specific colleges.
- Wright: No questions have been approved; must be brought to Senate.
- Harris: Evaluations should focus on faculty, not courses.
- Hendon: Not arguing that standard questions cannot be developed but will be limited.
- Question about distribution by eLearning; tends to only pull responses from unhappy students. Close assessment prior to final exams.
- Harris: Cannot force students to complete evals.
- Hendon: Withhold grades; course requirement. Instructor does not need to know that, but eLearning can enforce with reminders.
- Questions about response rates: last round was 7%.
- Harris: Legal issues with negative enforcement. Committee has not addressed role of eLearning.
- Hamilton: Where did eLearning get the questions?
- Montague: Chancellor approved task force to use eLearning in response to Covid-19.
- Received responses; etc. (3:15 PM). eLearning created a dedicated listserv to send questions about course evaluations   courseevaluations@ualr.edu
- Discussion extends for additional 30 minutes

XI.     Adjourn 3:44 PM

ATTACHMENT A: Recommendations from the Faculty Professional Development Committee

ATTACHMENT B: Admissions Deadlines and Criteria (Policy 502.2; Rev. FS_2020_16, FS_2013_3)

**Admissions of First-time Freshmen**
Applicants who present a high school diploma with all of the following academic qualifications will receive admission:
- Completion of the high school Core Curriculum for college preparation as required by Arkansas Code Annotated §§6-60-208 and 6-61-217 and defined by the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board in consultation with the Arkansas State Board of Education, and either
  - A cumulative high school grade-point average of 3.5 on a 4.0 scale, or
  - A cumulative high school grade-point average of 2.25 on a 4.0 scale, and ACT English, Math and Reading sub-scores of 15 or higher (minimum SAT sub-scores of 26 Writing, 26 Reading, and 515 Math), or
  - Satisfaction of the ACT requirement of the Arkansas Academic Challenge for traditional students as set forth by the Arkansas Department of Higher Education.

Students who receive a GED or are graduates of home schooling are admitted if they have ACT sub-scores in English, Math and Reading of 15 or higher

Students age 24 or older with a cumulative high school grade-point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale and who have completed all appropriate placement will receive admission

Students using $6^{th}$ semester transcripts will be admitted with the expectation of continued academic success in high school. Preference for housing will be given based on the date of admission.

**Admission of Freshman Transfer Students**
Freshmen Transfer Students are students with fewer than 12 acceptable transfer credits from another college or university. These students will be admitted if they meet the admission standards for first-time entering freshmen.

Students who do not meet our admission requirements are encouraged to apply and will be reviewed for possible admission. Any applicant whose admission is denied or deferred may, with the submission of additional information, request reconsideration.