

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes **APPROVED 11/10/23**

April 28, 2023 | 1:00 PM Synchronous Online

### I. Welcome and Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 1 p.m.

- II. **Roll Call: ATTENDING:** CHASSE–Hamilton; Cheatham; Barrio Vilar; Carder; Cox; Hagins; Hunter; Scranton; CSTEM: Street; Milanova; Khodakovskaya; Deng; Nichols; CBHHS: Atkins; Ruhr; Sadaka; Staley; Rose; Felan; Solomon; LIBRARY: Macheak, LAW: EX OFFICIO: President Matson; Anson; Ray; David Montegue on behalf of Provost Bain; **ABSENT:** Smith; Condron; Cates Groesbeck; Hardeman; Blanton; Wright; Lewis; Woolbright; McAlister; Golden; Bajwa; Chancellor Drale; Provost Bain

### III. Review of Minutes:: February 24, 2023, March 31, 2023, April 7, 2023

### IV. Overview of Faculty Senate meeting structure and procedures -- Joanne Matson

- If legislation pertains to a University policy, please include the policy number on the legislation. See [policy page](#)
- When legislation has been passed and signed; please provide both red-lined and clean copy back to the executive committee.
- See [Roberts Rules of Order](#) material from Arizona State webinar.
- Add impacted units on any new legislation.
- Implementing “2 bites at the apple” rule for complicated discussions.
- See new [Operations and Motions](#) section on Senate website along the left column

### V. Announcements

None

### VI. Airing of Concerns and Congratulations (2 minute limit)

Laura: She stated that she was concerned about the upcoming construction that will be taking place in the SUA building. They had received a notice a couple of days ago that a new roof would be placed on the building beginning May 1. She reported that this was of concern as faculty members had student presentations during this time

and needed the technology in the building. She reported that there had been no consultation with faculty. Communication needs to be better.

ED: He gave a final one while the building was being power washed and had to go out and have them stop. He wanted to congratulate the UALR History Department as Online U has ranked them as the country's seventh-best online BA in History. He would like to add that UALR, across the board, has a very excellent faculty with a very wide range of expertise.

Larry: Congratulations to my colleague Stephanie Thibeault, who will not return after this semester due to retrenchment. The remaining two faculty members went from being tenured associate professors to teaching as a visiting. He said it has taken him this long to appreciate how hard it must be to just work year to year after having that security. Stephanie is the last person standing in the dance department, along with the five graduates. He wanted to say thank you to Stephanie and for it to go on the record.

Laura: She wanted to bring up two things. She emailed about how students and instructors can access their course evaluations. She wanted to know if there was a way to delegate the task of reminding the faculty about this. She also wanted to know if there was a way to have them available earlier. They were available only from the 26th. She would like them to be available earlier, particularly for her in-person classes. She recalled when the forms were paper, and we got them a couple of weeks before the end of class.

President Matson: These are all very good recommendations and exactly what the AD Hoc committee needs. She will refer this to the as-yet-to-be-created committee. Any additional new topics? None were noted. She wanted to remind everyone that she could have been better at multitasking, and if you were putting items in the chat that you wanted everybody to hear, please raise your hand and say it. She noted that David Montague had his hand up.

David: Thanks for recognizing me. He asked that eLearning be involved in these discussions. This is to make sure that a date selected is one that is not feasible.

President Matson: Any new topic? We will move forward without new topics as we have a long agenda.

## **VII. Reports**

- a. Chancellor's Report – Christy Drale, Chancellor: No report for today as just having done the Assembly meeting
- b. Provost's Report -- Ann Bain, Executive Vice Chancellor, and Provost: Very quickly. I just want to thank all those people out there who've been working hours and hours and hours on budget pages and revised budget pages, and then another revised budget page because they did yeoman's jobs. Just

congratulations to our staff awards winners and our faculty excellence award winners. Also, thanks to all those who worked to make the Research Expo a success. Just returned from ADHE meetings, and there are some updates on their requirements for reporting for program and certificate viability. We will include this in the updates that go out. That is all I have to say, except for those of you who get to go away for the summer, have a great break...have a great summer.

President Matson: The next items on the agenda are the Undergraduate Council Report and the Graduate Council Report, both of which include the Simple Syllabus discussions. Zac and Nancy, please give us a brief summary of this discussion.

- a. [Graduate Council Report](#), Nancy Hamilton, Chair
  - o [March GC Report](#) (includes SS discussion)

Nancy: We just tried to follow the charge that the Faculty Senate gave us and to consider the three goals that were given to us by the Administration, including the reasons that they wanted Simple Syllabus, which was to make sure the university policies are consistent across the campus to make sure that syllabi are ADA Compliant and to ensure that there is an easy access repository of syllabi for the purpose of I shall see requirements. So with those two things in mind, our policy and Personnel committee made documents with Dr. Montague and Erin Finzer and sought out many different perspectives, and ultimately, the Graduate Council recommends that Simple Syllabus be adopted without the requirement that chairs approve syllabi. Currently, for students to access a syllabus, the chair must approve it. We recommend a two-year evaluation period where faculty can be allowed to use it, but as a Faculty Senate, we would not require them to use it.

- a. [Undergraduate Council Report](#) (includes SS discussion) Zac Hagins, Chair
  - o [UGC Report - \(new link\)](#)

Zac: We discussed this in depth this week, but we were informed of what the GS decided at that point. There were many questions. For the time being, we recommend that a continued pilot period be established. We did not come up with a specific time period. We recommend that it remain optional during the pilot period. Unless an academic unit decides to adopt it for its whole unit, Ultimately, a decision has to be made one way or another because we cannot move forward with this being optional forever. In our attached report, there are questions, and I encourage you to look at the report.

President Matson: It is a helpful report that has many links.

Continued Discussion about Simple Syllabus:

Laura: SS does not have to use BB, and you can give students a link.

Joshua: He participated in a meeting in which the Provost's office made it clear that Simple Syllabus would never be made mandatory, and so he appreciates the work that the graduate and undergraduate councils did on this, but there's no longer any thought that this is going to become mandatory.

Ed: I would rather spend the money we spend on all sorts of things, which we have been doing over the years ourselves rather effectively, and take that money and keep faculty.

Zac: Just to reply to Josh. Where UGC was going was that we have been told lots of things over the years and were told that some things were optional, and eventually, they became mandatory...Faculty Success is one of these. He reported that thinking of HLC requirements—we would have two repositories for these.

Nancy: She brought the recommendations from the GC, and personally, we can do this by having someone make a lesson plan template that meets all the required ADA policies, etc. It would be editable. It would be in an easily accessed location.

President Matson: Thanks for the comments; she appreciates all the work on this. She is sure there will be more about this in the fall.

There was some discussion about the cost and the fact that Simple Syllabus did not go through the shared governance process. The administration has not come before this body to inform us that SS will be optional.

Zac: Has yet to see how to make a syllabus ADA-compliant. We may need to take this up in the fall.

President Matson: We will take this up in the fall.

- c. Parking and Traffic Committee -- [Committee Update](#) -- Jeremy Paprocki

Fariah Solomon was present and represented Jeremy. She read the attached report.

- d. Governance Committee, Rosalie Cheatham, Chair

Rosalie: She reported that it is the responsibility of the Governance Committee to review and bring a report to the Senate every two years. They are ensuring that the policies in our Faculty Handbook reflect such things as changes in the Board of Trustees and system policies. She reported that the issue is that the faculty handbook is posted in the catalog section, and it is not easily accessible

to faculty; we want to make sure that the information in the links is accessible. Within the last two years, 13 Board of Trustees policies have been updated in three U of A system policies have been updated. Not all of these are updated on our site, and we are working to complete this.

The Governance Docs: Once the unit has approved its document, it is sent to the Provost at their UALR website. The Provost sends it to the Dean, who has 30 days to approve it. It goes back to the website or to the Provost Office, and then it simultaneously comes to the Governance Committee and the Provost. Now in that part of the process, we are reviewing eight unit governance documents and will have completed our work on at least six of these. The last two were received this week. We should have the six completed, and remember that they are not completed until the Chancellor signs.

- e. **Joanne Matson, Faculty Senate Report;** In the interest of time, I have two items on my report. We calculated the census so that we could figure out how many senators should come from each college. Every two years, we re-calculate how many faculty are in each college. What we do at the end of the spring semester of that year, in fact, may change radically by the fall, but it is still what we go by because you have to have a snapshot. you have to stop counting at some point, and because of various things, we will have fewer Senators. Next year, CBHHS will have the same number--11; CHASSE will go from 14 to 12; STEM will go from 10 to 9; Library will stay the same with 1; Law will go from 3 to 2. Provisionally, we are having provisional discussions incorporating the Clinton School into the Senate. The most recent HLC approval process asked why the school could not be incorporated into the Senate. The other thing is that there will be an Ad Hoc committee on student evaluations.

- f. Report on Faculty Census

- CBHHS -- 11
- CHASSE -- 12
- DCSTEM -- 9
- Ottenheimer Library -- 1
- School of Law -- 2

## VII. Old Business

- A. Chancellor Denial of FS\_2023-01 Freedom of Speech. [See Chancellor's Letter here.](#)

The tenure committee will submit a new motion in the fall to clarify.

- B. **FS\_2023-04. Admissions and Transfer Credit Committee** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting; no second required). Modify Admissions Deadlines and Criteria title (Policy 502.2).

Peter Scheidt: Move 502.2 be changed to Freshman Admission Criteria; if approved, this policy would go into effect July 1, 2023. So, if you

click through that link, you can see that this policy no longer references any deadlines and deals only with freshman admission standards. This is part of a general cleanup to make the title reflect the policy's concerns. This had to do with military credit transfer.

No discussion. President Matson launched a poll. The motion passes.

2023.05: To modify placement and transfer credit policy

## IX. **New Business**

- A. (no second required.) Approve graduates for Spring 2023.

***Be it resolved that*** those applicants completing all requirements for various University of Arkansas Little Rock degrees in the 2023 Spring and Summer Semesters shall be approved for graduation. (See [here](#) for a list of candidates for graduation, current as of 25 April 2023.)

**Motion Passed**

- B. **FS\_2023-07. Executive Committee** (Resolution. Requires majority vote at one Faculty Senate meeting, no second required.) Commend the UA Little Rock Women's Basketball Team.

**Whereas** the UA Little Rock Trojan Women's Basketball Team was named the Ohio Valley Conference (OVC) regular season champs in their first year in the OVC conference; and

**Whereas** the Trojans advanced to the championship game of the OVC tournament; and

**Whereas** the Trojans advanced to the WNIT; and

**Whereas** Coach Joe Foley was named the OVC coach of the year; and

**Whereas** Sali Kourouma, Tia Harvey, and Jiyah Harris-Smith earned all-conference honors;

**Therefore, be it resolved that** the Faculty Senate congratulates them and recognizes their contribution to UA Little Rock.

**Motion Passed**

- C. **FS\_2023-08 Executive Committee** (Legislation, Majority vote at one meeting; no second required). Revise [Policy 404.9](#) on accommodating students with disabilities.

**Be it resolved that** the title of Policy 404.9 (Academic Adjustment for Students with Disabilities) be changed to “Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities”; and

**Be it further resolved that** Policy 404.9 be replaced with the language in [Attachment B](#); and

**Be it further resolved that** if approved, the modifications to this policy would go into effect July 1, 2023.

**Commentary:** The new language and title reflect current practice.

**Motion Passed**

**FS\_2023-09. Senator Angela Hunter** (Recommendation. Majority vote at one meeting; second required). Recommend Re-Structuring Tenure-Track Promotion Raises.

**Whereas** the most recent merit pay raise for faculty was in AY 2016-2017 (7 years ago) and any forthcoming merit raises will likely be sporadic rather than annual in nature; and

**Whereas** for tenure-track faculty, the promotion from Associate Professor to Full Professor is accompanied by a larger pay increase than that from Assistant to Associate (promotion to Associate is typically accompanied by a raise of \$2800 and promotion to Full is typically accompanied by a raise of \$4100); and

**Whereas** regular unit, college, and university service duties are spread over a shrinking pool of total faculty, increasing the overall service load; additionally, many faculty members have increased participation in enhanced recruitment and retention activities, with the result of reduced time for research/creative productivity, thus delaying the application for Full Professor; and

**Whereas** retention of quality faculty members is essential to the well-being of the university, and salary is a significant factor in faculty retention; and

**Whereas** receiving a more significant raise at the first promotion is a positive outcome for faculty retention; and

**Whereas** an increase in base salary makes any later merit raise more substantial as well as increasing the salary for those opting to teach summer courses, both positive outcomes for faculty retention;

**Therefore, let it be recommended to the Provost and to the Chancellor that** beginning in AY 24 one of these three options be considered:

Swap the increases between Associate and Full Professor

Make both increases \$4100

Equalize the raises for both to \$3450

order of the promotion raises for tenure-track faculty be re-structured such that the \$4100 raise occurs upon promotion to Associate and the \$2800 upon promotion to Full, beginning in AY24 and adjusting the raises given for promotion to Associate Professor for anyone who was promoted starting AY 2017-18. Let there be a grandparent clause included that would protect any current Associate Professor whose first promotion raise followed the previous model so that their raise at promotion to Full will continue to use that model.

And therefore, let it be recommended that a similar reasonable adjustment be included for advancement raises for Full-time Non-tenure-track Instructors as well.

**Motion Passed**

- D. **FS\_2023-10. Governance Committee** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting; no second required). Remove [UALR Policy 403.14](#) (Appointments, Promotion, Tenure, Non-reappointment, and Dismissal) from the Policy Index.

**Whereas** UA Little Rock policy 403.14 is not consistent with current Board of Trustees policy (BP) 405.1; and

**Whereas** Board of Trustees policies supersede campus policies in all instances;

**Therefore, be it resolved** to remove the content of UA Little Rock policy 403.14 and replace it with a link to BP 405.1 ([link](#)) so that as the BP may be amended, the UA Little Rock policy will consistently conform to all requirements. **Whereas** these documents serve as the foundational principles guiding faculty peer review, academic unit governance documents. and administrative review of faculty performance; and **Whereas** neither document was written in policy language as is currently expected;



**Therefore, be it resolved** to remove Roles and Rewards I and II from the policy list and place them in the Faculty Handbook in a new section titled “Roles and Rewards” in order to retain them for historical guidance with a clear indication that these reflect underlying values rather than active policies. are no longer binding.

**Motion Passed**

- E. **FS\_2023-11. Governance Committee** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting; no second required). Remove [UALR Policy 403.20](#) and [UALR Policy 403.23](#) (Faculty Roles and Rewards I and II) from the Policy Index and relocate them in the Faculty Handbook.

**Whereas** the Faculty Senate adopted in April 2007 the Roles and Rewards I (RRI) report for tenured and tenure-track faculty in order to define common expectations and understandings of such faculty’s performance; and

**Whereas** the Faculty Senate adopted in April 2010 the Roles and Rewards II (RRII) report for non-tenure track faculty to define common expectations and understandings of such faculty’s performance; and

**Whereas** these documents are important historical records of the campus understanding of teaching, scholarship and service; and

**Whereas** these documents serve as the foundational principles guiding faculty peer review, academic unit governance documents. and administrative review of faculty performance; and

**Whereas** neither document was written in policy language as is currently expected;

**Therefore, be it resolved** to remove Roles and Rewards I and II from the policy list and place them in the Faculty Handbook in a new section titled “Roles and Rewards” in order to retain them for historical guidance with a clear indication that these reflect underlying values rather than active policies. are no longer binding.

**Motion Passed**

- F. **FS\_2023-12. Governance Committee** (Legislation. Majority vote at one meeting; no second required). Replace the current UP 403.23 (Faculty Roles and Rewards II) with guidelines written in policy language that are updated to reflect current practice for faculty review.

**Whereas** the current policy UP 403.23 although not written in policy language is the only approved, guiding document for full-time, non tenure-track faculty advancement; and

**Whereas** university-level advancement guidelines for full-time, non tenure-track faculty provide essential guidance for faculty, academic units and administrators reviewing faculty performance;

**Therefore be it resolved** to replace the current UP 403.23 with the approved advancement guidelines written in policy language and updated to reflect current practices for faculty review ([See Attachment C](#)); and

**Furthermore, be it resolved** to rename the revised UP 403.23 “Advancement Guidelines for Full-time Non-tenure-track Instructors

**Motion Passed**

- G. **Motion FS\_2023-13. Tenure Committee (Legislation. Majority Vote at one Meeting, no second required.)** Revise U.P. [Policy 403.25](#), Academic Freedom policy.

Be it resolved to amend the Academic Freedom policy (403.25) as shown in [Attachment A](#). [Underline denotes additions; strikethrough denotes deletions.]

This item was passed, reviewed by the campus, and will be forwarded to the Chancellor for review and signature.

**COMMENTARY:**

This is an attempt to cure the Chancellor’s denial of [FS\\_2023-01](#).

[See Chancellor’s letter here.](#)

Commentary from Tenure Committee: We’ve seen incidents where university attorneys have asserted that faculty do not have academic freedom that can be interposed relative to administrators. These attorneys claim that academic freedom only protects the university from interference from outsiders, not faculty internally. For example, suppose a professor is teaching criminal law, and she wants to discuss the crime of rape. Then imagine that the dean tells the instructor she should skip the topic altogether. Under normal notions of academic freedom, the professor is entitled to decide whether to cover the topic of rape within her criminal law class. However, under the view of some university attorneys, the professor doesn’t have that right. These attorneys argue that academic freedom only applies in a situation like the following: The teacher and administration *agree* that criminal law includes discussions of rape. The governor, however, doesn’t want rape taught in criminal law and tells the Chancellor that he, the governor, is the boss—so, don’t teach rape. That is too narrow a view of academic freedom, and this legislation clarifies that point in our policy.

**XI. Open Forum :** Naeem Bajwa had two questions. She reported that she should have asked these when the chancellor was in the meeting. She wanted to know if we were going to do an analysis of our restructuring and what did we gain from this. She reports she is seeing all the negative, some not positive. Is the administration planning to do a cost analysis. Her second question was that were they going to take any initiative for the restructuring as they took previously.

**XII. Adjourned at 4:36 pm**

## Attachment A

### Academic Freedom policy (403.25)

#### STATEMENT ARTICULATING THE UNIVERSITY'S OVERARCHING COMMITMENT TO FREE, ROBUST, AND UNINHIBITED DEBATE AND DELIBERATION AMONG ALL MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY'S COMMUNITY

Our students and faculty have the right to discuss any problem that presents itself. This right is grounded in long-standing principles of academic freedom and is reflected in university accreditation standards. Academic freedom rights are guaranteed herein to each faculty member such that no faculty member shall be dismissed, otherwise disciplined, or denied reappointment for the mere expression of opinions related to the faculty member's scholarship, teaching, or service. The “cure” for ideas we oppose lies through open discussion rather than through inhibition. Free inquiry is indispensable to the good life, universities exist for the sake of such inquiry, and without it they cease to be universities. This is the essence of critical thinking that provides society and individuals with progress.

Education is not intended to make people comfortable; it is meant to make them think. Universities are expected to provide the conditions within which hard thought, and therefore strong disagreement, independent judgment, and the questioning of stubborn assumptions, can flourish in an environment of the greatest freedom.

The ideas of different members of the University community will often and quite naturally conflict. But it is inappropriate for the University to attempt to shield individuals from ideas and opinions they find unwelcome, disagreeable, or even deeply offensive. Although the University community greatly values civility, and although all members of the University community share in the responsibility for maintaining a climate of mutual respect, concerns about civility and mutual respect can *never* be used as a justification for closing off discussion of ideas, however offensive or disagreeable those ideas may be to some members of our community.

The freedom to debate and discuss the merits of competing ideas does not, of course, mean that individuals may say whatever they wish, wherever they wish. But the University may legally restrict the substance of expression only when it explicitly violates the law, i.e., when speech falsely defames a specific individual, constitutes a genuine threat or actual harassment, or invades legally recognized privacy interests. In addition, reasonable time, place, and manner regulations are recognized as legal. But these are narrow exceptions to the general principle of freedom of expression, and it is vitally important that these exceptions never be used in a manner that is inconsistent with the University's commitment to a completely free and open discussion of ideas.

The University's fundamental commitment is to the principle that debate or deliberation may not be suppressed because the ideas put forth are thought by some or even by most members of the University community or society at large to be offensive, unwise, immoral, or wrong-headed. The individual members of the University community—not the University as an institution, its administration, nor any external constituency—are entitled to make those judgments for themselves, and to act on those judgments not by seeking to suppress speech, but by openly and vigorously contesting the ideas that they oppose. Indeed, fostering the ability of members of the University community to engage in such debate and deliberation in an effective and responsible manner is an essential part of the University's educational mission.

As a corollary to the University's commitment to protect and promote free expression, members of the University community must also act in conformity with the principle of free expression. Although members of the University community are free to criticize and contest the views expressed on campus, and to criticize and contest speakers who are invited to express their views on campus, they may not obstruct or otherwise interfere with the freedom of others to express views they reject or even loathe. To this end, the University has a solemn responsibility not only to promote a lively and fearless freedom of debate and deliberation, but also to protect that freedom when others attempt to restrict it.

#### Freedom of Speech and Thought:

Faculty shall not be restricted from communicating with members of the public, whether part of the UALR community or the public at large, on any matter except for matters in any way prohibited by state ~~laws and rules~~ and federal laws and regulations, other than delineated below:

- (1) The school may impose reasonable time, place, and manner restrictions while the employee is working; and
- (2) Nothing in this policy shall be construed to interfere with state ~~laws and rules~~ and federal laws and regulations for the prohibition of discrimination.

History: adopted April 26, 2018; rev. November 22, 2019; [rev. September 8, 2023;]