

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS AT LITTLE ROCK

Faculty Senate Meeting

Friday, April 14, 2006, 1:00 p.m.
Donaghey Student Center, Meeting Rooms A & B

MINUTES

Present: CAHSS – S. Anderson, F. Chadwick, R. Cheatham, M. Garnett, C. Musgrove, E. Ramsey, B. Sanderson, M. Smith. CB – S. Edison, R. Ford, J. Nickels. CE – G. Barrett, D. Spillers, B. Stanford, J. Van Der Putten. CISSE – M. Milanova, H. Patangia, R. Wigand, A. Wright, H. Xie. LAW – M. Beard, T. Sullivan. LIBRARY – B. Nelson. CPS – C. Call, J. Faust, S. Rhodes, R. Robertson, L. Smith-Olinde. CSM – M. Douglas, T. Hall, N. Kosmatov, S. Leslie, T. Mansell. EX OFFICIO – J. Anderson, C. F. Williams, P. Tschumi, J. Tipshus.

Absent: CAHSS – B. Black, S. Dhonau, R. Groesbeck, J. Levernier, J. Parins, CB – D. Blevins. CE – A. Lindsay. CISSE – N. Jovanovic. LAW – F. Epps. CPS – B. Gregg. CSM – M. Kleve, B. Prince, S. Ragsdale. EX OFFICIO – D. Belcher, G. Borici, G. Rexha, C. Stover.

I. Welcome and introductions.

President Williams called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m, and in the process, alerted the Senate to the recent apprehension at Kennedy airport of a deceptively innocuous looking representative of the dreaded group Al Gebra. Authorities were tipped off by his carrying of weapons of math instruction. The calculators, protractors, and at least one slide rule were confiscated. When the faculty's gasps died down, the president asked the secretary to call the roll.

II. Review of minutes

The minutes of the March 10 regular meeting and the March 23 special meeting were reviewed and approved by the Senate.

III. Reports

Report from the Chancellor

The chancellor noted that the annual luncheon for emeritus faculty is winding up as we meet, and reminded the Senate of the Faculty Excellence Awards Banquet upcoming. He also mentioned that last night the Derrick Fisher Practice Court in the Stephens Center was transformed for a benefit dinner for the arts here, and took note of the KLRE-KUAR on-air fundraising campaign over the last ten or so days.

Next Thursday, the chancellor will roll out the strategic plan to the Board of Visitors, and the plan will go on the university's web site that day. The following Tuesday, he will address the University Assembly.

This week he circulated to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee a draft of a contributions policy. The chancellor thanked the Executive Committee for working with him on refining the language and our thinking about how new employees should be introduced to development. The policy addresses some of those issues that arose as areas of concern earlier this year, including confidentiality of donors and the nature and source of solicitations.

Q from Call: If one of us is on a board of directors for a community agency, is there policy direction for us about giving colleagues the opportunity to contribute to those causes?

A: If what's intended is a campuswide solicitation, there should probably be discussion about it. If on the other hand, it's an unplanned or ad hoc appeal, it probably is acceptable. The chancellor indicated that without further conversation, he could probably not make a better answer, and that he would be pleased to talk further about it outside the meeting.

Q from Smith-Olinde: The purpose of this new policy, then, is to prevent other campuswide solicitations?

A: In a sense, yes. He is hesitant to speak in absolutes, but wants the policy to make clear that there are only two formal campuswide solicitations. He said he wouldn't get excited if he sees an appeal for some worthy cause appearing on FacFocus, but added that he can't guarantee others might not.

Q from Call: She asked about decision making in connection with other charitable activities the university supports.

A: We get many, many invitations to participate in various charitable campaigns. Every couple of months, the chancellor and vice-chancellors, along with the development director, review those and sort them, making decisions about which it is appropriate for us to take on. If those are "walks," or similar kinds of participatory fundraisers, we look for an interested faculty sponsor who encourages folks to join in. The University's support is minimal but important, such as perhaps providing a tee shirt for those who enter the special event.

The chancellor observed that for this year's comprehensive campaign, the number of people participating was down one percent, 548 people, or 41% of faculty and staff, but the amount contributed was up, to a very respectable \$242,277

Report from the Calendar Committee, Marian Douglas, chair

Douglas noted the committee wanted a vote today on the proposed calendar for 2009-2010, and she apologized for not having made that clear to the president so

that it could have been correctly placed on the agenda as an action item. It will come back at the next meeting. ←

She distributed a draft of the calendar. For the first time, the committee has included the summer schedule in the proposed calendar, and is addressing issues raised by Saturday classes. She encouraged the Senate to review the draft and come prepared to vote at the May meeting

Report from Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force. Carl Moneyhon, chair

President Williams, acknowledging Moneyhon's absence, said the report will be rescheduled for May.

Report from ad hoc Committee to Review Faculty Excellence Awards. Steve Edison, chair

Edison and the committee have discussed with chancellor, provost, winners, and would-be winners how we might do these awards even better. The committee's research has shown them that not all universities have such awards, and has led them to believe that of those who do, we are in good company and in good standing.

Edison invited senators to join the committee for a final meeting and prioritization of recommendations. He said the recommendations have arisen from four principles articulated by the committee: standardization, simplification, fairness, and equity.

The committee believes the teaching award packet requirement needs to be reconsidered, and to some greater extent standardized. There is a general concern that the application packets themselves would seem to favor those who write best.

About service: Should paid service count? Is service to one's discipline different from service to the community? Should we see people whose job is service as ineligible for this award? There appears to be widespread agreement across campus on the unwieldiness of the packet itself, which is a problem both for applicants and reviewers. and a sense that there is little consistency in the decisions made at the college level across campus.

The committee is considering again the interval between receipt of the award and the next year of eligibility for the award.

They are also considering an award for excellence in administration. The chancellor, Edison said, suggested that such an award be one made by the faculty.

Another question on the agenda is whether we ought to reinstate the Department of Excellence award, and how we can, in the interest of equity, even out the advantages that may accrue to better-funded departments.

Douglas offered a caution about the trade-offs of digitizing the packets. If we anticipate sophisticated use of technology, we may be simply shifting the advantage from good writers to good electronic-document designers.

Edison invited comments to be sent to him at swedison@ualr.edu.

Special recognition

President Williams reminded us that when we started out the year last August, he underscored the importance of committees. The truth is, he said, there are some committees that are a whole lot tougher than others, and the following three people, along with Jim Parins, who chaired Planning and Finance, have done fine service for the faculty and the university with their leadership of four of them: Kim Porter, Admissions and Transfer Credit Committee, one of the four areas the trustees give faculty explicit authority and responsibility for; Dave Spillers, Academic Technology and Computing Committee, increasingly crucial to the quality of our academic life; and Pete Tschumi, who took on the *ad hoc* committee on Faculty Handbook revision, and whom Williams declared was the perfect person to take this on. President Williams presented each of these three senators with a university mug wrapped in a useful piece of potentially stress-relieving bubble wrap.

IV. New business

A. Motion: *Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting)* That the High School Concurrent Enrollment Policy adopted by the Faculty Senate on February 5, 1999, be amended to insert the language as indicated below in the underscored text:

Under state law UALR may concurrently admit qualified high school students to its academic programs as part-time students.

To be eligible to apply for High School Concurrent (HC) enrollment, the applicant must meet the requirements of:

- a. *Completion of * at least 50% of the state-recommended college preparatory course* with a minimum GPA of 2.5*; or
- b. Minimum overall high school GPA of 3.0; or
- c. Minimum 21 ACT composite score

Individual university departments may restrict enrollment into specific courses based on:

- a. acceptable score on a departmentally approved placement or proficiency test; or
- b. acceptable subscores on the ACT in the specific substantive areas, e.g. math, English, or reading; or
- c. permission of the department chair or instructor

All courses offered in any concurrent enrollment program shall be approved by the UALR curriculum review process. All faculty teaching in a concurrent enrollment program shall be approved by the appropriate UALR department and be provided an orientation to UALR procedures with respect to Faculty Handbook responsibilities, instructional procedures, and materials prior to teaching the course.

Vice-president Ford presented the motion regarding concurrent enrollment, reminding the Senate that we considered this matter at the March 23 called meeting. Based on the lively discussion there, the Executive Committee revisited the language presented in the original motion, and has brought forward the present proposal to revise our existing policy. The intent is to have policy that will support not only the proposed partnership with ASMSA but other future opportunities for concurrent enrollment courses at other high schools.

Q from Douglas: Does the motion contemplate annual review of concurrent enrollment courses by the Undergraduate Council (UGC), or does it afford departments authority to make necessary changes from year to year as required? *A:* It does not contemplate annual review by UGC; the authority and responsibility for instruction rest at the department level.

Q from Wright: Does the policy allow any external assignment of teaching responsibility? *A:* The policy does not permit that.

Mark Workman, dean of Extended Programs, spoke about the challenge of sorting out what belongs in policy and what belongs in memoranda of understanding specific to each concurrent enrollment site. Each site has a different set of circumstances, and we do indeed need to think about those differences. Ford asked if Workman intends to float the memoranda of understanding (MOUs) through appropriate faculty bodies before entering into them. Workman said he thinks we do need a lot of eyes on these agreements, getting everyone to look at them ahead of time. Tschumi asked for Workman's assurance that MOUs will be reviewed by UGC before adoption. Robertson suggested it is sense of the Senate that any memoranda of understanding with ASMSA or other prospective partners in concurrent enrollment will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Ford asked for reassurance that this will happen, and Workman agreed that it will.

On voice vote, the **motion carried** unanimously.

Tschumi presented three motions from the *ad hoc* task force on revision of the *Faculty Handbook*.

B.1. Motion: *Faculty Handbook Review Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting.) (Action to be submitted to the University Assembly for ratification at two ~~consecutive~~ ~~Assembly~~ meetings.)* That the section of the constitution specifying the officers of the Faculty Senate be modified as shown below to create the position of resources manager.

Article III The Faculty Senate

Officers of the Faculty Senate

Officers of the Faculty Senate shall be the president, the immediate past president, the vice president, the secretary, and the parliamentarian, **and resources manager**. The immediate past president shall have all rights of Senate membership, serve as advisor to the president of the

Senate, and have voice on the Executive Committee. The president of the Assembly shall serve as president of the Faculty Senate. The vice president, secretary, and parliamentarian shall be elected by the Faculty Senate for two-year terms. In the event that a senator elected to one of these three offices ceases to be a member of the Faculty Senate, another senator shall be elected to fulfill the remainder of the term of office. The election of new officers shall take place during the first meeting of the academic year after new members of the Faculty Senate have been elected. Vacancies shall be filled by election at the next regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meeting.

The president shall preside at meetings of the Faculty Senate and of the Executive Committee, and also shall discharge the responsibilities specified elsewhere in this constitution.

The vice president shall be the presiding officer at Faculty Senate meetings in the absence of the president, and shall also serve as vice president of the Executive Committee.

The secretary shall be responsible for preparing the minutes of each Faculty Senate meeting and for submitting the minutes to the office of the vice chancellor and provost for distribution to all members of the Faculty Senate and Assembly. The secretary also shall serve as secretary of the Executive Committee. The secretary shall collect papers and documents concerned with Faculty Senate matters and transfer them to the UALR Archives or equivalent place at the end of each academic year.

The parliamentarian shall advise the officers and members of the Faculty Senate on questions of procedure in order that the business of the Faculty Senate be transacted correctly, efficiently, and impartially. The parliamentarian also shall serve as parliamentarian of the Executive Committee.

The resources manager shall be responsible for ensuring that copies of records related to faculty governance are maintained in the Faculty Senate offices and are current. The resources manager shall provide expertise to the executive committee on current policies and the historical background on important issues. The resources manager shall be a faculty member and shall be appointed by the elected officers of the Faculty Senate to a renewable, two-year term that is staggered relative to the Faculty Senate officers. The appointment shall be reported to the Faculty Senate.

Persons newly elected as officers of the Faculty Senate shall assume their offices immediately after the meeting at which they are elected, except that the outgoing secretary remains responsible for the minutes of that election meeting.

The first creates a new position, for which they had difficulty finding a good name, and which they ended by calling "resource manager." Tschumi said we find we need to help institutionalize the importance of faculty governance, something that was easier when the idea was new, some years ago. This person, he said, will be a sort of chief of staff, or guardian of faculty governance. Robertson raised the issue of qualifications. Tschumi, on behalf of the committee, accepted a friendly amendment to inset the language "shall be a faculty member."

Ramsey asked what kind of person the Executive Committee envisioned in this position. After a brief and thoughtful silence, Cheatham said we were actually thinking of "a Tschumerian." Ramsey said he found that answer entirely satisfactory.

Garnett wondered about whether the Senate should in some way confirm the appointment of this person. After considerable discussion, the president called for a vote on the motion as written, with the inclusion of friendly amendments inserting the phrases *shall be a faculty member* and *shall be reported to the Faculty Senate* in the description of the position (language incorporated in the text above).

On voice vote, the **motion carried** unanimously.

B. 2. Motion. *Faculty Handbook Review Committee (Legislation. Requires three-fifths vote at two meetings.)* That a new Faculty Senate committee on faculty governance be added to the constitution as shown below.

Councils and Committees of the Faculty Senate

Faculty Governance Committee: This committee acts to facilitate faculty governance and to insure that governance documents and policies are in accordance with all campus and University of Arkansas Board of Trustee policies. It monitors the Faculty Handbook insuring that approved changes are promptly and accurately incorporated into the Handbook. The committee shall establish cycles of review for the Handbook and all faculty governance documents from academic departments and schools and colleges. In the event a governance document does not reflect current campus policy(ies), the committee shall inform the unit(s) involved and assist the unit in developing needed modifications as feasible. The committee shall develop for approval by the Faculty Senate and Chancellor a generic college and a generic department governance document to be available for use by a newly created academic unit.

In the event such a new academic department or college is created, this committee shall assist the new unit(s) with the development of governance document(s). Until such new document(s) is/are created, the new unit shall operate within the framework of the generic governance document provided by the committee.

The committee shall consist of the officers of the Faculty Senate and all past presidents of the University Assembly who do not hold administrative appointments above the level of department chair.

The motion establishes a Faculty Governance Committee. The language describing who's eligible for membership is written to concur with the language about eligibility for election to the Faculty Senate.

The committee has accepted a friendly amendment, offered by the chancellor to change the word *maintains* to the word *monitors* (language incorporated in the text above) in reference to the *Faculty Handbook*.

Robertson expressed concern about establishing a committee that can intervene in the process of department governance. Tschumi said that is not at all the intent of the motion, nor does the motion permit it.

Garnett asked if it would be smarter to have a regular elected committee since it seems that they may have to deal with significant and sometimes difficult questions.

Robertson questioned whether the composition of the committee is most advisable in light of the fact that governance changes as time and circumstance change – and that perhaps we need some perspective other than the historical.

Leslie reminded the Senate that the requirements for governance documents and so on are already set in policy, and that this committee has no charge to mess with them. Rather, it will be a mechanism to ensure that policies of the Senate and the System are appropriately taken into account so that omissions or errors don't come back to bite the departments.

Wright said he agrees in principle with the motion, and understands, as he thinks his colleagues in Cyber College do, why such a committee would be useful.

Cheatham noted that these motions have been reviewed by the provost and chancellor.

Robertson once again underscored his point: if we're talking about a committee that will influence governance documents, then it should have broader representation; if the intent is not to be so active, then the language should be revised to make clearer that in no way will this committee micromanage departmental governance documents.

Garnett moved, seconded by Vander Putten, to table the motion. **Motion to table failed** on voice vote.

The **motion passed**, 20 votes in favor, 5 opposed.

B.3. Motion. *Faculty Handbook Review Committee (Legislation. Requires majority vote at one meeting.) (Action to be submitted to the University Assembly for ratification at two consecutive Assembly meetings.)* That the Article IV of the constitution specifying the college, school, and departmental governance be modified as shown.

Article IV

College, School, and Department Meetings Governance

~~Colleges and schools shall hold meetings at least once each semester of the nine-month academic year. Meetings shall be held on written call of the dean. Unless provided otherwise in an approved governance document, additional meetings shall be held upon written call signed by one-fourth or more of the full time faculty. The faculty of each college or school shall develop written policies and procedures for conducting business. Such policies and procedures shall be submitted for review, first to the dean, then to the vice chancellor and provost, and, for approval, to the chancellor. Said policies shall not be in conflict with provisions outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.~~

The faculty of each college or school shall develop a governance document that specifies written policies and procedures for conducting business and shall hold meetings at least once each semester of the nine-month academic year. Unless provided otherwise in the governance document, additional meetings shall be held upon written call signed by one-fourth or more of the full time faculty. **In addition,** meetings shall be held on written call of the dean.

The governance document shall be submitted for review first to the dean, then **simultaneously** to the Vice Chancellor and Provost **and to the Faculty Governance Committee,** and finally to the Chancellor for approval. **The review of governance documents must occur during the regular nine-month academic year. Each review shall be accomplished within 30 calendar days and comments from the reviewers shall accompany the document as it is forwarded throughout the review and approval process. Upon the agreement of the dean, provost, and two representatives of the faculty governance committee, the review time may be extended to ninety days.** Said policies shall not be in conflict with provisions outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

Responsibilities of colleges and schools are as follows:

1. By secret ballot to elect representatives and one alternate for each representative to the Faculty Senate, the Undergraduate Council, the Graduate Council, the Committee on Tenure, and the Appeals Council. Election as an alternate will be for a one-year period only, and an alternate will serve only in the event of a vacancy. Each college or school will provide a list of alternates (by position) to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate on an annual basis.
2. To study college or school curricula. Each college or school shall establish its own curriculum process. Routing of curriculum and program proposals shall follow the procedures outlined in the description of the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council.

The faculty of each department shall develop its own policies and procedures for conducting business and shall hold meetings at least once each semester of the nine-month academic year for the purpose of discussing and acting upon departmental affairs. In addition to the methods of calling meetings specified in an approved governance document, faculty meetings may be convened by a written call of the department chairperson or by a written call of one-fourth or more of the full-time faculty. The faculty of each department shall develop its own policies and procedures for conducting business. Such policies and procedures shall be submitted for review to the department chairperson, the dean, and the vice chancellor and provost and, for approval, to the chancellor

The governance document shall be submitted for review first to the department chairperson, then to the dean, then simultaneously to the Vice Chancellor and Provost and to the Faculty Governance Committee, and finally, for approval, to the Chancellor. The review of governance documents must occur during the regular nine-month academic year. Each review shall be accomplished within 30 calendar days and comments from the reviewers shall accompany the document as it is forwarded throughout the review and approval process. Upon the agreement of the dean, provost, and two representatives of the faculty governance committee, the review time may be extended to ninety days. Said policies shall not be in conflict with provisions outlined in the *Faculty Handbook*.

The third motion is to take care of the timeline for review of governance documents. The provost has raised some concern about the timeline. He has been doing those reviews, and suggests that the time period as specified in the motion is fine if there are not three or four documents coming forward for review at the same time. A friendly amendment was proposed, and accepted by the committee to add two sentences to the motion in two places, once for college and school governance documents and once for departmental governance documents: "The review of governance documents must occur during the regular nine-month academic year" and "Upon the agreement of the dean, provost, and two representatives of the faculty governance committee, the review time may be extended to ninety days" (language reflected in the motion text above). The "ninety days" was added in response to Wright's suggestion that placing an outside limit on delays in review might be wise.

On voice vote, the motion carried unanimously.

IV. Open Forum

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.

Judith Faust, Secretary