

3-23-2002

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, March 23, 2002

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>

Citation

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. Faculty Senate. (2002). Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, March 23, 2002. *Faculty Senate Minutes*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/32>

This Periodical is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu.

Minutes of the March 23, 2002 Faculty Senate Meeting

- Present:** Officers: Watkins, Allison, Rogers
Senators Don Johnson, Rom, Rosenkrans, Wardlow, Warnock, Allison, Amason,
(Elected): Cochran, Freund, Gupta, Dale Johnson, Kennedy, Lieber, Ryan, Schroeder,
Denny, Stegman, Dennis, Nutter, Martin, Salisbury, Etges, Fort, Gay, King,
Schmitt, Springer
Senators
(Admin.): Williams, Geren
- Absent:** Officers: Lyle
Senators Wall, Redfern, Chappell, Brady, MacRae, Magalene Taylor, Lee, Phillip
(Elected): Taylor, White, Farley, Park, Hall, Killenbeck, Holyfield, Kral, Miller, Musick,
Norwood
Senators White, Smith, Weidemann, Shannon, Woods, Dutton, Greenwood, Loewer,
(Admin.): Moberly, Henderson Allen

- I. Patsy Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:32 PM.
- II. Approval of Agenda.
Without objection the agenda was approved.
Approval of Minutes
Without objection the minutes of February 20, 2002 were approved.
- III. Information Items
 - a. Michael Freeman, International Programs Officer. Freeman distributed an information sheet titled "Questions Frequently Asked of the International Programs Office Since September 11, 2001." He discussed faculty concerns re international students, including these definitions: The VISA is a document which allows entry into a country, and the I-20 document is concerned with length of stay. In addition, a student must be classified as a full-time student. He noted faculty concerns about students admitted into a program but who do not show up, stating that students are often admitted to several different universities and just do not contact UAF about their choices. However, if a student does arrive at UAF but stops coming to class, etc, the International Programs Office should be contacted. Several other points are addressed on the handout that is posted at:
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/InternationalProg.pdf>
During Q&A, it was brought out that in order to enter the country, a person must prove that s/he has financial support. A student who comes to the UAF without financial support is not in compliance with the law. If this occurs the International Programs Office should be contacted.
 - b. Randy Apon, Director of ISIS. Apon discussed the replacement of SAFARI with a new student information system. Company support for SAFARI is to end in 2004. The university is dependent on a computer system to generate a number of reports which affect students and the acquisition of millions of dollars each year, thus the importance of adopting a good system. During the purchasing process, UAF received 6 bids and dismissed the 3 lowest rated vendors. An evaluation phase followed with on-campus demos based on 10 scenarios written by local personnel. Campus experts (100) viewed and scored the demos. The next phase included site visits to selected campuses by UAF personnel. The company PeopleSoft, was then selected to supply the software. UAF has written in safeguards for cost overruns. The contract will be awarded in March 2002. The hardware and database software must be purchased. The implementation will begin April 1. ISIS will move into the 5th floor of Hotz in the summer 2002. Questions or comments regarding should be directed to Randy Apon at rapon@uark.edu.
- IV. Old Business
 - a. Changes in Student Judicial System (Student Code of Conduct), presented by Jerry Patnoe, chair of the All-University Judiciary Subcommittee.
The document under consideration is posted on the FS website at:
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/UpdatedStudCode.pdf>
Patnoe presented a history of the code revision process, which included examination by several units such as the Judicial Affairs staff, UAPD, AUJ board faculty members, the associate dean of Fulbright College, and students Recommendations were made and the revised draft sent back to the AUJ faculty members. Problems with the old code included 1) holding students accountable; 2) the level of faculty participation/interest on the board; 3) university policies being scattered throughout the catalog of studies; and 4) the role of the

graduate school. Other significant changes included increasing the number of undergraduate representatives. In the document posted at the FS website, only Section 1, Student Conduct and Disciplines has been changed from the previous document.

It was moved and seconded to approve the document.

Q&A: There was concern with various parts of the document; i.e. page 45 was one example that this document was variant to how committees currently operate and the way faculty governance documents are delineated.

It was moved and seconded to table sections II through VI and the appendix, until the next meeting. Motion passed with a vote of 16 to 5.

It was moved and seconded to table the motion to approve the document. Motion passed.

It was moved and seconded to reconsider the vote. Motion passed with a vote of 11 to 3.

Q&A: The sections II-VI and appendix are currently in the catalog of studies. Passing this will just move the document to one section of the catalog of studies. Curt Rom stated that the copy should be correct when published and to vote on an incorrect copy would not be in the best interest of the university. David Gay stated that the time period to review such a long, detailed document is too brief. Another senator pointed out that at the last FS meeting it was stated that it would be considered in April. However, it was also pointed out that a mark-up copy that correlates past and present policy was not available thus making consideration of changes difficult.

It was moved and seconded to table consideration of the document until the FS April meeting. Motion failed by a vote of 8-12.

It was stated that the official deadline for having this revised document in the catalog has passed, however, if voted on favorably today then it could be included.

The motion was divided into 2 parts. First part was to pass Section I; The second part was to pass the rest of the document that places the various current catalog copy into one section of the Catalog Of Studies (Sections II-VI and appendices).
The first part of the divided motion passed.

During Q&A some senators stated that to consider this document in this short period of time was inappropriate. This type of document should come to the FS well in advance and reviewed.

On the divided motion, it was moved and seconded to refer the second part of the document to a committee for study. Motion passed.

It was pointed out that the Faculty Senate just passed Section I without any discussion of content and that this was not in the best interest of the senate or the university.

- b. **Motion to accept the Rationale for General Education Core passed.** This was posted on the FS website at:
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Feb/GenEdCore.pdf>
- c. Academic Standards Committee: Anne O'Leary-Kelly, chair. O'Leary-Kelly distributed a handout which is posted on the FS website at:
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/GradeForgiv.pdf>
Since the presentation at the February 2002 FS meeting the committee met with some of the members of the original committee that set up the grade redemption policy. In discussions, it was thought that if a deadline date were not given then a student would shop around with respect to what course s/he would replace. This could lead to grade inflation. With this information, the current committee still brings a proposal to eliminate the deadline date for grade redemption.
It was moved and seconded to accept the recommendation. Motion passes..
- d. APT Committee: Deborah Thomas, chair. Two topics were discussed. The first topic concerned the Distinguished and University Professor guidelines. The second topic concerned

revisions of the Promotion and Tenure document passed in the FS last year, but modified in the summer 2001 by the administration over objection from the Chair (John King) and Chair elect (Patsy Watkins) of the FS.

First Topic:

Recommendations from the Committee regarding the adoption of Distinguished and University Professor Guidelines were considered. Questions that arose at the January FS meeting and changes regarding these questions:

- This is appointment will not require the same information that a Promotion and Tenure packet would provide. Something less will be required.
- Outside letters will not be required for University Professor
- Outside letters will be required for Distinguished Professor
- Current Distinguished Professors will be grandfathered in. They will not be required to go through the review.
- Input from the University Counsel was requested However, none was forthcoming due to other pressing matters.

It was moved and seconded to accept the document.

During Q&A the following points were added. The committee thought that each departmental unit would have criteria for teach position. Under Item 3, it was thought that in one case there should be an anonymous vote because non-tenured, tenure track faculty were voting. A full time administrative position cannot hold the University Professor title until 3 years after leaving an administration position. The committee did not consider a salary increase/decrease with appointment. The titles were thought to be an honor and not necessarily a salary raise.

It was moved and seconded to amend the document by deleting "in the spirit of collegiality" (University Professor, line 2-3)

It was pointed out that the concept of collegiality is very subjective.

Motion to amend the document failed

It was pointed out that a clerical error was in the document. For University Professor the committee felt that both tenured and tenure-track professors should vote and that this vote should be anonymous. This will be changed in the final document.

Motion to accept the document passed (with clerical error change).

The second topic concerned changes in the promotion and tenure document.

It was moved and seconded to delete the changes in the paragraph III.B.8.g paragraph.

It was thought that including the candidate in the process of recommending reviewers would affect confidentiality. Also some concern was stated over the possibility that the candidates could recommend reviewers that were inappropriately chosen.

It was moved and seconded to hold until April consideration of this motion.

Motion passed with a vote of 10-8.

V. New Business

1. Resolution from Senators Lieber, Gupta, Ryan, Macrae, Chappel, Kennedy, Freund and Etges.

Michael Lieber stated that at an earlier FS meeting, an AAUP Resolution was not supported by the FS due to the complicated nature of the Resolution. The resolution presented today is much simpler. A review of this resolution was presented.

This resolution is in the agenda and is posted at:

<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/FSResolutionTenureUASystem.pdf>

A quorum was called. After a count, a quorum was not present. Meeting adjourned at 5:15.

Patsy Watkins, Chair;

Neil Allison, Secretary.

Minutes approved:
4/17/02