### University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

## ScholarWorks@UARK

**Faculty Senate Minutes** 

**Faculty Senate** 

4-17-2002

### Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting, April 17, 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, April 17, 2002. Faculty Senate Minutes. Retrieved from https://scholarworks.uark.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/33

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 April 17, 2002 Faculty Senate Meeting

**Present**: Officers: Watkins, Lyle, Allison, Rogers

Senators Redfern, Rosenkrans, Warnock, Allison, Brady, Cochran, Freund, Gupta, (Elected): Dale Johnson, Lieber, MacRae, Ryan, Phillip Taylor, Denny, Farley, Park,

Hall, Martin, Killenbeck, Etges, Fort, Gay, Kral, Miller, Musick, Schmitt

Senators

(Admin.): Smith, Geren

Absent: Officers:

Senators Wall, Don Johnson, Rom, Wardlow, Amason, Chappell, Kennedy, Magalene (Elected): Taylor, Schroeder, Lee, White, Stegman, Dennis, Nutter, Salisbury, Holyfield,

King, Norwood, Springer

Senators White, Weidemann, Shannon, Woods, Williams, Dutton, Greenwood, Loewer,

(Admin.): Moberly, Henderson Allen

I. Patsy Watkins called the meeting to order at 3:30 PM.Ê

II. Approval of Agenda.<u>Ê</u>

Without objection the agenda was approved.

III. Approval of Minutes

Without objection the minutes of March 23, 2002 were approved.

IV. Reports

A. Dean of Enrollment Arlene Cash presented data on enrollment and retention of students dating from 1999.È Details are in a handout that is posted at:

 $\underline{\text{http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-}}$ 

2002/2002Apr/UAPerformanceSummary\_Cash.pdf

In Fall 1999, students with 3.0 GPA or 20 ACT were automatically admitted. Starting in Fall 2000 students with 3.0 GPA and 20 ACT were automatically admitted. Special categories of students were also admitted, including administrative admits in all years. Starting in Fall 2000 this included students with a 3.0 GPA or 20 ACT. Other smaller categories of students were admitted; one is a summer program in which students enter during summer, but are required to pass all courses to continue in fall. In addition, special enrollment admits students conditionally as a non-degree seeking. Retention rates are given for each year in the handout. During Q&A, one question raised the possibility of using other measures of than retention rates.

It was noted that approximately 45% of the automatic admits do not come to UAF.Ê Asked what is being done to recruit these students, Dr. Cash stated that some students base their decisions on geography (about a third), some students desire assistance (this is looked at seriously with the funds available), and some students just slip through the cracks.Ê This last group may not have connected with the university.Ê This is an area receiving more resources.

B. Susan Neyman from the Arkansas Office of Development discussed faculty and staff giving.Ê In the past year 745 faculty and staff gave \$237,860.Ê A new opportunity, the *Faculty Scholarship Fund*, is now available for giving.Ê This fund is designed for students with agreat records without financial awardsa.Ê The aFaculty Scholarshipa award will be merit based and available for graduate and undergraduate students.Ê Support will be determined later and will depend on the amount of money raised.Ê A letter will soon be sent to faculty and staff with the details.

During Q&A Jerry Musick suggested that it would be mutually beneficial to include one or two committee members from the Faculty Senate so the Senate can keep abreast of developments from this office.

Neyman suggested that students who now go to other schools might go to UAF if \$1,000 could be given in recognition of their accomplishments. È It was also pointed out that this is not an endowed scholarship at this point. È However, if enough funds were raised it could become endowed.

At this point Patsy Watkins recognized Jerry Musick, who is retiring, for his leadership role at the University of Arkansas.Ê Jerryâs expertise will be missed.

V. Old Business

A. At the last FS meeting a resolution was presented which supports tenure for all UA system units. Ê At that time a quorum was called. Ê This resolution was again presented at this April meeting. Ê The resolution is given on the Faculty Web page at:

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

It was stated that 65% of community colleges and 95% of four-year colleges grant tenure. Ê All colleges that are in systems (like UA system) all have tenure protocols, except at Arkansas. Ê This resolution would support tenure at UA Fort Smith. Ê During Q&A it was pointed out that the previous governing board for West Ark Community College (which is now UA Fort Smith, which is now governed by the UofA Board of Trustees) abolished tenure."

#### It was moved and seconded to support this resolution. ÉMotion passes.

B. Consent Agenda Ballot.Ê This is an informational item regarding a vote that was taken after the March FS meeting.Ê At the March FS meeting, a quorum was called and the meeting was adjourned before routine items on the consent agenda were considered.Ê From the March Agenda, items c, d, and e were approved by a vote of 14 for and 0 against (using email).Ê The March Agenda is posted at:

http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/2002MarchAgenda.htm

C. Phil Taylor represented the Committee on Appointment, Promotion and Tenure..Ê The APT committee has suggested changes to the Promotion and Tenure document; these are posted at:

http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/APT%20CommitteeTenure.pdf

# It was moved and seconded to accept the suggested changes to the APT document. Ê This motion was separated into three parts.

Part 1) Letters for candidates. È Six letters are requested, two suggested by the candidate, two by the chairperson, and two by the candidate and chairperson.

During Q&A someone expressed the view that this would be a burden on the chair and review committees. Ê The question arose with respect to why this was dropped out from the original document last year. Ê Provost Smith stated that the original draft was objectionable because the candidate could have influenced choices for two out of the three requested letters.

#### Vote in favor of the first part 19 to 6, motion passes

Part 2) Review committees. È Rank specific committees were recommended because concern was expressed that some departments may want rank specific committees to review candidate as materials.

#### Vote in favor of the second part, motion passes

Part 3) Other non-APT-specified groups/bodies/ committees or individuals.Ê The addition of this section dictates that the Chancellor, Provost, and Deans are expected to make their decisions on promotion and tenure based on the provided candidateâs packet.Ê During Q&A Provost Smith inquired whether a Provost could consult with a Dean of the candidateâs college.Ê Phil Taylor stated that this would, in his opinion, be within the guidelines of the APT document, but that it would not be appropriate to send out a candidateâs packet to all of the Deans of several colleges.Ê

It was mentioned that in the past, some committees not specified in the APT document were formed inappropriately thus resulting in this section being added to the document. Ê Phil Taylor stated that this provision would not preclude Deans, Provost, etc. to receive generic information, i.e. whether a journal was indeed nationally recognized as stated in a packet, etc. Ê But it would not be appropriate to get specific information regarding a specific journal article of a person under review.

Provost Smith stated that since his term here, the files of candidates have not been shared. Ê However, this provision would tie his hands with respect to meeting with a dean and a chair who had opposing opinions. Ê Phil Taylor then stated that the APT committee requested cooperation in drafting this document from the Provostas office. Ê Since nothing was forthcoming, this document was then brought back to the Faculty Senate. Ê It was stated that procedural guidelines were drafted but the Provostas office was advised by UA counsel that this might open up liability issues.

It was moved and seconded to table this third section of the motion. E It was moved and seconded to amend this motion that the report on the third section will be brought back to the Faculty Senate in September 2002.

Amended motion passes

Motion to table passes by a vote of 16 to 8.

- VI. New Business
  - A. 1) Consent Agenda left over from March Agenda

It was moved to accept the consent agenda without objection. Ê There was objection.

Each section was then discussed.Ê This agenda items were on the March agenda, however, when a quorum was not present, they were moved to the April agenda.

VI.A.1. Proposal to Create the University Course and Programs Committee and the University Program Review Committee.Ê The information regarding this section is posted at: <a href="http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/GradSchool.pdf">http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/GradSchool.pdf</a>. After Collis Geren requested that Pat Koski (associate dean of the graduate school) be allowed to speak, Dr. Koski stated that two committees from the Faculty Senate and two Graduate Council Committees often do not know what each committee is doing, i.e. the Undergraduate and Graduate Course Committees may be looking at dual listings for basically the same undergraduate and graduate courses.Ê This new committee structure is a replacement for existing committees.Ê The Program Review Committee only job is to look at programs already in progress, not new programs.

#### Motion passes for VI.A.1.

VI.A.2.Ê Changes To The Financial Aid Policy.Ê This will help students submit applications for financial aid by aligning the university with the current Federal Aid guidelines. This basically backs off of the criteria for 67% of completed courses to 60% completed courses.Ê The Director of the Office of Financial Aid thought that a committee should be making the decisions on a studentâs financial aid, rather than an individual.

#### Motion passes for VI.A.2.

2) Current Consent Agenda

With no objection the current consent agenda (#2) was approved.

B. Research Council, represented by George Denny

## It came moved and seconded to accept the wording changes suggested by the Research Council.

The proposed Faculty Handbook changes pertinent to the Research Council are posted at: <a href="http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/ReseachCouncilFacHandbookChange.pdf">http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/ReseachCouncilFacHandbookChange.pdf</a>.

The suggested changes clean up the wording for the research conduct section and the membership of the Research Council

#### Motion passes

VII Announcement

Patsy requested that the FS members review the Toxic Substance Policy posted at: <a href="http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/ToxicSub.pdf">http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/ToxicSub.pdf</a>.

Please contact Ralph Henry, Chair, Toxic Substances Committee with any comments, etc.

VII Adjourned 5:12 pm

Patsy Watkins, Chair; Neil Allison, Secretary. Minutes approved: 5/8/02