

**Agenda
Faculty Senate
April 17, 2002
Giffels Auditorium
3:30 p.m.**

- I. Call to Order: Patsy Watkins, Chair
- II. Approval of Agenda
- III. Approval of Minutes: March 13, 2002
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/2002-MarMinutes.htm>

IV. Reports

- IV.A. Enrollment Report: Arlene Cash
- IV.B. Annual Giving: Susan Neyman

V. Old Business

V.A. Resolution

The following resolution is cosponsored by Senators Lieber, Gupta, Ryan, Macrae, Chappel, Kennedy, Freund and Etges to be presented at the March Faculty Senate meeting::

Faculty Senate Resolution

Whereas academic freedom is one of the foundations of higher education, and tenure is principal guarantor of academic freedom,

Whereas the prospect of eventually receiving tenure is essential to attracting and retaining the high quality faculty on which the reputation of the University of Arkansas depends,

Whereas a high quality faculty is necessary to guarantee the high quality education which the students of Arkansas deserve,

Whereas the University of Arkansas system has grown by the addition of several campuses, most notably the new University of Arkansas at Fort Smith where tenure has been abolished for recent faculty hires, or at campuses such as Phillips County Community College where tenure has never existed,

Therefore, the members of the faculty senate at the University of Arkansas, Fayetteville express their support for establishing the tenure system at all the campuses of the University of Arkansas System and urge the Board of Trustees to see that this policy is implemented as soon as possible.

V.B. Consent Agenda Ballot: items c., d., and e., from March Agenda, approved by a vote of 14 for 0 against.

V.C. APT Committee (from March agenda)

Recommended changes to "Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure (as revised August 20, 2001) as approved by the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion & Tenure, February 13, 2001.

1. Paragraph III.B.8.g - Letters for Candidates

A. Existing

A minimum of three letters from impartial (e.g., who lack a familial relationship with the candidate, who lack a former student/teacher relationship with the candidate, and who lack any apparent or actual conflict of interest) outside reviewers (persons who possess appropriate expertise to assess the candidate's professional accomplishments) at peer institutions will be included. During the outside reviewer selection process, outside reviewers suggested by the candidate will be considered. All reviewer letters should be included in the packet as well as a short vita from the outside reviewers. These responses should be based on the evaluator's knowledge of the complete record of the candidate, including a description of responsibilities with a breakdown of teaching, research, and service assignments during the time period being evaluated.

B. Recommended Changes:

Changes in Bold print:

Addition to Paragraph III. B. 8. g. A minimum of three letters from impartial (e.g. who lack a familiar relationship with the candidate, who lack a former student/teacher relations with the candidate, and who lack any apparent or actual conflict of interest) outsider reviewers (persons who possess appropriate expertise to assess the candidate's professional accomplishments) at peer institutions will be included. ***A minimum of six reviewers will be solicited (two to be nominated by the candidate, two to be nominated by the department/unit chairperson, and two to be jointly nominated by the candidate and the chairperson) by the department chairperson or the unit committee (as determined by the unit faculty).*** All review responses should be included in the packet as well as a short vita from the outside reviewers. These responses should be based on the evaluator's knowledge of the complete record of the candidate, including a description of responsibilities with a breakdown of teaching, research and service assignments during the period.

Recommended changes to "Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure (as revised August 20, 2001) as approved by the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion & Tenure, February 13, 2001.

2. Paragraph III. B. 9. - Review Committees

A. Existing

9. The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, and any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the unit committee. After both meeting and voting independently of the department chairperson, the unit committee shall make its recommendation and recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson and the tenured unit faculty along with a written statement of the unit committee's rationale for its recommendation. The unit committee shall send a copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate. (A 'positive recommendation' is a recommendation to promote; a 'negative recommendation' is a recommendation not to promote.)

B. Recommended Changes :

add a Footnote addition to Paragraph III. B. 9.

9. The candidate's file of supporting material, written evaluations from outside reviewers, and any other relevant material shall be evaluated by the unit **committee**^{1/}.

After both meeting and voting independently of the department chairperson, the unit **committee**^{1/} shall make its recommendation and recorded vote in writing and forward it to the chairperson and the tenured unit faculty along with a written statement of the unit committee's rationale for its recommendation. The unit **committee**^{1/} shall send a copy of its recommendation and statement of rationale to the candidate. (A 'positive recommendation' is a recommendation to promote; a 'negative recommendation' is a recommendation not to promote.)

^{1/} *Under this policy, each unit may allow additional committees according to the unit personnel document, including rank specific committees.*

Recommended changes to "Evaluative Criteria, Procedures and General Standards for Initial Appointment, Successive Appointments, Annual and Post-Tenure Review, Promotion and Tenure (as revised August 20, 2001) as approved by the University Committee on Appointment, Promotion & Tenure, February 13, 2001.

3. Paragraph III. B. 22. - Review by Administration

A. Existing:

There is no existing section.

B. Recommended Changes:

Additional of Paragraph III. B. 22. Any other formal or informal bodies, groups, committees, or individuals consulted by the Chancellor, Provost, or the Dean, not in the specific procedures outlined heretofore, constitutes a violation of the promotion and/or tenure process.

VI. New Business

VI.A. Consent Agenda

- 1) Left over from March Agenda
 - ◆ Proposal to Create the *University Course and Programs Committee* and the *University Program Review Committee*
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/GradSchool.pdf>
 - ◆ Changes to the Financial Aid Policy
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Mar/GradSchool.pdf>
- 2) Current
 - ◆ Approved by the Graduate Council (03/14/02); Changes to the Academic Graduate Grievance Policy procedure
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/AcademicGrievancePolicy.pdf>
 - ◆ Approved by the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee (03/14/02): Course listing and copies of curriculum change forms
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/GCCCMAR.pdf>
 - ◆ Approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (03/12/02): Course listings and copies of curriculum change forms
<http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/UCCMAR.pdf>
 - ◆ Approved by the Undergraduate Program Committee
(a) College: ARSC

Change: Add pre-professional requirements to the BS and BA degrees in computer science

(b) College: EDUC

Change: Eliminate kinesiology concentration for physical education for secondary only.

(c) College: BADM

Change: To change requirements under Finance component of GBUS major field

VI.B. Research Council; Proposed Changes: George Denny

[http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-](http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/ReseachCouncilFacHandbookChange.pdf)

[2002/2002Apr/ReseachCouncilFacHandbookChange.pdf](http://www.uark.edu/depts/facsen/AgendaMinutes/2001-2002/2002Apr/ReseachCouncilFacHandbookChange.pdf)

VII. Announcement

Proposed policy from University's Toxic Substances Committee

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

Senators may provide comments on the proposed policy to the Chair of the Toxic Substances Committee: Dr. Ralph Henry, GERR B-2, rahenny@uark.edu

VIII. Adjourn