

Minutes of  
THE FACULTY SENATE  
OF  
ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY

The Faculty Senate met Wednesday, December 13, 2017, at 1:00 p.m. in Rothwell 456.  
The following members were present:

|                     |                     |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Dr. Molly Brant     | Dr. Jason Patton    |
| Dr. Jon Clements    | Dr. Michael Rogers  |
| Dr. Melissa Darnell | Dr. Jeremy Schwehm  |
| Dr. David Eshelman  | Dr. Monty Smith     |
| Dr. Debra Hunter    | Dr. V. Carole Smith |
| Dr. Shelia Jackson  | Dr. James Stobaugh  |
| Dr. Chris Kellner   | Dr. Bruce Tedford   |
| Dr. Joshua Lockyer  | Dr. Jack Tucci      |
| Dr. Johnette Moody  | Dr. Susan Underwood |

Dr. Marcel Finan and Ms. Holly Ruth Gale were absent. Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman, Dr. David Blanks, Dr. David Ward, Dr. Penny Willmering, Ms. Tammy Weaver, Dr. Sean Huss, Mr. Thomas Pennington, Dr. Jeff Mitchell and Ms. Pat Chronister were visitors.

CALL TO ORDER

President Clements then called for a motion in regard to the minutes of November 14, 2017.

**Motion by Dr. Jackson, seconded by Dr. Stobaugh, to approve the minutes as distributed.**

Dr. Lockyer requested the minutes be amended in open forum, specifying that white supremacy groups on college campuses had been recruiting students, targeting faculty, and holding events requiring increased security.

APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES

Dr. Hunter asked the minutes be amended in open forum regarding the IT Prioritization Committee update, to be consistent with the minutes of that committee.

Dr. Kellner noted it had been reported in November the Fisheries and Wildlife program had five vehicles available for use, but the accurate number was four vehicles.

**Motion by Dr. Jackson, seconded by Dr. Underwood, to amend the minutes as requested, and approve.**

**Motion to approve as amended carried.**

VPAA UPDATE

President Clements introduced Dr. Mohamed Abdelrahman, Vice President for Academic Affairs, to address the Senate. Dr. Abdelrahman thanked the senators for their work over the fall semester. He reported some administrative changes in Academic Affairs: As of January 1, Dr. Mary Gunter will serve as Chief of Staff for Dr. Bowen, Dr. Linda Bean will serve as Interim Dean of the College of Education, and Dr. Jeff Robertson will serve as Interim Graduate Dean, while continuing to serve as the Dean of the College of Natural and Health Sciences. Additionally, he reported Dr. Hanna Norton would continue to serve as Dean of the College of eTech through June 30, and would then return to full-time faculty in the Department of Communication and Journalism.

Dr. Abdelrahman stated he had asked President Clements to appoint two or three faculty to a working group looking at enrollment issues. He noted his preference for enrollment issues to be decided within the departments and colleges. He also reported the deans and

departments heads would be having a retreat on January 9, and one item of discussion would be ideas for reducing workload, particularly with mundane tasks that could be eliminated. The group would also be discussing putting the “tech back in Tech” by identifying existing courses that are technology intensive and developing a designation for those courses.

Dr. Abdelrahman announced, based on discussions in the Senate, Ms. Bernadette Hinkle, Vice President for Administration and Finance, would be moving forward with the purchase of a new university van, primarily for short range use. Dr. Patton thanked Dr. Abdelrahman for his help in this matter.

Dr. Abdelrahman reported the procedure for transfer students to be advised within the department had become challenging, especially in the summer term when faculty were not always available. He stated transfer students with less than 60 hours would now be advised in the Academic Advising Center. Dr. V. Carole Smith emphasized the importance of the professional advisors connecting with the colleges and programs.

Motion by Dr. Moody, seconded by Dr. Rogers, to amend the agenda, moving Item D of Old Business to the next item on the agenda. Motion carried.

#### ATTENDANCE REPORTING / DROPPING FOR EXCESSIVE ABSENCES

President Clements invited Ms. Tammy Weaver, Registrar, to address the Senate. Ms. Weaver indicated the online attendance module had been developed due to the increase of online offerings through the eTech initiative, as well as a change in the definition of “attendance” for federal financial aid purposes. She stated the module can be turned off for face to face classes, but she noted the module had been used to accommodate students who were unable to be on campus at the beginning of the class, such as active duty or international students. Ms. Weaver reported students can be dropped for excessive absences with a grade of “FE” who either never attended or who initially attended, then stopped. She stated there were also examples of other universities in the state assigning a grade other than an “F” which was not punitive for the student’s GPA (but would have financial aid implications).

Senators discussed a lack of communication in the process and policy for using the online attendance module. Discussion also included the onus for communication between faculty and students when attempting to drop a student for excessive absences, and concern that the majority of the responsibility was on the instructor. Dr. Abdelrahman agreed to look further into this, and Ms. Weaver suggested convening the standing Admissions, Academic Standards, and Student Honors Committee in the spring semester. She stated the committee could research and bring a recommendation to the Senate. President Clements agreed, and volunteered to speak to the committee.

#### NEW BUSINESS: CURRICULAR ITEMS

President Clements called for a motion in regard to the curricular items.

Motion by Dr. Stobaugh, seconded by Dr. Hunter, to approve the curricular proposals from the Department of Behavioral Sciences as presented:

#### College of Arts and Humanities – Department of Behavioral Sciences

1. Modify the prerequisites for RS 4104: Service Learning in Rehabilitation Science, FROM: Prerequisites: RS 3203: Interviewing Skills, RS 3123: Ethics and Professional Development, and RS 4023: Case Management Strategies, with a C or better; TO: Prerequisites: RS 3203: Interviewing Skills, RS 3123: Ethics and Professional Development, and RS 4023: Case Management Strategies, with a C or better; For students choosing RS 4012, the internship option, this course may only be taken with permission from the Rehabilitation Science Program Director;
2. Modify the prerequisites for RS 4123: Survey of Counseling Theories, FROM: Prerequisites: Nine hours of psychology to include PSY 2003: General Psychology,

PSY 3063: Developmental Psychology I, and PSY 3003: Abnormal Psychology, or PSY 3153: Theories of Personality, senior standing, or consent of the instructor; TO: PSY 2003: General Psychology, or consent of the instructor; and

3. a) Combine the minor in Child Welfare and Social Services; and require 18 hours from the following courses:
  - RS 3013: World of Work
  - RS 3043: Introduction to Social Services and the Social Service Case Process
  - RS 3141-3: Rehabilitation Science Seminar
  - RS 3153: Assistive Technology in Rehabilitation Settings
  - RS 3243: Social Services for Individuals and Families
  - RS 4163: Introduction to Addictions
  - RS 4173: Family Centered Services
  - RS 4183: Family Services Seminar
  - RP 3013: Inclusive Recreation
  - SOC 3023: Family
  - SOC 3113: Social Movements and Social Change
  - SOC 4003: Minority Relations
  - SOC 4053: Sociology of Health and Illness
  - SOC 4063: Social Stratification
  - RP 4073: Principles and Techniques of Therapeutic Recreation
  - CJ/SOC 2033: Social Problems
- b) Add PHIL 3043: Clinical Bioethics, to the list of course choices for the minor in Disability Studies;
- c) Add RS 4163: Introduction to Addictions, to the list of course choices for the minor in Aging and Disability Studies; and
- d) Modify the Curriculum in Rehabilitation Science, as outlined in the matrix.

**Motion carried.**

**Motion by Dr. Jackson, seconded by Dr. Stobaugh, to approve the curricular proposals from the Department of History and Political Science as presented:**

College of Arts and Humanities – Department of History and Political Sciences

1. Delete the following courses from the course descriptions:
  - a. PHIL 3013: Modern Philosophy;
  - b. PHIL 3113: Contemporary Philosophy; and
  - c. PHIL 3203: Medieval Philosophy;
2. Add PHIL 2033: The Meaning of Life, to the course descriptions;
3. Add PHIL 2053: Introduction to Critical Thinking, to the course descriptions; and add to the course to the list of courses satisfying General Education Humanities; and
4. Add PHIL 3083: Leadership Ethics;
5. Modify the prerequisites for HIST 4963: Senior Seminar, FROM: Prerequisites: HIST 1503: World History to 1500, HIST 1513: World History since 1500, HIST 2003: United States History to 1877, and HIST 2013: United States History since 1877; TO: Prerequisite: HIST 2513: Sources and Methods in History;
6. Add the Prerequisite: HIST 2513: Sources and Methods in History, to POLS 4963: Senior Seminar;
7. Modify the Minor in Philosophy as follows: delete PHIL 3013: Modern Philosophy, PHIL 3103: Logic; PHIL 3113: Contemporary Philosophy, and PHIL 3203: Medieval Philosophy; and change 12 hours selected courses to 15 hours;
8. Modify the Minor in Pre-Law as follows: add PHIL 3073: Philosophy of Law, to the list of 6 hours of electives;
9. Modify the Minor in Religious Studies as follows: require PHIL 2023: Buddhist Philosophy; and delete ANTH 2003: Cultural Anthropology, AND HIST 1503:

World History to 1500; add ANTH 2003: Cultural Anthropology, OR HIST 1503: World History to 1500; and

10. Modify the Curriculum in International Studies Cultural Affairs Concentration and Political Affairs Concentration as follows: delete the Cultural Affairs Concentration and Political Affairs Concentration; modify the curriculum as follows: require core 18 hours from the Curriculum in Political Science; require 6 hours from world politics; require 6 hours from world history; require 3 hours from global culture; require 3 hours from world geography; and require a minor in foreign language.

**Motion carried.**

**Motion by Dr. Hunter, seconded by Dr. Brant, to approve the curricular proposals from the Department of Management and Marketing as presented:**

College of Business – Department of Management and Marketing

1. Add the following courses to the course descriptions:
  - a. BDA 2023: Introduction to Data Visualization;
  - b. MKT 3063: Social Media Marketing;
  - c. MKT 3083: Retailing and the Virtual Marketplace;
  - d. MKT 3103: Selling and Sales Management;
  - e. MKT 4013: Digital Metrics; and
  - f. MGMT 4103: Supply Chain Management;
2. Change the title for MKT 4063: Advertising, TO: Integrated Marketing Communication in a Digital Age; and modify the course description, FROM: The “how” and “why” of advertising: principal problems faced by advertisers and advertising agencies, approaches, policies, and procedures as related to successful marketing techniques; TO: The study of every element of promotion within the marketing mix, including the importance of a unified message, as well as understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of all available media;
3. Change the title for MKT 4143: Marketing Management, TO: Marketing Strategy;
4. Change the title for MKT 4153: Research Methods, TO: Marketing Research and Analysis; change the course number TO: 3153; and modify the course description FROM: A study of the development of the basic methodology in research design for primary and secondary data, including requirements for collection, analysis, editing, coding, and presentation of data to support marketing decisions; TO: A study of the use of data needed to make marketing decisions, including design, collection and analysis of both primary and secondary data;
5. Reconfigure the Curriculum in Management and Marketing, to create the following: For the Marketing major, there will be two tracks: Digital Marketing and Marketing Strategy; and for the Management major, there will be three tracks: Entrepreneurship, Human Resource Management, and Business Management.

**Motion carried.**

## DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

President Clements introduced Dr. David Blanks, Department Head for History and Political Science, and invited him to address the Senate. Dr. Blanks reported he had been asked by the administration to chair a super committee on diversity and inclusion. He stated he was in the process of forming a series of committees focusing on the various aspects of diversity and inclusion, and would report to President Bowen at the end of the year. Dr. Blanks asked the senators to voice any concerns.

Dr. Monty Smith encouraged the super committee to research how other universities, and

even the private industry, approach issues of diversity and inclusion. Dr. Eshelman suggested including the topic in the professional development sessions for faculty. Dr. V. Carole Smith expressed the importance of inviting a speaker who was both knowledgeable and able to address the issue directly, rather than attempting to make everyone comfortable.

Dr. Tedford stated, given recent interactions with state representatives, the Office of Diversity and Inclusion should work closely with the community, educating members that inclusion did not mean exclusion or being “anti” anything. Dr. V. Carole Smith indicated she would be in support of the university establishing itself as anti-racism or anti-white supremacy.

Dr. Kellner reported his colleagues at other institutions involved in researching or teaching topics such as climate change had recently come under fire, and were finding it difficult to proceed.

Some senators indicated inclusivity involved many groups, including those with disabilities, and Dr. Blanks confirmed there would be a subcommittee to address these groups.

Dr. Rogers noted the complexity of the issue and the challenge of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and students in this region, given the demography of the community. Senators discussed the key factors for students when choosing a university, and questioned if diversity and inclusion efforts were a deciding factor. Dr. Schwehm responded white students may not take that into consideration, but students of color would. Dr. V. Carole Smith agreed, confirming it was a deciding factor for the minority populations.

Dr. Blanks thanked the senators, and invited them to email him any additional ideas they may have. He excused himself from the meeting.

#### UNCOMPENSATED TEACHING LOADS

President Clements stated the discussion of uncompensated teaching loads tied in to earlier discussions regarding low enrollment courses. He reported Dr. Phillip Bridgmon, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, was forming a working group to investigate the issues further, and asked for volunteers to serve. Drs. Tedford, Patton and Moody volunteered to serve, and President Clements stated Dr. Bridgmon would be in contact with them.

#### ACADEMIC ADVISOR EVALUATION

President Clements reported a draft of an Academic Advisor Evaluation (Attachment A) had been distributed with the agenda, and would be discussed further at the February meeting, when Dr. Jeff Woods, Dean of Arts and Humanities, would be present to answer questions.

#### OLD BUSINESS: EXTERNAL WORK POLICY

President Clements distributed a draft of the External Employment Policy (Attachment B) and invited Mr. Thomas Pennington, University Counsel, to address the Senate. Mr. Pennington stated, essentially, university resources and facilities should not be used for personal gain. Senators expressed concern about discerning between faculty scholarship and personal gain, when scholarship or professional development could lead to personal gain, such as publishing a book. Mr. Pennington offered to draft a Memorandum of Understanding for such instances and bring to the February Senate meeting for review.

As a reminder, Mr. Pennington distributed the Extra Income Statement (Attachment C) required by the State of Arkansas for state employees who earn income in excess of \$500 outside of the regular salary.

Dr. Patton asked Mr. Pennington for an update on the promotion and tenure revisions. Mr. Pennington responded he had reviewed several times, and he felt it was close. Dr. Patton asked if it would be ready to go forward to the April or May Board of Trustees meeting, and Mr. Pennington believed it would.

Mr. Pennington thanked the Senate and excused himself from the meeting.

President Clements reported, if the promotion and tenure draft was finalized in time, the Faculty Senate would hold a special session at the end of January in order to vote. He asked the senators to hold Tuesday, January 30, 2018 for the possible session.

ETECH ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE /  
COLLEGE  
CURRICULUM  
COMMITTEES

President Clements distributed a draft of the proposed *Faculty Handbook* changes, establishing Departmental or College Curriculum Committees (Attachment D). He asked for volunteers to review the document, and reported he had reached out to Dr. Christine Austin, Director of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, and Dr. Shellie Hanna, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, to join as well. Drs. Schwehm, Rogers, Huss and Clements volunteered to serve.

INDIRECT COSTS

President Clements reported Dr. Kellner was heading the subcommittee looking at indirect costs, which would be meeting with Dr. Abdelrahman to finalize a proposal, then bring back to the Senate in February.

OPEN FORUM

Dr. Hunter clarified the Curriculum Committee does not currently review graduate proposals, as indicated in the proposed curriculum process changes (Attachment D); graduate proposals go directly to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Jackson stated, pertaining to the proposed advising evaluation (Attachment A), she did not believe it was appropriate to evaluate advisors when the advising load can vary greatly between faculty members. She stated she did not support this evaluation being part of the faculty member's summative evaluation. President Clements responded the proposed advising evaluation had not been approved yet, and would be discussed further by the Senate in February.

Dr. Darnell asked if there was a mandatory day for faculty to return in January. Ms. Chronister responded there is not a set date, but faculty were asked to attend professional development activities on Wednesday, and to be available to advise in the departments on Thursday and Friday. Dr. Darnell asked if this was left up to each department head, and Ms. Chronister confirmed it was, rather than being mandated from Academic Affairs.

Dr. Rogers suggested the Senate follow up with Institutional Research on the return rate for the fully online student evaluations, as that method had now been in place for multiple terms. Dr. Monty Smith reported evaluations were still opening before the last day to drop the class, permitting students who drop during that period to evaluate the course. President Clements called for a motion to suspend the rules of open forum to allow for a motion on this matter.

**Motion by Dr. Underwood, seconded by Dr. Eshelman, to suspend the rules of open forum. Motion carried.**

**Motion by Dr. Tucci, seconded by Dr. Schwehm, to move the online course evaluation start date after the last day to withdraw from a course.**

Following the motion, Dr. Patton expressed the need for a single system to capture feedback from both types of students; students completing the course would receive the course evaluation and students withdrawing from the course would be asked to complete the questions which were added to the withdrawal form. President Clements suggested starting with the change to the timeline, and if the issue was not resolved, revisiting with an additional recommendation.

**Motion carried.**

Dr. Kellner asked if the HLC reaccreditation process had changed, stating he understood HLC had a new approach to site visits. Dr. Underwood confirmed the pathway had changed,



and the steering committee would be providing education on the changes during the professional development day.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Stobaugh announced the food recovery program had collected 12,789 pounds of food for fall 2017, bringing the total since the beginning of the program to 41,434 pounds.

Dr. Tedford stated he had been identified as a Campus Security Authority and understood he would be required to submit monthly reports, and would receive monthly email reminders from Public Safety to do so. He reported he had not submitted any reports and had not received any email reminders. He spoke with Public Safety, but did not receive a clear response as to whether he was out of compliance.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:58pm.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jon F. Clements".

Jon Clements, D.M., President

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Jack Tucci".

Jack Tucci, Ph.D., Secretary

## Attachment A

## Academic Advising Evaluation Survey

Who is your academic advisor? \_\_\_\_\_

Did you meet with your advisor at least once per semester?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes

\_\_\_\_\_ No

If you answered “No” to the above question, why did you not meet with your advisor? (Check all that apply)

\_\_\_\_\_ I did not arrange a time to meet with my advisor

\_\_\_\_\_ My advisor could not find time to meet with me.

\_\_\_\_\_ I did not feel as though I needed to meet with my advisor.

\_\_\_\_\_ I met with another faculty member or administrator to get my academic advising.

\_\_\_\_\_ Other (please

specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

My advisor is available for appointments.

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Uncertain

My advisor responds when I communicate with her or him outside of advising meetings.

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Uncertain

My advisor is knowledgeable about degree program requirements, procedures for registration, and academic regulations.

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Uncertain

My advisor seems well informed about campus support services (tutoring, placement tests, personal counseling, etc.).

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Agree

\_\_\_\_\_ Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Strongly Disagree

\_\_\_\_\_ Uncertain



If unable to provide the information or assistance I need, my advisor knows where to refer me.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Uncertain

My advisor is helping me identify academic and career goals.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Uncertain

My advisor is willing to spend sufficient time with me to assist me with my academic concerns.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Uncertain

I am pleased with the overall experiences of my advising appointments.

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Uncertain

Do you have any additional sources of advising?

- ☐ Yes (Please list): \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ No

What has been most helpful about your advising sessions?

What might have been improved about your advising sessions?

## Arkansas Tech University External Employment Policy

External employment is defined as any paid activity for any non-university entity or person, whether or not such work is performed on campus, and also includes self-employment such as, but not necessarily limited to, consulting, advising, workshops, seminars, conferences, or similar work performed in addition to the official responsibilities of a full-time employee.

Arkansas Tech University employees are expected to fulfill their duties and responsibilities assigned to their particular position or job. External employment should not interfere with university employment. External employment must not create or result in a conflict of interest.

External employment is subject to the following expectations:

1. The external employment may not interfere with the obligations of the employee to the university or create any conflicts of interest;
2. For employees who accrue annual leave, annual leave must be taken if the external employment would overlap with regularly scheduled work hours of the employee;
3. ~~Usage of university facilities or resources is prohibited;~~ As a general rule, university resources (including facilities, supplies, and equipment) shall not be used for personal gain. However, in certain projects which accrue to the mutual benefit of the university and the individual faculty member, a contract for reimbursement to the university may be entered into in order to provide access to university resources.
4. Employees performing external employment are solely responsible for work performed in the course of external employment, and the university is not responsible for such work;
5. All external work is performed in the employee's individual capacity;
6. Employees engaged in external employment do not officially represent the university, will not receive legal representation from the university, and are not an agent of the university when acting in that capacity; and
7. The views, thoughts, and expressions of the employee during the external employment do not represent the views or position of the university.

## Attachment C

**Arkansas Codes Addressing  
Extra Income Statement****Section 21-8-203. Disclosure of income required.**

The General Assembly determines that it is essential to the efficient operation of government, and to minimize the opportunities for conflicts of interest, that all state employees who are employed on a regular salary basis shall be required to disclose each source of income in excess of five hundred dollars (\$500) earned during any calendar year from sources other than their regular salary from employment or from professional or consultant services rendered for any public agency.

History. Acts 1977, No. 849, 1; A.S.A. 1947, 12-1628.

**Section 21-8-204. Filing of income disclosure statement.**

(a) On or before January 31 following the close of each calendar year, all state employees who are employed by a state office, agency, department, board, commission, or institution of higher learning in this state on a regular salary basis shall file a statement under oath reflecting all income in excess of five hundred dollars (\$500) received by them during the preceding calendar year as wages or salary or as fees or payments for professional or consultant services rendered to any public agency of this state, as defined in 21-8-201 hereof, other than the salary said person receives on a regular salary basis.

(b)(1) All state employees who are employed by any state office, agency, department, board, or commission, other than employees of institutions of higher learning, shall file the statement required herein with the Secretary of State.

(2) All employees of institutions of higher learning in the state shall file the statement with the president of the institution of higher learning by which the employee is employed, and all such statements filed with the presidents of the various institutions of higher learning shall be public records and shall be open to public inspection during reasonable business hours.

History. Acts 1977, No. 849, 3, 4; A.S.A. 1947, 12-1630, 12-1631.

**Secretary of State**  
**MARK MARTIN**

Filing for year \_\_\_\_\_

**Elections Division**  
**State Capitol, Rm 026**  
**Little Rock, AR 72201**  
**501/682/5070**

**Extra Income Statement  
Of  
State Employees**

1. Name of Employee: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name and address of agency where employed:

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Agency)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Street, PO Box, Rural Route)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(City)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(State)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Zip)

3. Source and amount of income in excess of \$500.00:

(a) \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Entity) (Amount)

(b) \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Entity) (Amount)

(c) \_\_\_\_\_ \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(Name of Entity) (Amount)

**NOTE:** Extra Income statements must be filed by January 31 of each year. Persons employed by institutions of higher learning must file with the President of that institution.

**- Verification -**

I do solemnly swear that the foregoing Extra Income Statement filed herewith is in all things true and correct, and fully shows all the information required to be reported by me.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of State Employee

State of Arkansas

County of \_\_\_\_\_

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a Notary Public, this the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment D

## 2016-2017 Faculty Handbook

## III

## RELATION OF THE FACULTY MEMBER TO ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

**University Curriculum Committee**

*\*Membership:* Two tenured faculty members, one of which has online course delivery training, elected from each college including the supernumerary voting block, to serve staggered, two-year terms. Three at large tenured faculty with online experience and online certification to serve staggered two-year terms. One at large untenured faculty member elected annually for a one-year term. The registrar, a member of the library faculty, and two student members, selected by the Student Government Association, serve as ex officio members.

*Function:* Monitor the total undergraduate curriculum. This includes evaluating and approving all proposed course changes and all program change proposals, once they have been approved and forwarded from Department and/or College Curriculum Committees. The University Curriculum Committee then forwards its recommendations to Faculty Senate (undergraduate curriculum changes) or Graduate Council (graduate curriculum changes) for consideration prior to transmittal to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

(From page 105)

## V

## SELECTED ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES AFFECTING THE FACULTY

## COURSE OFFERINGS AND CHANGES IN CURRICULUM

## Committees or Departments Involved in Reviewing Curriculum Changes

Any change in course offerings (online, mixed method, or face-to-face) and/or curriculum for a program must be reviewed by the following committees and departments unless that change is deemed to be "cosmetic" by the University Registrar:

1. **Departmental or College Curriculum Committee**

While faculty members will typically propose changes to the curriculum, each curriculum change or course review must be approved by either a Departmental Curriculum Committee (DCC) or College Curriculum Committee (CCC), as determined by faculty in their respective academic units. The CCC or DCC will serve as the originating committee for any change to course offerings and/or curriculum for any given program. The primary function of the CCC/DCC is to monitor, assess, produce, and review all necessary paperwork submitted for the approval of the proposed changes to course offerings or curriculum for their respective department or program.

The CCC/DCC membership shall be composed of a minimum of five full-time, elected faculty members (tenured, tenure-track, and/or instructor-track) from the relevant department or program. Members of the CCC/DCC may serve an unlimited number of terms on their respective DCC, with elections held during the Departmental or College meeting during the Fall term at the beginning of the academic year. At least two of the committee members must hold online certification (e.g., eTech) or equivalent experience in online education as determined by the CCC/DCC to facilitate review of online course or program offerings. Members from complimentary departments may be recruited to serve on another department or program CCC/DCC, if the originating department has difficulty meeting the minimum membership requirements for their respective CCC/DCC. Serving as a member of a CCC/DCC in another department or program will be considered equivalent to service on a CCC/DCC in the faculty member's assigned department or program; such faculty members may be exempted from serving on the CCC/DCC for their department or program.



The CCC/DCC shall work with the proposing faculty member to meet the requirements of the Registrar's Office and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness so that all proposed curriculum changes are compliant with timelines, accrediting bodies, and state agencies. The CCC/DCC also will work with faculty in the process of developing online course offerings, as well as encourage such faculty to work with representatives of the Online Course Design office, so that online courses meet SARA and HLC guidelines.

As part of their duties, the CCC/DCC will elect a chair to organize meetings, collect necessary forms and paperwork, and serve as the primary point of contact for the CCC/DCC when working with the Registrar's Office and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness. Additional duties of the CCC/DCC include but are not limited to:

- A. Verify that the proposed course number(s) are not in use for the current or recent course catalogs, as well as ensure that the proposed course number(s) are appropriate to the intended level of the course. The levels of proposed course number(s) and the sequencing of proposed courses should also be considered, especially in regard to pre/co-requisites included in proposed course descriptions.
- B. Verify that general education requirements and the number of required hours in the degree program (i.e., upper division, within major, and total hours) are in compliance with accrediting bodies and state agencies. In the instance that a proposal includes requirements that exceed those mandated by accrediting bodies or state agencies, then a justification for this difference should be included in the proposal.
- C. Verify that all programs and departments affected by the proposed change have been contacted and the proposal includes approval forms from each of the affected programs or departments.
- D. Verify that all proposal forms are typed, signed, and included in the proposal for the curriculum change before submitting the full proposal to the Department Head.
- E. Make certain that all proposals are submitted and complete within the timelines specified by the Registrar's Office.

Note that the CCC/DCC also is expected to perform reviews of the current curriculum offered to ensure that the curriculum provides the appropriate range of course offerings as dictated by disciplines and expertise in each respective field of study. In the instance of such reviews, all face-to-face, mixed method, and online offerings are to be reviewed using the same criteria and methods, with one exception: members of the CCC/DCC evaluating online course material must hold online certification (e.g., eTech) or equivalent online experience as determined by the CCC/DCC. The CCC/DCC will work to identify specific criteria and methods for the review of courses, in line with accrediting bodies and state agency requirements. This list of criteria for review should be made available to all faculty to facilitate both curriculum development and course review. Further, no course review by the CCC/DCC will focus on any individual professor's content or any individual professor's specific course. Course reviews will focus on all courses sharing the same course number in each respective program, with an emphasis placed on determining if the course meets expectations within the selected curriculum or should be revised. In effect, course reviews are general reviews of courses within the curriculum to ensure that departments meet accrediting body, state agency, and disciplinary standards. The CCC/DCC will have the sole responsibility of identifying courses for review and make recommendations to their respective units on updates or changes to the existing curriculum based on recommendations from the faculty or Department Head. In addition, course reviews are for departmental use only and are not forwarded to any additional committee; only curriculum changes arising from a departmental course review would be forwarded for subsequent approval.

Note also that, in the instance of a program proposal only, the CCC/DCC is expected to work with the proposing faculty member and the Department Head on an initial "white paper" describing the proposed program and reasons for initiating a new program. This white paper should include a description of the proposed program, courses to be added, numbers of anticipated majors, and any additional information requested by the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA). The VPAA makes the final decision to approve or deny a proposal for a new program.

The CCC/DCC is expected to work with the faculty, the Registrar's Office, the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, and the Department Head to identify standards for the curriculum in each program. Once a change has been approved by the CCC/DCC, the proposal or change is then forwarded to the Department Head for final departmental review.

## **2. Department Heads and Deans**

As part of their administrative duties, the Department Heads and Dean must serve as the final review of any curriculum change recommended by a CCC/DCC. This final review requires that Department Heads and Deans verify that the CCC/DCC has met its obligations in vetting the proposal as it moves forward.

Throughout the curriculum change process, the Department Heads and Deans are expected to work with the CCC/DCC, Registrar's Office, Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness to ensure consistency in the process as the proposal moves forward. In the instance in which a proposal is incomplete or inadequate, as determined by a Department Head or Dean, that proposal will be returned to the proposing CCC/DCC for additional review and correction.

## **3. University Curriculum Committee**

The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) will serve as the university-level reviewing committee for any change to course offerings and/or curriculum at Arkansas Tech University. The primary function of this committee is to monitor the total undergraduate curriculum, along with evaluating, assessing, and approving all proposed course changes/reviews and all program change proposals, once they have been approved and forwarded from Department and/or College Curriculum Committees. The University Curriculum Committee forwards its undergraduate curriculum recommendations to the Faculty Senate for final consideration and it forwards its graduate curriculum recommendations to the Graduate Council for final consideration. Both the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council forward these changes to the Vice President for Academic Affairs upon approval by each respective committee.

The UCC is required to verify that all proposals have been thoroughly vetted and meet the requirements of accrediting bodies and state agencies. The UCC does not evaluate proposals based on content of courses, but instead is mandated to ensure that all proposed curriculum changes have adequate assessment standards and meet general expectations for coursework at Arkansas Tech University. The UCC may request that members of a CCC/DCC be present to add information, answer questions, or address concerns when reviewing the proposed curriculum change. In the instance in which a proposal is found to be incomplete or inadequate, the UCC may be returned to the proposing CCC/DCC for additional review and correction.

## **4. Faculty Senate and Graduate Council**

Both the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council serve as the committees that perform a final review of all curriculum changes before submitting to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Any proposed change to the undergraduate curriculum will be submitted by the UCC to the Faculty Senate for final faculty review and approval. Any proposed change to the graduate level curriculum will be submitted by the UCC to the Graduate Council for final faculty review and approval. In the instance that any proposal is found to be incomplete or inadequate, both the Faculty Senate and



the Graduate Council may return that proposal to the UCC for additional review and communication with the proposing CCC/DCC.

**5. Vice President of Academic Affairs**

The Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA) is the chief academic officer at Arkansas Tech University. As such, the VPAA has numerous duties and is primarily responsible for managing the internal academic operations of the university. One responsibility of the VPAA is to review proposed curriculum changes. Given the VPAA's position as an administrator, his or her evaluation of proposed changes will be broader in scope by placing proposed changes in a context of departmental, program, college, and university needs. The VPAA also receives and approves white papers on proposed program changes in advance of the work of the CCC/DCC in developing program proposals. In the instance that any proposal is found to be incomplete or inadequate, the VPAA may return that proposal to the UCC for additional review and communication with the proposing CCC/DCC.

**6. President and Board of Trustees**

The President is the chief executive officer at Arkansas Tech University. As such, the President has numerous duties and responsibilities in managing both internal operations and external relationships for the university. One responsibility of the President is to review proposed changes to the curriculum. Given the President's position as an administrator, his or her evaluation of proposed curriculum changes will be broader in scope by placing proposed curriculum changes in a context of departmental, program, college, and university needs. The President makes the final recommendation to the Board of Trustees on a proposed curriculum change. In the instance that any proposal is found to be incomplete or inadequate, the President may return that proposal to the VPAA and UCC for additional review and communication with the proposing CCC/DCC.

**7. Board of Trustees**

The Board of Trustees (Board) is the final decision-making body for Arkansas Tech University. As such, the Board has final approval in all matters related to adopting a curriculum change.

## Curriculum Change Processes

### 1. Developmental Stage

In curricular changes of any significance, early communication is critical to sparing needless effort and later controversy. All faculty within a department should be involved in, or at least be made aware of, any departmental curriculum changes. Even prior to departmental approval, intended changes should be communicated to all those likely to be affected, with a request for their input.

Forms and instructions are available on the Curriculum Committee website: [http://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum\\_forms.php](http://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum_forms.php) Each curriculum request form has an associated assessment form specific to that type of change request. Completed assessment forms must accompany each curriculum request form, whether cosmetic or regular curriculum change.

Those who should be routinely involved or informed in most cases include the following:

- College or Departmental Curriculum Committee
- Online Course Design Office (for online courses only)
- Registrar
- Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness
- Deans, department heads, CCC/DCC
- Vice President for Academic Affairs (particularly in relation to new program proposals)

Curriculum changes can be classified as either cosmetic or regular, with the difference mainly consisting of the amount of documentation required and the shortened time period required for review by the appropriate committees.

#### A. Cosmetic Changes

A cosmetic change is one which does not significantly impact another department, or change the intent or focus of the affected course or curriculum (e.g., deleting a prerequisite, modifying a course description, changing the name of a course, etc.). The CCC/DCC and department head initiating the curriculum change will consult with the Registrar's Office to determine whether the change requested can be considered cosmetic or whether the change will need to be initiated through the more formal curriculum change process.

Cosmetic changes will be posted for a minimum of two weeks, during which time any faculty member may object to the proposal on the basis that it is not cosmetic, or may object to the completeness of the proposal's justification / rationale. These objections must be emailed to [curriculum@atu.edu](mailto:curriculum@atu.edu) with a "cc" to the appropriate department head. If the proposal is deemed cosmetic but needs additional information or rationale, this will allow the initiating department to submit a revised cosmetic change with complete justification; conversely, if the proposal is not considered cosmetic, the department will have the opportunity to prepare a standard curriculum proposal as appropriate. Unless

objections are received, cosmetic changes will be considered "approved" by the faculty at large and implemented in the appropriate catalog.

Review by faculty of cosmetic changes will normally occur during the academic year (not summers) when all full time faculty are teaching.

**B. Regular Changes**

Regular curriculum changes include Course Additions, Course Deletions, Program Additions, Certificates, and Program Deletions. Curriculum proposals of these types are required to proceed through the entire curriculum approval process outlined in the Submission Stage section below.

Regular undergraduate curriculum proposals will be posted on the Curriculum Committee website and should be reviewed by the committees identified above. Regular graduate curriculum proposals will be posted on the Graduate Council's website and should also be reviewed by the appropriate committees. Proposals affecting the teacher certification and master's programs in Education should be presented first to the Teacher Education Council. Proposals affecting general education should be presented to the General Education Committee. Review of regular curriculum proposals will take place primarily during the fall semester of each academic year. Exceptions may be granted by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, particularly for curricular changes resulting from modified accreditation standards or State licensure changes.

**2. Pre-Approval Stage (White Paper Submission and New Program Development)**

Note that curriculum proposals for new degree programs must follow the Pre-Approval process. These instances include: new programs, new certificates, new concentrations, new minors, and splitting existing programs into separate majors. Such pre-approvals require the submission of a white paper prior to submission of the formal proposal. Guidelines for the white paper are provided on the Curriculum Forms website and general information on white papers is provided in the next section ([https://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum\\_forms.php](https://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum_forms.php)).

The Pre-Approval Process requires the following procedures:

**A. Pre-Proposal Stage**

- i. New program is identified and discussed between CCC/DCC, Department Head, and Dean of the College. The CCC/DCC and Department Head then produce a one to two paged white paper that provides justifications for the new program. This white paper should also include current courses and needed additions to the curriculum, as well as support courses from other departments to be included in the new program. Finally, white papers should include a discussion and resources needed for the new program, including estimated costs for the first three years of the new program. (See guidelines and examples at [https://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum\\_forms.php](https://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum_forms.php)).



- ii. White papers are then submitted to and reviewed by all college deans. Deans may make comments or recommendations on the white paper, which is then forwarded to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.
- iii. The VPAA will review the white paper, while taking into account comments from all college deans. The VPAA then approves or disapproves of the program proposed in the white paper. If approved, the VPAA will then forward the white paper and her or his comments to the President, typically by April 1<sup>st</sup>. If disapproved by the VPAA, the white paper will be returned to the originating CCC/DCC and Department Head with written reasons for disapproval/rejection and recommendations on the future of the proposed program.
- iv. The President will then review and make the final decision on approval or disapproval by April 15<sup>th</sup>. This white paper is then returned to academic affairs with the President's decision. If approved, Academic Affairs will then submit the final approved copy to the Registrar's Office for proposal development. If not approved by the President, the white paper will be returned by Academic Affairs to the originating CCC/DCC and Department Head with written reasons for disapproval/rejection and recommendations on the future of the proposed program.
- v. CCC/DCC and Department Head will begin program proposal development in consultation with the Registrar's Office and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness. In particular, the CCC/DCC and Department Head should work closely with the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness to write an assessment plan for the new program as part of the Program Proposal Development phase (next section).

B. Program Proposal Development

- i. The CCC/DCC will work with the Department Head to develop a complete needs and cost analysis for the proposed new program (see Pre-Proposal White Paper outline at [https://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum\\_forms.php](https://www.atu.edu/registrar/curriculum_forms.php)). This needs and cost analysis will be submitted to the VPAA, President, and Board of Trustees along with a Letter of Intent to begin a new program by either May 1<sup>st</sup> for the May Board meeting or August 1<sup>st</sup> for the August 1<sup>st</sup> Board meeting. While awaiting approval of the Letter of Intent from the Board of Trustees, the CCC/DCC and Department Head will continue work on the proposal in consultation with the previously mentioned offices and be at roughly 50% completion by the Letter of Intent approval or disapproval by the Board of Trustees.
- ii. At either the May 1<sup>st</sup> or August 1<sup>st</sup> Board of Trustees meeting, the Board will offer final approval or disapproval of the proposed new program. In the instance of approval, the Letter of Intent will be forwarded to the Arkansas Department of Higher Education (ADHE) by either June 1<sup>st</sup> or September 1<sup>st</sup>, depending on the meeting at which approval occurred. The originating CCC/DCC and Department Head may then continue the proposal. If the new program is not approved, the originating CCC/DCC and Department Head will be notified in writing by the VPAA.

- iii. Subsequent to all approvals and submission to ADHE, the final draft of the proposal will then be submitted to the Registrar's Office by July 1<sup>st</sup>. This final draft is expected to include all relevant forms with complete information, including all assessment procedures and approvals by all relevant programs. The originating CCC/DCC will work with the Registrar's Office to guarantee that a complete proposal is submitted for faculty governance review by all relevant committees (see Approval process below). The proposal should be in the formal, approved ADHE format prior to subsequent review. All relevant faculty governance committees may return the proposal to the originating CCC/DCC and Department Head for revision, if approval is not granted, at any step in the process.
- iv. After final Faculty Senate and/or Graduate Council review and approval, the new program proposal is then submitted to the VPAA and President for administrative approvals. The VPAA and President then submit the final proposal to the Board of Trustees for final approval by October 1<sup>st</sup>.
- v. Subsequent to Board of Trustees Approval, the final approved version of the new program proposal will then be submitted to ADHE for final approval, with a November 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for January or February approval from ADHE.

### **3. Submission Stage**

Curriculum proposals may be submitted at any time during the academic year. Faculty are encouraged to review curricula and submit changes based upon evidence derived from assessment data, using both direct and indirect measures, and upon an analysis of the current state of the discipline.

To be included in the catalogs for the next academic year, however, proposals are due in the appropriate Dean's office by July 1 of each year. The Dean should then submit all approved curricular proposals to the Registrar's Office by July 15. The Registrar's Office and Academic Affairs will review proposals and work with departments for clean and accurate submissions of proposals through the appropriate committee structure. This timeline allows for a more timely updated submission of the proposals through both the cosmetic change process and the regular curriculum change process. It also allows for timely submission of any program proposals (whether new, modifications, or deletions) to the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board, so that those programmatic change may also be included in the upcoming academic year's catalog. Proposals submitted after July 1 require the approval of the Vice President for Academic Affairs for action during the current curricular cycle. If approval is not given, those proposals will be held for action during the next year's curricular cycle.

### **4. Approval Stage**

Although curricular development may occur throughout the year, may be initiated in various ways and for various reasons, and may or may not have a fixed time table, the approval process is considerably more formal and fixed. It is constrained by 1) the need for campus-wide approval; 2)

the need for off-campus approval by the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board; and 3) the deadline for catalog copy (see above on timeline for submission).

The Approval Stage Process is as follows:

- i. After development of the change and consultation with appropriate offices (e.g., Online Course Design, Registrar's Office, Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness), the curriculum change proposal will be forwarded by the CCC/DCC and Department Head to the College Dean who shall review the proposal and then forward to the Registrar all recommended proposals (timeline in the Submission Stage above).
- ii. The Office of Academic Affairs will ask the Registrar to summarily review each proposal for satisfaction of inclusion of all relevant information. Any proposals found to be incomplete or incorrect will be returned to the originating CCC/DCC for correction. The approval process will start over in that instance.
- iii. After review by the Registrar and Academic Affairs, all potential cosmetic changes (undergraduate and graduate) will be posted on the Curriculum Committee's website for review by all faculty. In particular faculty serving on the committees listed below should review each proposal carefully.

**Undergraduate Proposal**

Teacher Education Council  
General Education Committee  
Assessment Committee  
University Curriculum Committee  
Faculty Senate

**Graduate Proposal**

Teacher Education Council  
Assessment Committee  
University Curriculum Committee  
Graduate Council

- iv. After approval through faculty governance, all proposals will be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Affairs for approval. When appropriate, the Vice President will submit program proposals to the President and Board of Trustees for approval. All new programs, modifications of programs, or program deletions require final approval by the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board

(After approval at the University level, new program proposals shall be submitted to the Arkansas Higher Education Coordinating Board according to the "Criteria and Procedures for Preparing Academic Proposals" as outlined on the Arkansas Department of Higher Education website and utilizing the appropriate forms:  
<http://www.adhe.edu/divisions/academicaffairs/Pages/academicaffairs.aspx>)

## 5. Catalog Stage

Once all needed approvals are obtained, the curricular changes must be prepared and submitted for inclusion in the next University online catalog. Minor editorial changes in the catalog may be made by those with responsibility for given sections, but any change in substance must have gone through the approval process described above.

Catalog copy is prepared in accordance with instructions provided by Academic Affairs to ensure timely and efficient preparation of the online copy. The timetable is typically as follows:

| <u>Step</u>                                                                                           | <u>Deadline</u> |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Academic Affairs forward catalog copy (excluding curricula) to Vice Presidents and Deans for editing  | October 15      |
| Edited catalog copy to Academic Affairs for compilation                                               | November 15     |
| Academic Affairs forwards link to online developmental catalog to Deans/Department Heads for proofing | February 15     |
| Final edited copy due in Academic Affairs                                                             | March 1         |
| Catalogs available online                                                                             | April 1         |