1. **Improvements to Christian Cafeteria – follow up**
   1. **Concern background:** Recently we attended a state conference held on the Arkansas Tech University campus.  Our luncheon session was held in a room adjacent to the cafeteria.  We were incredibly impressed.  The room is bright; access to the cafeteria is easy; and, most of all, the food is great!  The ATU cafeteria offers a wide variety of healthy meals unlike the limited choices meals offered in the UCA cafeteria.  The cost is reasonable and everyone at the conference was able to choose individual meals.
      * **More follow up from Aramark**

I have listed below our Healthy For Life program, the link to our catering menus, and also the way to access our Campus Dish app.

* I think that as we discussed this morning, the same things being served at our catering functions is simply due to what our clients order.  We do not set each groups menu’s, they have many selections to choose from, but I know at times it seems that groups default to the menu’s they have enjoyed in the past.  This is the reason I think we should share our catering menu’s with Kaye. o   [www.ucacatering.catertrax.com](http://www.ucacatering.catertrax.com/)
* In addition to providing a link to the Healthy For Life program, I would like for you to let Kaye know that we have a Registered Dietitian on staff who would be happy to go over all of our healthy options, and how the Healthy For Life program works.  Check out the Eat Well Tab at the top of the page, and the Nutrition & Wellness Tab about half way down the home page.o   [www.ucadining.com](http://www.ucadining.com/)
* The Campus Dish application is available on iOS devices and Android devices. This app shows our daily menus in the cafeteria, and the nutritional information for each item.o   In your mobile device app store search for Campus Dish, once there select University of Central Arkansas – see attachment
* Our Registered Dietitian is:o   Lauren Allinson  [501-852-0185](tel:(501)%20852-0185)  [allinson-lauren@aramark.com](mailto:allinson-lauren@aramark.com)

 I have also looked over the Dining site for Arkansas Tech, and they do not have any special stations for “healthy” options.  They offer 2 vegan/vegetarian options, at lunch were we offer a minimum of one daily.  Other than them having a fairly recently renovated cafeteria, that added stations such as a Mongolian Grill, their menus are for the most part very similar to ours.

Let me know if you need anything else,

**Jim Nabors**| Aramark |General Manager | University of Central Arkansas | Higher Education

201 Donaghey Ave.  Conway, AR.  72035 **P:** [501-450-5980](tel:(501)%20450-5980) **M:** [501-733-2394](tel:(501)%20733-2394) **F:** [501-450-3336](tel:(501)%20450-3336)

1. **Tenure track first year faculty**
   1. **Concern:** There is a disparity in the additional loads of our first year tenure track faculty. Some are not required to do service in their first year at UCA to allow them more time to focus on their new course preparations, research and learning our system. Others are given service assignments such as committees and advising loads. Shouldn’t we be doing more for our first year faculty and not requiring service to help them on their way to tenure?
   2. **Response:** There is no UCA wide policy on this. There is a wide variety of different types of consideration given to first year faculty. Each case and each department handle this differently – similarly to Academic Freedom, we allow Department Chairs to address everyone as best for the individual and department. Any course release time is addressed the same for all faculty.
2. **Class attendance**
   1. **Concern:** A constituent come to me the other day and asked when did we decide not to excuse athletic events for athletes who missed classes?

It turns out that a student athlete with a 3.5 GPA had to drop a class (she would have graduated in May) and has to take the class in the summer because the instructor has only two absences in his/her class and this athlete due to a track schedule would miss over that number of days. The instructor claimed academic freedom as the reason.

The constituent wanted to express his concern that faculty were unwilling to work with not only student athletes but anyone who was involved in university activities who would miss some days due to conferences or other events. He also hoped that if this was the policy of the faculty member that he/she was being consistent with all students which means that if a student misses more than two days due to illness that they will be dropped.

* 1. **Clarification:** UCA's current policy is that attendance policies are set by the instructor. Those policies must be in the syllabus. As each class may have unique attendance requirements based on the material and student involvement requirements (among other things), we cannot make a universal policy. For these reasons as well, Faculty Senate chose not to set what is and is not an "excused" absence.

1. **UCA Core Assessment Process**
   1. **Concern:** I teach two of the upper division CORE courses for CSD. I received this email today, and have gone to the link and read the proposal. I haven't spent a lot of time with it, but what I see so far concerns me greatly. This is a complete overhaul of the assessment piece of the CORE, seemingly needed because only 68% of faculty submitted their assessment or if they did they gave "blanket" scores to whole classes. I assessed the CORE for Responsible Living in the fall of 2016, with no problems.

The issue that concerns me the most is the fact that "faculty evaluators who are familiar with the CORE rubric" will be grading the CORE assignment, not the course instructor. I realize that the CORE assignments do not necessarily have to be included in course grades, but this seems wrought with problems to me. It tells the instructor of the course to "provide enough information to the scorers so that they can grade your assignment appropriately." My assignment for the Responsible Living CORE Rubric is a senior-level project containing discipline-specific information, as I'm sure many UD CORE assignment are. It's not an extremely difficult subject, but I believe I am the best person to analyze if the student got the "responsible living" component of the assignment as it relates to the CSD major, not someone else.

I am going to try my best to attend one of the meetings regarding these changes, but I wanted to share my concerns with you as well. In some places this reads as a proposal, and in others a done deal, so I'm not sure if input at this point is even appropriate. Had I been asked I would have given input into this new proposal, but never saw anything asking for faculty input. In the end, if I believe another faculty member (not in my department) is going to be grading student work in my courses, then my assignment will likely have to go from a deep exploration of a discipline-specific topic, to a quiz or essay that someone else can grade easily, and that is not in my student's best interests.

Thanks for your work on our behalf.

* 1. **Follow up from the constituent:** Thanks, *Senator*, I do appreciate your response. Please pass along the following input to the Faculty Senate:

I disagree with the new CORE assessment process and am not the least bit convinced that an independent evaluator will be able to judge the responsible living component of my assignment better than myself, bias or not. I want to be a team player, but my main concern is not university outcomes measures; it is student learning. I'm certain that the results will be more calibrated across departments if independent evaluators are used, but it does nothing to ensure that the outside evaluators are grading the responsible living component of upper division courses accurately in the first place.

When the CORE was introduced, our department submitted which courses we would use for the CORE, submitted the assignment we were going to use, and were approved. To now say that we need to turn that assignment over to someone else to grade is a game-changer. In order for me to make an assignment that outside evaluators can judge appropriately would mean that I would have to change the assignment that was submitted and approved. I have no intention of doing that, as it is an assignment I want in my course so that my students can meet the learning objectives. If the university wants me to assign my students an assignment ONLY for the purpose of outcome measures, that could be problematic.

For now I will continue to give my responsible living assignment and grade it. If asked, I will share student work with evaluators, and they can grade it however they would like. However, I have no intention of providing them "the information they need to grade my assignment" (even just for the responsible living component) because that is frankly impossible. Also, it does not seem fair to my students to have someone who doesn't have the discipline-specific knowledge needed to judge their competency regarding responsible living or diversity as it relates to this specific field.

For our upper division courses, this move will make the CORE assignments weaker (in terms of student learning). But yes, the bias will be controlled, and the outcome measures will look nice.

* 1. **Response from the assessment office:** The reason they are using independent evaluators is that the process needs to be unbiased (as in any research on outcome measures). I will pass on your concerns to the Senate and we will try to find more answers for you that will either alleviate your concerns or help in the evaluation process.
  2. **Response from the Director of the Core Council:** They asked me to encourage all concerned parties to come to the informational meetings. Also to let constituents know that they have faculty representation on the Core Council that they can dialogue with to address their concerns. If their concerns are remain, these can be brought back to the Core Council by their representatives and/or addressed at the noted forums. http://uca.edu/committees/corecouncil/
     + Tuesday, March 14th at 9:00am in Burdick 205, and at 3:30 pm in Irby 114
     + Wednesday March 15th at 9:00 am in Irby 121, and at 3:30 pm in Irby 102

1. **Faculty Senate Constitution**
   1. **Concern**: The version posted on the UCA Faculty Senate web page does not match the one in the May 2016 Faculty Handbook.
   2. **Research and conclusion:**

* The version on our web site has not been updated in some time:
  + <http://uca.edu/facultysenate/constitution/>
  + This is an example of why the Faculty Handbook has stopped including Board Policies and just references them.
  + I recommend we do the same and refer Constitution to the Faculty Handbook.
* The version on the Faculty Senate minutes in 2012 also appears to not be current: <http://uca.edu/facultysenate/files/2012/08/Constitution-revisons1.pdf>
* I believe there must have been a change from the above version and before it went to vote, but have not been able to verify that.
* Senator Burley found in the May 2013 (page 23) BOT minutes that they approved the constitutional changes, which the faculty voted on and approved.
  + <http://uca.edu/board/files/2013/05/130503botminutes.pdf>
* Here is the May 2013 Handbook, which should be the one the BOT approved which should be the version the faculty voted on and approved:
  + <http://uca.edu/academicaffairs/files/2011/08/FHB-May-2013-FINAL.pdf>
* Here is the May 2016 Handbook, approved last year.
  + <http://uca.edu/academicaffairs/files/2014/07/fhb-current.pdf>
  + I have compared the 2013 and 2016 handbooks versions of the Faculty Senate Constitution word for word and except for one **bold** word, they are the same.
* The version Senator Parrack presented in January 2017, which was the basis of our 8 resolutions, appears to be the one from the most recent Faculty Handbook, and thus the current version.

=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=-=

1. ASKED and STILL PENDING = None