**ATTENDANCE:**

**College of Business:** David McCalman (2017), Kaye McKinzie (2018), Anthony McMullen (2019)

**College of Education:** Wendy Rickman (2017), Nancy P. Gallavan-aa (2018), Jud Copeland (2019)

**College of Fine Arts and Communication:** Larry Dilday (2017), Polly Walter (2018), Jane Dahlenburg-aa (2019)

**College of Health and Behavioral Sciences:** Steve Forbush (2017), Denise Demers (2018), Duston Morris (2019)

**College of Liberal Arts:** John Parrack (2017), Taine Duncan (2018), Lynn Burley (2019)

**College of Natural Science and Mathematics:** Lori Isom (2017), Rahul Mehta (2018), Jeff Padberg (2019)

**At Large Senators:** Lisa Christman (2017), Lisa Ray (2017), Phillip Spivey (2018), Julia Winden-Fey(2018), Kim Eskola (2019) and Becky Bogoslavsky (2019)

**Part-Time Senator:** Lee Sanders (2017)

**Information Items:**

1. Comments – Provost Runge
   1. See comments on webpage
   2. Spending cutbacks – should not affect faculty as we are still well over reserves.
2. Comments – President McKinzie
   1. Asked and Answered
   2. Thanks senators for work on committees.
   3. Charge for Academic Affairs to research what peer institutions are doing with the minus and plus system. We have a whole letter grade system and want to know what other campuses are doing.
3. Academic Affairs, Senator McMullen, Chair
   1. Withdrawal policy change: January 10th
   2. The Academic Affairs Committee will be ready to present a resolution at the first Senate meeting in January. The resolution is in draft form, and I have circulated it among the committee members for edits. Our proposal will be (1) to eliminate the WP/WF grades and associated drop deadline, (2) to move the current W deadline one calendar week later in the semester, and (3) to create an AW grade for administrative withdrawals (these would be withdrawals not initiated by the student).

In addition, President McKenzie has requested that we take on an additional charge where we would review the grading policies of our peer institutions and prepare a report by April. We will start working on this charge when the new semester begins.

1. Faculty Affairs I, Senator Copeland, Chair
   1. See full committee report on the webpage
   2. Reoccurring Athletic Committee report: February 23rd
   3. Update on Charge # 1:

Until we have facts, figures, and documents to ensure that we have the correct version of the Constitution, Faculty Affairs I is proposing a new timeline for addressing the proposed changes to the Senate Constitution:

January 10, 2017:  Present resolution on changes to constitution

January 26, 2017:  Senate vote on changes

Mid-February 2017:  General Faculty Association vote on changes to constitution

February 23, 2017:  Senate addresses changes to bylaws, provided the constitutional amendments are approved.

1. Faculty Affairs II, Senator Spivey, Chair
   1. See documents on the webpage
   2. No change in the fall schedule. Spring was not discussed.
   3. Senator Morris – survey was possibly skewed more toward students. Students will still may miss the two days of Thanksgiving or an extra day at fall break.
   4. Senator Burley – no traction on ending the semester at Thanksgiving break
   5. Salary review: March 14th
2. Financial Update – Secretary Eskola
   1. FS Budget = $6,453.11
      1. Food for meeting = $210.89
      2. Account balance = $10,413

**Action Items:**

1. Minutes from the last meeting - Secretary Eskola
   1. Motion to approve the minutes by Senator Forbush
   2. Motion second by Senator Rickman
   3. Senator Winden-Fey – can we go back to typing minutes verbatim?
   4. Senator Eskola – I summarize the minutes because often times people say the same things. It is also hard to type what everyone says word for word. The minutes are to inform the discussions at the meetings but do not have to be a dictation.
   5. Senator Walter - Item 9 on the previous minutes– can we get the report by course designations?
      1. Provost Runge made notes to have the report printed by designations.
   6. Motion carried
2. Committee on Committees – VP Duncan
   1. Appointment to the Safety Committee: Donna Pinckley, CFAC
      1. Motion to approve appointment by Senator Duncan
      2. Motion second by Senator Eskola
      3. Senator Walter endorsed the appointment
      4. Motion carried
   2. Idea about how to get reports from each committees. Committee reports will be in the minutes and will be on the webpage.
   3. Senator Burley – There are about 20 committees that have to give extensive reports, are those still required?
   4. FS President McKinzie – yes but those are usually annual reports and we are asking for monthly reports to keep FS updated
3. FA I procedural document changes – notice moved to January 10 meeting
4. FA II Thursday/Monday start – no action
5. Resolution Honors College
   1. Motion to accept resolution by Senator Forbush
   2. Second by Senator Eskola
   3. Discussion
      1. Senator Forbush – current policy is in direct conflict in the HB in regards to the Honor’s College. They are under a different standard and in the HB they are dually reported but they are not a dual appointment in reality. There are also some things in the HB that do not need to be in the HB. Tenure and review process should be appropriate for that college. Considerations: Who should review tenure packet? We do not have to be exactly the same as all departments. Library does not have a dean and report directly to Associate Provost. The Honor’s reports directly to Provost. The suggestion would be to report directly to the dean.
      2. Senator Burley – Can you point out what is contradictory?
      3. Senator Forbush – Discussed the difference between dual appointments and faculty positions, and while they have tenure in honors would still have to retain discipline specific teaching, scholarship and service.
      4. Provost Runge – That language has to stay in there as long as we have the joint to single language in the HB.
      5. Senator Forbush – the intent is to remove that language.
      6. Provost Runge- all faculty review on assistant dean is problematic
      7. Senator Parrack – dean of HC would still be involved this circumvents the assistant dean and the dean. In time we could revisit the special faculty appointments language. 11 years ago it was a compromise and there are several problems with the “whereas” in the resolution. Several contradict or are not factual.
      8. Senator Forbush – the last whereas states that several are not in their department and do not have a dual appointment but still service in teaching and scholarship to the department but not in the area of discipline. It is not just HC.
      9. Senator Isom – Suggest that we fix the resolution now and we put forward a solution for the HC today. This has been going on for years. Served on a committee a few years ago and gave feedback to HC to go back to faculty and develop a change. We asked for specifics on what they thought should happen and we wanted feedback. They have done both things and have been faithful in that charge.
      10. Senator Morris – Who establishes the tenure and promotion for those who are hired by HC? If the individual ever leaves UCA, how is it an advantage to them if they are not following discipline specific requirements? Are the rigors of TNP out of HC the same as the disciplines? We would want to make sure they were competitive.
      11. Provost Runge– right now the TNP is made by the discipline. We have a very distributive system for those decisions. We would need to ensure HC set the bar appropriately
      12. Lacy Lyons speaking on behalf of the Honor’s College
          1. If we pass this resolution as it then yes the HC would set the TNP as it did before the joint to single wording in the HB. The criteria would be rigorous enough and in their discipline so that they could be competitive within their discipline. We are seeing more interdisciplinary positions and more Honor’s programs. The current wording using the assistant dean and the dean as the reporting line. It is the same as the department chair who reports to the dean. With a new dean, we see a realignment anyhow with the assistant dean being more focused on faculty and the dean more external.
      13. Senator McCalman – appreciate the effort on doing the leg work
      14. Senator Duncan – Concern with the structure of review. If the Honor’s Council does the review then we would also have to make the step that the council is tenure since it currently can have non-tenure on the council. We would have to change the make-up of the council.
      15. Senator Burley – procedure is flawed. Honor’s council is asked to recommend honors and awards and we are asking them to function as a DPAC and review tenure and promotion applications.
      16. Elson Bihm – Honor’s College and Honor’s council
          1. Does not think it is an unusual request at all to ask them to review
      17. Senator Forbush – it mimics exactly the library process. If they are not tenured on the Honor’s Council then they would not sit on review.
      18. Senator Parrack – motion to amend the second paragraph under the “Therefore, be it resolved” section.
          1. See document
      19. Senator Isom second
      20. Senator Isom – We could add an Associate Provost to replace the dean
      21. Senator Burley – Which Associate Provost position would fill that role?
      22. Provost Runge– Jonathan Glenn AP for academic services would be the best fit.
      23. Laci Lyons – If we exclude the non-tenure from Honor’s Council then we are missing out on several good instructors who have a passion for honors and may have come through the Honor’s College.
      24. Senator Forbush – suggest no problem making amendments. I would like this to pass in whatever portion is past. The part that I would not support is changing the composition of the Honor’s Council.
      25. Senator Burley – How about having a separate TNP committee that reviews the Honor’s TNP
      26. Senator Duncan – would have concern with Honor’s Council but does support a separate TNP committee.
      27. Senator Isom – Having someone from another department on the TNP happens all the time as I was asked to be on the TNP committee for Geography when they did not have enough. The HC already has a TNP with their tenured faculty so they would not need to appoint another TNP
      28. Provost Runge– UC has a process similar that works. The joint to single appointment is really the concern. This resolution will remove this and will have a stand-alone position in honors.
      29. Senator Eskola – Can we get clarification of how much discipline specific load
      30. Rick Scott – Dean of the Honor’s College
          1. One class in discipline and majority in HC
          2. Agreement with the dean in one college at no cost to HC.
          3. What we are hearing from deans in colleges, they could not really be in the position to review for tenure unless they continued to teach in the discipline.
          4. Integration into academics with HC – tenure are not designed to be integrated. We don’t go through TNP that go through everyone in any college. They are specific to disciplines to lead to career specific pathways.
      31. Senator Winden-fey – recognizing that something doesn’t work is not a step backwards. I am in support of moving backwards to move forwards
      32. Senator Forbush – successful HC around the nation – they have their own faculty, their own positions.
      33. Provost Runge– the reason I think it is going backwards is because it does not address the dual appointment. The way forward is to have the core faculty but we cannot have enough faculty lines for HC. It is through dual appointments.
      34. Senator Isom – when we met two years ago, the perception of the HC to the faculty was that they were elite. The idea that HC was integrated and a hierarchy. The idea that we would have “borrowed” faculty is part of the issue. It is about fairness.
      35. Senator Morris – We have a few programs that struggle with this same issue. PhD in Leadership “borrow” from faculty campus because there are not enough faculty lines. The confusion is between the two resolutions that were sent to us.
      36. Senator Duncan – clarification – the language in HB that deals with joint to single is ONLY about HC, however, it is not the only place that this occurs. The other resolution addresses the changes in language. It does not need to be specific to just HC
      37. Patricia Smith – Asst. Dean of HC
          1. Joint appointments are great if the salary is shared by both departments, however, in HC 100% of the salary is paid by HC and we loan out faculty to the discipline specific but that is not affecting us. We are not able to offer a diverse course offerings. The ways we have tried to diversify in HC is “borrowed” faculty from departments.
      38. Senator Parrack – to make this successful is the art of compromise. This proposal is not one that he would come up with but the goal of the amendment is to come with a compromise today that will cover the concerns of the HC. The issues of joint appointments were the same 11 years ago but we “kicked them down the road”.
      39. Senator Burley – Motion to amend the resolution to include that the Honor’s College would have to appoint a member in the review process from the discipline.
          1. Senator Parrack second
          2. Senator Forbush – I would speak against this because this language was specific to HC
          3. Senator Parrack – See some value of this new amendment hard to compare HC to another department.
          4. Senator Duncan – Would that be a problem to have someone from the discipline?
          5. Dean Scott – we do it anyway but would like it not to be mandated
          6. Provost Runge – Agree with Dean Scott that we do this in several areas across campus
          7. Senator Duncan called question
          8. Senator Spivey second
             1. Question called
             2. Amendment fails
      40. Senator Demers moved to add Associate Provost to the resolution
          1. Senator Isom second
             1. Amendment passes
   4. Discussion on first amendment/substitution
      1. Senator Forbush moved to amend resolution
      2. Senator Christman second
      3. Amendment passed
   5. Vote on substitution to the original motion
      1. Motion on substitution passes
   6. Original motion with substitutions/amendments passes
      1. HB will clean up language
      2. See final copy of resolution on FS webpage
6. Senator Forbush moved to send the resolution for Joint/Dual appointments to the HB
   1. Senator Christman second
   2. Discussion ensued on clarification of dual/joint appointments and clarification on the language of the resolution. One reason to have a “home” department is for one dept. to handle the service. We can write in the HB that the departments can work together and give reports.
   3. Motion passed to send to HB

**Guests**

1. CFAC: Echo policies & procedures
   1. See Asked and Answer on the webpage
   2. Senator Winden-fey – Is there some oversight on controlling errors
   3. FS President McKinzie – How can we control factual information?
   4. David Keith, Advisor for the ECHO explained his role. Worked for 25 years in newspaper journalism. He has been a free-lance journalist during his 11 years with UCA.
   5. Senator Duncan – Is there a procedure in place where students hold themselves accountable?
   6. David Keith - Contact editor or advisor when you see questionable facts
   7. Senator Walter – They do update somethings on the webpage. UCAECHO.net
      1. When students from Channel 6, Scroll, Echo and The Vortex call you, please try to respond to them in a timely manner.
   8. Senator Morris – Are there classes that educate students about researching factual information?
   9. Senator Walter – Yes there are classes and students are expected to research their topics and become “mini experts”. They also go to alumni and upper classmen.
   10. Senator Forbush – Assurance from reporter about committee meetings and that assurance was breached which I see as an ethical issue. If someone gives a promise and the editor overrides the assurance and publishes anyway, there is no recourse.
   11. David Keith – You are talking about specific issues where it was a young reporter. The advisor stated it open up a door for people to review articles before they are published. There are some things that you cannot give assurance because of a domino effect. In each meeting, there are trainings on ethics and policies. Advisor does try to add or clarify at the end of each meeting.
   12. Senator Forbush – once a promise is made whether it was ill advised or not, you should honor that promise because there are comments and actions that are taken due to that promise.
   13. Senator Morris – this is a learning opportunity for the students. Most people do not rely on the paper for information, however, it does affect behavior.
   14. Senator Eskola – question about consequences for the student who continues to violate ethics or policies? Agree with Senator Forbush that the assurance should have been honored and if the student continued to go against policy or procedures that there should have been a recourse.
   15. Senator Duncan – Senator Walter, if the on-line version is different than print version. What is the relationship between the two?
   16. Senator Walter - One publication and same staff for both.
   17. Senator Walter clarification that there is recourse for students who do violate. There is a nine person committee who makes those decisions on editors and recourse for reporters who do continue to violate ethics and policies. There is oversight.
   18. Statement from Dean Wright – Concerned about the 14 question e-mail that made inference to what the FS can do in regards to the student newspaper.
   19. Dean Wright would like the minutes to reflect that he was not allowed to respond to the e-mail that was sent to him and that he was not allowed to give the response to his faculty senators.
   20. President McKinzie stated that she would get with him because the e-mail with the 14 questions did not go out to Faculty Senate but this discussion sufficiently covered the questions by FS to follow up on constituent concerns.
2. University Admissions Committee Report
   1. See report on webpage
3. Student Success and Retention Council Report
   1. See report on webpage
   2. Highlighted last four bullets on the report. Adopting some strategies from the University of Northern Iowa
4. Employee Benefits Advisory Committee Report
   1. See report on webpage
   2. 1.25 million in reserves and will be adding an extra million dollar in surplus which is significant as this would have gone to an insurance company. Due to the decrease enrollment, that money will be in reserves to offset any increase in insurance.

**Other:**

1. Committee Updates – VP Duncan
   1. Reports will be on the webpage
2. Faculty announcements and concerns
   1. Provost Runge – discussion that we had earlier about the resolution is exactly they process that should take place. This is what makes UCA work well.
   2. Next meeting for Faculty Senate will be 12:45 pm on January 10, 2016
3. Adjournment at 2:07 pm