

AGENDA

UCA Faculty Senate



Tuesday, February 10, 2009

Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from January 22, 2008 (see Attachment 1)
- II. President's report
 - A. Update on presidential search
 - B. Address to the Board of Trustees, February 6, 2009
 - C. Faculty Handbook Committee
 1. Minutes (see Attachment 2)
 2. Resolution: Changes to APAC (see Attachment 3)
- III. Committee reports
 - A. Executive Committee
 1. APAC Recommendations on Various Faculty Evaluation Issues (see Attachment 4)
 - B. Committee on Committees
 1. Recommendation: Changes to Professional Education Council (see Attachment 5)
 2. Resolution: Committee reports to the Faculty Senate (see Attachment 6)
 - C. Academic Affairs
 - D. Faculty Affairs I
 - E. Faculty Affairs II
- IV. Announcements and concerns
 - A. Faculty concerns and announcements
 - B. Reminder: Get your picture taken for the UCA website, any x-period in room 22 of Main Hall
 - C. Next meeting: February 26, 2009, at 12:45 p.m.
- V. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 1

Minutes

UCA Faculty Senate
Thursday, January 22, 2009
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

President Boniecki called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m. Present were Boniecki, Parrack, Seifert, Ray, Jones, Castner-Post, Lichtenstein, McCullough, Powers, Wiedmaier, Lance, Isom, Schaefer, Mehta, Rospert, Johnson, Acre, Holden, Moore, Fletcher, Castro, Albritton, Hebert, and Nilu Runge and Provost Grahn. Absences: Bell.

I. Approval of Minutes from December 11, 2008. (see Attachment 1 of the Agenda)

Senator Lance moved to approve minutes with second by Senator Ray. Motion passed approving the minutes with no corrections.

II. Budget Q & A: President Tom Courtway and Bunny Adcock.

President Courtway gave an overview of this year and next year's budget. He said that he will come back to the Senate as many times as needed so that the faculty is informed. Bunny Adcock presented a cash flow analysis he developed in order to better understand University revenue and expenses. Departments across campus are doing a good job of keeping expenses down. President Courtway says we can probably only count on about \$2 million more from the State. We will need to continue with this very tight budget for the next couple of years.

Question- Senator Johnson: What is the status of those Wachovia funds?

Response- Bunny Adcock: There is about \$1.7 million left and we get payments when they sell off portions, but it has slowed down considerably.

Question- Senator Moore: Why is so much of funding in category B, and is the same thing going to happen next year?

Response- President Courtway: 1) We are going to work to make sure this doesn't happen again. 2) There was reluctance in the legislature to put that growth money in our base (category A).

Question- Senator Castro: There is a rumor that there will be 1% pay cut for faculty. Is this true?

Response- President Courtway: I haven't said that.

Question- Senator Castro: Will travel money be available for faculty working towards tenure and promotion?

Response- President Courtway: The provost will work to make sure that faculty gets the support they need. The Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) will have a lot of input in this area.

Question- Senator Castro: If we ever have a surplus, will faculty ever get more than a COL raise?

Response- President Courtway: Nothing is off the table but I can't say what will happen.

Question- Senator Castro: What's happened to the capital campaign money?

Response- President Courtway: Most of that is restricted for scholarships and other expenses.

Comment- President Courtway: I am looking at all options- No layoffs but times are really tough.

Question- Senator Powers: Does concurrent enrollment benefit us?

Response- President Courtway: That topic is under debate and we are looking at that very closely.

Question- Senator Parrack: Have you considered selling naming rights for buildings?

Response- President Courtway: Yes, we are actively pursuing all avenues of giving.

Question- Senator Albritton: You said you will be purging classes in February for lack of payment? Will this impact our revenues?

Response- President Courtway: This is a different step but a necessary step and we will be better off in the long haul. Students won't be able to access transcripts if they haven't paid. \$1.7 million is still out from Fall '08, \$5 million left will probably never be able to be collected.

Comment- Senator Albritton: Probably should send another notice to remind students about the February deadline.

Question - President Boniecki: In regards to athletics, are we continuing to transfer the max \$1.1 million to athletics?

Response- President Courtway: Yes, we probably will. Next year we will get \$400K from the Southland Conference so that may offset the 1.1 million.

Question - President Boniecki: Will the \$400K be deducted from the 1.1 million?

Response- President Courtway: That will have to be decided by the next president and the BOT.

III. President's Report.

A. Update on presidential search (see Attachment 2 of the Agenda):

1st meeting occurred Thursday, January 6; established procedures and responsibilities of committees; debated content of ad for *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Dr. Farris suffered a stroke and passed away this past week.

Additionally, the other co-chair- Jerry Manion- was hospitalized and can no longer serve. J. Gillian will serve as interim chair until the BOT can appoint another chair.

The ad that went to *The Chronicle of Higher Education* is attached (see Attachment 2).

Next meeting is February 2. The current plan is to meet the 1st and 3rd Monday of each month.

B. Admission statistics for 2008-09 entering freshman class (see Attachment 3 of the Agenda):

Comment- Senator Castro: How does the coding work? What is the definition of a "special circumstance?"

Senator Castro had several questions that she forwarded to President Boniecki. He will investigate these matters further.

C. Committee Charges:

1. Faculty Affairs II: Investigate concerns regarding the Miss University of Central Arkansas pageant, including the funding source and appropriateness of the event, and present a report and/or position statement to Faculty Senate.

IV. Committee Reports.

A. Executive Committee: No report.

B. Committee on Committees:

Senator Parrack moved to suspend rules with second by Senator Johnson. Motion passed approving suspension of rules.

Senator Parrack moved that new IRB and IACUC committee structure changes be approved- they are federally mandated- with second by Senator Seifert. Motion passed approving the committee structure changes. The committee changes will be forwarded to the Faculty Handbook Committee.

C. Academic Affairs: No report.

D. Faculty Affairs I: No report.

E. Faculty Affairs II: No report

IV. Announcements and Concerns.

A. Faculty Concerns and announcements.

1. Senator Seifert presented the following faculty concern:

Section IV.D of Chapter 5 of the Faculty Handbook (p.47) describes UCA's phased retirement program. Paragraph 1 of this section states that the program is "...available tofull-time tenured faculty members..." This implies that phased retirement is not available to faculty holding Lecturer rank/status. I've been asked whether the phased retirement program could be extended to lecturers. I think this is a good idea, and I'd appreciate it if you could bring this issue to the appropriate Senate committee.

President Boniecki: We will forward this to the Faculty Handbook Committee.

2. Senator Castro: What is the status of the academic misconduct policy?

President Boniecki: Still has not made it out of the Council of Deans

3. Senator Johnson presented the following faculty concern in regards to the recent e-mail regarding academic advising shifting responsibility to Faculty:

In view of the strong pressure coming from the State in terms of academic success, for the Academic Advising Center to abandon its focused attempts on probationary students seems exactly the wrong way to go. We all understand the problem, of course, but what Academic Advising has laid out here will be very hit-or-miss. For example--tutoring offered by departments? HAH! What resources? What graduate students? NONE. What faculty member will take time away from research? NONE. In fact, WHAT informed knowledge by faculty of the ins and outs of probation and suspension?

This is another example of UCA trying to be all things to all people with no resources. We can assign the job to some faculty, perhaps, with reduction in research expectations, or reduction in teaching load, but the institution may be unwilling to make that trade-off.

President Boniecki: The Executive Committee will discuss this issue.

B. Next Meeting: February 10, 2009 at 12:45 p.m.

V. Adjournment: Senator Seifert moved to adjourn meeting with second by Senator Ray. Motion passed approving adjournment at 2:28 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 2

Minutes **Faculty Handbook Committee** Wednesday, January 28, 2009

Present: Kurt Boniecki (Chair), Francie Bolter, Clint Johnson, Katherine Larson, Mary Mosley, Susan Moss-Logan, Michael Schaefer, John Parrack (ex-officio), Katie Henry (ex-officio)

I. Corrections

- A. Ch. 3, II, D, 3. Procedures for Advancement (p. 12):
"During the ~~fourth~~ **sixth** year of continuous service...."
- B. Ch. 3, X. Terms of Tenure Appointment (p. 24):
"Applications for tenure should be made by ~~October 15~~ **September 1** of the sixth year."

II. Past Business

Boniecki summarized revisions to the Faculty Handbook approved by the Faculty Handbook Committee and the Faculty Senate last academic year. These revisions will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for approval and inclusion in the next Faculty Handbook.

III. New Business

- A. Revisions to university committees
 - 1. Institutional Review Board: Approved
 - 2. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee: Approved
 - 3. Budget Advisory Committee: Approved
 - 4. Academic Planning and Assessment Committee: Approved
 - 5. Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee: Tabled until next meeting

IV. Future Business

- A. Review of tenure and promotion for Honors faculty
(more info at <http://www.uca.edu/org/facultysenate/Documents/HonorsDiscussion.htm>)
- B. Review of tenure and promotion procedures when a department has only one tenured faculty member (see pg. 21 of the handbook)
- C. Rewrite of Chapter 3
 - 1. Bolter draft
 - 2. Page 24 of the current handbook is the only place where it says that you must apply for tenure in your 6th year. Should it also say this earlier when the handbook first describes the application process (pg. 20)?

- D. Review of appointment to graduate faculty (pg. 36 of the handbook)
- E. Phased retirement for faculty holding Lecturer rank (pg. 47 of the handbook)
- F. Rewrite of grievance procedures

V. Next Meeting: Wednesday, February 11, 1:30, Wingo 315

ATTACHMENT 3

WHEREAS the Faculty Handbook Committee recommends the following changes to the membership of the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee as stated in the Faculty Handbook;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves the following changes and recommends their approval to the Board of Trustees.

(strikethrough = delete, underline = add):

Academic Planning and Assessment Committee

3. Membership
 - a. ~~Assistant~~Associate provost, who shall serve as committee chair
 - b. Chairs, Curriculum and Assessment Committees from each of the six colleges;
 - c. Director of University College (or designee)
 - d. Director of the General Education Program (or designee)
 - e. ~~Member of faculty, Graduate School of Management, Leadership, and Administration, appointed by the graduate dean, three-year term~~
 - f. Graduate student, appointed by the Student Government Association, one-year term
 - g. Undergraduate student, appointed by the Student Government Association, one-year term

Rationale for changes:

- The Assistant Provost position was renamed the Associate Provost
- The GSLMA program no longer exists.

ATTACHMENT 4

APAC: Recommendations on Various Faculty Evaluation Issues, 2008-2009

Early in AY 2008–2009, the Faculty Senate referred several issues related to faculty evaluation by students to the Academic Planning and Assessment Committee (APAC). The following responses were developed by the committee’s chair and by the committee as indicated below. All recommendations were approved by the committee, after development and review of background material in the committee’s URSA group over several months. Votes were taken in a meeting held on January 22, 2009.

Recommendation 1

Faculty Senate request: “Review the pros and cons of implementing an online student evaluation system and submit a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.”

APAC recommendation:

1a. *The committee unanimously voted to recommend that UCA move to an online format for conducting student evaluations.* The vote was taken after discussion of the successful pilot program last semester with SurveyDIG and the online courses (overall, a higher than 50% response rate), as well as the information provided by an article from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and responses to a tele-survey of SurveyDIG users conducted by Brian Corbin, UCA’s Director of Testing Services.

The committee made these requests with its recommendation:

- Faculty on the committee would be very interested in knowing if student participation could somehow be verified in order for faculty to give incentive/bonus points.
- Please ensure that deans and chairs understand that the first few semesters may produce very different results (or fewer results) than the old system and that this must not be a disadvantage for faculty coming up for promotion and/or tenure.

The committee also noted the following probable pros and cons of implementing its recommendation.

Pros – benefits of implementing an online evaluation system (in no particular order):

- does not reduce valuable in-class time
- all reports suggest that student comments are more thorough and more thoughtful
- once students become used to URSA and this system, it will be convenient
- saves the university thousands of dollars in resources as well as an estimated 750 hours of human effort or more each semester (20 hrs/department x 35 departments; 42 hours IT (6 hrs/college plus UC/Honors); 50 hours Provost’s office)
- does not rely on student being in attendance on a particular day
- may be more secure and confidential: involves fewer “hands” on evaluations
- could easily include summer classes, which are frequently not assessed under the current system

Cons – possible negative results of implementing an online evaluation system (in no particular order):

- all reports and studies suggest we will see a much lower response rate, at least initially
- may encourage more extreme (and lengthy) comments from students
- will need faculty support and encouragement to be successful

1b. *The committee unanimously voted to recommend immediate implementation of online student evaluations, using SurveyDIG for the spring 2009 semester with one stipulation: that we do so only if we can ensure a smooth process so that faculty and students do not get frustrated the first time out. Otherwise, implement in the summer or fall.*

Recommendation 2

Faculty Senate request: “Propose specific structured questions to guide student comments consistent with the APAC student evaluation recommendations of 2007.”

APAC recommendation:

The committee voted unanimously to recommend that the university move to more structured questions to guide student written comments student evaluations. Further, the committee recommended those proposed by the TEC2000 as possible questions for use.

[For reference purposes, the structured questions proposed by TEC2000 are reproduced here (see the full report online at http://www.uca.edu/panda/eval/tec2000_report.html):

Describe one or more things about the course that you found helpful. Please give examples and be specific.

Was there anything else the instructor could do, given time constraints, that you would find helpful?

How would you assess your own performance in this course?

Comment on how assigned work contributed to the learning process. What books, labs, drills, etc. were most useful to you? Which were least useful and why?

NB: The Council of Deans, asked for its thoughts on the structured questions, has recommended that the questions be simplified to the following:

1. What did you like most about this course?

2. How could this course be improved?

Would you recommend this course to a friend? Why, or why not?

Principle reasons cited in favor of this simplification are that the questions as proposed by the TEC2000 report are complex enough that they are likely either to inhibit written responses altogether or to cause confusion for survey takers. Additionally, responses to questions like TEC2000's number 3 are likely to be of limited value in a completely anonymous context, where it is not possible to consider responses to one question in the context of responses to the other structured questions or to items 1–28. In that case, responses to the question serve neither a formative nor a summative purpose.

I concur with the Council of Deans recommendation and will provide this feedback to APAC for their counsel. Because the current APAC recommendation leaves open the possibility for further discussion of this issue – “possible questions for use” – I have chosen not to delay this report further. – JAG]

Clarification

Clarification/justification formally requested by the Faculty Senate regarding one part of APAC's faculty evaluation recommendations of April 2007.

The APAC 2007 recommendation: “The Academic Planning and Assessment Committee recommends that the summary report of student evaluations of faculty (a) should include the mean for items 4–33, (b) should include the rating scales for each section of the report, and (c) should not include the current graphical representation of the departmental and college-level comparisons for items 1–3.”

Rationale for APAC recommendation and actions taken, if any:

Note: Because the current membership of APAC is mostly different from its 2006–2007 membership, the following clarifications were developed by Jonathan Glenn. The committee reviewed the response and approved its presentation to Faculty Senate.

(a) Averages (specifically, means) are widely used to report some kinds of ordinal data (e.g., responses to Likert-like scales such as those used in items 1–26 of the current faculty evaluation instrument), in spite of debate about this issue among statisticians: the mean response is often understood as a good representation of the “central tendency” in responses where the values are ranked and assumed for purposes of discussion to be continuous (although they are not actually so). If the question is “How do students, on average, rate me as an instructor vis à vis X?” then an average is an eminently appropriate form for the answer.

Locally, TEC2000 (the most recent formal study by a faculty committee of faculty evaluation by students) stipulated that individual averages would be reported for items 1–3 along with statistics about the college and department contexts of individual mean scores. To calculate a mean or not to do so for responses to other items in the survey seems not to have been of concern to TEC2000; rather, this committee's concern was the use or not of individual scores in promotion and tenure contexts and in considerations related to merit pay, and whether or not department and college comparative information would be appropriate for items beyond the first three.

Additionally, the Faculty Senate request for clarification reflects questions that have recently been raised about college and department “context information” – specifically, the median (50th percentile) and the first and third quartiles – reported for items 1–3, the contention being that medians should be compared to medians and means to means. (See TEC2000 for its stipulations for the comparison.) It is important to recognize in this regard that the quartile/percentile information reported comprises statistics about various sets of course section means, not about individual student ratings. Thus, when the context information identifies the median, it is identifying the median of mean scores for all the course sections in, for example, the English department at the lower-division undergraduate level.

In April 2007 as indicated above, APAC approved reporting calculation of mean for all items. This was intended as a service to faculty members: it eases the understanding of student responses. It is clear, however, that since items 29–33 are undefined (local questions) no mean should be reported for these items. It is also clear that the mean is not useful in reporting responses to items 27 and 28 (kind of course [major, elective, etc.] and student class level). Since Fall 2007, evaluation reports have included a calculated mean for items 1–3 and 4–26. Dr. Glenn was able to implement this recommendation without significantly changing the report format or displacing other information.

(b) and (c) APAC believed, in light of feedback from faculty, that it would be useful to include the rating scales for the evaluation on the report, since the rating scale is not identical for all the items in the evaluation survey. The only way to include the rating scales and to keep the report to a single page is to omit something – in this case, APAC believed, the graph representing departmental and college comparisons for items 1–3. Hence APAC’s recommendation. As it happens, this recommendation has not been implemented, for complementary reasons: the rating scales can easily be identified by reference to the survey instrument, accessible to all online; and implementing the recommendation significantly affects the look and feel of the report. In the absence of authoritative direction, then, Dr. Glenn did not change this feature of the report.

Attachments

“Tele-survey” results, decision-factors document (developed by Glenn), article from *Chronicle of Higher Education* are available on the faculty senate website at <http://www2.uca.edu/org/facultysenate/Documents/OnlineEvals.htm>.

ATTACHMENT 5

Committee on Committees RECOMMENDATION ON PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COUNCIL (PEC)

The Committee on Committees recommends the following revision to the Faculty Handbook description of the Professional Education Council (PEC). This revision seeks to resolve the lack of Senate participation in the composition of the council and align its description with other university councils and committees that have unique needs and should be staffed from a small pool of qualified university faculty. This revision was developed by the staff in the College of Education in consultation with the Committee on Committees. It was approved by the PEC in November, 2008.

Professional Education Council Membership Policy

1. Charge:
 - a. The Professional Education Council (PEC) provides leadership for all professional education programs. It initiates, receives, and develops recommendations on all policies, proceedings, and standards effecting professional education.
 - b. To ensure that all professional education programs are organized, unified, and coordinated to allow fulfillment of the mission of the professional education unit.
 - c. To ensure that the professional education curricula are built upon knowledge bases essential for effective practice and upon the findings of research.

2. Membership: The PEC consists of fourteen voting members serving three-year staggered terms (except student and school-based educator representatives will serve two year terms) and a chair. Appointments must be completed by Faculty Senate by August 1st. In addition, deans and chairs representing each Professional Education Unit (PEU) program are ex-officio non-voting members of the PEC as well as one public school superintendent will serve as an ex-officio non-voting member.
 - a. Three members (one from each department) from the College of Education: Early Childhood and Special Education; Leadership Studies; and Teaching, Learning, and Technology. Chairs in consultation with the Dean of the College of Education will fill these positions.
 - b. Two permanent members representing Service Units in the College of Education appointed by the Dean of the College of Education.
 - c. Four members who are active participants in the PEU representing each of the colleges outside of the College of Education who have professional education programs. These members (faculty or chairs) appointed by the Faculty Senate from at least two nominations by the deans of the colleges listed below.
 - One member from the College of Fine Arts and Communication (Departments with professional education programs include Art and Music)
 - One member from the College of Health and Behavioral Sciences (Departments with professional education programs include Family and Consumer Science, Kinesiology and Physical Education, and School Psychology)
 - One member from the College of Liberal Arts (Departments with professional education programs include English, Social Studies, and World Languages)
 - One member from the College of Natural Science and Mathematics (Departments with professional education programs include Biology, Physics, Mathematics)
 - d. Two student members (serving two year terms) appointed by the College of Education Administrative Council – one undergraduate student and one graduate student.

- e. Three practicing professionals (serving two year terms) will be appointed by the College of Education Administrative Council.
To fill a vacancy in any of the College of Education positions, student appointments, or school-based educators; the College of Education Administrative Council will make the appointment.
To fill a vacancy in the positions outside of the College of Education, the Faculty Senate will select one faculty member from a list of two nominees named by the Dean of the college.
3. Chairperson: The Dean of the College of Education or his/her designee will serve as chair. The chair will vote in two circumstances: 1) to break a tie vote, or 2) when required to establish a quorum of voting members.
4. Meetings: Professional Education Council meetings will be held once a month during fall and spring semesters. Meetings may be called in the summer if business requires. A majority of voting members constitutes a quorum. The Council will conduct business if voting members send an email vote to the PEC chairperson.

ATTACHMENT 6

Committee on Committees
RESOLUTION ON ANNUAL REPORTS

WHEREAS university committees and councils are central to shared governance at UCA; and

WHEREAS more formal lines of communication between these committees and councils and the Faculty Senate would promote more effective decision-making and policy implementation at UCA;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the following university committees and councils shall provide an annual report to the Senate by the date indicated:

Committee	Date
Academic Planning and Assessment	April 15
Affirmative Action	February 1
Distance Education/Extended Learning	October 1
Financial Aid	November 15
Graduate Council	October 1
Salary Review	March 1
Undergraduate Council	October 1
University Admissions	November 15
University Computing	April 15

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate pages corresponding to the above committees and councils be amended to include the following:

“The Faculty Senate requests that this committee/council provide a written report to the Faculty Senate by date of each year. This report should summarize the body’s activities during the prior year, provide appropriate statistics and data, and outline long-range planning for the following year. This report should be approved by the membership of the committee/council.”

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the following university committees and councils shall provide an annual report and schedule a presentation to the Senate by the date indicated:

Committee	Date
Athletic	February 1
Budget Advisory	September 1
Faculty Grievance	February 1
Faculty Handbook	April 15
Fringe Benefits	November 1
General Education Council	October 1
Retention	November 15

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate pages corresponding to the above committees and councils be amended to include the following:

“The Faculty Senate requests that this committee/council provide a written report to the Faculty Senate by date of each year. This report should summarize the body’s activities during the prior year, provide appropriate statistics and data, and outline long-range planning for the following year. This report should be approved by the membership of the committee/council. The chair of this committee/council shall contact the President of the Faculty Senate to schedule a presentation to the full Senate by this same date.”