

AGENDA
UCA Faculty Senate
C
Tuesday, February 12, 2008
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from January 24, 2008 (attachment 1)

- II. President's report
 - A. Honors Faculty Status Position Paper (separate attachment)
 - B. Faculty Handbook Committee report
 - C. Provost search update
 - D. Correspondence

- III. Committee reports
 - A. Executive Committee
 - 1. Resolution: Procedures for Campus Discussion on Honors Faculty Status (attachment 2)
 - 2. Faculty Affairs II Sub-Committee Charge

 - B. Committee on Committees
 - 1. Resolution: Recommendation to include the President-elect of the Faculty Senate as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Handbook Committee (attachment 3)

 - C. Academic Affairs

 - D. Faculty Affairs I
 - 1. Resolution: (attachment 4)

 - E. Faculty Affairs II

- IV. Announcements and Concerns
 - A. Next meeting: Thursday, February 28, 2008 (12:45 pm)
 - B. Faculty concerns and announcements
 - C. Other

- V. Adjournment

Attachment 1: Minutes from January 24, 2008

UCA Faculty Senate
Thursday, January 24, 2008
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

President Powers called the meeting to order at 12:45 p.m. Present were Powers, Boniecki, Johnson, Parrack, Bradley, Bell, Wilmes, Wiedmaier, Hebert, Rospert, McCullough, Lance, Craig, Castro, Mehta, Seifert, Christman, Jones, Ray, Schaefer, Runge, Interim Provost Atkinson. Absent: Holden, Lichtenstein. Advised Absence: Young.

I. Approval of minutes from December 13, 2007. Senator Seifert moved approval of the minutes with second by Senator Bell. Motion passed.

II. President's report

A. Part-Time Faculty Representative. President Powers introduced Nihu Runge of the Biology Department as the new part-time faculty representative. He noted that the part-time faculty representative votes on matters relating to part-time faculty.

B. Information Technology External Review. An information technology external review team from Missouri State University has just completed its review of UCA IT infrastructure, and services. The visitors talked with faculty, deans, and other users. UCA is awaiting its report next week. The report will be an important resource for changes in IT infrastructure and services [Provost: it is fair to say that substantial changes will be recommended and will be implemented.]

C. Executive Committee Lunch with President Hardin. Two issues were discussed: (1) State-level proposal to tie state funding of universities to graduation rates; and (2) concurrent enrollment questions. Regarding state funding, President Hardin agrees that it is a difficult proposal; the Presidents and Chancellors are concerned about it and are meeting as a group next week to discuss what approach the colleges and universities should take to it. They may ask their faculty senates to make a position statement on the proposal. This issue occupies an important place on President Hardin's agenda. Regarding concurrent enrollment, the executive committee advised President Hardin what it believed to be unresolved issues. Faculty Senate president Powers is in regular contact with Dr. Francie Bolter, chair of the Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Committee. The committee will advise President Hardin on means to ensure quality education. [Provost: At a meeting recently, one private college expects to admit high school graduates with 60 hours of college credit.]

D. Faculty Handbook Committee Report. The committee will meet regularly on a weekly basis over the next several weeks. As chair of that committee, Faculty Senate President Powers will give a progress report at the next senate meeting.

E. Provost Search Update. Having gone through the bid process, the search committee is close to finalizing a contract with the executive search firm that has been identified as the preferred firm. The search will proceed in an expeditious manner, in time for on-campus interviews this Spring term.

F. Honors Update. There has been a slight delay in the process outlined in previous Senate meetings. Director Scott reports that his position paper will be available by the end of this month or the first of the next month. His position paper will be extensive. It will have an executive summary that will be supported by a great amount of detail in the body of the report. The executive committee of the senate will next determine how to proceed with distribution, but college senators should be on the alert to be ready to organize college elections for a college representative to the review committee that will receive and review individual faculty "white papers" in response.

G. Correspondence: Budget Advisory committee. Vice-president McLendon reports that the committee meets only every other year, when the General Assembly is in session. No major changes are anticipated to the budget this year, since 2008 is not a legislative year, but he will call a meeting if asked. President powers observed that it is important to meet and review budget priorities every year, regardless of funding circumstances.

III. Committee reports

A. Executive Committee: the committee has met several times since the last senate meeting, to discuss the Honors process, concurrent enrollment, fringe benefits, and the graduation rates/funding issue. A lengthy discussion was held on how to implement the Academic Misconduct Policy. The Executive Committee is working with Associate Provost Jonathan Glenn on implementation issues, and it will refer the matter also to the Faculty Handbook Committee to see that academic misconduct policy is worked into the Faculty Handbook as appropriate. It will also contact Student Services to ensure the policy is adequately publicized to students.

Charges to Committees from the Executive Committee:

1. Academic Affairs on UCA Athlete Progress, Retention and Graduation

The committee is charged with generating a report on UCA athlete progress, retention, and graduation rates. All elements of the report should be structured using the same categories required in NCAA reports (by sport, race, and gender).

* Progress should be measured by mean semester hours passed, mean G.P.A., number of athletes placed on academic probation, and any additional measures the subcommittee deems appropriate.

* Retention should be measured by the number of athletes exiting UCA without graduating every semester beginning in the Fall semester 2005.

* Graduation rates should be measured by the percentage of athletes graduating within 5-years (10 semesters).

The committee is also charged with generating a report on the resources provided by UCA to help athletes succeed as students. For example, does UCA provide tutoring/supplemental instruction, structured study environments, academic advising, etc.? Are there any plans to create additional academic-support resources to athletes within the next 12-months?

Primary contact for this report should be Athletic Director Brad Teague. Make it clear that the Faculty Senate is not attacking athletes or athletics. However, faculty members have a keen interest in developing the student side of the student-athlete. We would like to see more transparency in athletics programs and we want to establish better communication between athletics programs and faculty. We need to know what problems exist before we can begin to help address these problems.

If the committee deems it necessary, we can invite Director Teague to speak to the Senate in person.

2. Faculty Affairs I on Fringe Benefits

The committee is charged to follow up on Fringe Benefits Committee decision-making procedures, especially concerning health care coverage. It should follow up on how the Faculty Senate recommendations have been responded to. Study and recommendation by the Faculty Affairs I on such items as the nature of the justification offered by Fringe Benefits for the policies recommended, frequency of open bid opportunities for potential vendors, opportunities for input by faculty, expert faculty participation and recommendation to the fringe benefit decision process, and even the appointment of expert faculty to the committee, are encouraged.

B. Committee on Committees: no report

C. Academic Affairs: no report

D. Faculty Affairs I: Still working on faculty development funding resolution. There needs to be a "set aside" for faculty development that is not static but rather proportionate to size of university and size of budget—a stable rate of funding over time.

E. Faculty Affairs II: (1) Proposed resolution draft circulated (not final). (2) Technology funding needs assessment and proposals report as follows:

According to Institutional Research there were 514 full-time faculty in 2006 and a total of 6535 classes taught from Summer II 2006 - Summer I 2007... the most up-to-date figures that the committee has. In summary of recommended funds for classroom technology:

Faculty Office Technology: \$715 per faculty member X 514 full-time faculty = \$367,510

Classroom Technology: 6535 classes / 25 classes/package X \$5,000/package = \$1,305,000

Support Personnel 5 people X \$60,000 (salary) + \$20,000 (travel, training, and supplies) = \$320,000

Discipline Specific Funding \$250,000

Total cost = \$ 2,242,510

Discussion on the senate suggested that the budgeting process at UCA is obsolete not only in technology but in other areas as well. It does not take account of obsolescence and the need for a regular routine of replacement as well as keeping pace with developments in technology. The problem of historical cost funding versus the escalation of costs over time is a major issue in many areas, not just technology. Specifically for the technology area, there needs to be a Master Technology Plan. The technology fee should really be reserved for technology. [Provost: there will be a proposal this year for a significant increase in the technology budget to come to an account in the Provost's Office.] Various assumptions have to be made in constructing a technology fund: for example, that one-half of the faculty would be on laptop and one-half on desktop. Support equipment such as docking stations for laptops will have to be included. The future cost of software is a challenge to estimate. Various review bodies need to be included in the development of this budget.

IV. Announcements and Concerns

A. The next meeting of the senate is Tuesday, February 12.

B. Senator Bradley: the former Provost's statement that we are going back to 12% for summer pay didn't happen. We still see caps that penalize us when competing against schools with much better summer rates. [Provost: last summer and this past fall this matter has been under discussion, involving V-P for Financial Services Paul McLendon and graduate dean Elaine McNiece. The decision from those discussions is to remove the cap and move the rate up in small increments over three or four years to a rate of 7.5% for a summer course. It is not clear that this plan will be implemented for Summer 2008.] It was also observed that a share of summer school "profits" did not go to the Provost; rather, the Provost received a flat \$250,000 rather than a profit share. It is possible that this amount may be increased.

C. Senator Mehta delivered the following statement to the Faculty Senate, conveying concerns of several NSM faculty members:

"I believe several faculty, including myself, would like to see the Faculty Handbook changed to allow early consideration for promotion (maybe tenure). Any thoughts?" [from a concerned faculty member]

"Be certain to ask about the motivation behind the current growth pattern. What is the goal and why? Also ask if athletic expenditures due to DIAA move are in line with earlier predictions or if they are lower or (as I expect) a lot higher than originally anticipated. I'd like to hear the admin's thoughts on the impact of athletics on academic excellence. Can one relate these two?" [another faculty member from NSM]

"It was said to the library committee that when it came down to faculty raises or money for the library, the support was overwhelming in favor of raises by the senate. Was that the case? If so, the library needs strong senate support to see its budget improve." [another faculty member] {Orally: while library budget support was included in initial budget planning, when it came to crunch time the available monies were placed on faculty salaries and less to the library.} {Clarification, President Powers: the library did receive an additional \$200,000 this year.}

D. Senator Castro: (1) Plus/minus grades: Many faculty want to understand the rationale for not having them. (2) Fringe benefits re Reynolds Performing Arts series: formerly extensive privileges now changed to three shows total. This represents erosion of benefits and faculty senator seeks an explanation.

E. Senator Runge: Part-time faculty concerns. (1) Part-time faculty have to go stand in line to get the parking sticker. If it could be sent by mail with a charge to the paycheck it would be much more convenient to part-time faculty. (2) About five years ago UCA gave \$300 toward "Social Security" for part-time faculty but that practice is now stopped. [Was "TIAA CREF" intended to be stated instead of "Social Security", it was asked.] Rita Fleming the Director of Human Resources was asked about this and she replied that the decision was made before she arrived. (3) Is it true part-time faculty don't have Social Security withheld? (4) Is UCA contributing 10% to TIAA?

V. Adjournment

Motion by Senator Bell with second by Senator Christman to adjourn. Meeting adjourned 2:00 p.m.

Attachment 2: Procedures for Campus Discussion on Honors Faculty Status

Honors Faculty Status Discussion

Purpose: To discuss the future status of the Honors faculty at UCA with an emphasis on whether or not Honors should be allowed to hire and tenure faculty members who are otherwise unaffiliated with academic departments at UCA.

Procedure:

1. The current director of Honors will submit a position paper regarding how future Honors faculty members should be recruited, hired, tenured, and promoted. The director of Honors should provide justifications to support the proposed faculty model including (if necessary) reasons for promoting Honors as an independent entity, detached from established academic departments at UCA. The position paper will be made available to the faculty on the Faculty Senate web pages. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee will be responsible for advertising the link to the document and ensuring that all interested faculty members have the opportunity to view it.
2. Faculty members at UCA are invited to submit formal written responses to the Honors position paper. Responses should include pragmatic suggestions for revising the Honors director's proposal or should present alternative models for Honors program staffing. Group submissions are acceptable. No anonymous submissions will be accepted. The call for position papers will be issued in February, 2008. The deadline for faculty responses is June 30, 2008.
3. A seven-member Honors discussion panel will be selected during the spring semester, 2008. The Honors discussion panel will be comprised of one elected representative from each college at UCA and one faculty member from the Honors program. Faculty senators from each college are charged with coordinating the nomination and election of representatives from their colleges to serve on the panel. Elections of discussion panel members may be held as special elections or may be held concurrent with spring Faculty Senate elections. However, each college must elect a participant by ____, 2008. The representative from Honors will be appointed by the director of Honors. The discussion panel will elect a chair from among its members.
4. Submissions of faculty position papers will be reviewed by members of the Honors discussion panel to ensure compliance with the basic guidelines for submission. The director of Honors will also be given the opportunity to review submitted papers and check them for factual errors or misrepresentations of Honors faculty, students, or programs. Position papers that fail to comply with the basic guidelines or papers that are found to contain distorted facts will be returned to their authors for further editing. Position papers that are submitted before the Honors discussion panel is selected will

be held by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee until the discussion panel is in place.

5. Once reviewed and approved by the Honors discussion panel, submissions will be posted on the Faculty Senate website for the campus to read.

6. After full review of all accepted position papers, the elected panel will conduct a public discussion of the proposal, suggested revisions to the proposal, and submitted alternatives to the proposal. The length of this discussion will be determined by the Honors discussion panel and may vary depending on the volume of proposals received. The discussion date, time, and location will be determined by the Honors discussion panel. However, the discussion must take place no earlier than August 18, 2008 and not later than October 2, 2008. The date, time, and location of the discussion should be announced via the Admin-L email listserv at least five working days before the discussion.

7. The audience to the discussion will be invited to provide written feedback related to the public discussion (however, the audience will not be allowed to participate in the panel discussion). Written feedback must be submitted to the chair of the Honors discussion panel within 5 working days of the panel discussion.

8. After the discussion and after written feedback from the discussion has been collected, the discussion panel will have ten working days to make a formal recommendation regarding the future status of the Honors program. The panel's recommendation will consider the original proposal, suggested revisions to the proposal, submitted alternatives to the proposal, and written feedback received from the audience to the discussion. If the recommendation is not unanimous, the panel's vote will be recorded and panel members voting in the minority will be permitted to attach dissenting opinions to the majority's recommendation.

9. The discussion panel's recommendation (along with any dissenting opinions) will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for immediate consideration.

Attachment 3: Recommendation to include the President-elect of the Faculty Senate as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Handbook Committee

Background:

The current description of the Faculty Handbook Committee designates the President of the Faculty Senate as the chair of the committee. This is often an awkward arrangement primarily because the President of the Faculty Senate may have little or no experience with the handbook committee prior to chairing the committee. As a result of the chair's lack of experience, year-to-year continuity of committee proceedings is threatened and unnecessary inefficiencies are introduced.

Recommendation:

The description of Faculty Handbook Committee membership should be revised to include the president-elect of the Faculty Senate as an ex-officio member.

Rationale:

Including the president-elect as a non-voting member of the Faculty Handbook Committee will improve the functioning of the committee in several ways:

- The future chair of the committee will better understand Faculty Handbook review and revision procedures.
- The president-elect will be able to provide assistance to the Faculty Handbook Committee on matters concerning the structure and function of university committees (because of the president-elect's role as chair of the Committee on Committees).
- There will be more year-to-year consistency in committee activities.

Attachment 4: Faculty Affairs 1 Resolution for Faculty Development

University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate
Faculty Affairs 1 Resolution for Faculty Development
February 12, 2007

Whereas the Faculty Senate was charged with the task of determining a fair and realistic recommendation regarding the amount and procedures for distributing faculty development funds;

Whereas there has been no significant increase in the faculty development budget per faculty member in many years;

Whereas faculty were surveyed and given the opportunity to provide suggestions and examples of necessary travel amounts and procedures;

Whereas a majority of faculty reported that they often had to pay out of pocket to attend and present at conferences or in some instances decline the opportunity to present because of there were no travel funds available;

Whereas the University of Central Arkansas is truly becoming the "Center of Learning" not only for Arkansas but is also establishing both a regional and national presence.

Whereas the University of Central Arkansas has a long tradition of visionary growth and academic excellence;

Be it hereby resolved that the Faculty Senate requests that the University of Central Arkansas take this opportunity to make a substantial commitment to faculty development, research, and continued education;

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate believes that both attendance and participation in local, regional, national, and international conferences is critical to our ability to build on the tradition of academic excellence as we (the faculty) continue to make a difference for the students of today and tomorrow. Additionally, our presence and participation at these conferences further strengthens the concept (and reality) of UCA as the "Center of Learning."

Be it hereby further resolved that the Faculty Senate recommends that the University of Central Arkansas establish a line item in the budget for faculty development rather than rolling these funds into departmental M & O accounts. The budget from fiscal year 2006-2007 indicates that \$704,594.00 was spent under the umbrella of "academic travel." The Faculty Senate requests that amount be limited to full-time faculty development usage only. So, for the fiscal year 2008-2009, \$704,594.00 would be budgeted for faculty development. This is equivalent to approximately \$1200.00 per full-time faculty member when divided by the number of current full-time faculty (581). Additionally, the Faculty Senate requests that this number be adjusted annually to account for cost of living increases as well as changes in faculty numbers within departments. It is also recommended that individual departments would be responsible for developing fair and equitable guidelines for distributing the funds based on the unique departmental circumstances.