

AGENDA

UCA Faculty Senate



Thursday, April 23, 2009

Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

- I. Approval of minutes from April 14, 2009 (see Attachment 1)
- II. Budget Update from President Courtway
- III. President's report
 - A. Faculty Handbook Committee
 1. Minutes (see Attachment 2)
 2. Resolution: Tenure and Promotion of Honors College Faculty (see Attachment 3)
- IV. Committee reports
 - A. Executive Committee
 1. Resolution: Recommendation Regarding Concurrent Enrollment (see Attachment 4)
 - B. Committee on Committees
 - C. Academic Affairs
 1. Resolution: The Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee (see Attachment 5)
 - D. Faculty Affairs I
 - E. Faculty Affairs II
 1. Report on the Miss UCA Pageant (see Attachment 6)
- V. Announcements and concerns
 - A. Faculty concerns and announcements
 - B. Next meeting: May 5, 2009, at 11:00 a.m.
- VI. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT 1

Minutes

UCA Faculty Senate
Tuesday, April 14, 2009
Wingo 315, 12:45 p.m.

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

I. Approval of Minutes from February 26, 2009. (see Agenda Attachment 1)

Senator Ray moved to approve minutes with second by Senator Seifert. Motion passed approving the minutes with the following corrections: 1) Alma Corley (rather than Conley) and 2) Jaime Zambrano (rather than Zambrono).

II. Academic Budget Summary from the Provost

Provost Grahn presented the most current DRAFT budget for Fiscal year 2010. Provost Grahn provided information and context regarding budgetary decisions. He reported that the budget is a work in progress and that he is diligently working towards establishing a balanced budget for fiscal year 2010.

III. President's Report.

A. Election results:

At-Large: Debbie Bratton
Don Jones
Bus.: Summer Bartczak
Ed.: Jud Copeland
FA: Lynn Burley
HBS: K.C. Poole
LA: Phillip Spivey
NSM: George Bratton

B. Final Report from the Concurrent Enrollment Advisory Committee (see Agenda Attachments 2 & 3):

Comment – Senator Runge: On page 2 of attachment 3, I would like to clarify my opinion that adjunct faculty do not diminish the quality of education but instead we play a significant and important role on campus.

C. Faculty Handbook Committee

1. Minutes (see Agenda Attachments 4 - 6)
2. Resolution: Budget Advisory Committee (see Agenda Attachment 7)

Senator Seifert moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Budget Advisory Committee.

Question – Senator Castro: Why were some positions eliminated?

Response – President Boniecki: The committee was re-structured in an attempt to eliminate conflicts of interest and to provide for fair and balanced representation.

The motion was seconded by Senator Ray and the motion passed unanimously approving the change.

3. Resolution: Faculty Handbook Committee (see Agenda Attachment 8)

Senator Johnson moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Faculty Handbook Committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Castro and the motion passed unanimously approving the change.

4. Resolution: Tenure and Promotion of Honors College Faculty (see Agenda Attachment 9)

Senator Johnson moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Tenure and Promotion of Honors College Faculty. The motion was seconded.

Much discussion ensued regarding the need for honors faculty to continue to have contact (i.e., teach a course) in the appropriate discipline-specific department. Several senators proposed that this should be strongly encouraged and should be put in writing rather than just implied. A motion was made by Senator Powers to change the wording to reflect this need for continued departmental service. The motion was seconded by Senator Castro.

Senator Johnson made a motion to table this resolution until the Faculty Handbook Committee could resolve this wording issue. The motion was seconded by Senator Parrack. The motion passed to table this issue with 1 vote against and 1 abstention.

5. Resolution: Appointment to the Graduate Faculty (see Agenda Attachment 10)

Senator Johnson made a motion to table this resolution until the Graduate Council could meet and contribute to a more fully developed resolution. The motion was seconded by Senator Ray. The motion passed to table this resolution with 2 votes against.

Dr. Elaine McNeice distributed information regarding the process of graduate faculty appointment. The Graduate Council has been working on this issue for two years. Senator Wiedmaier noted that standards put forth by HLC and other accrediting organizations, such as NCATE, have to be followed, and the guidelines for graduate faculty appointment help meet those standards. The Graduate Council plans to have a final copy of the guidelines soon.

6. Resolution: Award Committees (see Agenda Attachment 11)

Senator Schaefer moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Award Committees. The motion was seconded by Senator Castro and the motion passed unanimously approving the change.

7. Resolution: General Education Council (see Agenda Attachment 12)

Senator Holden moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the General Education Council. The motion was seconded by Senator Seifert.

Senator Wiedmaier stated that faculty in the College of Education do not teach general education courses, and that those faculty in the College of Education that are the most suited for membership on the council are not typically tenure-track.

Senator Schaefer suggested that the comma following "library director" be removed. Following discussion, the motion passed approving the change with 1 vote against.

8. Resolution: Department Tenure and Promotion Committee (see Agenda Attachment 13)

Senator Castro moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Department Tenure and

Promotion Committee. The motion was seconded by Senator Castner-Post. Senator Castner-Post moved to amend the motion with a change to the wording of the last sentence. Senator Mehta seconded the motion to amend. The motion to amend and the original motion passed unanimously.

9. Resolution: Extension of the Probationary Period (see Agenda Attachment 14)

Senator Castro moved to approve the resolution to accept the changes recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee to the Faculty Handbook regarding the Extension of the Probationary Period. The motion was seconded by Senator Jones and the motion passed unanimously approving the change.

III. Committee Reports.

A. Executive Committee: No report.

B. Committee on Committees: No report.

C. Academic Affairs:

1. Resolution: Student Honor Code (see Agenda Attachment 15)

Senator Albritton moved to approve the resolution of the Student Honor Code (which will be forwarded to SGA). The motion was seconded by Senator Schaefer. Minor wording changes were requested following discussion. The motion passed unanimously approving the resolution with the wording changes.

D. Faculty Affairs I: No report.

E. Faculty Affairs II: No report.

IV. Announcements and Concerns.

A. Faculty Concerns and announcements.

1. Senator Moore presented the following faculty concern:

The appropriations bill for 2009-2010 has a line item of 1.5 million dollars for travel. Our department chairs have told us the provost has said there will be no state money used for travel. The administration is going against the will of the legislature. Interestingly, in a recent Arkansas Democrat Gazette article, the athletic director has said that the athletic department is receiving 1.5 million dollars in auxiliary funds – the same amount appropriated for travel. I would like to remind the administration that education, not entertainment, is the mission of the university. I would like to see the administration fund crucial academic needs as the legislature intended, instead of finding other questionable uses for the money.

Response – Provost Grahn: That is not an accurate reflection of what I said in conversation with the deans. Please remember that the budget for next year has not been finalized and is still a work in progress. Travel has not been eliminated from the draft budget; although it has been cut back in order to protect instructional lines. Tough choices will simply have to be made in this current fiscal environment.

2. Senator Johnson: A potential topic for the required faculty/staff training seminars next year might be a session addressing campus safety and security issues.

B. Next Meeting: April 23, 2009 at 12:45 p.m.

V. Adjournment: Senator Holden moved to adjourn meeting with second by Senator Mehta. Motion passed approving adjournment at 2:35 p.m.

ATTACHMENT 2

Minutes **Faculty Handbook Committee** Wednesday, April 20, 2009

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

I. Procedures for the Tenure and Promotion of Honors Faculty

The committee discussed adding language to the new section on Honors College faculty that would facilitate the involvement of Honors College faculty members in their related departments after tenure. Rick Scott, Director of the Honors College, attended the meeting to answer questions. After deliberation, a motion and second was made to add the following sentence.

Tenured faculty members in the Honors College are expected to maintain their involvement in the discipline-appropriate department through their teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

The motion passed unanimously. Francie Bolter also provided grammatical and formatting changes for the new section. A new draft of the section will be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for approval.

II. Formation of Departmental Tenure and Promotion Committees When There Are Fewer than Three Tenured Faculty in a Department

Per the recommendation from the Faculty Senate, the committee revised the following new section on the construction of department tenure and promotion committees.

To ensure a fair and professionally responsible review, the tenure and promotion committee will consist of no fewer than three members. ~~In the case that there are not three tenured faculty members in~~ if a department does not have three tenured faculty members, members of the tenure and promotion committee will be sought from departmental emeriti, retired departmental faculty, and/or tenured faculty from allied disciplines until the committee has three members. These members of the committee who are not tenured faculty in the department will be selected by the department chair and college dean with advance notification to the provost. In this case, the department chair and college dean will select these committee members with advance notification to the provost.

III. Next Meeting: No further meetings are scheduled. The committee will meet as needed.

ATTACHMENT 3

Faculty Senate Resolution

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves the following change to the *Faculty Handbook* recommended by the Faculty Handbook Committee.

Recommendation: Add the following language to Chapter 3, Section II (current C, D, and E will change to D, E, and F).

C. Honors College Faculty

Honors College faculty may hold the tenurable academic rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor. The tenure and promotion of Honors College Faculty hired before September 1, 2005, will follow the procedures in Board policy No. 303. The following policies will apply only to Honors College faculty members hired after September 1, 2005.

Tenure-track faculty positions in the Honors College are initially dual appointments in the Honors College and a discipline-appropriate department. Thus, during the probationary period, any procedure that applies to Honors College faculty that mentions the "department chair" will be read to mean both the Director of the Honors College and the chair of the discipline-appropriate department. After the faculty member earns tenure, the position becomes a single appointment in the Honors College. Tenured faculty members in the Honors College are expected to maintain their involvement in the discipline-appropriate department through their teaching, scholarship, and/or service.

Procedures for the hire, tenure, and promotion of Honors College faculty are the same as those procedures for other tenured and tenure-track faculty except as outlined below.

1. Hiring

Hiring for Honors College faculty positions will be undertaken jointly by the discipline-appropriate departments and the Honors College. The Honors College will define the special areas of training, competence, expertise and knowledge needed in the hiring of a potential faculty member. The discipline-appropriate departments will participate throughout the hiring process to ensure that potential faculty members have sufficient breadth and depth in background and training to teach that department's general courses for general education and majors/minors.

2. Probationary Period

A faculty member will spend the probationary period for tenure working in both a discipline-appropriate department and the Honors College, with the position funded by the Honors College and by the university with the intention that after the probationary period and a successful tenure decision, he or she will move from a dual appointment to a permanent single appointment in the Honors College. Such faculty will not occupy permanent lines in the department but will occupy positions otherwise filled by other types of temporary faculty. During the probationary period, the faculty member will build a body of teaching, scholarship and service that will become the basis of future evaluation and review by both the Honors College and the discipline-appropriate department. Annual review of faculty will be conducted jointly by the chair of the discipline-appropriate department and the Director of the Honors College. Mid-tenure review will be conducted by the tenure committee as described below, the department chair, the Director of the Honors College, and the college dean following the procedures in Chapter 3, Section VII, Part G of the *Faculty Handbook*.

3. Tenure Review

The department-level decision regarding tenure will be undertaken by a tenure committee consisting of the discipline-appropriate department's tenure and promotion committee and tenured Honors College faculty. The number of tenured Honors College faculty members on the tenure committee shall not exceed the number of faculty on the discipline-appropriate department's tenure committee. The tenured Honors College faculty will select which members of their tenured faculty will serve on the tenure committee.

The tenure committee shall make a recommendation for tenure based on all relevant criteria and explain the rationale for their recommendation in a letter to both the chair of the discipline-appropriate department and the Director of the Honors College. The chair of the department and the Director of the Honors College shall jointly write a letter recommending or not recommending tenure. After this evaluation, the application will follow the typical review process as outlined in Chapter 3, Section VIII of the *Faculty Handbook*, moving to the college tenure and promotion committee and then dean of the college in which the discipline is housed, before being reviewed by the provost. Except where noted above, all procedures and guidelines for tenure, including time deadlines, procedures for confidentiality, and appeal procedures, will follow those in Chapter 3, Sections VI – XII of the *Faculty Handbook*.

4. Location of Tenure

Following the probationary period served in a department and the Honors College and a favorable tenure decision, a faculty member will become a full-time and permanent member of the Honors College faculty. His/her tenure will follow him/her into the Honors College.

5. Promotion Review

The department-level decision regarding promotion from assistant to associate professor will be undertaken by a promotion committee consisting of the discipline-appropriate department's tenure and promotion committee and tenured Honors College faculty. The number of tenured Honors College faculty members on the promotion committee shall not exceed the number of faculty on the discipline-appropriate department's tenure and promotion committee. The tenured Honors College faculty will select which members of their tenured faculty will serve on the promotion committee.

The department-level decision regarding promotion from associate to full professor will be undertaken by a promotion committee consisting of all the tenured faculty members of the Honors College and tenured faculty from the discipline-appropriate department. The number of tenured departmental faculty members on the promotion committee shall not exceed the number of tenured faculty members in the Honors College. The tenured faculty members of the discipline-appropriate department will select which members of their tenured faculty will serve on the promotion committee.

The promotion committee shall make a recommendation for promotion based on all relevant criteria and explain the rationale for their recommendation in a letter to both the chair of the discipline-appropriate department and the Director of the Honors College. Positive recommendations for promotion will be placed in priority order. The chair of the department and the Director of the Honors College shall jointly write a letter recommending or not recommending promotion. Positive recommendations for promotion will be placed in priority order. After this evaluation, the application will follow the typical review process as outlined in Chapter 3, Section VIII of the *Faculty Handbook*, moving to the college tenure and promotion committee and then dean of the college in which the discipline is housed, before being reviewed by the provost. Except where noted above, all procedures and guidelines for promotion, including time deadlines, procedures for confidentiality, and appeal procedures, will follow those in Chapter 3, Sections VI – XII of the *Faculty Handbook*.

ATTACHMENT 4

**Faculty Senate Resolution
Recommendation Regarding Concurrent Enrollment
April 23, 2009**

WHEREAS former President Hardin, in his 2006 address to the faculty, stated that we have begun concurrent enrollment with Arkansas high schools as a *pilot* program;

WHEREAS the Faculty Senate constituted and charged the Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee to conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the university's concurrent enrollment initiative;

WHEREAS the Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee completed its analysis and reported to the Faculty Senate that "the university's Concurrent Enrollment (CE) initiative indicates the program has produced no tangible benefit..." (view the full report at <http://www2.uca.edu/org/facultysenate/KeyDocuments.htm>);

WHEREAS the Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee reported that the CE initiative has cost the University of Central Arkansas more than one million dollars over the past three years;

WHEREAS the Concurrent Enrollment Policy Committee reported that their analysis "produced no conclusive findings related to the implicit costs and benefits of UCA's CE program;"

WHEREAS students have other existing opportunities for earning college credit while still in high school;

WHEREAS the economic climate has caused many institutions of higher education to adopt cost saving measures;

WHEREAS the current budget situation at UCA forces this university to cut costs and focus its resources on the university's core mission;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends a moratorium on the Concurrent Enrollment program until a strategic plan can be created, in consultation with faculty, that would ensure the explicit and implicit benefits of Concurrent Enrollment equal or exceed the costs.

Faculty Senate Resolution April 23, 2009

WHEREAS the Academic Affairs Committee was charged by the Faculty Senate to conduct a review of the charge and membership of the Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee and provide a recommendation to the Faculty Senate;

WHEREAS the Academic Affairs Committee, in response to their charge, reviewed the Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee Web site (2009), the *UCA Faculty Handbook* (2007, p. 73), *Administrative Policy 409: Copyright Ownership – Electronic Distance Learning* (2002), the *Curriculum Development Process Guide* (2007) and the *Assessment Process Guide for Academic Programs, Faculty, and Administrators* (2005);

WHEREAS the Academic Affairs Committee has proposed the following recommendations in relation to the Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee (DEELAC);

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate endorses the following recommendations:

I. Reconstitute and refocus the DEELAC Committee.

We recommend that the Faculty Senate reconstitute the DEELAC by including:

- representation of faculty members from each college of the university for a two-year, rotational service;
- a faculty member from IDC as chair of the committee, and
- as permanent, *ex officio*, non-voting members, the Director of the Library or his designee, the Director of IDC, the Coordinator of Credit and Distance Learning, the Chief Technology Officer, and the Dean of Academic Outreach.

We recommend that the Faculty Senate refocus the DEELAC on ensuring the development of quality online courses.

Rationale:

This committee should exist to give a stronger voice for the development of quality distance-learning experiences. Academic faculty have the content-area and pedagogical expertise to evaluate the experiences proposed; thus, an advisory committee for distance learning should be populated and chaired by faculty members. Including a faculty member from IDC as chair of the committee would emphasize the new focus of the committee and make the pedagogical resources of the IDC readily available to committee members through its director.

The Director of the Library or his/her designee should be included because the Library is expected to provide information resources to students who are taking online, and therefore, often off-campus, courses. This affects the Library's budget, technology, staff, and more.

In addition, there is conflicting membership information on two Web sites, so this discrepancy must be resolved. The Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee Web site (2009, para. 3) contains the following on this committee's membership:

The Chief Technology Officer and a representative from each college appointed by the Faculty Senate. The coordinator of credit programs and distance education and the director of the IDC shall serve as *ex officio*

members. Faculty Senate appointments are selected on a rotational basis with each member serving a term of three years. The Chief Technology Officer serves as chair.

The *UCA Faculty Handbook* (2007, p. 73) contains the following on membership:

The Dean of Academic Outreach and Extended Programs, a representative from each college, and a representative from GSMLA. The coordinator of credit programs and distance education and the director of the IDC shall serve as *ex officio* members. All members are selected on a rotational basis with each member serving a term of two years. The dean of AOEP serves as the chair.

II. Expand the charge of the DEELAC Committee.

We recommend that the Faculty Senate expand the charge of this committee. The expanded scope of the committee should include:

- a clear focus on best teaching and learning practices in a distance learning environment as committee members evaluate proposals to deliver courses online;
- the development of training programs faculty would take before redesigning their courses for online delivery; this training should focus on *why* (quality online pedagogy) elements should be created in a certain way for online delivery rather than on *how* (tools) courses are placed online;
- the establishment of a clear technological support path for faculty as they create/convert courses for online delivery;
- the *ex officio* members serve to connect the necessary divisions for accomplishing online education (IDC, AOEP, IT, and Library services);
- compliance with Board Policy 409; and
- the approval of reassigned time and stipends if/when available.

Rationale:

The charge should focus on pedagogical support for faculty who are creating or converting courses for distance learning. The new charge should be firmly rooted in quality in the distance learning endeavors of the university rather than simply a charge to assure compliance with legalities.

The Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee Web site (2009, para. 3) currently contains the following charge:

In accordance with Board Policy 409, the Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee, chaired by the Chief Technology Officer, shall be responsible for the administration of policy 409, applying the policy equitably, and ensuring appropriate agreements are completed prior to mounting web-based courses for full delivery on the university's server. The committee will make recommendations for the approval of reassigned time or summer stipends for faculty seeking to convert courses into full Internet delivery. In addition, the committee will make recommendations regarding support of academic courses delivered through distance technology.

The *UCA Faculty Handbook* (2007, p. 73) currently contains the following charge:

In accordance with Board Policy 409, the Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee, chaired by the dean of Academic Outreach and Extended Programs (AOEP), shall be responsible for the administration of policy 409, applying the policy equitably, and ensuring appropriate agreements are completed prior to mounting web-based courses for full delivery on the university's server. The committee will make recommendations for

the approval of reassigned time or summer stipends for faculty seeking to convert courses to full Internet delivery. In addition, the committee will make recommendations regarding support of academic courses delivered through distance technology.

References

- Assessment process guide for academic programs, faculty, and administrators* (2005). Retrieved April 7, 2009 from <http://www2.uca.edu/panda/apg/>
- Administrative policy 409: Copyright ownership – electronic distance learning* (2002). Retrieved April 7, 2009, from <http://www.uca.edu/divisions/admin/board/policies/409.html>
- Curriculum Development Process Guide* (2007). Retrieved April 9, 2009, from [http://www2.uca.edu/panda/curriculum/Distance Education/Extended Learning Advisory Committee](http://www2.uca.edu/panda/curriculum/Distance%20Education/Extended%20Learning%20Advisory%20Committee) (2009, March 12). Retrieved April 7, 2009, from <http://www.uca.edu/org/facultysenate/CommitteePages/DEAC.html>
- UCA faculty handbook* (2007). Retrieved from <http://www.uca.edu/divisions/academic/provost/pubs/2007FHB-post.pdf>

ATTACHMENT 6

Miss UCA Scholarship Pageant Inquiry

Faculty Affairs II Committee

Senators Moore, Ray, Rospert, Schaefer, Isom.

The following statement concerning the Miss UCA Scholarship Pageant is submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Faculty Affairs II committee. A summary of information supporting the statement, and a compilation of information gathered by Faculty Affairs II committee concerning the issue can be found on the Faculty Senate web site at <http://www2.uca.edu/org/facultysenate/KeyDocuments.htm>.

Statement to the Faculty Senate:

We, as a committee, find the objectifying and exploitive nature of the UCA Scholarship Pageant offensive and inconsistent with the mission and ethical integrity of our Institution. The offering of UCA Scholarships on the basis of appearance or academically unrelated talent is an antiquated and sexist practice. Further, we believe the superficial nature of the event has a negative influence on UCA's public image as an institution of higher learning that values and promotes the academic success and character development of its students, regardless of gender or appearance.

However, based on our investigation, the transfer of Pageant ownership occurred before the UCA name was trademarked and so any request for formal action to remove the UCA name from the pageant is beyond the scope of the Faculty Senate. Therefore, we do not recommend any further action by the Senate at this time.