Minutes

University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate

Tuesday, April 14th, 2015

12:45 p.m. – Room 315: Wingo Hall

**Attendance:**

College of Business: Kaye McKinzie (2015), Don Bradley (2016) aa, Doug Voss (2017)

College of Education: Shoudong Feng (2015), Jud Copeland (2016), Kevin Stoltz (2017)

College of Fine Arts and Communication: Garry Craig Powell (2015), Jane Dahlenburg (2016), VACANT (2017)

College of Health and Behavioral Sciences: K.C. Poole (2015), Duston Morris (2016), Mitchum Parker (2017)

College of Liberal Arts: Jacob Held (2015), Chris Craun (2016), John Parrack (2017)

College of Natural Science and Mathematics: Rahul Mehta (2015), Ben Rowley (2016), Lori Isom (2017)

At Large Senators: Debbie Bratton (2015), Art Lichtenstein (2015), Kim Eskola (2016), Amber Wilson (2016) , Lisa Christman (2017), Lisa Ray (2017)

Part-Time Senator: Deb Forssman Hill (2015)

1. Call to Order – By Senator Bradley
   1. Call to Order: 12: 45 pm
2. Comments: Faculty Senate President Bradley
   1. Introduce: Dr. Michael Judge, Director of Distance Learning
      1. MJudge@uca.edu; 852-2767; Burdick 111
   2. Comments:
      1. On Noel Campbell: Our duty is to protect tenure. We’ve monitored each step along the way and everything has been according to standard. Due process is being followed.
3. Comments: President Courtway
   1. We are putting the budget together. The budget seminar will be done in webinar format. State funding is flat. 1% of our budget has been put in category B, but it should still be accessible. Next academic year’s budget will be fine. We are looking seriously at not raising tuition, as well as providing a 1% COLA for faculty and staff plus a limited amount for a merit/equity pool. We are building a portion of the on-line tuition into the base budget, and that is where this money will be coming from. If the state will not give us additional money, tuition will have to bear the brunt of COLA and merit and equity in the future.
   2. Questions?
      1. Senator Copeland: Recent construction projects still on track?
         1. Yes, there will be a dual ground breaking. Invitations will be sent out. Donaghey will be open Fall of 2016, Lewis science center will open Spring semester 2017.
      2. Senator Parrack: Is a 1% COLA the new normal going forward?
         1. No, I do not think this is the new normal. But considering where we are it is what can be offered this year. There’s a great deal of pressure to keep tuition low, and we can’t squeeze the budget much more. The solution is twofold: 1) grow programs and strategically increase enrollment and retention and 2) getting increased funding from the state.
      3. Senator Christman: The 1% is for faculty and staff, will administration be held to that as well?
         1. For the COLA “Yes,” but there will be raises in addition to it.
         2. Senator Bradley: last year some faculty got as high as a 12% raise in addition to what people got across the board.
      4. Senator Isom: I had the same question as Senator Christman, and you’ve done a great job by us, but no one is arguing against equity. If that exists among administrators it should be fixed, but the concern is that administrators are getting raises that seem unfair or disproportionate to what others on campus are receiving.
      5. Senator Eskola: likewise if there is merit for administration there should be merit for faculty. Merit and equity are different.
         1. President Courtway: The money is turned over to the Provost and the Deans, they determine merit and equity.
      6. Senator Morris: As we move forward with UCA On-line, is there a way that programs that are operating on-line programs can receive more money directly from those programs so they can use that income to supplement those programs?
         1. President Courtway: Provost Runge has been working to increase incentives to do UCA on-line. On-line income, however, fluctuates, so we haven’t built it into the budget historically. What we’ve now done, is since we have a baseline we know what money will be recurring and we can build that into the budget.
         2. Laura Young: Recent projections support the creation of additional funding for the IDC to help support faculty who are offering or plan to offer on-line courses.
      7. Senator Lichtenstein: When you talk about a cost of a 1% COLA at 850,000 dollars who is that?
         1. President Courtway: That’s everyone on payroll who draws a check who is eligible. Merit and equity is in addition to that.
      8. Senator Parker: Have the leadership of the Universities across the state come together to speak to the legislature to lobby?
         1. President Courtway: The conversations have been held, but it’s a function of state budgeting: We’re fourth. K-12 comes first, and they get whatever they need. Second is a dead heat between corrections and human services. That pretty much takes up everything and then us, at fourth. And they know we can raise tuition to generate funding. (Discussion ensues re: highway and transportation and state funding.) This is a common situation among states in the country. We’re not unique. It’s not great, but it could be a whole lot worse.
      9. Senator Forsmann Hill: Part time never gets COLA. That would be nice.
      10. Senator Bradley ends the discussion in interests of time. And thank you President Courtway for being open and receptive. We appreciate all you’ve done for UCA.
4. Consideration of Minutes – March 19th, 2015
   1. Motion Senator Ray, Second Senator Mehta
   2. Discussion
   3. Vote: Unanimous in favor with four abstentions.
5. Report from Committee on Committees: Senator Rowley
   1. Two items: 1) Previous discussion regarding revising the structure of the committee. It didn’t get done this year. With the assistance of Senator Parrack I am hoping that over summer we can revise the proposal and have something ready next year. 2) Looking into electronic surveys regarding what we should be doing or looking at. Remind your constituents to fill this out regarding what committees you’re willing to serve on.
6. Handbook changes discussion and vote
   1. Discussion
      1. Motion Senator Ray, Second Senator Wilson
      2. Senator McKinzie: The entire paragraph regarding early tenure if you were offered tenure from another institution. Why was that struck?
         1. Senator Isom: Handbook removed it. You could still negotiate at the point of hire. But you can’t adjust the initial agreement at the point of hire.
         2. Senator Bradley: The re-negotiation aspect of this adds complications legally.
         3. Senator Craun: There’s also the issue of who grants tenure, who would negotiate this, is it the department or the dean or an administrator.
         4. Senator Isom: One of the problems is how this would waste time as you interview just for leverage. It corrupts the interview process.
      3. Senator Parrack: Thanks to colleagues on handbook for their hard work. However, I don’t support the lowering of the period from 6 to 3 years for senior faculty. It will lower standards, it is not in line with aspirant instructions, nor will it increase retention. I think a better solution would be the creation of a fourth level, namely, distinguished professor.
         1. Senator Bradley: Provost Runge supports reworking that section.
         2. Senator Voss: Basically, there’s no hope for raises in the future, we won’t allow people to go up early for tenure, nor will we allow people to go up for full early. You don’t get raises for high performance, so what’s the incentive to perform highly. Some of these incentives should be left intact.
         3. Motion to separate the question: all the changes, and the 3 year 6 year promotion question.
            1. Second Isom
            2. Vote: All in favor with 2 opposed. Motion passes.
            3. Will now have two votes.
      4. Discussion on the whole minus the 3-6 year clauses
         1. Senator Parrack: Concerns about the college advancement committee. How will you guarantee you get enough reps on this, and how do you enforce it if you don’t get enough?
            1. Senator Isom: Deans will randomize how they select these people. But they can resolve this.
            2. Senator Christman: So this is unclear for those that don’t have a Dean or aren’t in a college. (Discussion ensues.)
            3. Senator Parrack: Motion to divide the question further. Chapter 3, Pt. 7, C. The portion discussing the “advancement committee”

Second Senator McKinzie

Vote: All in favor, 1 against, no abstentions.

* + 1. Discussion for the total minus the 2 divided questions (advancement committee and 3-6 year promotion)
       1. Senator Dahlenburg: Is the language about suggested revisions new?
          1. Senator Bradley: It’s clarification of the process as it is already done.
       2. Vote: All in favor, 1 against.
    2. On the divided questions: 3-6 year promotion.
       1. Senator Held: The concern that the shift from 3-6 years for promotion will lead to a loss of integrity or lowering of standards is ridiculous. Those standards are maintained at several levels, dept committees, chairs, college committees, deans, the provost. IF the system is so corrupt that standards can’t be maintained that’s true at 6 years as it is at 3, if it’s not that corrupt then the argument fails. Why not offer departments and faculty the choice to go up early and recognize high performers.
       2. Senator Eskola: This rewards outstanding performers.
       3. Senator Isom: When we discussed this this came from faculty in CNSM. My perception was that this is a compromise. People have diligently lobbied for this shortening. This isn’t about a check list. To show real maturity requires a period of time. But being promoted is more than that.
       4. Senator Bradley: I was promoted to full in 1989. And it would be nice if there was another level.
       5. Senator Parrack: A change like this isn’t appropriate to fix salary issues.
       6. Senator Eskola: Issue regarding tenured faculty versus lecturer.
       7. Senator Voss: As a response to Senator Parrack, we have no control over salary in some regards, but we do have control over this. We can do what we can to incentive people.
       8. Senator Stoltz: This would change the standard if we go with the developmental approach.
       9. Senator Parrack: Would like to send it back.
       10. Senator McKinzie calls the question. Senator Rowley seconds
           1. Unanimous to call the question
       11. Vote on the 6-3.
           1. Vote: 10 in favor, 12 against
           2. Motion fails.
    3. Other division: Advancement committee
       1. Discussion: Senator Isom – concerns that have been raised are legitimate and I think it needs to go back. Senator McKinzie – But is this better than what existed? Senator Isom – Yes, there is currently no college level committee. Senator Wilson – This also doesn’t take into account the unaffiliated faculty.
       2. Vote: 1 in favor, 19 against, 1 abstention. Motion fails.

1. UCA Online Coca-Cola Proposal
   1. Remainder of Coca-Cola Faculty Senate Money to be used for traditional instruction, online course grants in Pool 1 and 2, evenly distributed across the three categories. This will be administered through the IDC.
      1. Lowering the dollar amount to 21,000 from the former 34,000
      2. Motion Senator Rowley, Second Senator Morris
      3. Discussion: Senator Eskola – The university should fund on-line, not the senate’s funds that is designed to benefit the faculty as a whole. Senator McKinzie – we were supposed to see a bunch of proposals that had been cleared with the university lawyer. What happened to the other proposals? (Concurrence from various senators.) Senator Morris – This seems like we don’t know where this proposal came from: it came from President Bradley, not Provost Runge. Let’s not see this as though it is being shoved or forced on us. Senator Eskola – It’s not a bad proposal but the Coca Cola money is supposed to benefit as many faculty as possible.
      4. Move to table until next time Senator Wilson, Second Senator Copeland
      5. Vote: 14 in favor, 7 against. Motion is tabled.
2. Religious and Civil Liberties Proposal
   1. Discussion only, no vote
      1. Discussion re discrimination:
      2. Senator Craun: This was authored by the history faculty and I compiled their concerns and brought it here. This is a proposal.
      3. Senator McKinzie: We’ve had conflicting reports regarding if state law or federal is operative. For example we don’t’ recognize same sex marriages.
      4. Senator Held: State law would trump in the case of sexual orientation since federal law does not recognize sexual orientation as a protected class.
      5. Senator Bradley: We are in the midst of a culture war currently in the state of Arkansas, and so this is a delicate matter. We don’t discriminate, and we need to recognize that we need not antagonize some people unduly.
      6. Motion to endorse this proposal Senator Isom, Second Senator Powell.
         1. Senator Isom withdraws her motion.
         2. Senator Bradley moves to end the meeting due to time
         3. Motion to adjourn Senator Wilson, Second Senator Voss
3. Report from Faculty Affairs I Committee
4. Report from Faculty Affairs II Committee
5. Report from Academic Affairs Committee
6. Announcements
7. Faculty Concerns (***The concerns below reflect the position of the faculty member who submitted them. All concerns are anonymous. They are included verbatim if sent ahead of time or electronically. (Verbatim comments are italicized.) Comments are paraphrased if presented by a faculty senate member without being accompanied by a written version. The comments below do not necessarily reflect the opinion of any faculty senate member, department, college, or university official. The comments herein presented are unedited. The faculty senate or its agents cannot attest to the veracity of claims made under the “Faculty Concerns” section of the Faculty Senate minutes.***)
8. Adjournment