**ATTENDANCE:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Introduction Items:**

1. Comments – President Davis
   1. Academic Calendar – I am most concerned with the impact on teaching and the student impact.
   2. Senator Forbush – Suggest as we look into the Cyber Security degree that we do have Mega data and a firewall that will allow that data which has been told to our dept. in the past that we do not have the firewall for that.
2. Comments – Provost Runge
   1. See Provost’s Notes on FS webpage
   2. Cyber Security Degree
      1. Multi-disciplinary
      2. Only university in the country that will be able to train students on what is being used in the field.
   3. Submitted letters of intent for a BS in Computer Engineering and our physics track to Physical Engineering.
   4. Graduate Dean Candidate Interview Schedule
   5. Amendment to University Withdrawal Policy
      1. Moving forward with changes
   6. Academic Calendar
      1. FS in December meeting took a no position on the calendar changes for a Monday start.
      2. Met with SGA three times (twice with exec and once with full body) they voted for the Monday start and that fall break would move to a Monday/Tuesday.
      3. Reasons why this has been discussed: 1) reduce number of partial weeks in a semester which will have less impact on classes especially lab and studio courses. 2) Adds three days to beginning of fall and spring semester. Would push Welcome Week up a week but Housing was consulted in order to have time to turn Resident Halls around. 3) a big reason I support the initiative, we compress our welcome week into three and half days. This allows more time for our student volunteers (SOS) to plan and have time to work with freshmen rather than work from 7 am to 2 am. We need to bring students in who are conditional a week early so we can do the summer bridge program to get help before the term starts.
         1. Questions: Senator Isom – Would bridge students not be able to participate in the normal Welcome Week activities?
         2. Senator Winden Fey- because of the time crunch, we cut out the academic portion of Welcome Week to preserve the social aspect to get students involved. We have worked on a schedule for a full Welcome Week that would allow academic aspect in the morning.
         3. Senator Gallavan – When do faculty have to return if we have a Monday start? Will faculty return three days before or a week?
         4. Provost Runge– August 16th is the official start day for 9 month faculty. Unless there is a calendar glitch which did happen a few years ago, faculty will need to report on August 16th which should not be the first day of school.
         5. Senator Copeland – Cyber Security – Is Dr. Chris Davis involved?
         6. Provost Runge– absolutely.
         7. Senator Burley – Adding six instructional days does not mean additional compensation for faculty?
         8. Provost Runge – the contracts have always been August 16th through May 15th. We have had conversations about COLA and merit/equity adjustments and conversations to the CUPA median by disciplines. We are having solid conversations to have a three year plan to get there. It is not a promise but we have had sold conversations.
         9. President Davis – we are trying to propose a systematic method to the BOT to close the gap in 3-4 years and asking them for their assistance to help reach that goal.
         10. Provost Runge – We need about 2.5 million to get to the CUPA median. We are also trying to “fold in” staff into the conversation.
         11. Senator Parrack – I don’t have a strong opinion on the Monday start but I do have an issue about how it came about. How this was rolled out and the issue of shared governance was not considered by stakeholders.
         12. Provost Runge - waited until President Davis was here and discussed this with several bodies starting last fall. Did make sure that those who would have to make adjustments were involved. I don’t agree that there was any intent that groups were not asked and considered on changes to the academic calendar.
         13. Senator Dilday – How receptive would Administration be to changing the “three and out rule”. IF the FS voted to change the Faculty Handbook to change that rule to be that after five years that on the sixth year those individuals received terminal contracts.
         14. FS President McKinzie – Remember that the senate did vote on this early and elected to NOT change the 3 and out rule.
         15. Provost Runge – any recommendations will be heard and President Davis asked to find out what UA does and even though it was hard to find, they have a hard three and out rule.
         16. Senator Isom – Would we ever start classes on August 15th? Second question, the data from the survey cannot be used and we cannot say that faculty did not hold a position. State the truth about the survey rather than saying that faculty did not have a position.
         17. Provost Runge – I do not see that ever happening because of summer camps and Welcome Week.
         18. Senator Burley – I agree with Senator Isom. I think that some took the survey and then when it was not an overwhelming response for either way that we were taken by surprise when it ended up on the board’s agenda.
         19. Senator Winden-Fey – First time IR sent it out the introductory paragraph was omitted. There was some confusion about the survey.
         20. FS President McKinzie – We have three years to implement.
3. Comments – President McKinzie
   1. Meeting will adjourn at 2:30
   2. Welcome new senators
   3. We have voted on constitutional changes but they have not gone through BOT so the changes are not in affect yet.

**Action Items:**

1. Minutes from the last meeting - Secretary Eskola
   1. Motion to approve minutes by Senator Copeland
   2. Second by Senator Mehta
   3. Motion passed
2. Committee Updates/Appointments – VP Duncan
   1. We took care of everyone last meeting
3. Resolutions on Study Abroad Funding
   1. See resolution on FS webpage
   2. Senator Demers moved to accept resolution I
   3. Second by Senator Parrack
   4. Senator Demers - These students are not on campus and still have to pay these fees.
   5. Provost Runge – VP Newton is in agreement with the no fees. Students who are fully on-line are charge the same fees as on campus students. We are proposing a flat fee to BOT for fully on-line programs. It will reduce the fees of those students who will not be using the extra fees. We should talk about something similar with the study abroad students. We do have to look at ramifications on the budget. On the backside, you still have to fund your operations. We may also look at a flat rate.
   6. Senator Copeland – How many students are affected by the flat fee?
   7. Provost Runge – around 75 to 80 students
   8. Senator Parrack – What is the origin of the resolution?
   9. FS President McKinzie – came from a constituent to write resolution and they approached their representative to assist in writing it.
   10. Senator Walter – Are most Honor’s College students?
   11. Senator McMullen – supportive of this because if a student cannot take advantage of the service they should not have to pay the fees.
   12. Senator Duncan – moved to table the motion
   13. Second by Senator Eskola
4. Resolution on Adjunct Pay
   1. Motion by Senator Padberg on resolution
   2. Second by Senator Christman
   3. Senator Parrack – forth whereas – I don’t see where these facts are presented.
   4. Senator Dilday – Those who are teach a four hour course get paid the same?
   5. FS President McKinzie – No they are not the same but are paid per credit hour.
   6. Senator Forbush – Motion to amend and add three hour in the first and fourth whereas
   7. Second by Senator Duncan
   8. Senator Duncan – commend the writer’s resolution to mirror the three year goals that the President
   9. Senator Parrack – Wonder if would be better to have simple numbers instead of percentage.
   10. Senator Forbush – anytime you put specific numbers in a resolution then you are saying that those figure are concrete. There may be some inaccuracies so the percent increase allows for modifications.
   11. Senator Christman – proposes and amendment to the resolved to include summer.
   12. Senator Parrack second
   13. Motion to add summer passed
   14. Senator Burley – why are we not asking the faculty salary review committee and not SBAC?
   15. Dr. Rogers – This should ideally be coming out of faculty salary review to SBAC.
   16. Motion passed

**Information Items:**

1. Academic Affairs, Senator McMullen, Chair
   1. See document on FS webpage
   2. **Charge:** By the last meeting of this Faculty Senate in April 2017, provide a review of a subset of our peer, aspirant and competitive universities letter grade policies and any academic trends as it pertains to using whole letter grades (A, B, C, D, F) or using some other measure such as a + or - system combined with letter grades (A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, ...).

**Methodology:** Members of the Committee were tasked with reviewing the grading policy of a number universities and reporting back to the Chair. In addition to the report, the members of the Committee thought that a campus survey would be beneficial. To that end, the Committee worked with Institutional Research to develop a survey that was distributed to the campus community.

**Findings:**

Other Universities: Members of the committee reviewed the policies at Arkansas’ four-year institutions, UCA’s peer and aspirant institutions, and UCA’s Southland Conference peers. The trend toward whole letter grades versus plus/minus grades appears to be regional, with southern schools using whole letter grades and Midwestern and northeastern schools using plus/minus grades.

Arkansas: John Brown University uses plus/minus grades, as does the University of Arkansas in its law school, architecture school, and agricultural college. The law school at the University of Arkansas—Little Rock uses a numerical system were a grade point (4.0 to 1.2) is assigned. All other Arkansas four-year institutions use a whole letter system.

Southland Conference: All Southland Conference peers use whole letter grades.

Peer Institutions: Seven of our peer institutions use plus/minus grading systems:

Plus/minus: Appalachian State University, William Paterson University of New Jersey, CUNY Lehman College, Middle Tennessee State University, Eastern Michigan University, Northern Kentucky University, Minnesota State University—Mankato.

Whole letters: Arkansas State University, Morehead State University, Northern Kentucky University, Texas A&M International University, University of Central Oklahoma, University of Tennessee—Chattanooga, University of Louisiana—Lafayette, University of West Georgia, Valdosta State University

Aspirant Institutions: Twelve of our aspirant institutions use plus/minus grading systems:

Plus/minus: San Jose State University, Central Connecticut State University, University of Northern Iowa, Western Illinois University, Bridgewater State University (MA), Grand Valley State University, Missouri State University, Kean University (NJ), Baruch College (NY), Brooklyn College (NY), Buffalo State SUNY, West Chester University (PA)

Whole letters: Eastern Illinois University, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville, Murray State University, University of Central Missouri, Texas State University

Survey Data: The results of the survey are listed on the following pages. The highlights are as follows:

Note: In describing the two systems, a plus/minus system is defined as ones with grades such as A, A-, B+, B, B-, etc. A hybrid system is one with grades defined as A, AB, B, BC, etc.

1. After eliminating blank responses (respondents who opened the survey but did not complete enough of the survey for the data to be meaningful), we had 275 faculty members, 82 staff members, and 1137 students complete the survey. (Some applications did not complete the entire survey, but their results were included if they gave opinions on at least converting to a plus/minus or hybrid system.)
2. Faculty were split nearly evenly on their opinions about a plus/minus grading system, with 123 favoring the system and 120 disfavoring the system (30 were neutral). The greatest proponents of a plus/minus system were in Fine Arts and Communication (31/51 favoring, 21 of those strongly favoring) and Liberal Arts (35/52 favoring, 16 of those strongly favoring). The biggest opponents were Business (20/28 disfavoring, with 18 of those strongly disfavoring) and University College (6/7 disfavoring, 5 of those strongly disfavoring). Faculty were unified in their dislike of the hybrid system, with 198/275 disfavoring, 138 of those strongly disfavoring.
3. In response to a faculty member who wanted to go as far as eliminating D’s from our grading policy, respondents were asked about eliminating D’s. Only 14/272 faculty members, 7/79 staff members, and 89/1099 students favored eliminating D’s. Surprisingly, while most of the faculty believed that a D should a passing grade (232/272), there was a substantial (but not majority) support among staff and students for a D being a failing grade. (23/79 staff members and 352/1100 students disfavored D being a passing grade.)
4. Faculty were split on whether there should be discretion in giving plus/minus grades, with 127 favoring faculty member discretion and 123 favoring a mandatory policy (19 were neutral). However, of those favoring faculty member discretion, 101 strongly favored it.
5. A majority of faculty thought that a change in policy would have no effect on retention, graduate school applications, transfers to UCA, or transfers from UCA. Of those who thought that a change would make a difference, however, the plurality thought that the change would be slightly positive in each case. The opinions of UCA staff were much more diverse. A plurality of staff members thought that a plus/minus system would have a positive effect on retention (32 positive, 22 none, 24 negative) and graduate applications (32 positive, 19 none, 27 negative). A plurality of staff members thought that there would be no change to the effect on transfers to UCA (22 positive, 29 none, 24 negative) or transfers from UCA (26 positive, 31 none, 20 negative).
6. When it came to the students, we received a good cross section of the student body as it relates to classifications and colleges, but not grades. A majority (654/1135) self-reported a cumulative GPAs of 3.5 and above. Only 56 self-reported a cumulative GPA of below 2.5.
7. Students do not like the plus/minus system (808/1130 disfavored the system, with 620 strongly disfavoring it). The hybrid system faired only slightly better (736 disfavoring the system, with 557 strongly disfavoring it). More students opined that their GPAs would go down (455) than up (341). The overwhelming majority of students thought that a change would not affect how much they would learn or study. Of those for whom they believe a change would make a difference, more students thought that they would study more (317 more to 106 less), but more students thought that they would learn less (177 less to 136 more).

We finally note that our charge was merely to research and present the information. While members of the committee have their own opinions on these policies, we as a committee offer no opinion as to whether our grading policy should be changed.

1. Faculty Affairs I, Senator Copeland, Chair
   1. See documents on FS webpage
   2. CHARGE # 1 UPDATE: Faculty Affairs I reviewed and updated the Senate Bylaws. With respect to alignment, the Senate Bylaws were updated in relation to the revised Senate Constitution based on the results of the Faculty Association approval of the proposed four (4) Bundled Resolutions (eight [8] Resolutions Total) on March 7- 9, 2017.
   3. The Update Bylaws have been sent to the Executive Committee for the Senate Meeting April 27, 2017
   4. Working manual edits will carry over to next senate
2. Faculty Affairs II, Senator Spivey, Chair
   1. See documents on FS webpage
   2. Charge 2:  Work with the Faculty Salary Review Committee (and others as deemed necessary) to review the salary for adjunct, part time and overload faculty in comparison with our peer, aspirant and Arkansas competitor institutions. By the first meeting of the Faculty Senate in March 2017, make recommendations (potentially a resolution) to the Faculty Senate as to our current policies and salaries for these types of teaching roles.

Minutes: Committee members reviewed data collected by the 2014 Faculty Affairs I Committee concerning adjunct, part-time, and overload faculty pay at UCA in comparison with our peer, aspirant, and Arkansas institutions. In addition, we added what little updated data we could find. We have been attempting to collect 2017 data and have limited data, because of the lack of response from peer and aspirant institutions.

* Arkansas institutions’ adjunct, part-time, and overload pay scale means: $1,879 to $2,520 (2015)
* Aspirant institution adjunct, part-time, and overload pay scale means: $3,072 to $4,402 (2015)
* UCA adjunct, part-time, and overload pay is slightly higher than most Arkansas institutions, but significantly lower than Aspirant institutions.

Currently, UCA pays $2,652 per course for adjunct, part-time, and overload (2017). If a similar 2% increase since 2015 is added to Arkansas and aspirant institutions pay scales, then the means would be: Arkansas institutions - $1,917 to $2,570 and Aspirant institutions - $3,133 to $4,490.

**Recommendation**: If UCA is to remain above Arkansas institution pay scales **and** reach the mean of Aspirant institution pay scales, then UCA would have to pay $3,384 per course for adjunct, part-time, and overload. **Faculty Affairs II Committee recommends the Faculty Salary Review Committee consider proposing a minimum adjunct, part-time, overload pay increase of 5% annually per course for the next 4 years, in order to** **reach the Aspirant institution average pay of $3,384 per course. In addition, we recommend Faculty Salary Review Committee work closely with SBAC on this issue.**

**Guests:**

1. UCA Online Policy Updates
   1. Dr. Boniecki – See draft on FS webpage
   2. At what point do you think this will no longer be a draft and be permanent?
   3. After this meeting with FS feedback.
   4. Questions – Senator Isom – If I make my own videos, since I am not using UCA’s resources that would still be mine and not property of UCA, correct?
   5. Dr. Boniecki – correct
   6. Senator Duncan – the content regardless will still go with us. If we produced that video, UCA still may have some rights but it will be able to still go with me.
   7. If it is produced with the assistance of others at UCA then it will remain with UCA.
   8. FS President McKinzie – a lot of videos are on You Tube. Do I have to download to UCA’s servers?
   9. Dr. Boniecki – Let me ask Michael Judge but I do not think they would have to be on UCA’s server.
   10. Senator Forbush – If professor gives that course to someone then they relinquish those rights.
   11. Senator Burley – Work for hire?
   12. Dr. Boniecki – We would have to develop an agreement for part time faculty.
   13. Senator Forbush – FS may want to consider a vote of support
   14. Provost Runge – Agree with Senator Forbush that it would nice for a vote of support since this was a hot topic when we started discussing UCA on-line
   15. Senator Parrack – I move that FS support this policy.
   16. Second by Senator Eskola
   17. Motion passed
2. SBAC update
   1. Dr. Tammy Rogers
   2. see documents on FS webpage for update
3. Budget update
   1. See document and power points on FS webpage
   2. Senator Parrack – Are those transfers out of Physical Plant? Are you transferring item 4 to cover item 15. What is the overall FTE enrollment?
   3. 260,000 student semester credit hours for UG. We go to IR for information.
   4. Information for item 1 was from 2016-2017 numbers.

**Other beginning at 2:00 PM**

1. Passing of the gavel
2. Faculty announcements and concerns
   1. Senator Bogoslavsky - I wanted to mention some recent work we have been doing in UC. We are looking at the data on our conditional students. Before co-req model, we were getting about 30% of those students through credit-bearing courses. Now, with the co-req, we are over 70% (both math and writing). We are also analyzing data to see how they are progressing through after those initial classes.

I only mention this because the data is preliminary, but Dr. Baldwin will have all the numbers after the summer. I didn't know if that type of information is something you would want presented, and I am biased, but I think the campus needs to know what is going on with those students who are generally our toughest to advance. In the fall, if anyone wants to know more, Dr. Baldwin would be happy to give an update.

* 1. Senator Copeland - Our Department Faculty have requested that the "Official" Faculty Handbook Policy be made available online.
  2. Senator Parrack and Senator Isom both expressed concern from constituents about the process and the lack of shared governance about the Monday start in 2020. While they made it clear that constituents were not necessarily against the Monday start, they felt like the support for the Monday start was not reliable and that the process was rushed.
  3. Senator Dahlenburg - I received the following:

“I tried to take the faculty survey today.  The beginning sections were okay.  But the diary section?? Why does the survey want to know what I do on my off time and with whom?  Also, the ethnic choices were not inclusive or representative...White (only)?!?  Why are we still asked these ridiculous questions?”

* 1. Senator Eskola also received concerns about the timing of the workload survey. Constituents were upset because the charge was given in August 2016 but this survey comes out on the final day of classes (for most) in the following semester. They stated that it may not be a “good snapshot” of faculty workload because you may see the extremes but most faculty workloads are lighter on the last day of classes.
  2. Senator Duncan - A constituent was concerned that the online final exam schedule does not map onto our traditional final exam schedule. He has a student who is taking both online and in-person courses. The exam time scheduled for his online class straddles the time allotted for two of his in-person finals. Luckily, in this instance the faculty member was able to work with his chair and dean to make arrangements, but this concern seems to have the potential for broader impact as we move to offering more online courses.

The issue was that the instructor for the online course was permitted to make a final exam time (from 12-4, which is why it affected two different finals). There is no official policy, I suspect, for online instructors in establishing those timelines.

1. Adjournment