Minutes

University of Central Arkansas Faculty Senate

Thursday, March 10th, 2015

12:45 p.m. – Room 315: Wingo Hall

**Attendance:**

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

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

College of Fine Arts and Communication: Garry Craig Powell (2015) a, 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) a

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) a, Lisa Ray (2017)

Part-Time Senator: Deb Forssman Hill (2015)

1. Call to Order – By Senator Rowley
   1. Call to order – 12:45 pm
2. Consideration of Minutes – February 26th, 2015
   1. Move by Senator Copeland, Second Mehta
   2. Discussion: Senator Bratton corrected attendance
   3. Vote, unanimous in favor, 2 abstentions
3. Coca-Cola Resolutions and Possible Votes
   1. See attached resolutions
   2. Move to bring forward IDC grants by Senator McKinzie, Second Morris
      1. Discussion: Presentation by Amy Hawkins, Director of the IDC. (See Appendices A-D)
         1. Senator Parrack: Is there no additional support for the on-line programs?
            1. Provost Runge: No, that was a one-time allocation. We funded 9000 from our reserves last year and that will likely happen again next year, for online or any professional development.
         2. Senator Isom: What were the historical numbers regarding funding for faculty development?
            1. Roughly 20,000, as opposed to our current 9000. So we bumped it this year and Faculty Senate assisted as well.
         3. Senator Feng: Can this be only for travel to conferences?
            1. No, it can also be used to bring people here.
         4. Senator Forssman Hill: Are these open to all faculty?
            1. Yes, adjuncts, part-time, visiting…We’ve also relaxed guidelines to make sure resources get distributed more fairly.
         5. Senator Craun: How does this fit with UCA Online? Is the cost or funding for quality matters certifications going to be covered by IDC?
            1. No, they are separate.
         6. Senator Craun: Would this affect academic affairs’ contributions to departments?
            1. No, this is independent. This also does not impact the stipend money for developing on line courses. This money will be on top of anything else we have already allocated.
         7. Senator McKinzie: This expends all the budget of the Coca-Cola money but if affects maybe 100 of the faculty.
         8. Senator Craun: With this proposal we’re funneling this money and it’s going to narrow the scope of who does apply for or get this money. But it seems we’re taking all of the Coke money and putting it in a small bucket.
         9. Senator Morris: So this wouldn’t be limited to just the three online programs. Anyone on campus teaching on line courses would be able to use these funds.
         10. Senator Craun: But it seems to favor those three programs. It’s not a level playing field.
         11. Senator Eskola: Same concern regarding entire Coke fund going to this. It seems the online program shouldn’t be funded this way. What touches the most faculty? That’s where we should put the money. Plus, there are programs that won’t or don’t want to develop online programs and they will have a limited benefit from this.
         12. Senator Copeland: This could really help people get on line. Could it help those that are thinking about going online?
         13. Senator McKinzie: I think this proposal would send this money to a very small pool. I’d support a friendly amendment to change this to not include all the Coke money.
         14. Senator Parrack: If we “should” go online, if it “needs” to be done then that is simply one’s job and needn’t be incentivized.
         15. Senator Morris: We could offer more grants and this would be a competitive program, so it doesn’t favor anyone. A case must be made.
             1. Amy Hawkins: Yes, it’s a competitive and fair process.
             2. Provost Runge: Point of clarification. It’s one existing program, and two committing to go online. Additional programs will be added in the future. The intent of our funding is to help with that transition. It’s not just those three programs.
         16. Senator Copeland: This proposal is part of a much bigger program. We have to address the trend to offer courses on line.
         17. Senator Morris: In considering all the proposals sent forward, this seems to take the long view in terms of considering where the college is going.
         18. Senator Isom: If this is funding for a necessary initiative, then it should come from administration. This is one-time money, it is not continuing.
         19. Senator Craun: This is not a referendum on on-line. The issue here is that this particular one time money for the faculty at large. In terms of competition, the three programs that need to be online are going to probably take precedence, and so they may get a leg up in this process. So there is an issue of how open and fair the competition for this money will be.
             1. Provost Runge: This isn’t the only way to help faculty to deliver these programs. We’re hiring people who specialize in this…So this is supplemental.
         20. Senator Bratton: Concurrence with Senator Isom. This is one time money and it shouldn’t go to fund or supplement programs that should be funded by the administration.
         21. Senator Eskola: Why do we need to spend 34,000 dollars this semester? Can’t we put it in a fund?
             1. Provost Runge: This money is in a rollover account. It’s an accumulation of 2 years. If not spent it will be there next year.
         22. Senator Parker: So will there be money if we don’t’ spend it?
             1. Provost Runge: Yes, the 34,000 will be there next year if you don’t spend it. The amount of new money is unclear. But holding it over won’t impact the money received next year.
         23. Senator Craun: Call the question, Second by Senator Wilson
             1. Vote to call the question, unanimous in favor, 2 abstentions.
      2. Vote on the IDC proposal
         1. Vote 6 in favor, 11 nays, 3 abstentions.
         2. Motion fails.
      3. Move to consider the proposal on bonuses by Senator McKinzie, second by Senator Eskola (See appendix E)
         1. Discussion: Senator Eskola, discuss intention of this.
         2. Senator Parrack: This violates the contract with Coca-Cola. We can’t do this. Contract states this can’t be used for salaries or benefits.
         3. Senator McKinzie withdraws, Senator Eskola concurs.
      4. Motion to consider Parking Senator McKinzie, Second by Senator Stoltz. (See Appendix F)
         1. Discussion: Is this a benefit?
         2. Provost Runge: Be really careful on this. This may be a benefit and so violate the contract. You should check with legal.
         3. Senator Eskola: Plus this goes to UCA PD. How would this affect their budget, aren’t we just giving them that money?
         4. Senator Forssman Hill: Why not consider part time and adjunct in this as well?
         5. Senator McKinzie: Withdraw motion, second approves.
         6. Senator Rowley: We should triple check this and bring it back to legal.
         7. Senator Lichtenstein: Did the original agreement indicate how the money could be spent?
      5. Discussion is closed.
4. Report from Faculty Affairs I Committee
   1. Senator Eskola presents the report
      1. Recommend this proposal go back to the Honors College to develop a compromise.
5. Report from Faculty Affairs II Committee
   1. No Report
6. Report from Academic Affairs Committee
   1. Senator Craun: (See Appendix G, survey results)
      1. We did not come up with a recommended policy. But simply wanted to report how faculty perceive the issue. Summary: Most faculty don’t want a policy, if there was one they seem to want it to be quite lenient.
      2. Senator McKinzie: Faculty also wanted greater support in enforcing their policies.
      3. Provost Runge: I’m glad you educated the faculty on extent policies. This is really good, good feedback.
7. Announcements
   1. Senator Eskola: April 23rd we’ll do national walk at lunch day on x-period.
   2. Senator Held: Kudos to Library Faculty and Staff for volunteering space for a lactation suite. One open 24/5.
8. 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.***)
   1. Submitted by Senator Dahlenburg: *“I'm sending this to my senators and a few people that I'm assuming are alarmed about the possibility that we may be forced to allow guns on campus. Is there anything we can do about this lunacy at the moment? Is there anything we can do should it come to pass? Am I over-reacting to be thinking about some form of strike or other mass protest or act of civil disobedience? I don't think we should quietly lay down for this. I don't want to work in Dodge City c. 1878! Senators, please pass on this concern at the next senate meeting.”*
   2. Second Email: *Dear Senators,  
        
      I was the Resident Master at the  University of Central Arkansas in the fall of 2008 when two of my students were shot and killed outside of my apartment door - I heard the gun shots and was the first to witness the bodies before the police arrived on the scene.  Frightened students standing in the courtyard and in the college lobby took refuge in my apartment until the campus police could arrive. The following minutes, hours and days are forever in my memory, as are the lives of the two students who were innocent bystanders of a drive-by shooter.  
        
       I can personally attest that there would have been nothing beneficial if others in the crowd had been allowed to carry guns on campus. I can only imagine the additional chaos that would have ensued.  
        
      I continue to teach at this university because I believe in the democratic process and the good judgement of our Board of Trustees who have wisely voted to keep weapons off of our campus.  
        
      I am not opposed to gun ownership, i own shotguns for the sport of skeet and trap shooting, I had a 20 year with the Department of Defense before teaching in Higher Education, and earned a Masters Diploma in National Security and Strategic Studies from the Naval War College.  
        
      The US Constitution allows us the right to bare arms, but while protecting that right, legislators also have a duty to create laws that protect the public.  HB1077 would create and even encourage opportunities for reactionary violence.  
        
      Please respect the will of your public when they have already voiced the opposition to HB1077 through Board of Trustee resolutions to keep our institutions of higher learning free from weapons.*
      1. A lively email exchange accompanied this email.
      2. Statement by Provost Runge: I’ve received several emails. None speak in favor of the current legislation. My positions and the President’s position is that we don’t’ favor the loss of the “opt out” option in this legislation. This is the word we are giving as an institution to the state legislature.
      3. Senator Craun: Be aware that there are a good 35 percent of the faculty that favor concealed carry on campus.
   3. Senator Craun: Email proposal for Coke money from Lynn Burley. See Appendix ?
   4. Senator Craun: Please when you ask legal ask what “continuing programs” means as well as “benefits.”
   5. Senator Feng: submitted Emailed concern: *I would like the committee to consider the pay given to faculty concerning overloads. If the adjuncts are getting paid $3300, then faculty need to be paid the same amount.*
   6. Senator Stoltz: In the summer the smell by the cafeteria is foul. Can anything be done about this?
   7. Senator Isom: submitted concern: *"A request has been made that UCA hold open forums for the three finalists for the Director of Admissions position. (UALR holds these type of forums for high level position finalists)"*
   8. Provost Runge: Comment on Senator Isom’s concern. I requested a forum for the director of admissions candidate and the committee opted not to. Discussion ensues: Senators Wilson, Isom, Eskola, McKinzie, and Provost Runge
9. Adjournment
   1. Motion Senator Rowley, Second Senator Eskola

Next Faculty Senate meeting March 19th at 12:45 p.m.