

UCA Faculty Senate Minutes of Tuesday, March 8th, 2011 at 1245pm, Wingo Hall 315

Members Present (/a: absent; /aa: absent advised)

- Business Administration: Bartczak, Bradley, Moore.
- Education: Albritton/aa, Copeland, Hebert.
- Fine Arts And Communication: Browne, President Burley, Castner Post.
- Health And Behavioral Sciences: Fletcher, Poole, Ray.
- Liberal Arts: Arnold, Parrack, Spivey.
- Natural Sciences And Mathematics: BrattonG, Isom, Rowley.
- At-Large Senators: Acre, BrattonD, Jones, Lichtenstein, WilsonA., WilsonJ.
- Senator For Part-Time Faculty: RungeN.
- Office Of The Provost: Provost Grahn.

I. Approval of Minutes from February 24, 2011 (attached)

MOTION TO APPROVE: Copeland, Ray

MOTION APPROVED.

II. Remarks, President Meadors

- 1) The legislative bill regarding remedial education is no longer under consideration. Passage of this bill would have cost UCA approximately \$3,000,000.
- 2) The big unknown with regard to the State budget is the issue of tax cuts.
- 3) Compared to many universities, our budget situation is not too bad.
- 4) UCA is trying to limit the fy2011-2012 tuition/fee increase to no more than 4%. Our Arkansas colleague institutions are projecting 4% to 6%.

III. Remarks, Provost Lance Grahn

- 1) Last week, along with three faculty from the UCA General Education Council, attended the Association of American Colleges and Universities meeting on general education assessment. We have a lot of work to do, but there are a lot of good models from which we can borrow.
- 2) Despite some of the negative material in the press lately linking UCA to former UCA President, Lu Hardin, please keep in mind that UCA can and will move ahead in a positive direction. Our recent Higher Learning Commission report advised that, as long as we move positively into the future and not stay in the past, UCA can achieve excellence.
- 3) With regard to the fy2011-2012 budget, hard decision will have to be made. The budget is not expanding; we do not foresee having more money. However, we can still achieve great things.
- 4) Today's agenda has generated a lot of interest. As we move through this agenda, please be mindful and respectful of your colleagues.

5) Thank you for the good work you are doing for our students, for UCA, and for our profession.

Bradley: Objects to one of the Provost's comments about an "attack" by one faculty member against another faculty member at the last meeting.

President Burly: So Noted.

IV. President's Report

A. Charge to Committee on Committees: Determine the feasibility of creating a membership position for a part-time faculty member on the Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee.

WilsonJ: The new chair of the Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee is Dr. Victor Puelo, Department of Economics, Finance, and Insurance & Risk Management

B. Faculty Affairs I: Determine the feasibility of placing the part-time Senator on one of the standing Faculty Senate Committees.

C. Strategic Planning and Resource Committee Draft: Strategic Planning Initiatives (attached)

President Burley: The draft was sent to all Senators for comment. Please email comments to President Burley. Thank you to Mike Schaeffer for all the hard work he and his committee members have been doing.

WilsonJ: What's the next step for the Strategic Planning Initiative?

President Burley: [to Mike Schaefer] Would you like to respond?

Schaefer: Thank you. A full draft of the strategic plan that will go to President Meadors, the faculty, and others. However, the initiatives, as chosen by the whole campus, are set.

BrattonG: With regard to item "B" above, please note that the Faculty Senate Constitution (III.1.B) addresses and specifies the role of the Part-Time Faculty Senator.

V. Faculty Handbook Resolution on the Reorganization of Chapter Three (attached)

MOTION TO APPROVE: Parrack, Bradley.

Parrack: This reorganization represents several years of work by the Faculty Handbook Committee and ample input from Faculty. Request approval so the reorganized chapter may be presented to the Board of Trustees.

Bradley: Concurs with Parrack and requests approval. It is time for this to go to the Board.

MOTION APPROVED.

VI. Faculty Handbook Resolution on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ranks (attached)

MOTION TO APPROVE: Ray, BrattonD.

BrattonG: MOTION TO DIVIDE THE QUESTION; 2nd Isom.

MOTION APPROVED

President Burley: Let's begin by considering, 1) the creation of a third level of rank for non-tenure track continuing faculty (with titles "senior lecturer, "senior clinical instructor" and "clinical professor" and "senior laboratory instructor")

Castner Post: These are all non-tenurable ranks, correct? What about the issue of the addition of the titles "clinical assistant professor" and "clinical associate professor"?

President Burley: That issue is the other half of the question.

Fletcher: The faculty in my college (CHBS) whom I have received feedback from support the resolution, without exception. They believe the FHC workgroup considered all sides of the issue and recognizes there are differences between disciplines and faculty. The proposal gives a choice, not a mandate. They believe that not allowing appropriate disciplines the right to use expanded advancement within NTT ranks is restrictive and harmful and that UCA is too diverse of a university to have a one-size-fits-all tenure track system. The needs of the CHBS are not being met under the current system. This proposal will help with both recruitment and retention of clinical faculty, especially since most NTT faculty in CHBS have greater earning potential should they choose to return to practice as their primary source of income. We need this proposal as a better mechanism to recognize individual professional growth. The CHBS faculty do not fear the change and diversity the proposal would bring and feel that it will help UCA as it becomes a more diverse, comprehensive university that is growing and changing to meet the demands of the public. They trust the faculty of the departments and colleges to establish the guidelines and criteria for the ranks that will be needed to ensure that the mission of the dept and university is fulfilled.

(additional comments: Ray, Copeland, BrattonD, Bradley, Castner Post, Burley, Fletcher, Browne, President Meadors, Isom, Acre, Parrack, BrattonG)

MOTION TO CALL THE QUESTION: Bradley, Parrack.

MOTION APPROVED with paper ballot: 16 for, 6 against, no abstentions.

President Burley: We will now consider the second half of the resolution, 2) the addition of the titles "clinical assistant professor" and "clinical associate professor."

Castner Post: It is not a good idea to keep creating non-tenure track positions.

President Burley: I will submit for the record the position of UCA's AAUP Chapter as submitted by Mike Schaeffer,

"Resolution: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ranks

Key Concerns and Questions

In the spirit of shared governance, UCA's Richard Hudson Chapter of the American Association of University Professors has reviewed a resolution before the Faculty Senate that seeks to add four additional non-tenurable ranks.

We offer here for your consideration our key concerns, along with explanations and supporting data. We further include at the end of this document a list of questions we believe need to be addressed before any action is taken.

The approval of this resolution:

1) is almost certain to worsen existing gender inequities

UCA's Institutional Research has not yet posted 2010 data, but data from 2000-2009 reveals hiring patterns worth noting:

- The percentage of tenured or tenure-track full-time faculty who were female ranged from 33-37%.
- For non-tenurable appointments, the percentage of females was approximately twice as large (65-72%).
- Approximately one-half of full-time female faculty held non-tenurable positions, compared to only about 1 in 5 males.

Thus, non-tenurable positions appear to contribute to a troubling discrepancy between male and female faculty status and salary.

The creation of four additional non-tenured ranks, especially those with the lure of a professorial title, is almost certain to further this gender inequity.

2) will promote unfairness by increasing the number of faculty made vulnerable by few protections for academic freedom

Writing for the POPE Center for Higher Education Policy (2009), Donald Downs articulates what many of us already know: "Faculty members who do not have tenure also enjoy basic due process and academic freedom protections, though generally less fully than faculty members who have tenure—mainly because they have limited-term contracts, and because the politics and folkways of campus life bestow more power upon tenured faculty members." [www.popecenter.org]

The creation of additional non-tenurable ranks increases the number of faculty who, by the very nature of their contract, will have less academic freedom than their tenured colleagues.

At our university, the Faculty Handbook makes clear the value of academic freedom, noting that it is “essential to free inquiry and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. The teaching aspect of academic freedom is fundamental to freedom in learning.”

Adding four additional non-tenurable ranks goes against the institution’s core values.

3) will stop the important discussion of how “teaching-only” faculty might attain tenure.

If we continue to appoint faculty to “teaching-only” positions, isn’t it only fair that we create alternate paths toward tenure? As the AAUP notes, “Tenure was not designed as a merit badge for research-intensive faculty or as a fence to exclude those with teaching-intensive commitments.”

Adding a “Senior Lecturer” position may seem to offer a reward for years of teaching excellence in a non-tenured position. Yet in many ways, it’s an insult. In effect, it says: “Yes, we value your work; yes, you do a terrific job teaching students; yes, you are an important part of our profession and play a significant role in our department. Yet, we don’t believe you are worthy of tenure.”

Developing criteria for a tenure-eligible Senior Lecturer position should receive a considered look. As a teaching-only position, such criteria could include evidence of successful teaching, service to the profession as well as to the university, and appropriate forms of engagement in research or the scholarship of teaching. Some departments are already beginning conversations about the possibility of creating such tenure-eligible positions. However, the approval of an NTT third level of advancement is bound to silence such discussions.

4) will continue a gross disproportion of term appointments to tenure appointments in some departments

Four of the eight departments in the College of Health and Behavioral Sciences have significantly less than 40% tenure-line faculty. Startlingly, one department’s faculty is 81% non-tenurable instructors; the faculty make-up of two additional departments is over 50% clinical instructors.

While we understand administrators’ expressed need for “flexibility” in hiring, these numbers suggest a calculated institutionalization of marginalized faculty.

5) may increase the service burden for tenure-line faculty

Shared governance depends upon faculty involvement. However, numerous college- and university-level committees require appointments from the tenure-line faculty who may feel more secure than their non-tenured colleagues in voicing positions of dissent. And perhaps

rightly so, since non-tenured faculty hold year-to-year contracts, making them vulnerable to pressure from any number of sources.

6) may adversely affect graduation rates at a time when such rates may be used in Arkansas as a basis for funding higher education, and UCA specifically

A number of recent studies indicate that permanent non-tenure track faculty appointments have negative consequences for student retention and graduation. A study by Ronald Ehrenberg and Liang Zhang raised the question: “Do Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty Matter?” [Cornell Higher Education Research Institute Working Paper 53 (2004)] Their research addressed “whether the increased usage of such faculty adversely affects undergraduate students' graduation rates.” They report “using institutional level panel data from the College Board and other sources,” and believe their “econometric analyses suggest that the increased usage of these faculty types does adversely affect graduation rates of students at 4-year colleges, with the largest impact on students being felt at the public masters-level institutions.”

7) will reverse a recent uptick at UCA of tenure-line faculty

Ten years ago, out of the total number of faculty (including full- and part-time), UCA’s percentage of tenure-line faculty equaled around 50%. This academic year, tenure-line faculty comprise at least 65% of total faculty. Increasing the number of non-tenured ranks will invite a reversal of this positive increase.

8) will change UCA’s definition of “professor.”

At UCA, the word “professor” actually means something: that you have earned a terminal degree in your field and have been judged by your peers to be worthy of a certain rank. If this resolution is approved, the word “professor” becomes almost meaningless since neither a terminal degree nor peer review is a requirement of this title.

Of note is the fact that UA-Fayetteville does award the title Clinical Assistant Professor and Clinical Associate Professor to faculty in its College of Education & Health Professions. Within this college are such departments as Curriculum and Instruction, Health Science, Kinesiology, Recreation and Dance; Rehabilitation, Human Resources and Communication Disorders; and The Eleanor Mann School of Nursing.

Based on a review of the college’s website, the college employs 14 faculty in clinical assistant professor positions and 2 in clinical associate professor positions.

Of further note is that ALL 16 of the faculty in these positions HAVE DOCTORAL DEGREES.

Unanswered Questions

While the list below is by no means exhaustive, among the questions this resolution fails to address are these:

- 1) How will departments determine whether to hire faculty into clinical instructorship positions or clinical professorship positions? What separates the positions?
- 2) What happens to existing clinical instructors? Will all be offered clinical assistant professorships?
- 3) Are there rank differences between, say, a clinical instructor II and a clinical assistant professor? Which is the higher rank? To what purposes might this hierarchy be used?
- 4) Are there salary differences between the clinical instructorships and the clinical assistant professorships? If so, what are the salary differences?
- 5) How will the salaries of the three clinical professorships be reported in our SREB salary reports? Will these new positions skew our averages even lower than they already are?
- 6) Some departments already have a disproportionate number of non-tenured faculty. Will adding four new non-tenured positions invite even larger disproportions?"

President Burley: I will submit for the record a statement from Dr. Neil Hattlestad, Dean CHBS concerning this issue,

"Colleagues:

Please review the strong opposition to the NTT resolution by the AAUP chapter (attached) as well as the uninformed criticism of the College of Health and Behavioral Sciences. As a comprehensive institution with a growing national reputation, particularly in programs in this college, policies should be in place that will support and sustain that growth. It is difficult to understand how a college with graduates who score among the highest nationally in licensure examinations and find immediate employment in their chosen field should be singled out for such criticism. The members of our faculty and our students work very hard, and deserve better.

The Faculty Handbook Committee under the exceptional leadership of Dr. John Parrack, invested countless hours in the development of the NTT resolution. It would be most unfortunate if those efforts were to be ignored."

(discussion and comments: Fletcher, Castner Post, visitor Mike Schaefer, Parrack, Browne, Isom, Copeland, Bradley, Rowley, visitor Barbara Williams, visitor Francie Bolter, Burley, BrattonG, Arnold)

MOTION TO DEFEAT and call for paper ballot: Parrack, Ray.

MOTION DEFEATED: 5 for, 16 against, 1 abstention.

VII. Committee Reports

A. Executive Committee

President Burley: No report.

B. Committee on Committees

WilsonJ: No report.

C. Academic Affairs

Castner Post: No report.

D. Faculty Affairs I

Fletcher: No report.

E. Faculty Affairs II

Ray: No report.

VIII. Announcements and Concerns

RungeN: Question to BrattonG concerning “BrattonG: With regard to item "B" above, please note that the Faculty Senate Constitution (III.1.B) addresses and specifies the role of the Part-Time Faculty Senator.” What does this section say?

BrattonG: Reads III.1.B: “B. Ex Officio: (For purposes of this paragraph 'part-time faculty' means 'part-time employees of the university with teaching included as a responsibility of their appointment.')

One part-time faculty member of the university elected by the part-time faculty of the university. This shall be a non-voting member except on issues that directly affect the part-time faculty of the university as determined by the president of the Faculty Senate.”

Fletcher: Requests clarification of vote on “Faculty Handbook Resolution on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Ranks.” Did we defeat “the addition of the titles ‘clinical assistant professor’ and ‘clinical associate professor’”?

Browne: If yes, what’s left of the resolution that passed.

BrattonG: We approved, “the creation of a third level of rank for non-tenure track continuing faculty (with titles ‘senior lecturer,’ ‘senior clinical instructor’ and ‘senior laboratory instructor’)”

Rowley: Gives update on search for Vice President for Enrollment Management. There are five candidates on the short list.

WilsonA: Submits constituent concerns regarding the 2011 Holiday Calendar,

“Constituent 1 Concern:

As you may know, HR has sent out the 2011 holiday calendar. The President, his Executive Council, and the leadership of the Staff Senate have approved the university being closed for 10 working days during December for our Christmas break. This means that people who earn vacation/sick time will have to give up 4 vacation days or, if they are eligible, earn comp time.

Staff can officially earn comp time so it is not an issue for them. Nor is it an issue for 9 month faculty. However, 12 month faculty cannot earn comp time and are being penalized by having to use 4 vacation days at a time that is not of their choosing. Also, this can pose a problem for any new employees that are 12 month faculty if they begin their employment late in the year; they may not even have time to earn enough hours of vacation time to equal 4 days. If the administration is going to impose this on 12 month faculty, then I feel that there should be some type of arrangement for 12 month faculty to not be forced to use 4 of their vacation days for the Christmas holidays. I am not necessarily unhappy with having 10 working days off but I am unhappy with being made to give up 4 vacation days when staff and 9 month faculty are not required to give up anything.

Twelve month faculty are as much a part of the UCA faculty body as the 9 month faculty and I would like for the Faculty Senate to address this with the administration on our behalf. Thank you.

Constituent 2 Concern:

I agree with [my colleague] on this one. It isn't fair to require 12 month faculty to be required to give up four days of vacation pay, or any vacation pay for that matter. And she is correct, a new employee could easily find themselves in the "hole" in regard to vacation time.

Constituent 3 Concern:

I, too, think it is unfair that the 12 month faculty have no provision for officially earning comp time when the university decides to close. We are being treated unfairly because of our position.

I would hope that the Faculty Senate would see that we are as much a part of the university as the 9 month faculty. Thank you for your time.

Constituent 4 Concern:

I would like to express my concerns about the holiday schedule and the mandated use of 4 vacation days during the Christmas break. As 12-month faculty cannot earn comp time, this means that we will have to use vacation time. It does seem that staff, who can earn comp time and 9-month faculty have an unfair advantage. New 12-month faculty hired after the beginning of July will also be at a disadvantage, as they will have barely earned enough to have 4 days. I hope that the Faculty Senate will discuss this and perhaps find a more equitable solution."

President Meadors: With regard to this issue, please keep in mind that it affects not just Library Faculty but also all 12 month faculty including both the President and the Provost.

Lichtenstein: President Meadors is correct. However, please keep in mind also that salaries for Library Faculty are inequitably and dismally low. For example, the two most recent Library

Faculty hires will start at \$36,000 for a twelve month work year. They work through all intersessions, semester breaks, reading days, etc. Should they choose to pursue tenure, they are required to have, or earn on the job, at least 30 graduate credits, in an approved field, beyond their American Library Association accredited Master's degree, before they apply for tenure. Also, using the \$36,000 as an example, please bear in mind that if adjusted to the normal nine month faculty work schedule, the annual salary for a starting UCA Library Faculty member is \$27,000 per year.

Browne: Constituent concern,

"There is an asterisk at the end of section IV.A. (it shows up again in V.D.) in the Faculty Handbook that states: 'One who holds the sixty semester hour Master of Fine Arts degree with creative thesis in studio art or theatre or one who holds the MFA degree in creative writing is qualified to apply for promotion to each academic rank.'

. . . [personal references deleted] brought this to Kurt's attention via email last year, but my email must not have been enough to get a change going. Technically there is part C in the same section for Exceptions, but that is really for other types of cases IMO. The statement also reads as though someone with a less than 60 hour MFA in Creative Writing is eligible, which is a little flaky to me, but if it is a big deal then keep that language.

I would really like to see this change to something like:

'One who holds the sixty semester hour Master of Fine Arts degree (or the MFA degree in creative writing - if necessary) is qualified to apply for promotion to each academic rank.'"

Bradley: Where do things stand with regard to the Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee and the issues of retirement and health benefits?

Burley: This concern will be brought to the new Fringe Benefits Advisory Committee Chair, Dr. Victor Puelo.

Poole: Regarding the vacation calendar issue, perhaps the problem is not the four days but that it was not announced far enough in advance? Perhaps there could be a compromise worked out?

President Meadors: This type of issue gets complicated, some individuals wish to close the campus and, some individuals do not want us to close the campus; this should be a university wide discussion.

(additional comments: Burley, RungeN)

Rowley: Constituent concern, "What is the status of the Resident Masters proposal?"

President Burly: Still under consideration.

MOTION TO ADJOURN: Fletcher, Arnold.

BrattonD: What's the status of the University College recommendation?

President Burly: Still under consideration.

A. Next Meeting: April 12, 2011.

B. Budget Advisory Committee's next meeting: March 10, 2011 in Wingo 315

C. Faculty Senate will meet at 11:00 on May 3, 2011.

D. Meal tickets for the Cafeteria

IX. Adjournment

MOTION TO ADJOURN APPROVED.

Adjournment Time: 225pm.